

ITERATION OF λ -COMPLETE FORCING
NOTIONS NOT COLLAPSING λ^+ .

SAHARON SHELAH

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Mathematics Department
New Brunswick, NJ USA

ABSTRACT. We look for a parallel to the notion of “proper forcing” among λ -complete forcing notions not collapsing λ^+ . We suggest such a definition and prove that it is preserved by suitable iterations.

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

This research was supported by The Israel Science Foundation founded by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Publication 655.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ - $\text{\textsf{TeX}}$

1.1 Context.

- (a) $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} > \aleph_0$ and
- (b) $\mathcal{S}^1, \mathcal{S}^2$ disjoint subsets of λ , $\mathcal{S}^1$ stationary, $\mathcal{S}^2$ an unbounded set of even ordinals, $0 \in \mathcal{S}^2$
- (c) D is a normal filter on λ such that some $\bar{F} = \langle F_\delta : \delta \in \mathcal{S} \rangle$ is a D -diamond sequence, which means: $\mathcal{S} \in D^+$, $F_\delta \in {}^\delta \delta$ and $(\forall F \in {}^\lambda \lambda)(\exists {}^{D^+} \delta \in \mathcal{S})(F_\delta \subseteq F)$ (usually $D = \mathcal{D}_\lambda$, the club filter)
- (d) pr is a definable pairing function on λ , say $\text{pr}(\alpha, \beta) = \omega^{\alpha+\beta} + \beta$
- (e) every forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ has an element $\emptyset_{\mathbb{P}}$ which is minimal, i.e. $p \in \mathbb{P} \Rightarrow \emptyset_{\mathbb{P}} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ and $*$ $\notin \mathbb{P}$ (and belong to all the N 's we consider).

Notation: 1) If $\mathbb{P}$ is a λ -complete forcing notion then in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$, D will mean the normal filter on λ which D generates, so such forcing preserves “ $X \neq \emptyset \bmod D$ ”.

2) For an object x let $\bar{F}^{[x]} = \langle F_\delta^{[x]} : \delta \in \mathcal{S} \rangle$ where $F_\delta^{[x]}$ is the function with domain δ such that $F_\delta^{[x]}(\alpha)$ is $F_\delta(\text{pr}(x, \alpha))$ if well defined, $\emptyset$ otherwise.

1.2 Fact: 1) Being a D -diamond is preserved by λ -complete forcing.

2) If $\bar{F}$ is a D -diamond sequence, then for every $x \in \lambda$, $\bar{F}^{(x)}$ is a D -diamond sequence.

1.3 Definition. Let $\bar{F} = \langle F_\delta : \delta \in \mathcal{S} \rangle$ be a D -diamond sequence.

1) Let $K_D^{1,s}[\bar{F}]$ be the family of forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ such that:

- (a) $\mathbb{P}$ is λ -complete (i.e. every increasing sequence of length $< \lambda$ has an upper bound)
- (b) if χ is large enough, $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and $N \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$, $\|N\| = \lambda$, $N^{<\lambda} \subseteq N$ and $\{\lambda, p, \mathbb{P}, \bar{F}\} \in N$ and h is a function from λ onto N and $\bar{q} = \langle q_\delta : \delta \in \mathcal{S} \rangle$ is a $(N, h, \mathbb{P})$ -candidate (see below, part (3)), then there is $r \in \mathbb{P}$ above p such that r is $(N, h, \mathbb{P})$ -generic for $\bar{q}$, (see below, part(2), this depends on $\bar{F}$; if not clear we may say “over $\bar{F}$ ”).

1A) $K_D^{1,t}[\bar{F}]$ is the family of forcing notions $\mathbb{P}$ which belongs to $K_D^{1,s}[\bar{F}^{[x]}]$ for some x (so in clause (b), without loss of generality $\bar{F} \in N$).

1B) K_D^1 is the family of forcing notions $\mathbb{P}$ which belong to $K_D^{1,s}[\bar{F}]$ for every D -diamond $\bar{F}$.

