

NONREFLECTING STATIONARY SETS IN  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ 

SAHARON SHELAH AND MASAHIRO SHIOYA

ABSTRACT. Let  $\kappa$  be a regular uncountable cardinal and  $\lambda \geq \kappa^+$ . The principle of stationary reflection for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  has been successful in settling problems of infinite combinatorics in the case  $\kappa = \omega_1$ . For a greater  $\kappa$  the principle is known to fail at some  $\lambda$ . This note shows that it fails at every  $\lambda$  if  $\kappa$  is the successor of a regular uncountable cardinal or  $\kappa$  is countably closed.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In [6] Foreman, Magidor and Shelah introduced the following principle for  $\lambda \geq \omega_2$ : If  $S$  is a stationary subset of  $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}\lambda$ , then  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}A$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}A$  for some  $\omega_1 \subset A \subset \lambda$  of size  $\omega_1$ . Let us call the principle stationary reflection for  $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}\lambda$ . It follows from Martin's Maximum (see [6]) and holds in the Lévy model where  $\omega_2$  was supercompact in the ground model (see [2]). See [3, 15, 17, 18] for recent applications of reflection principles for stationary sets in  $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}\lambda$ .

What if  $\omega_1$  is replaced by a higher regular cardinal? Feng and Magidor [4] proved that the corresponding statement for  $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_2}\lambda$  is false at some large enough  $\lambda$ . Their argument (see also [2]) showed in effect that stationary reflection for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  at some large enough  $\lambda$  implies the presaturation of the club filter on  $\kappa$  for a successor cardinal  $\kappa$ , which is known to be false if in addition  $\kappa \geq \omega_2$  by [11].

Foreman and Magidor [5] extended the Feng–Magidor result for every regular cardinal  $\kappa \geq \omega_2$ , although they proved only the case  $\kappa = \omega_2$ . We present below what was proved in effect and in §4 its proof of our own:

**Theorem 1.** *Stationary reflection for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  fails at every  $\lambda \geq 2^{\kappa^+}$  if  $\kappa \geq \omega_2$  is regular.*

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E05.

The first author was supported by the Israel Science Foundation founded by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Publication 764. The second author was partially supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No.12640098), Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture of Japan.

See [13] for a further example of nonreflection, which is based on pcf theory [12]. This note addresses the problem whether stationary reflection for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  fails *everywhere*, i.e. at every  $\lambda \geq \kappa^+$ . Specifically we prove

**Theorem 2.** *Stationary reflection for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  fails everywhere if  $\nu < \kappa$  are both regular uncountable and  $\text{cf}(\nu, \gamma) < \kappa$  for  $\nu < \gamma < \kappa$ .*

Here  $\text{cf}(\nu, \gamma)$  is the smallest size of unbounded subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_\nu\gamma$ . The last condition in Theorem 2 holds if  $\kappa = \nu^+$  or if  $\nu = \omega_1$  and  $\gamma^\omega < \kappa$  for  $\gamma < \kappa$ . In §3 we prove Theorem 2 in much greater generality.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

For background material we refer the reader to [7]. Throughout the paper,  $\kappa$  and  $\nu$  stand for a regular cardinal  $\geq \omega_1$  and  $\mu < \lambda$  a cardinal  $\geq \kappa$ . We write  $S_\kappa^\nu$  for  $\{\gamma < \kappa : \text{cf } \gamma = \nu\}$ . Let  $A$  be a set of ordinals. The set of limit points of  $A$  is denoted  $\lim A$ . It is easy to see  $|\lim A| \leq |A|$ .  $A$  is called  $\sigma$ -closed if  $\gamma \in A$  for  $\gamma \in \lim A$  of cofinality  $\omega$ . Let  $f : [\lambda]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ . We write  $C(f)$  for  $\{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda : \bigcup f''[x]^{<\omega} \subset x\}$ . For  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  the smallest superset of  $x$  in  $C(f)$  is denoted  $\text{cl}_f x$ .

Stationary reflection for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  states that if  $S$  is a stationary subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ , then  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  for some  $\kappa \subset A \subset \lambda$  of size  $\kappa$ . It is easily seen that stationary reflection for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  implies one for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\mu$ . Hence stationary reflection for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  fails everywhere iff it fails at  $\lambda = \kappa^+$ .

