WAS ULAM RIGHT?
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Abstract. We introduce various colouring principles which generalise the so-called onto mapping principle of Sierpiński to larger cardinals and general ideals. We prove that these principles capture the notion of an Ulam matrix and allow us to characterize large cardinals, most notably weakly compact and ineffable cardinals. We also develop the basic theory of these colouring principles, connecting them to the classical negative square bracket partition relations, proving pumping-up theorems, and deciding various instances of theirs. We also demonstrate that our principles provide a uniform way of obtaining non-saturation results for ideals in contexts when Ulam matrices might not be available.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, $\kappa$ denotes an infinite cardinal, and $\theta$ denotes some nonzero cardinal $\leq \kappa$. The set-theoretic study of strong colourings traditionally centres around the study of all pairs of cardinals $(\kappa, \theta)$ for which the partition relation $\kappa \nrightarrow [\kappa]^2_\theta$ holds:

**Definition 1.1** ([EHR65 §18]). $\kappa \nrightarrow [\kappa]^2_\theta$ asserts the existence of a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ such that, for every $B \in [\kappa]^\kappa$, $c''[B]^2 = \theta$.

The most prominent open questions in this vein are:

1. Does $\lambda^+ \nrightarrow [\lambda^+]^2_\lambda$ hold for every singular cardinal $\lambda$?
2. How large must an inaccessible cardinal $\kappa$ be for $\kappa \nrightarrow [\kappa]^2_\kappa$ to not hold?
3. Does $\kappa \nrightarrow [\kappa]^2_\omega$ hold for every regular $\kappa > \aleph_0$ that is not weakly compact?\footnote{We take here the convention that $\aleph_0$ is not weakly compact.}

Since these questions have been outstanding for very long now, it makes sense to identify closely-related questions that may be more approachable, yet having a similar web of applications. For this, we formulate here a family of colouring principles along these lines and study their existence. Our first example is the following.

**Definition 1.2.** For an ideal $J$ over $\kappa$, $\text{unbounded}(J, \theta)$ asserts the existence of a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ that is upper-regressive (i.e., $c(\alpha, \beta) < \beta$ for all $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$) and satisfying that, for every $B \in J^+$, there is $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $\otp(c[[\alpha] \odot B]) = \theta$.

Let $J^{bd}[\kappa]$ stand for the ideal of bounded subsets of $\kappa$, let $\text{NS}_\kappa$ stand for the ideal of nonstationary subsets of $\kappa$, and let $\text{NS}_\kappa[ S := \text{NS}_\kappa \cap \mathcal{P}(S)$. We prove:

**Theorem A.**

1. $\text{unbounded}(J^{bd}[\lambda^+], \lambda)$ holds for every singular cardinal $\lambda$;
2. If $\kappa$ is a regular uncountable cardinal for which $\text{unbounded}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa)$ fails, then $\kappa$ is greatly Mahlo;
3. $\text{unbounded}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega)$ holds iff $\kappa$ is not weakly compact;
4. If $\kappa = \cf(\kappa) > \omega$, then $\text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_\kappa[ S \subseteq \kappa]$ holds iff $S$ is not ineffable.

As these findings are close in spirit to the classical open questions, the possibility arises that they could serve as hints towards their eventual solution. More broadly, there is a general bootstrapping phenomenon in which strong colouring theorems for a cardinal $\kappa_0$ give rise to strong club-guessing theorems for a cardinal $\kappa_1 > \kappa_0$ that then give rise to strong colouring theorems for a cardinal $\kappa_2 > \kappa_1$. To demonstrate, let us briefly review a relatively recent construction of a colouring that is strong in the traditional sense.

In [Rin14a §3], a colouring witnessing a strong form of $\kappa \nrightarrow [\kappa]^2_\kappa$ denoted $\text{Pr}_1(\kappa, \kappa, \kappa, \chi)$ was constructed from $\square(\kappa)$ and the oscillation oracle $P_{6}(\chi^+, \omega, \chi)$. As made clear by the proof of [Rin14b Theorem 2.3], for an infinite $\theta$, the existence of a club-guessing sequence that may be partitioned into $\theta$ many pieces gives rise to $P_{6}(\chi^+, \theta, \chi)$. Whether every club-guessing sequence may be partitioned is an open problem. The best results so far are due to Shelah [She97 §3] where a variety of methods is used. While working on the paper [IR21], we realized that the following strengthening of the $\text{unbounded}(\ldots)$ principle is sufficient for partitioning club-guessing sequences in a uniform way.
**Definition 1.3.** For an ideal $J$ over $\kappa$, $\text{onto}(J, \theta)$ asserts the existence of a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ satisfying that, for every $B \in J^+$, there is $\alpha < \kappa$ with $c(\{\alpha\} \cap B) = \theta$.

Let us now step back to the simpler problem of partitioning sets which are positive with respect to an ideal. The classical elementary method uses Ulam matrices [Ula30]. These apply to successor cardinals, and Hajnal [Haj69] has generalised them to cardinals which admit a stationary set not reflecting at regulars. Another method is the one used to give an elementary proof (see [Lec03 §8]) of the famous theorem of Solovay [Sol71] that every stationary subset of a regular cardinal $\kappa$ can be partitioned into $\kappa$-many pairwise disjoint stationary subsets. The original inspiration for our definition of unbounded(...) and onto(...) was the onto mapping principle of Sierpiński [Sie34], but upon further investigation we realised that these two principles and their variants have sufficient generality to capture — and hence to compare — these and other methods for proving results about the non-weak-saturation properties of ideals. We emphasise though that our focus, which comes from our desired application, is on providing a uniform method of obtaining these results. For that reason, constructions such as those appearing in [BHM75, BR19] relying on a recursive process are not applicable even though they are in some cases stronger results when seen purely from the point of view of weak saturation.