2) Let $N, h, \mathbb{P}, \bar{q}$ be as in part (1) and $r \in \mathbb{P}$. We say that r is $(N, h, \mathbb{P})$ -generic for $\bar{q}$ (over $\bar{F}$, of course) meaning that for the following game $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(r, N, h, \mathbb{P}, \bar{F}, \bar{q})$ the generic player has a winning strategy. A play lasts λ moves, in the i th move $r_i \in \mathbb{P}$

is chosen such that $r \leq r_i$, $\bigwedge_{j < i} r_j \leq r_i$ and the generic player chooses r_i if $i \in \lambda \setminus \mathcal{S}'$,

the antigeranic player chooses r_i if $i \in \mathcal{S}'$
(remember $0 \in \mathcal{S}'!$).

In the end the generic player wins (the play) if

(α) $G' = \{p' \in \mathbb{P} \cap N : (\exists i < \lambda)(p' \leq r_i)\} \subseteq \mathbb{P} \cap N$ is a subset of $\mathbb{P} \cap N$ generic over N

(β) $\{\delta \in \mathcal{S} : \langle h \circ F_\delta(\alpha) : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is an $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ -increasing sequence of members of G' (so a sequence of members of N ;
recall: $\emptyset$ is considered $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ p for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$)
but $q_\delta \notin G'\} = \emptyset \bmod D$

note that each of the players, if it increases a condition r_i , its choice can only improve his situation.

3) If $N, h, \mathbb{P}, \bar{q}$ are as in part (1) above we say $\bar{q}$ is an $(N, h, \mathbb{P})$ -candidate (over $\bar{F}$, of course; or we can say $(N, h, \mathbb{P}, \bar{F})$ -candidate) if $\bar{q} = \langle q_\delta : \delta \in \mathcal{S} \rangle$, $q_\delta \in N \cap \mathbb{P}$ and for every dense open subset $\mathcal{S} \in N$ of $\mathbb{P}$ we have:

(α) $\{\delta \in \mathcal{S} : q_\delta \notin \mathcal{S}\} = \emptyset \bmod D$

(β) $\{\delta \in \mathcal{S} : \langle h \circ F_\delta(\alpha) : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ -increasing sequence of members of $P \cap N$ but $q_\delta \in P$ is not an upper bound of $\{h \circ F_\delta(\alpha) : \alpha < \delta\}\} = \emptyset \bmod D$.

1.4 Claim. 1) In Definition 1.3, if $\mathbb{P}$ is λ -complete then for the given $\bar{F}, N, h$ there is a $(N, h, \mathbb{P}, \bar{F})$ -candidate, in fact we can add: if $\mathcal{S} \in N$ is a dense open subset of $\mathbb{P}$ then $q_\delta \in \mathcal{S}$ for every large enough δ (and can add this to the definition of a candidate).

2) If r is $(N, h, \mathbb{P})$ -generic for some $(N, h, \mathbb{P})$ -candidate $\bar{q}$ (over a D -diamond sequence $\bar{F}$), then r is $(N, \mathbb{P})$ -generic.

3) If $\mathbb{P} \in K_D^{1,s}[\bar{F}]$, $\bar{F}$ a D -diamond then:

(a) forcing with $\mathbb{P}$ does not collapse λ^+

(b) let $\mu \geq \lambda$, $Y \subseteq [\lambda]^{\leq \lambda}$ be from $\mathbf{V}$, forcing with $\mathbb{P}$ preserves the property:

(i) Y is a cofinal subset of $[\mu]^{\leq \lambda}$ (under inclusion)

(ii) for every large enough χ and $x \in \mathcal{H}(\chi)$ there is $N \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$ such that $\|N\| = \lambda$, $N \cap \lambda^+ \in \lambda^+$, $N^{<\lambda} \subseteq N$, $N \cap \mu \in Y$.