Let  $S$  be a stationary subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ .  $S$  is called nonreflecting if it witnesses the failure of stationary reflection, i.e.  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  is nonstationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  for  $\kappa \subset A \subset \lambda$  of size  $\kappa$ . More generally  $S$  is called  $\mu$ -nonreflecting if  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  is nonstationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  for  $\mu \subset A \subset \lambda$  of size  $\mu$ .

We write  $[\lambda]^\mu$  for  $\{x \subset \lambda : |x| = \mu\}$ . A filter  $F$  on  $[\lambda]^\mu$  is called fine if it is  $\mu^+$ -complete and  $\{x \in [\lambda]^\mu : \alpha \in x\} \in F$  for  $\alpha < \lambda$ . The specific example relevant to us was introduced in [10]:

**Lemma 1.** *A fine filter on  $[\lambda]^\mu$  is generated by the sets of the form  $\{\bigcup_{n < \omega} A_n : \{A_n : n < \omega\} \subset [\lambda]^\mu \wedge \forall n < \omega (\varphi(\langle A_k : k < n \rangle) \subset A_n)\}$ , where  $\varphi : ([\lambda]^\mu)^{<\omega} \rightarrow [\lambda]^\mu$ .*

We need an analogue [9] of Ulam's theorem in our context:

**Lemma 2.**  *$[\lambda]^\mu$  splits into  $\lambda$  disjoint  $F$ -positive sets if  $F$  is a fine filter on  $[\lambda]^\mu$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to split  $X$   $F$ -positive into  $\nu$  disjoint  $F$ -positive sets for  $\mu < \nu \leq \lambda$  regular. Fix a bijection  $\pi_x : \mu \rightarrow x$  for  $x \in X$ . Set

$X_{\gamma\xi} = \{x \in X : \pi_x(\xi) = \gamma\}$  for  $\gamma < \nu$  and  $\xi < \mu$ . Then  $\bigcup_{\xi < \mu} X_{\gamma\xi} = \{x \in X : \gamma \in x\}$  is  $F$ -positive for  $\gamma < \nu$ . Hence for  $\gamma < \nu$  we have  $\xi < \mu$  such that  $X_{\gamma\xi}$  is  $F$ -positive, since  $F$  is  $\mu^+$ -complete. Thus we have  $F$ -positive sets  $\{X_{\gamma\xi} : \gamma \in A\} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  for some  $A \in [\nu]^\nu$  and  $\xi < \mu$ , which are mutually disjoint, as desired.  $\square$

### 3. MAIN THEOREM

This section is devoted to the main result of this paper. Like the proof [11] of a diamond principle for some  $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}\lambda$  (see also [16]), our argument originates from nonstructure theory [14].

Throughout the section, let  $\nu < \kappa$  be regular cardinals  $\geq \omega_1$  and  $\mu < \lambda$  cardinals  $\geq \kappa$ . Recall from [12]  $\text{cov}(\lambda, \mu^+, \mu^+, \nu) = \lambda$  iff  $\{\bigcup_{\alpha \in a} E_\alpha : a \in \mathcal{P}_\nu \lambda\}$  is unbounded in  $[\lambda]^\mu$  for some  $\{E_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \subset [\lambda]^\mu$ . It is easy to see  $\text{cov}(\mu^+, \mu^+, \mu^+, \nu) = \mu^+$ .

For the moment assume further  $\text{cf}(\nu, \gamma) < \kappa$  for  $\nu < \gamma < \kappa$ . Inductively we have  $\{c_\xi : \xi < \kappa\} \subset \mathcal{P}_\nu \kappa$  and  $g : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$  so that  $\{c_\xi : \xi < g(\gamma)\}$  is unbounded in  $\mathcal{P}_\nu \gamma$  for  $\nu \leq \gamma < \kappa$ . Then  $T = \{\gamma \in S_\kappa^\nu : g''\gamma \subset \gamma\}$  is stationary in  $\kappa$  and  $\{c_\xi : \xi < \gamma\}$  is unbounded in  $\mathcal{P}_\nu \gamma$  for  $\gamma \in T$ . Hence Theorem 2 follows from the case  $\lambda = \mu^+ = \kappa^+$  of