As suggested by Clauses (3) and (4) of Theorem A, the principles under discussion also allow to characterise large cardinal properties. It is easy to see that

- $\kappa$ is ineffable iff $\text{onto}(\text{NS}_{\kappa}, 2)$ fails, and that
- $\kappa$ is almost ineffable iff $\text{onto}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], 2)$ fails,

and we prove here:

- $\kappa > \aleph_0$ is weakly compact iff $\text{onto}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], 3)$ fails;
- $\kappa \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ is weakly compact iff $\text{onto}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], \aleph_0)$ fails.

In Gödel’s constructible universe $L$, many of our principles coincide, but, in general, it is possible to distinguish them. First, $\text{onto}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\aleph_1], \aleph_0)$ holds, and a result of Larson [Lar07] shows that $\text{onto}(\text{NS}_{\aleph_1}, \aleph_1)$ may consistently fail. Second, using large cardinals, additional patterns of failure may be obtained:

**Theorem B.** Assuming the consistency of large cardinals, each of the following are consistent with $\kappa$ being a regular uncountable limit cardinal:

- $\kappa = 2^\theta$, but $\text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_{\kappa}, \theta)$ fails;
- $\aleph_0 < \theta < \kappa$, $\text{onto}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$ holds, but $\text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_{\kappa}, \theta^+)$ fails;
- $\sup\{\theta < \kappa \mid \text{onto}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta)\} = \kappa$, but $\text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_{\kappa}, \kappa)$ fails;
- $\text{onto}(\text{NS}_{\kappa}, \kappa)$ holds, but $\text{unbounded}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], \omega)$ fails.

We shall prove pump-up theorems for deriving $\text{onto}(J, \theta)$ from $\text{unbounded}(J, \theta')$ typically with $\theta < \theta'$, but we also have a result in the other direction, asserting that for an infinite regular $\theta$, $\text{onto}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\theta], \theta)$ together with $\mathfrak{b}_\theta = \theta^+$ imply $\text{onto}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\theta^+], \theta^+)$. We also prove theorems for getting $\text{onto}(J, \theta)$ by other means. Here is a list of corollaries.

**Theorem C.**

1. If $\kappa$ is a successor cardinal, then $\text{onto}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$ holds for every regular cardinal $\theta < \kappa$, and $\Gamma(\kappa)$ implies $\text{onto}(\text{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], \kappa)$;
2. For every stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$, there exists a stationary $S' \subseteq S$ such that $\text{onto}(\text{NS}_{\kappa}, S', \theta)$ holds for every regular cardinal $\theta < \kappa$;
3. If $\check{\varphi}(\kappa)$ holds, then so does $\text{onto}(\text{NS}_{\kappa}, \kappa)$;
(4) If ♠(T) holds for some stationary T ⊆ κ that does not reflect at regulars, then onto(J^{bd}[κ], κ) holds;

(5) If λ = θ, then onto(J^{bd}[κ], θ) holds for all κ with λ < cf(κ) ≤ κ ≤ 2^λ.

The proof of Clause (4) goes through the colouring principle unbounded∗(...)
having the property that, for normal ideals I, J, unbounded∗(J, I^+) allows to derive onto(I, θ) from onto(J, θ). What more, we shall prove that for a stationary T ⊆ κ, unbounded∗(J^{bd}[κ], {T}) holds iff T does not reflect at regulars iff κ carries a triangular Ulam matrix with support T.

It thus follows from Clause (2) of Theorem A that the principle unbounded(J^{bd}[κ], κ) is weaker than the existence of a triangular Ulam matrix at κ, yet, as easily seen, unbounded(NS_κ, θ) implies that any positive set of any normal ideal J over κ may be partitioned into θ-many pairwise disjoint J-positive sets. Here is a concise summary of what is known about onto(NS_κ, θ).

**Theorem D.** If onto(NS_κ, θ) fails for a pair of infinite regular cardinals θ < κ, then:

(i) κ is greatly Mahlo;
(ii) ♠*(Reg(κ)) fails;
(iii) Refl(κ, κ, Reg(κ)) holds. In particular:
(iv) □(κ, <μ) fails for all μ < κ.
(v) κ ↠ [κ]_θ fails. In particular, there are no κ-Souslin trees.

1.1. **Organization of this paper.** In Section 2 we introduce the colouring principles, some of which we have already seen and other variants, that we will be studying in this paper and we give the basic application that motivated us, that of partitioning positive sets of an ideal into many disjoint positive sets.

In Section 3 we introduce the ideal SA_κ which is strongly tied to the weak-compactness of κ. In L the ideal SA_κ is trivial if and only if κ is weakly compact. We also show that unbounded(J^{bd}[κ], κ) holds exactly when SA_κ consists of all the subsets of κ and then we provide some consistency strength lower bounds for when this does not happen. We end with some facts connecting forcing with these ideals.

The proof of Clause (2) of Theorem A will be found there.