1.5 Definition. 1) Let $\bar{F}$ be a D -diamond sequence and $\alpha \in (0, \lambda^+)$. Let $K_D^{\alpha, s}[\bar{F}]$ be the family of forcing notions $\mathbb{P}$ such that:

- (a) $\mathbb{P}$ is λ -complete
- (b) if χ is large enough, $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\bar{N} = \langle N_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ satisfies:
 $N_\beta \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$ is increasing, $\|N_\beta\| = \lambda$, $N_\beta^{<\lambda} \subseteq N_\beta$,
 $\{\lambda, p, \mathbb{P}, \bar{N} \restriction \beta, \bar{F}\} \in N_\beta$ and h_β is a one to one function from λ onto N_β
such that $\langle h_\gamma : \gamma < \beta \rangle \in N_\beta$ and $\bar{q}^\beta = \langle q_\delta^\beta : \delta \in \mathcal{S} \rangle$ is an $(N_\beta, h_\beta, \mathbb{P})$ -
candidate and $\langle \bar{q}^\gamma : \gamma < \beta \rangle \in N_\beta$, then there is $r \in \mathbb{P}$ above p which is
 $(N_\beta, h_\beta, \mathbb{P})$ -generic for $\bar{q}^\beta$ over $\bar{F}$ for each $\beta < \alpha$.

2) We define $K_D^{\alpha, t}[\bar{F}]$, K_D^α parallely.

1.6 Observation. Concerning Definition 1.5, for $\alpha = 1$, this is the same as in Definition 1.3.

Proof. Straight.

1.7 Discussion. 1) It seems too much to hope for a notion fully parallel to proper among λ -complete forcing notions as even for “ λ^+ -c.c. λ -complete” there are problems. Still Definition 1.3 this seems a reasonable partial substitute.

2) This work follows [Sh 587] (and see history there) but we do not rely on it. There we have parallels to [Sh 64], [Sh:98] whereas here we try to have parallels to [Sh 100], [Sh:b, Ch.III], [Sh:b, Ch.V, §5-§7] and hopefully [Sh:f, Ch.VI], [Sh:f, Ch.XVIII]

3) We shall also define a version of Definition 1.3 where the diamond is “spread out”.

4) Note: if forcing with $\mathbb{P}$ does not add new subsets to λ , then the game in Definition 1.3 degenerates as without loss of generality r forces a value to $\dot{G}_\mathbb{P} \cap N$; and this is preserved by $(< \lambda^+)$ -support iterations (see [Sh 587]).

1.8 Main Lemma. *Let $D, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'$ be as in 1.1. Iteration with $(< \lambda^+)$ -support preserve the property “ $\in K_D^1$ ” hence the limit does not collapse λ^+ (and, of course, is λ -complete hence add no new sequence of ordinals of length $< \lambda$).*

1.9 Remark. 1) So we can deduce consistency of forcing axioms.

2) The proof in fact specifies the $\bar{F}$ ’s used.

Proof. Let $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \langle \mathbb{P}_i, \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_i : i < \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) \rangle$ be such an iteration and let $\zeta = \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$.

First note that

- (*)₁ $\mathbb{P}_\zeta$ is λ -complete
[why? easy].

Let $\bar{F}$ be a D -diamond sequence. Now let $N, h, \bar{q}$ be as in Definition 1.3.

If $i \in N \cap (\zeta + 1)$, $G_{\mathbb{P}_i} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_i$ is generic over $\mathbf{V}$, let $h^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] : \lambda \rightarrow N[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}]$ be: if $h(\gamma)$ function, $i \in \text{Dom}(h(\gamma))$ and $(h(\gamma))(i)$ is a $\mathbb{P}_i$ -name, then $(h^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}])(\gamma) = ((h(\gamma))(i)[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}])$, otherwise it is some fixed $*$ (here just an element of $N[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}]$ not in $\mathbb{Q}_i[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}]$). Also let $h^{[i]} : \lambda \rightarrow N$ be defined by $h^{[i]}(\gamma) = (h(\gamma)) \upharpoonright i$. Observe