**Theorem 3.** *Assume  $\text{cov}(\lambda, \mu^+, \mu^+, \nu) = \lambda$ ,  $\{c_\xi : \xi < \mu\} \subset \mathcal{P}_\nu \mu$ ,  $T$  is a stationary subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \mu$  of size  $\mu$  and  $\{c_\xi : \xi \in z\}$  is unbounded in  $\mathcal{P}_\nu z$  for  $z \in T$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$  has a  $\mu$ -nonreflecting stationary subset.*

*Proof.* Let  $\{E_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \subset [\lambda]^\mu$  witness  $\text{cov}(\lambda, \mu^+, \mu^+, \nu) = \lambda$ . Define  $e : \lambda \times \mu \rightarrow \lambda$  so that  $E_\alpha = e''\{\alpha\} \times \mu$ . Hence for  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{\mu^+} \lambda$  we have  $a \in \mathcal{P}_\nu \lambda$  with  $A \subset e''a \times \mu$ . Let  $F$  be the filter on  $[\lambda]^\mu$  as defined in Lemma 1. Lemma 2 allows us to split  $[\lambda]^\mu$  into  $\mu$  disjoint  $F$ -positive sets  $\{X_z : z \in T\}$ .

Set  $S = \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda : e''x \times (x \cap \mu) \subset x \wedge x \cap \mu \in T \wedge \exists b \in \mathcal{P}_\nu x (x \subset e''b \times \mu = e''x \times \mu \in X_{x \cap \mu})\}$ .

**Claim.**  $S$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $f : [\lambda]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$ . We may assume  $e''x \times (x \cap \mu) \subset x$  for  $x \in C(f)$ . For  $z \in T$  consider the following game  $\mathcal{G}(z)$  of length  $\omega$  between two players  $I$  and  $II$ :

At round  $n$   $I$  plays  $\mu \subset A_n \subset \lambda$  of size  $\mu$ . Then  $II$  plays a triple of  $b_n \in \mathcal{P}_\nu \lambda$ , a bijection  $\pi_n : \mu \rightarrow e''b_n \times \mu$  and  $x_n \in C(f)$  such that  $b_n \subset x_n = \pi_n''(x_n \cap \mu)$ . We further require  $A_n \subset e''b_n \times \mu \subset e''x_n \times \mu \subset A_{n+1}$  and  $x_n \subset x_{n+1}$ . Finally we let  $II$  win iff  $x_n \cap \mu = z$  for  $n < \omega$ .

Set  $T' = \{z \in T : II \text{ has no winning strategy in } \mathcal{G}(z)\}$ .

**Subclaim.**  $T'$  is nonstationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \mu$ .

*Proof.* Suppose otherwise. For  $z \in T'$  we have a winning strategy  $\tau_z$  for  $I$  in  $\mathcal{G}(z)$ , since the game is closed for  $II$ , hence determined. By induction on  $n < \omega$  build  $b_n, \pi_n$  and  $\{x_n^z : z \in T'\}$  so that  $\langle (b_n, \pi_n, x_n^z) : n < \omega \rangle$  is a play of  $II$  in  $\mathcal{G}(z)$  against  $\tau_z$  as follows:

Since  $|T'| \leq |T| = \mu$ , we have in  $\omega$  steps  $b_n \in \mathcal{P}_\nu \lambda$  such that  $\bigcup_{z \in T'} \tau_z(\langle (b_k, \pi_k, x_k^z) : k < n \rangle) \subset e''b_n \times \mu$ ,  $b_n \subset e''b_n \times \mu$  and  $e''b_n \times \mu$  is closed under  $f$ . Next fix a bijection  $\pi_n : \mu \rightarrow e''b_n \times \mu$ . Note that  $x_{n-1}^z = \pi_{n-1}''(x_{n-1}^z \cap \mu) \subset e''b_{n-1} \times \mu \subset \tau_z(\langle (b_k, \pi_k, x_k^z) : k < n \rangle) \subset e''b_n \times \mu$  for  $z \in T'$ . Hence we have  $x_{n-1}^z \cup b_n \subset x_n^z \subset e''b_n \times \mu$  such that  $\pi_n''(x_n^z \cap \mu) = x_n^z \in C(f)$ , since  $b_n \subset e''b_n \times \mu$  and  $e''b_n \times \mu$  is closed under  $f$ . If possible, we further require  $x_n^z \cap \mu = z$ , in which case we have  $x_n^z = \pi_n''z$ .