In Section 4 we introduce the ideal A_κ which is strongly tied to ineffability of κ. In L the ideal A_κ is trivial if and only if κ is ineffable and it follows easily from the definitions that if a cardinal κ is ineffable then A_κ is not trivial. We also show that unbounded(NS_κ, κ) holds exactly when A_κ consists of all the subsets of κ and then we provide some consistency strength lower bounds for when this does not happen. Again, we end with some facts connecting forcing with these ideals.

In Section 5 we prove that one of the strongest principles we formulate, the unbounded∗ principles, capture exactly the notion of an Ulam matrix as formulated by Ulam and its generalisation due to Hajnal. This also allows us to give explicit evidence that the unbounded principles we have formulated are a more applicable method of partitioning positive sets of an ideal.

Section 6 is the most technical of our sections. The theme here is to obtain implications between the various instances of our colouring principles as well as the classical negative square bracket principles. In particular we prove pumping theorems for the principles we have introduced as well as establish various monotonicity results between them. To do this we use a variety of guessing principles some of which are available in ZFC and some of which are not.
In Section 7 we prove ZFC results about our principles bolstered by the results of the previous sections, most strongly those of Section 6 which allow us to draw stronger conclusions. In particular we consider the case of singular cardinals and their successors, as well as cardinals below the continuum. The proofs of Clause (1) of Theorem A, and Clauses (2) and (5) of Theorem C will be found there.

In Section 8 we consider various aspects of the onto principles with the maximum number of colours. In particular we obtain them in certain instances from guessing principles and we establish pump-up theorems between them and some of the classical principles. The proofs of Clauses (1),(3) and (4) of Theorem C will be found there.

In Section 9 we collect together various failures and consistent failures of our colouring principles, some of them obtained assuming the consistency of large cardinals. In particular we show that the onto principle with the maximum number of colours always fails. The proof of Theorem B will be found there.

In Section 10 we prove Clause (3) of Theorem A and some related results which allow us to characterize weakly compact cardinals using our principles.

In Section 11 we provide some diagrams which summarise our results.

1.2. So was Ulam right? As previously mentioned, while working on the paper [R21] about club-guessing and after having proved particular applications of many of the theorems in this paper, we realised that the onto mapping principle of Sierpiński suggests a common framework for capturing almost all the partitioning results we were able to prove except for the ones proved using Ulam matrices. Later with the introduction of unbounded* we were able to capture Ulam matrices as well. So which is the correct way to partition positive sets of an ideal? It is obvious what the polite answer should be, but let us also mention another fact given the history of this paper: the natural alternative title for this paper was already taken.

1.3. Notation and conventions. Reg(κ) stands for the collection of all infinite regular cardinals below κ. Let $E^κ_0 := \{ \alpha < κ | \text{cf}(\alpha) = \theta \}$, and define $E^κ_0$, $E^κ_0$, $E^κ_0$, $E^κ_0$, $E^κ_0$ analogously. For a set of ordinals $A$, we write $\text{sup}(A) := \sup(\alpha + 1 | \alpha \in A)$, $\text{acc}^+(A) := \{ \alpha < \text{sup}(A) | \sup(A \cap \alpha) = \alpha > 0 \}$, $\text{acc}(A) := A \cap \text{acc}(A)$, and $\text{nacc}(A) := A \setminus \text{acc}(A)$. For a stationary $S \subseteq κ$, we write $\text{Tr}(S) := \{ α ∈ E^κ_0 | S \cap α \text{ is stationary in } α \}$. For the iterated trace operations $\text{Tr}^α$, see Definition 3.6 below. A cardinal $κ$ is greatly Mahlo iff $\text{Tr}^α(\text{Reg}(κ))$ is stationary for every $α < κ^+$. The principle $\text{Refl}(κ, S, T)$ asserts that for every sequence $(S_i | i < κ)$ of stationary subsets of $S$, there exists $δ ∈ T$ such that $δ \in \bigcap_{i < δ} \text{Tr}(S_i)$. For sets of ordinals $A, B$, we denote $A \oplus B := \{ (α, β) ∈ A × B | α < β \}$ and we identify $[B]^2$ with $B \oplus B$. In particular, we interpret the domain of a colouring $c : [κ]^2 → \theta$ as a collection of ordered pairs. In scenarios in which we are given an unordered pair $p = \{ α, β \}$, we shall write $c(\{ α, β \})$ for $c(\min(p), \max(p))$. We also agree to interpret $c(\{ α, β \})$ as 0, whenever $α = β$. For $θ > 2$, $[κ]^θ$ simply stands for the collection of all subsets of $κ$ of size $θ$. Similar to Definition 1.1, $κ → [κ]^θ_0$ asserts the existence of a colouring $c : [κ]^θ → θ$ such that, for all $A, B ∈ [κ]^κ$, $c[A \oplus B] = θ$.