- (*)₂ if $i \in N \cap (\zeta + 1)$, $G_{\mathbb{P}_i} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_i$ is generic over $\mathbf{V}$ and for now we assume $N[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] \cap \mathbf{V} = N$, then $\langle q_\delta(i)[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] : \delta \in \mathcal{S}_i^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] \rangle$ is a $(N[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], h^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], \mathbb{Q}_i[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], \bar{F}^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}])$ -candidate

where

- ⊠(i) $\mathcal{S}_i^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] = \{\delta \in \mathcal{S} : q_\delta \upharpoonright i \in G_{\mathbb{P}_i}\}$
- (ii) $\bar{F}^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}]$ is $\langle F_\delta^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] : \delta \in \mathcal{S}_i^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] \rangle$ where $\text{Dom}(F_\delta^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}]) = \delta$, and for $\alpha < \delta$ we have $(h \circ (F_\delta^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}])(\alpha) = ((h \circ F_\delta)(\alpha))(i)[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}]$ if well defined, $*$ otherwise
- (iii) $\bar{F}^{[i]} = \langle F_\delta^{[i]} : \delta \in \mathcal{S} \rangle$ is defined by: $F_\delta^{[i]}$ is a function with domain δ , and for $\alpha < \delta$, $(h \circ F_\delta^{[i]})(\alpha) = ((h \circ F)(\alpha)) \upharpoonright i$.

In this context we define

1.10 Definition. 1) We say that $(r, \bar{st})$ is a j -solution (for $(N, h, \bar{q})$) if:

- (a) $j \in N \cap (\zeta + 1)$, $r \in \mathbb{P}_j$, (may add $\text{Dom}(r) = N \cap j$, does not really matter)
- (b) $\bar{st} = \langle st_i : i \in N \cap j \rangle$, where st_i is a P_i -name and let $\bar{st}^{j^1} = \langle \bar{st}_i : i \in N \cap j^1 \rangle$ for any $j^1 \in N \cap (j + 1)$
- (c) for $i \in N \cap (j + 1)$ we have: $r \upharpoonright i$ is $(N, h, \mathbb{P}_i, \bar{F}^{[i]})$ -generic for $\langle q_\delta \upharpoonright i : \delta \in \mathcal{S} \rangle$ as witnessed by the $\bar{st}^i$ - canonical strategy (see below) and if $i \in j \cap N$ then

$r \upharpoonright i \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_i}$ “ $r(i)$ is $(N[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], h[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], \mathbb{Q}_i[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], \bar{F}^{<i>})$ -generic for $\bar{q}^{<i>} = \langle q_\delta(i)[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] : \delta \in \mathcal{S}^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] \rangle$ ”

as exemplified by the winning strategy st_i of the generic player

in the game $\mathcal{D}(r(i), N[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], h[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], \mathbb{Q}_i[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], \bar{F}^{<i>}, \bar{q}^{<i>})$.

2) Let $j \in N \cap (\zeta + 1)$, $\bar{st}$ as in clause (b) of part (1).

The $\bar{st}$ -canonical strategy for the generic player in the game $\mathcal{D}(r, N, h, \mathbb{P}_j, \bar{F}^{[j]}, \bar{q}^{<j>})$, is defined as follows: if $\langle r_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) \rangle$ were already chosen and $\varepsilon(*) \in \lambda \setminus \mathcal{S}'$, the generic player chooses $r_{\varepsilon(*)}$ such that: $\text{dom}(r_{\varepsilon(*)})$ is $\bigcup_{\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)} \text{Dom}(r_\varepsilon)$ union with

$\text{Dom}(q_{\varepsilon(*)}) \cap j$ if $\varepsilon(*) \in \mathcal{S}$ and for $i \in \text{Dom}(r_\varepsilon)$ we have:

- ⊗ if $i \in N \cap j$ then let $r_{\varepsilon(*)}(i)$ be the $\mathbb{P}_i$ -name which $\bar{st}_i$ tells him will be his $\varepsilon(*)$ -th move in the play $\langle r_\varepsilon(i)[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*), i \in \text{Dom}(r_\varepsilon) \rangle$ in the relevant game.

We shall fix $\langle \bar{st}_i : i \in N \cap (\zeta + 1) \rangle$ so do not write them. Now

- (*)₃ if $j \in N \cap (\zeta + 1)$ and $\aleph_0 \leq \text{cf}(j) < \lambda$ and $r \in \mathbb{P}_j$ and $\bar{st} = \langle \bar{st}_i : i \in N \cap j \rangle$ and $[i \in N \cap j \Rightarrow (r \restriction i, \bar{st} \restriction i) \text{ is an } i\text{-solution}]$ then $(r, \bar{st})$ is a j -solution [why? the least trivial point is why the canonical strategy is a winning strategy. Let $j = \bigcup_{\gamma < \text{cf}(j)} j_\gamma$ with $j_\gamma < j$ increasing with γ so assume that

$\langle r_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle$ is a play of the game $\mathcal{D}(r, N, \mathbb{P}_j, h, \bar{q}^{[j]}, \bar{F}^{[j]})$.