Set  $b = \bigcup_{n < \omega} b_n \in \mathcal{P}_\nu \lambda$  and  $E = e''b \times \mu \in [\lambda]^\mu$ . Then  $b \subset E$  by  $b_n \subset e''b_n \times \mu$ . Since  $e''b_n \times \mu \subset e''b_{n+1} \times \mu$  are closed under  $f$ , so is  $E$ . Also  $\mu \subset \bigcup_{z \in T'} \tau_z(\emptyset) \subset e''b_0 \times \mu \subset E$ . Since  $T'$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \mu$ , we have  $b \subset x \subset E$  such that  $x \in C(f)$ ,  $\pi_n''(x \cap \mu) = x \cap e''b_n \times \mu$  for  $n < \omega$  and  $x \cap \mu \in T'$ .

Set  $z = x \cap \mu$ . Since  $\mu \subset e''b_0 \times \mu \subset e''b_n \times \mu$ , it is easily seen that  $x \cap e''b_n \times \mu = \pi_n''z$  meets the requirements for  $x_n^z$ . Hence  $x_n^z = x \cap e''b_n \times \mu$  and  $x_n^z \cap \mu = x \cap \mu = z$  for  $n < \omega$ . Thus  $II$  wins against  $\tau_z$  with the play  $\langle (b_n, \pi_n, x_n^z) : n < \omega \rangle$ , which contradicts that  $\tau_z$  is a winning strategy for  $I$  in  $\mathcal{G}(z)$ , as desired.  $\square$

Fix  $z \in T - T'$  with a winning strategy  $\tau$  for  $II$  in  $\mathcal{G}(z)$ . Define  $\varphi : ([\lambda]^\mu)^{<\omega} \rightarrow [\lambda]^\mu$  by  $\varphi(\emptyset) = \mu$  and  $\varphi(s) = e''x \times \mu$ , where  $\tau(s) = (b, \pi, x)$ . Since  $X_z$  is  $F$ -positive,  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} A_n \in X_z$  for some  $\{A_n : n < \omega\} \subset [\lambda]^\mu$  such that  $\varphi(\langle A_k : k < n \rangle) \subset A_n$  for  $n < \omega$ . Set  $(b_n, \pi_n, x_n) = \tau(\langle A_k : k \leq n \rangle)$  for  $n < \omega$ . Then  $\langle A_n : n < \omega \rangle$  is a play of  $I$  in  $\mathcal{G}(z)$  against  $\tau$ , since  $\mu = \varphi(\emptyset) \subset A_0$  and  $e''x_n \times \mu = \varphi(\langle A_k : k \leq n \rangle) \subset A_{n+1}$ .

Set  $x = \bigcup_{n < \omega} x_n$ . Since  $\{x_n : n < \omega\} \subset C(f)$  is increasing, we have  $x \in C(f)$ , hence  $e''x \times (x \cap \mu) \subset x$ . Also  $x \cap \mu = z \in T$  by  $x_n \cap \mu = z$ . Note that  $b_n \in \mathcal{P}_\nu \lambda$ ,  $b_n \subset x_n = \pi_n''(x_n \cap \mu) \subset e''b_n \times \mu$  and  $A_n \subset e''b_n \times \mu \subset e''x_n \times \mu \subset A_{n+1}$  for  $n < \omega$ . Hence  $b = \bigcup_{n < \omega} b_n \in \mathcal{P}_\nu x$ . Also  $x \subset e''b \times \mu = e''x \times \mu = \bigcup_{n < \omega} A_n \in X_z = X_{x \cap \mu}$ . Thus we have  $x \in S \cap C(f)$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Claim.**  $S$  is  $\mu$ -nonreflecting.