2. Colouring principles and applications

**Definition 2.1.** For a family $A ⊆ P(κ)$, an ideal $J$ over $κ$, and subset $S \subseteq κ$:
(1) $\text{onto}^+(A, J, \theta)$ asserts the existence of a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ with the property that, for every $A \in A$ and every sequence $\langle B_\tau \mid \tau < \theta \rangle$ of elements of $J^+$, there is an $\eta \in A$ such that $\{\beta \in B_\tau \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau\} \in J^+$ for every $\tau < \theta$;

(2) $\text{onto}(A, J, \theta)$ asserts the existence of a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ with the property that, for all $A \in A$ and $B \in J^+$, there is an $\eta \in A$ such that $c(\{\eta\} \oplus B) = \theta$;

(3) $\text{onto}^-(S, \theta)$ asserts the existence of a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ with the property that, for every club $D \subseteq \kappa$ and for every regressive map $f : S \cap D \to \kappa$, there is an $\eta < \kappa$ such that $c(\{\eta\} \oplus \{\beta \in S \cap D \mid f(\beta) = \eta\}) = \theta$.

If we omit $A$, then we mean that $A := \{\kappa\}$.

Remark 2.2. The principle $\text{onto}(\{\eta_0\}, J^{bd}[\eta_1], \eta_1)$ is better known as Sierpiński’s onto mapping principle (see Fact 8.1 below), and the instance $\text{onto}(\kappa, J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$ is better known as the partition relation $\kappa \rightarrow [\kappa \uparrow \theta]^{\kappa}$ (see Proposition 6.6 below). For additional connections to other well-studied concepts, see Propositions 6.3 and 8.6 below.

Remark 2.3. Let us give a hint of the extra descriptive power of the first parameter $A$. Consider the three principles $\text{onto}(\{\eta_0\}, J^{bd}[\eta_1], \eta_1), \text{onto}(\{\eta_1\}, J^{bd}[\eta_1], \eta_1)$, and $\text{onto}(\{\eta_0\}, J^{bd}[\eta_1], \eta_1)$. Then the first principle asserts that for every $B \in J^{bd}[\eta_1]$ there is a single $\eta < \eta_1$ such that $c(\{\eta\} \oplus B) = \eta_1$. On the other hand, the second principle asserts that there is an end segment $[\eta, \eta_1)$ of $\eta_1$ such that any $\eta'$ in this end segment serves as such a witness. Lastly, the third principle asserts that there is such a witness $\eta$ which comes from a smaller, countable, pool of candidates.

It is clear that any colouring witnessing $\text{onto}^+(A, J, \theta)$ is a witness to $\text{onto}(A, J, \theta)$, and that if $J$ is a normal ideal extending $\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S$ for $S \subseteq \kappa$ a stationary set, then any colouring witnessing $\text{onto}(J, \theta)$ is a witness to $\text{onto}^-(S, \theta)$.

We now consider a weakening of the above principles by weakening the requirement of realizing a full range to one of realizing the maximal ordertype. As we will see in Theorem 2.24, this is often enough for certain applications. Recall that for $\theta \leq \kappa$ a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ is upper-regressive if $c(\alpha, \beta) < \beta$ for all $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$.

Definition 2.4. For families $A, T \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$, an ideal $J$ over $\kappa$, and a subset $S \subseteq \kappa$:

(1) $\text{unbounded}^+(A, J, \theta)$ asserts the existence of an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ with the property that, for every $A \in A$ and every sequence $\langle B_\tau \mid \tau < \theta \rangle$ of elements of $J^+$, there is an $\eta \in A$ and an injection $h : \theta \to \theta$ such that,

$$\text{otp}(\tau < \theta \mid \{\beta \in B_\tau \mid c(\eta, \beta) = h(\tau)\} \in J^+) = \theta;$$

(2) $\text{unbounded}^*(A, J, T)$ asserts the existence of an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ with the property that, for all $A \in A$ and $B \in J^+$, there is $T \in T$, such that, for every $\tau \in T$, there is an $\eta \in A \cap \tau$ and a $\beta \in B$ such that $c(\eta, \beta) = \tau$;

(3) $\text{unbounded}(A, J, \theta)$ asserts the existence of an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ with the property that, for all $A \in A$ and $B \in J^+$, there is $\eta \in A$ such that

$$\text{otp}(c(\{\eta\} \oplus B)) = \theta;$$
Note that all the principles of Definitions 2.1 and 2.4 hold vacuously for improper some stationary set Fact 2.9. talk about ideals over Convention 2.7.

Definition 2.8 (folklore). An ideal $J$ over $\kappa$, since they have the same collection of positive sets. In particular, when we identify an ideal over $\kappa$, we denote its dual filter by $J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa]$.

Conjecture 2.6. For $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ and an ideal $J$ over $\kappa$:

1. If onto$(A, J, \kappa)$ holds, then it may be witnessed by an upper-regressive map;
2. If onto$(A, J, \kappa)$ holds, then so does $\text{unbounded}^*(A, J, \kappa)$.

Proof. (1) Suppose that $c : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \kappa$ is a colouring witnessing onto$(A, J, \kappa)$. Fix a surjection $f : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ such that the preimage of any singleton has size $\kappa$. Define a colouring $d : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \kappa$ by letting, for all $\eta < \beta < \kappa$, $d(\eta, \beta) := f(c(\eta, \beta))$ provided that $f(c(\eta, \beta)) < \beta$; otherwise, let $d(\eta, \beta) := 0$. Clearly, $d$ is upper-regressive.

Now, given $A \subseteq A$ and $B \subseteq J^+$, fix $\eta \in A$ such that $c([\eta] \cap B) = \kappa$. To see that $d([\eta] \cap B) = \kappa$, let $\tau < \kappa$ be arbitrary. As the set $\{ \beta \in B \mid f(c(\eta, \beta)) = \tau \}$ has size $\kappa$, it contains an element $\beta^*$ above $\max\{\eta, \tau\}$, so that $d(\eta, \beta^*) = \tau$.