Let $G_j = \{p' : p' \in N, p' \in P_j \text{ and } (\exists \varepsilon)(p' \leq r_\varepsilon)\}$ and $G_{j_\gamma} = G_j \cap \mathbb{P}_{j_\gamma}$.

So for each $\gamma < \text{cf}(j)$ clearly $\langle r_\varepsilon \restriction j_\gamma : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle$ is a play of the game $\mathcal{D}(r \restriction j_\gamma, N, \mathbb{P}_{j_\gamma}, h^{[j_\gamma]}, \bar{q}^{[j_\gamma]}, \bar{F}^{[j_\gamma]})$, hence

$Y_\gamma = \{\varepsilon(*) \in \mathcal{S} : \langle h \circ F_\delta(\varepsilon) \restriction j_\gamma : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) \rangle \text{ is an } \leq^{\mathbb{P}_{j_\gamma}}\text{-increasing sequence of members of } G_{j_\gamma} \text{ but } q_\delta \restriction j_\gamma \notin G_{j_\gamma}\} = \emptyset \text{ mod } D$

Now we have to prove

$Y = \{\varepsilon(*) \in \mathcal{S} : \langle h \circ F_\delta(\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) \rangle \text{ is an } \leq^{\mathbb{P}_j}\text{-increasing sequence of members of } G_j \text{ but } q_\delta \notin G_j\} = \emptyset \text{ mod } D$

For this it suffices to show $Y \subseteq \bigcup_{\gamma < \text{cf}(j)} Y_\gamma$, which follows by

- ⊗ if $p \in \mathbb{P}_j$ and $\bigwedge_{\gamma < \text{cf}(j)} p \restriction j_\gamma \in G_{j_\gamma}$ then $(p \in N, \text{ of course, and } p \in G_j$ [why? $p \in N$ as $\text{cf}(j) < \lambda$ and $N^{<\lambda} \subseteq N$; now for each $\gamma < \text{cf}(j)$ for some $\xi_\gamma < \lambda$ we have $p \restriction j_\gamma \leq r_{\xi_\gamma} \restriction j_\gamma$, let $\xi = \sup\{\xi_\gamma : \gamma < \text{cf}(j)\}$. So $\xi < \lambda$ hence

$$\gamma < \text{cf}(j) \Rightarrow p \restriction j_\gamma \leq r_{\xi_\gamma} \restriction j_\gamma \leq r_\xi \restriction j_\xi$$

so by the definition of the iteration (so the order of $\mathbb{P}_j$) we have $\gamma < \text{cf}(j) \Rightarrow p = p \restriction j \leq r_\xi \Rightarrow p \in G_j$, as required.]

- (*)₄ if $j = i + 1 \in N \cap (\zeta + 1)$ and $r \in \mathbb{P}_j$ and $\bar{s}t = \langle st_\xi : \xi \in N \cap j \rangle$ and $(r \restriction i, \bar{s}t)$ is a i -solution and

$r \restriction i \Vdash "r(i) \text{ is } (N[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], Q_i[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], h[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}], \bar{F}^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}])\text{-generic for}$

$\bar{q}^{<i>}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}] \text{ by the strategy } st_i"$

then (r, st_i) is a j -solution.

[Why? like the proof of (*)₃ but we should remember:
if $Y \in V, Y \in D^{\mathbf{V}[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}]}$ then $Y \in D$.]

- (*)₅ if $\{i, j, p\} \subseteq N, i < j \leq \zeta, p \in \mathbb{P}_j, r \in \mathbb{P}_i$ and $(r, \bar{s}t \restriction i)$ is an i -solution and $p \restriction i \leq r$, then for some $r' \in \mathbb{P}_j$ and $\bar{s}t' = \langle st_\xi : \xi \in N \cap j \rangle$ we have $r' \restriction i = r, \bar{s}t' \restriction i = \bar{s}t$ and $p \leq r'$ and $(r', \bar{s}t')$ is a j -solution and $\text{Dom}(r') \setminus i = N \cap j \setminus i$.