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  for some  $\mu \subset A \subset \lambda$  of size  $\mu$ . Then  $\{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa A : e''x \times (x \cap \mu) \subset x\}$  is unbounded in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa A$ , hence  $e''A \times \mu \subset A$ . Moreover  $A = e''a \times \mu$  for some  $a \in \mathcal{P}_\nu A$ :

Fix a bijection  $\pi : \mu \rightarrow A$ . Then  $U = \{x \cap \mu : \pi''(x \cap \mu) = x \in S \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa A\}$  is a stationary subset of  $T$ . For  $z \in U$  we have  $b \in \mathcal{P}_\nu z$  and

$\xi \in z$  such that  $\pi''z \subset e''(\pi''z) \times \mu = e''(\pi''b) \times \mu \subset e''(\pi''c_\xi) \times \mu$ , since  $\pi''z \in S$  and  $\{c_\xi : \xi \in z\}$  is unbounded in  $\mathcal{P}_\nu z$ . Take  $\xi < \mu$  and  $U^* \subset U$  stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \mu$  so that  $\pi''z \subset e''(\pi''c_\xi) \times \mu$  for  $z \in U^*$ . Since  $\{\pi''z : z \in U^*\}$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa A$ ,  $A = \bigcup_{z \in U^*} \pi''z \subset e''(\pi''c_\xi) \times \mu \subset e''A \times \mu \subset A$ . Hence  $A = e''(\pi''c_\xi) \times \mu$  and  $\pi''c_\xi \in \mathcal{P}_\nu A$ , as desired.

For  $i = 0, 1$  take  $a \subset x^i \in S \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  so that  $x^i \cap \mu$  disagrees with each other. Then  $A = e''a \times \mu \subset e''x^i \times \mu \subset e''A \times \mu \subset A$ . Hence  $A = e''x^i \times \mu \in X_{x^i \cap \mu}$  by  $x^i \in S$ , which contradicts that  $X_{x^i \cap \mu}$  is disjoint from each other, as desired.  $\square$

Therefore  $S$  is the desired set.  $\square$

Let us derive another

**Corollary.**  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$  has a  $\kappa^+$ -nonreflecting stationary subset if  $\lambda \geq \kappa^{++}$  and  $\text{cf}(\nu, \gamma) < \kappa$  for  $\nu < \gamma < \kappa$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to prove the case  $\lambda = \kappa^{++}$  by checking the conditions of Theorem 3 for  $\lambda = \mu^+ = \kappa^{++}$ .

For  $\gamma < \mu = \kappa^+$  fix a club set  $T_\gamma \subset \mathcal{P}_\kappa \gamma$  of size  $\kappa$  and for  $z \in \bigcup_{\gamma < \mu} T_\gamma$  an unbounded set  $C_z \subset \mathcal{P}_\nu z$  of size  $< \kappa$ . Set  $\{c_\xi : \xi < \mu\} = \bigcup \{C_z : z \in \bigcup_{\gamma < \mu} T_\gamma\}$ . Then  $T = \{z \in \bigcup_{\gamma < \mu} T_\gamma : \{c_\xi : \xi \in z\} \text{ is unbounded in } \mathcal{P}_\nu z\}$  has size  $\mu$ . We claim that  $T$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \mu$ .

Fix  $f : [\mu]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa \mu$ . We have  $\gamma < \mu$  of cofinality  $\kappa$  such that  $\bigcup f''[\gamma]^{<\omega} \cup \bigcup_{\xi < \gamma} c_\xi \subset \gamma$  and  $C_y \subset \{c_\xi : \xi < \gamma\}$  for  $y \in \bigcup_{\beta < \gamma} T_\beta$ . Build an increasing and continuous sequence  $\{z_\alpha : \alpha < \nu\} \subset T_\gamma$  so that  $\bigcup f''[z_\alpha]^{<\omega} \cup \bigcup \{c_\xi : \xi \in z_\alpha\} \subset z_{\alpha+1}$  and  $C_y \subset \{c_\xi : \xi \in z_{\alpha+1}\}$  for some  $z_\alpha \subset y \in \bigcup_{\beta < \gamma} T_\beta$ . Then  $z = \bigcup_{\alpha < \nu} z_\alpha \in C(f)$ , since  $\bigcup f''[z_\alpha]^{<\omega} \subset z_{\alpha+1}$ . Since  $\{z_\alpha : \alpha < \nu\} \subset T_\gamma$  is increasing,  $z \in T_\gamma$ . Since  $\bigcup \{c_\xi : \xi \in z_\alpha\} \subset z_{\alpha+1}$ ,  $\{c_\xi : \xi \in z\} \subset \mathcal{P}_\nu z$ . To see that  $\{c_\xi : \xi \in z\}$  is unbounded in  $\mathcal{P}_\nu z$ , fix  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\nu z$ . We have  $\alpha < \nu$  with  $x \subset z_\alpha$ , hence  $\xi \in z_{\alpha+1}$  with  $x \subset c_\xi$ , as desired.  $\square$