(2) Any upper-regressive witness to onto$(A, J, \kappa)$ witnesses $\text{unbounded}^*(A, J, \kappa)$.

2.1. Interlude on ideals. For a set of ordinals $S$, $J^{\text{bd}}[S]$ stands for the ideal of bounded subsets of $S$. For $\kappa$ of uncountable cofinality, $\text{NS}_\kappa$ stands for the ideal of nonstationary subsets of $\kappa$, and $\text{NS}_\kappa \cap S$ stands for $\text{NS}_\kappa \cap \mathcal{P}(S)$.

For any ideal $J$ over $S$, we denote its dual filter by $J^* := \{ S \setminus X \mid X \in J \}$, and its collection of positive sets by $J^+ := \mathcal{P}(S) \setminus J$. An ideal $J$ is proper iff $J^+ \neq \emptyset$. Note that all the principles of Definitions 2.1 and 2.4 hold vacuously for improper $J$'s, and that any proper ideal over a singular cardinal $\kappa$ extending $J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa]$ is not $\text{cf}(\kappa)^+$-complete, let alone $\kappa$-complete.

Convention 2.7. In case $S$ is a cofinal subset of a cardinal $\kappa$, it is customary to identify an ideal $J$ over $S$ with the ideal $J = \{ X \cup Y \mid X \in J, Y \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa \setminus S) \}$ over $\kappa$, since they have the same collection of positive sets. In particular, when we talk about ideals over $\kappa$ extending $J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa]$ this also covers the cases of ideals over a cofinal subset $S$ of $\kappa$ extending $J^{\text{bd}}[S]$.

Definition 2.8 (folklore). An ideal $J$ over $\kappa$ is said to be normal if for every sequence $\langle E_\eta \mid \eta < \kappa \rangle$ of sets from $J^*$, its diagonal intersection $\Delta_{\eta < \kappa} E_\eta := \{ \beta < \kappa \mid \beta \in \bigcap_{\eta < \beta} E_\eta \}$ is in $J^*$.

Note that if $\kappa$ is singular, then there is no nontrivial normal ideal over $\kappa$ extending $J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa]$. The following is well-known.

Fact 2.9. Suppose that $\kappa$ is regular uncountable, and that $J$ is a normal ideal over some stationary set $S \subseteq \kappa$. If $J$ extends $J^{\text{bd}}[S]$, then:

1. $J$ is $\kappa$-complete;
2. $J$ extends $\text{NS}_\kappa \cap S$. 

(4) $\text{unbounded}^-(S, \theta)$ asserts the existence of an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ with the property that, for every club $D \subseteq \kappa$ and every regressive map $f : S \cap D \rightarrow \kappa$, there is $\eta < \kappa$ such that $\text{otp}(c([\eta] \cap D \mid f(\eta) = \eta)) = \theta$.

If we omit $A$, then we mean that $A := \{ \kappa \}$.
We now introduce a variation of normality that we call subnormality. Every normal ideal is subnormal, but so is $J^{bd}[\kappa]$ for every infinite cardinal $\kappa$.

**Definition 2.10.** An ideal $J$ over $\kappa$ is said to be subnormal if for every sequence $\langle E_\eta \mid \eta < \kappa \rangle$ of sets from $J^*$, the following two hold:

(i) for every $B \in J^+$, there exists $B' \subseteq B$ in $J^+$ such that, for every $(\eta, \beta) \in [B']^2$, $\beta \in E_\eta$;
(ii) for all $A, B \in J^+$, there exist $A' \subseteq A$ and $B' \subseteq B$ with $A', B' \in J^+$ such that, for every $(\eta, \beta) \in A' \otimes B'$, $\beta \in E_\eta$.

**Lemma 2.11.** Suppose that $J$ is a subnormal $\kappa$-complete ideal over $\kappa$ extending $J^{bd}[\kappa]$. Suppose that $\langle E_\eta \mid \eta < \kappa \rangle$ is a sequence of sets from $J^*$.

(i) For every $B \in J^+$, there exists $B' \subseteq B$ in $J^+$ such that, for every $(\alpha, \beta) \in [B']^2$, $\beta \in \bigcap_{\eta \leq \alpha} E_\eta$;
(ii) For all $A, B \in J^+$, there exist $A' \subseteq A$ and $B' \subseteq B$ with $A', B' \in J^+$ such that, for every $(\alpha, \beta) \in A' \otimes B'$, $\beta \in \bigcap_{\eta \leq \alpha} E_\eta$.

**Proof.** For each $\alpha < \kappa$, let $E^*_\alpha := \bigcap_{\eta \leq \alpha} E_\eta$ which by the $\kappa$-completeness of $J$ is in $J^*$. Now, invoke the subnormality of $J$ on the sequence $\langle E^*_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$.

**Lemma 2.12.** Suppose that $J$ is a subnormal ideal over $\kappa$ extending $J^{bd}[\kappa]$, $B \in J^+$ and $D$ is some cofinal subset of $\kappa$. Then there exists $B' \subseteq B$ in $J^+$ which is $D$-separated, that is, for every $(\eta, \beta) \in [B']^2$, there is $\delta \in D$ with $\eta < \delta < \beta$.