[Why? We prove this by induction on j . For $j = 0$ there is nothing to do. For j successor by the induction hypothesis without loss of generality $j = i + 1$, and define $r(i), st_i$ by the assumption on $\mathbb{Q}_i$ (for $p(i)$ and $N[G_{\mathbb{P}_i}]$) and then use (*)₄.

For j limit let $\sup(j \cap N) = \cup \{j_\gamma : \gamma < \text{cf}(j)\}$, j_γ increasingly continuous in $\gamma, j_\gamma \in N, j_0 = i$. Choose $r^\gamma \in \mathbb{P}_{j_\gamma}, \bar{s}t^\gamma = \langle st_\xi : \xi \in N \cap j_\gamma \rangle$ by induction on γ , such that $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 \Rightarrow r^{\gamma_1} = r^{\gamma_2} \restriction j_{\gamma_1}, \bar{s}t^{\gamma_1} = \bar{s}t^{\gamma_2} \restriction j_{\gamma_1}, p \restriction j_\gamma \leq r^\gamma, (r^0, \bar{s}t^0) = (r, \bar{s}t), \text{Dom}(r^\gamma) \setminus j_0 = N \cap j_\gamma \setminus j_0$ and $(r^\gamma, \bar{s}t^\gamma)$ is a j_γ -solution.

So as long as $\text{cf}(\gamma) < \lambda$ there is no problem to continue by the induction hypothesis: by (*)₄ for γ successor, trivially if $\gamma = 0$ and by (*)₃ if γ is limit. So if $\text{cf}(j) < \lambda$ we are done, hence assume $\text{cf}(j) = \lambda$; here we have to use the diagonal argument. In this case, in the inductive choice of $r^\gamma, \bar{s}t^\gamma$ we also choose p_γ and add to the inductive demands on $\gamma : p_\gamma \in \mathbb{P}_j \cap N, p_0 = p, p_\gamma \leq p_j$ increases $p_\gamma \restriction j_\gamma \leq r_\gamma$ and if $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$ then $\text{Dom}(p_\gamma)$ is $\bigcup_{\beta < \gamma} \text{Dom}(q_\beta)$

union with $\text{Dom}(q_\gamma)$ is well defined and $p_\gamma(\xi)$ is an upper bounds in Q_ξ of $\{p_\beta(\xi) : \beta < \gamma\} \cup \{q_\gamma(\xi)\}$ if possible (say the $<_\chi^*$ -first one) and an upper bound in Q_ξ of $\{p_\beta(\xi) : \beta < \gamma\}$ otherwise.

Now use (*)₆ below.]

$(*)_6$ if $j \in N \cap (\zeta + 1)$, $\text{cf}(j) = \lambda$, $r \in P_j$ and $\bar{s}t = \langle \bar{s}t_i : i \in N \cap j \rangle$ and
 $[i \in N \cap u \Rightarrow (\bar{r} \restriction i, \bar{s}t \restriction i) \text{ is an } i\text{-solution}]$ and $\langle p_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle$ is as above,
then $(r, \bar{s}t)$ is a j -solution.
 [Why? Similar to $(*)_3$.] $\square_{1.8}$

* * *

REFERENCES.

- [References of the form **math.XX**/ $\dots$ refer to the **xxx.lanl.gov** archive]
- [Sh 587] Saharon Shelah. Not collapsing cardinals $\leq \kappa$ in $(< \kappa)$ -support iterations. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **accepted**. **math.L0/9707225**
- [Sh 64] Saharon Shelah. Whitehead groups may be not free, even assuming CH. I. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **28**:193–204, 1977.
- [Sh 100] Saharon Shelah. Independence results. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **45**:563–573, 1980.
- [Sh:98] Saharon Shelah. Whitehead groups may not be free, even assuming CH. II. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **35**:257–285, 1980.
- [Sh:b] Saharon Shelah. *Proper forcing*, volume 940 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, xxix+496 pp, 1982.
- [Sh:f] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998.