Theorem 3 is void, however, if  $\text{cf } \mu < \kappa$  or if  $\kappa = \theta^+$  and  $\theta > \text{cf } \theta = \omega$ : In the former case  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \mu$  has no stationary subset of size  $\mu$ . In the latter case  $\mathcal{P}_\nu z$  has no unbounded subset of size  $\theta$  for  $z \in [\mu]^\theta$ , since  $\text{cf}(\nu, \theta) > \theta$  if  $\text{cf } \theta < \nu < \theta$ . See [9] for a nonreflection result in the latter case under additional assumptions.

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

This section is devoted to Foreman–Magidor’s example of a nonreflecting stationary set as we understand it. The proof invokes those [1, 2] that  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \kappa^+$  has a club subset of size  $\leq (\kappa^+)^{\omega_1}$  and that stationary reflection implies Chang’s conjecture.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Fix a bijection  $\pi_\gamma : \kappa \rightarrow \gamma$  for  $\kappa \leq \gamma < \kappa^+$ . Define  $h : [\kappa^+]^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa \kappa^+$  by  $h(\alpha, \beta) = \lim \pi_\beta \pi_\beta^{-1}(\alpha)$ . Since  $\lambda \geq 2^{\kappa^+}$ , we have a list  $\{g_\xi : \xi < \lambda\}$  of the functions  $g : \kappa^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa \kappa$ . Then  $D = \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda : \bigcup h''[x \cap \kappa^+]^2 \subset x \wedge \forall \gamma \in x \cap (\kappa^+ - \kappa) (\pi_\gamma \text{``}(x \cap \kappa) = x \cap \gamma) \wedge \forall \xi \in x (\bigcup g_\xi \text{``}(x \cap \kappa^+) \subset x)\}$  is club in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$ .

Set  $S = \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda : \{\sup(y \cap \kappa^+) : x \subset y \in D \wedge y \cap \kappa = x \cap \kappa\} \text{ is nonstationary in } \kappa^+\}$ .

**Claim.**  $S$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$ .

*Proof.* Suppose otherwise. By induction on  $n < \omega$  build  $f_n : [\lambda]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$  and  $\xi_n : [\lambda]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \lambda$  so that  $C(f_0) \subset D - S$ ,  $g_{\xi_n(a)}(\gamma) = \text{cl}_{f_n}(a \cup \{\gamma\}) \cap \kappa$  and  $f_{n+1}(a) = f_n(a) \cup \{\xi_n(a)\}$ . Define  $f : [\lambda]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$  by  $f(a) = \bigcup_{n < \omega} f_n(a)$ .

**Subclaim.**  $\{\sup(z \cap \kappa^+) : x \subset z \in C(f) \wedge z \cap \kappa = x \cap \kappa\}$  is unbounded in  $\kappa^+$  for  $x \in C(f)$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $\alpha < \kappa^+$ . Since  $x \in C(f) \subset \mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda - S$ ,  $\{\sup(y \cap \kappa^+) : x \subset y \in D \wedge y \cap \kappa = x \cap \kappa\}$  is stationary in  $\kappa^+$ . Hence we have  $x \subset y \in D$  with  $y \cap \kappa = x \cap \kappa$  and  $\alpha < \gamma \in y \cap \kappa^+$ .