**Proof.** For every $\eta < \kappa$, set $\delta_\eta := \min(D \setminus (\eta + 1))$. As $J$ extends $J^{bd}[\kappa]$, for every $\eta < \kappa$, $E_{\eta} := \kappa \setminus (\delta_\eta + 1)$ is in $J^*$. As $J$ is subnormal, fix $B' \subseteq B$ in $J^+$ such that, for every $(\eta, \beta) \in [B']^2$, $\beta \in E_\eta$. Then for every pair $\eta < \beta$ of points from $B'$, $\eta < \delta_\eta < \beta$.

### 2.2. Large cardinals, colourings and $C$-sequences.

In this subsection, we consider a couple of large cardinal notions.

**Definition 2.13 ([ET61] [Par2] [KT64]).** A cardinal $\kappa$ is weakly compact if it is strongly inaccessible and there are no $\kappa$-Aronszajn trees. Equivalently if it is uncountable and $\kappa \nrightarrow [\kappa]^2_2$ fails.

**Remark 2.14.** Note that we have adopted the convention that $\aleph_0$ is *not* weakly compact even though $\aleph_0 \rightarrow [\aleph_0]^2_2$ does hold.

Shortly after Jensen found a construction of a Souslin tree in $L$ [Jen68], he extracted from it a combinatorial principle named diamond. The standard formulation of $\Diamond$, as appears in [Jen72], is very close to Jensen’s original principle, but nevertheless is due to Kunen. It didn’t take long until Silver squeezed more out of the proof and formulated $\Diamond^+$, and then the three of them came up with the stronger principle that the proof gave, known as $\Diamond^*$. These strong combinatorial principles along with related large cardinals notions were then studied in the Jensen-Kunen manuscript [JK69].

**Definition 2.15 ([JK69]).** For $\kappa$ a regular uncountable cardinal, a subset $S \subseteq \kappa$ is an ineffable (resp. almost ineffable) subset of $\kappa$ if for every sequence $\langle A_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle$, there is $A \subseteq \kappa$ such that the following set is stationary (resp. cofinal) in $\kappa$:

\[
\{ \beta \in S \mid A_\beta \cap \beta = A \cap \beta \}.
\]
We say that a cardinal \( \kappa \) is \textit{ineffable} if it is regular and it is an ineffable subset of itself. If it is clear from the context, then we will simply call a subset \( S \subseteq \kappa \) an ineffable set without making a reference to \( \kappa \).

**Fact 2.16** (Kunen, [JK69]). For \( \kappa \) an uncountable regular cardinal, a subset \( S \subseteq \kappa \) is ineffable if and only if it is not the case that \( \kappa \rightarrow [\text{Stat}(S)]^2_2 \).

**Fact 2.17** (implicit in [JK69]). Suppose \( \kappa \rightarrow [\kappa]^2_2 \) is a colouring with \( 0 < \theta < \kappa \).

1. For every \( S \) ineffable in \( \kappa \), there exists a stationary \( B \subseteq S \), such that, for every \( \eta < \kappa \), \( |c[\{\eta\} \cap B]| = 1 \).
2. For every \( S \) almost ineffable in \( \kappa \), there exists a cofinal \( B \subseteq S \), such that, for every \( \eta < \kappa \), \( |c[\{\eta\} \cap B]| = 1 \).

We complement this with a related result about weakly compact cardinals.

**Proposition 2.18.** Suppose \( c : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta \) is a colouring with \( 0 < \theta < \kappa \).

If \( \kappa = \aleph_0 \) or if \( \kappa \) is weakly compact, then there is a cofinal \( B \subseteq \kappa \) such that, for every \( \eta < \kappa \), \( |c[\{\eta\} \cap B]| \leq 2 \).

**Proof.** Suppose that \( \kappa \rightarrow [\kappa]^2_2 \) holds. It follows that \( \kappa \) is regular and there exists a function \( f : \kappa \rightarrow \theta \) with the property that for every \( \alpha < \kappa \) there is a \( \beta \geq \alpha \) such that \( f \upharpoonright \alpha \subseteq c(\cdot, \beta) \). The least such \( \beta \) will be denoted by \( \beta(\alpha) \). Recursively construct an increasing sequence of ordinals \( \langle \alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \kappa \rangle \) such that, for all \( \xi < \xi' < \kappa \), \( \alpha_\xi < \beta(\alpha_\xi) < \alpha_{\xi'} < \beta(\alpha_{\xi'}) < \kappa \). In particular, \( B := \{ \beta(\alpha_\xi) \mid \xi < \kappa \} \) is cofinal in \( \kappa \). Towards a contradiction, suppose that there is some \( \eta < \kappa \) such that \( c[\{\eta\} \cap B] \geq 3 \).

Pick a triple \( \beta_0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 \) in \( B \setminus (\eta + 1) \) such that \( |\{ \{ \beta(\eta), \beta_i \} \mid i < 3 \}| = 3 \). For each \( i < 3 \), pick \( \alpha_i \in \{ \beta(\xi) \mid \xi < \kappa \} \) such that \( \beta_i = \beta(\alpha_i) \). So \( \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \). For \( i < 2 \), as \( \alpha_i \in D \cap \alpha_i + 1 \), we infer that \( \beta_i < \alpha_i + 1 \). Altogether,

\[
\eta < \beta_0 < \alpha_1 < \beta_1 < \alpha_2 < \beta_2.
\]

For \( i < 2 \), since \( f \upharpoonright \alpha_i + 1 \subseteq c(\cdot, \beta_{i+1}) \) and \( \eta < \alpha_i + 1 \), \( c(\eta, \beta_{i+1}) = f(\eta) \). So, \( c(\eta, \beta_1) = c(\eta, \beta_2) \), contradicting the choice of \( \beta_1 \) and \( \beta_2 \). \( \square \)

**Remark 2.19.** In Proposition [11.1](#), Remark [11.2](#), and Corollary [10.6](#) we establish the converse results.

Recall that a \textit{C-sequence} over a set of ordinals \( S \) is a sequence \( \bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle \) such that, for every \( \beta \in S \), \( C_\beta \) is a closed subset of \( \beta \) with \( \text{sup}(C_\beta) = \text{sup}(\beta) \). Each of the large cardinal properties under discussion admit a characterization in the language of \textit{C}-sequences, as follows.

**Fact 2.20** ([Tod87] Theorem 1.8]). A strongly inaccessible cardinal \( \kappa \) is weakly compact iff for every \textit{C}-sequence \( \bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \), there exists a club \( D \) in \( \kappa \) such that, for every \( \alpha < \kappa \), for some \( \beta \in [\alpha, \kappa) \), \( D \cap \alpha = C_\beta \cap \alpha \).

**Fact 2.21** ([BZ21] §5]). A strongly inaccessible cardinal \( \kappa \) is ineffable iff for every \textit{C}-sequence \( \bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \), there exists a club \( D \) in \( \kappa \) such that \( \{ \beta < \kappa \mid D \cap \beta = C_\beta \} \) is stationary in \( \kappa \).

**Remark 2.22.** A similar proof shows that a strongly inaccessible cardinal \( \kappa \) is almost ineffable iff for every \textit{C}-sequence \( \bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \), there exists a club \( D \) in \( \kappa \) such that \( \{ \beta < \kappa \mid D \cap \beta = C_\beta \} \) is cofinal in \( \kappa \).

We now obtain a result in the same spirit for weakly compacts.
Proposition 2.23. If \( \kappa \) is weakly compact, then for every C-sequence \( \vec{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \), there exists a club \( D \) in \( \kappa \) such that \( \{ \beta < \kappa \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \} \) is cofinal in \( \kappa \).

Proof. Suppose that \( \kappa \) is weakly compact. In particular, \( \kappa \) is strongly inaccessible.

Now, given a C-sequence \( \vec{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \), using Fact 2.20, let us fix a club \( D \subseteq \kappa \) such that, for every \( \alpha < \kappa \), for some \( \beta \in [\alpha, \kappa) \), \( D \cap \alpha = C_\beta \cap \alpha \). For each \( \epsilon < \kappa \), let \( \beta_\epsilon \) denote the least ordinal \( \beta \) such that \( \epsilon < \beta < \kappa \) and \( D \cap (\epsilon + 1) = C_\beta \cap (\epsilon + 1) \).

Now, consider the club \( E := \{ \delta \in D \mid \forall \epsilon < \delta \ (\beta_\epsilon < \delta) \} \).

Claim 2.23.1. Let \( \epsilon \in E \). Then \( E \cap \beta_\epsilon \subseteq C_\beta \).

Proof. As \( E \cap (\epsilon + 1) \subseteq D \cap (\epsilon + 1) \subseteq C_\beta \), it suffices to prove that \( E \cap (\epsilon + 1, \beta_\epsilon) = \emptyset \).

Let \( \delta \) be any element of \( E \) above \( \epsilon \), then, by the definition of \( E \), \( \delta > \beta_\epsilon \), as sought. \( \square \)

Remark 2.24. An alternative proof that does not make use of Fact 2.20 reads as follows. Suppose that there exists a C-sequence \( \vec{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \) such that, for every club \( D \) in \( \kappa \), \( \{ \beta < \kappa \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \} \) is bounded in \( \kappa \). Then, by Lemma 3.3 below, unbounded(\( J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa \)) holds. Then, by Theorem [6.9] below, unbounded(\( J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega \)) in particular holds. Then, by Corollary [10.2] below, \( \kappa \) is not weakly compact.

However, models constructed by Kunen [Kun78] show that the preceding property does not characterize weakly compact cardinals even when the cardinal is strongly inaccessible.

Corollary 2.25. (1) Assuming the consistency of a weakly compact cardinal, it is consistent that \( \kappa \) is a strongly inaccessible cardinal which is not weakly compact but for every C-sequence \( \vec{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \), there exists a club \( D \) in \( \kappa \) such that \( \{ \beta < \kappa \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \} \) is cofinal in \( \kappa \);

(2) Assuming the consistency of an ineffable cardinal, it is consistent that \( \kappa \) is a strongly inaccessible cardinal which is not weakly compact but for every C-sequence \( \vec{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \), there exists a club \( D \) in \( \kappa \) such that \( \{ \beta < \kappa \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \} \) is stationary in \( \kappa \).

Proof. Recall that in Kunen’s model \( V^R \) from [Kun78 §3], \( \kappa \) is a strongly inaccessible cardinal that is not weakly compact, but there exists a \( \kappa \)-cc forcing \( T \) such that:

- if \( V \models \{ \kappa \text{ is weakly compact} \} \), then \( V^{R,T} \models \{ \kappa \text{ is weakly compact} \} \);
- if \( V \models \{ \kappa \text{ is ineffable} \} \), then \( V^{R,T} \models \{ \kappa \text{ is ineffable} \} \).