Set  $z = \bigcup \{\text{cl}_{f_n}(a \cup \{\gamma\}) : n < \omega \wedge a \in [x]^{<\omega}\}$ . Then  $\alpha < \gamma \leq \sup(z \cap \kappa^+)$ . It is easy to see  $x \subset z \in C(f)$ . To see  $z \cap \kappa \subset x \cap \kappa$ , fix  $\beta \in z \cap \kappa$ . Then  $\beta \in \text{cl}_{f_n}(a \cup \{\gamma\}) \cap \kappa = g_{\xi_n(a)}(\gamma)$  for some  $n < \omega$  and  $a \in [x]^{<\omega}$ . Since  $x \in C(f)$  and  $a \in [x]^{<\omega}$ ,  $\xi_n(a) \in f(a) \subset x \subset y$ . Hence  $\beta \in g_{\xi_n(a)}(\gamma) \subset y \cap \kappa = x \cap \kappa$ , as desired, since  $\xi_n(a), \gamma \in y \in D$ .  $\square$

For  $i = 0, 1$  build an increasing and continuous sequence  $\{x_\xi^i : \xi < \omega_1\} \subset C(f)$  so that  $x_\xi^i \cap \kappa = x_0^0 \cap \kappa \in \kappa$  has cofinality  $\omega_1$ ,  $\sup(x_\xi^0 \cap \kappa^+) \leq \sup(x_\xi^1 \cap \kappa^+) < \sup(x_{\xi+1}^1 \cap \kappa^+)$  and  $x_0^1 \cap \kappa^+$  is not an initial segment of  $x_1^0 \cap \kappa^+$  as follows: First take  $x_0^0 \in C(f)$  with  $x_0^0 \cap \kappa \in S_\kappa^{\omega_1}$ . Subclaim allows us to take  $x_1^0$  from  $X = \{z \in C(f) : x_0^0 \subset z \wedge z \cap \kappa = x_0^0 \cap \kappa\}$  so that  $\{\sup(z \cap \kappa^+) : z \in X\} \cap \sup(x_1^0 \cap \kappa^+)$  has size  $\kappa$ . Since  $x_1^0 \cap \kappa^+$  has  $< \kappa$  initial segments, we have  $x_0^1 \in X$  as required above. The rest of the construction is routine.

Set  $x^i = \bigcup_{\xi < \omega_1} x_\xi^i$ . Then  $x^i \in C(f)$ , since  $\kappa \geq \omega_2$  is regular and  $\{x_\xi^i : \xi < \omega_1\} \subset C(f)$  is increasing. Also  $\sup(x^i \cap \kappa^+) = \sup_{\xi < \omega_1} \sup(x_\xi^i \cap \kappa^+)$  has cofinality  $\omega_1$  and agrees with each other by  $\sup(x_\xi^0 \cap \kappa^+) \leq \sup(x_\xi^1 \cap \kappa^+) < \sup(x_{\xi+1}^1 \cap \kappa^+)$ . Since  $x^i, x_\xi^i \in C(f) \subset D$ , we have  $x^i \cap \gamma = \pi_\gamma \text{``}(x^i \cap \kappa) = \pi_\gamma \text{``}(x_0^0 \cap \kappa) = \pi_\gamma \text{``}(x_\xi^i \cap \kappa) = x_\xi^i \cap \gamma$  for  $\gamma \in x_\xi^i \cap (\kappa^+ - \kappa)$ . Since  $x_0^1 \cap \kappa^+$  is not an initial segment of  $x_1^0 \cap \kappa^+$ ,  $x^i \cap \kappa^+$  disagrees with each other. Moreover  $x^i \cap \kappa^+$  is  $\sigma$ -closed:

Fix  $b \subset x^i \cap \kappa^+$  of order type  $\omega$ . We have  $b \subset \beta \in x^i \cap (\kappa^+ - \kappa)$  by  $\text{cf } \sup(x^i \cap \kappa^+) = \omega_1$ . Since  $\pi_\beta^{-1} \text{``}(x^i \cap \beta) = x^i \cap \kappa = x_0^0 \cap \kappa \in \kappa$

has cofinality  $\omega_1$ , we have  $\alpha \in x^i \cap \beta$  with  $\pi_\beta^{-1}b \subset \pi_\beta^{-1}(\alpha)$ . Hence  $b \subset \pi_\beta \pi_\beta^{-1}(\alpha)$ . Thus  $\sup b \in h(\alpha, \beta) \subset x^i$ , as desired, since  $\alpha, \beta \in x^i \in D$ .

Set  $c = x^0 \cap x^1 \cap \kappa^+$ , which is unbounded in  $\sup(x^i \cap \kappa^+)$ . Then  $x^i \cap \kappa^+ = \bigcup_{\gamma \in c} x^i \cap \gamma = \bigcup_{\gamma \in c} \pi_\gamma \pi_\gamma^{-1}(x^i \cap \kappa) = \bigcup_{\gamma \in c} \pi_\gamma \pi_\gamma^{-1}(x_0^0 \cap \kappa)$  by  $x^i \in D$ , which contradicts that  $x^i \cap \kappa^+$  disagrees with each other, as desired.  $\square$

**Claim.**  $S$  is nonreflecting.

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa A$  for some  $\kappa \subset A \subset \lambda$  of size  $\kappa$ . Fix a bijection  $\pi : \kappa \rightarrow A$ . Then  $T = \{\gamma < \kappa : \pi \pi^{-1} \gamma \in S \wedge \pi \pi^{-1} \gamma \cap \kappa = \gamma\}$  is stationary in  $\kappa$ , hence  $\{y \cap \kappa^+ : \pi \pi^{-1}(y \cap \kappa) \subset y \in D \wedge y \cap \kappa \in T\}$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \kappa^+$ . Thus  $\{\sup(y \cap \kappa^+) : \pi \pi^{-1}(y \cap \kappa) \subset y \in D \wedge y \cap \kappa \in T\}$  is stationary in  $\kappa^+$ , hence so is  $\{\sup(y \cap \kappa^+) : \pi \pi^{-1}(y \cap \kappa) \subset y \in D \wedge y \cap \kappa = \gamma\}$  for some  $\gamma \in T$ . Thus  $\{\sup(y \cap \kappa^+) : \pi \pi^{-1} \gamma \subset y \in D \wedge y \cap \kappa = \pi \pi^{-1} \gamma \cap \kappa\}$  is stationary in  $\kappa^+$ , which contradicts  $\pi \pi^{-1} \gamma \in S$ , as desired.  $\square$

Therefore stationary reflection for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$  fails.  $\square$

We remark that the same proof as above works if we replace “non-stationary” by “bounded” in the above definition of  $S$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Baumgartner, *On the size of closed unbounded sets*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 54 (1991) 195–227.
- [2] M. Bekkali, *Topics in Set Theory*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1476, Springer, Berlin, 1991.
- [3] J. Cummings, M. Foreman and M. Magidor, *Squares, scales and stationary reflection*, J. Math. Logic 1 (2001) 35–98.
- [4] Q. Feng and M. Magidor, *On reflection of stationary sets*, Fund. Math. 140 (1992) 175–181.
- [5] M. Foreman and M. Magidor, *Large cardinals and definable counterexamples to the continuum hypothesis*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 76 (1995) 47–97.
- [6] ——— and S. Shelah, *Martin’s Maximum, saturated ideals, and non-regular ultrafilters. Part I*, Ann. Math. 127 (1988) 1–47.
- [7] A. Kanamori, *The Higher Infinite*, Springer Monogr. Math., Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- [8] Y. Matsubara, *Menas’ conjecture and generic ultrapowers*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 36 (1987) 225–234.
- [9] ———, *Stationary preserving ideals over  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$* , J. Math. Soc. Japan 55 (2003) 827–835.
- [10] S. Shelah, *A compactness theorem for singular cardinals, free algebras, Whitehead problem and transversals*, Israel J. Math. 21 (1975) 319–349.
- [11] ———, *Around Classification Theory of Models*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1182, Springer, Berlin, 1986.

- [12] ———, Cardinal Arithmetic, Oxford Logic Guides 29, Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1994.
- [13] ———, *Existence of almost free abelian groups and reflection of stationary set*, Math. Japon. 45 (1997) 1–14.
- [14] ———, Structure Nonstructure Theory, Oxford Logic Guides, Oxford Univ. Press, New York, to be published.
- [15] ———, *Reflection implies the SCH*, preprint, 2004.
- [16] M. Shioya, *Splitting  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  into maximally many stationary sets*, Israel J. Math. 114 (1999) 347–357.
- [17] ———, *Stationary reflection and the club filter*, preprint, 2004.
- [18] W. Woodin, The Axiom of Determinacy, Forcing Axioms, and the Nonstationary Ideal, de Gruyter Ser. Log. Appl. 1, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM, 91904 ISRAEL.

*E-mail address:* `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TSUKUBA, TSUKUBA, 305-8571 JAPAN.

*E-mail address:* `shioya@math.tsukuba.ac.jp`