As \( T \) is \( \kappa \)-cc, for every club \( D \subseteq \kappa \) in \( V^{R,T} \), there exists a club \( D' \subseteq \kappa \) in \( V^R \) such that \( D' \subseteq D \). The conclusion now follows from Fact 2.21 and Proposition 2.23. \( \square \)

2.3. Non-weak-saturation of ideals. In this short subsection, \( \kappa \) stands for a regular uncountable cardinal, and all ideals are understood to be proper. An ideal \( J \) is weakly \( \theta \)-saturated iff every sequence \( \langle B_i \mid i < \theta \rangle \) of \( J^+ \)-sets there exist \( \langle i, j \rangle \in [\theta]^2 \) with \( B_i \cap B_j \neq \emptyset \). In this subsection we show that our colouring principles induce uniform decompositions witnessing that an ideal \( J \) is not weakly \( \theta \)-saturated.

Proposition 2.26. Suppose that \( S \subseteq \kappa \) is stationary.

(1) Suppose that unbounded(\( NS_\kappa \mid S, \theta \)) holds. Then there exists a colouring \( c : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta \) such that, for every normal ideal \( J \) over \( S \) extending \( J^{bd}[S] \), for every \( B \in J^+ \), there is \( \eta < \kappa \) such that for \( \eta \)-many \( \tau < \theta \),

\[
\{ \beta \in B \setminus (\eta + 1) \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \} \in J^+.
\]
(2) Suppose \( c \) is a colouring witnessing that onto\((\text{NS}_\kappa \restriction S, \theta)\) holds. Then, for every normal ideal \( J \) over \( S \) extending \( J^{\text{bd}}[S] \), for every \( B \in J^+ \), there is \( \eta < \kappa \) such that for every \( \tau < \theta \),
\[
\{ \beta \in B \setminus (\eta + 1) \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \} \in J^+.
\]

Proof. (1) The case \( \theta = \kappa \) is covered by Lemma \ref{lem:covering-lemma}, so suppose that \( \theta < \kappa \). Fix a colouring \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \) witnessing unbounded\((\text{NS}_\kappa \restriction S, \theta)\). Towards a contradiction, suppose that \( J \) is a normal ideal over \( S \) extending \( J^{\text{bd}}[S] \) and \( B \in J^+ \) form together a counterexample. Denote \( B^*_\eta := \{ \beta \in B \setminus (\eta + 1) \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \} \). By the choice of \( B \), for every \( \eta < \kappa \), the set \( T_\eta := \{ \tau < \theta \mid B^*_\eta \in J^+ \} \) has size \( < \theta \). By Fact \ref{fact:covering-lemma}, \( J \) is \( \theta^+ \)-complete, so \( E_\eta := S \setminus \bigcup_{\tau \in T_\eta} B^*_\eta \) is in \( J^* \). As \( J \) is normal, also \( E := \bigtriangleup_{\eta < \kappa} E_\eta \) is in \( J^* \). As \( B' := B \cap E \in J^+ \), Fact \ref{fact:covering-lemma} implies that \( B' \) is stationary, so, since \( c \) witnesses unbounded\((\text{NS}_\kappa \restriction S, \theta)\), there is an \( \eta < \kappa \) such that \( c(\eta) \uparrow B' \) has ordertype \( \theta \). In particular, we may pick \( \tau \in c(\eta) \uparrow B' \setminus T_\eta \). Pick \( \beta \in B' \), \( \beta > \eta \), such that \( c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \). As \( \beta \in B' \) and \( \beta > \eta \), we have that \( \beta \in E_\eta \), and as \( \tau \in \theta \setminus T_\eta \), \( E_\eta \cap B^*_\eta = \emptyset \). This is a contradiction.

(2) Left to the reader. \( \square \)

We remind the reader before they read the following result that by our convention \( \theta \) is always a cardinal, and if \( \theta \) is in fact an infinite cardinal then \( \theta + \theta = \theta \).

**Proposition 2.27.** Suppose that \( J \) is a subnormal ideal over \( \kappa \) extending \( J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa] \). For a colouring \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \), \( B \in J^+ \), and \( \eta < \kappa \), denote:
\[
T^*_\eta(B) := \{ \tau < \theta \mid \{ \beta \in B \setminus (\eta + 1) \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \} \in J^+ \}.
\]

1. Suppose that \( c \) witnesses unbounded\((J^+, J, \theta)\). If \( \theta \) is infinite, suppose also that \( \theta < \kappa \) and that \( J \) is \( \theta^+ \)-complete.

   Then, for all \( A, B \in J^+ \), there is \( \eta \in A \) such that \( |T^*_\eta(B)| = \theta \).

2. Suppose that \( c \) witnesses onto\((J^+, J, \theta)\).

   Then, for all \( A, B \in J^+ \), there is \( \eta \in A \) such that \( T^*_\eta(B) = \emptyset \).

3. Suppose that \( J \) is \( \kappa \)-complete, \( \theta < \kappa \), \( c \) witnesses unbounded\((J, \theta + \theta)\), and \( \pi : \theta + \theta \to \theta \) is some 2-to-1 surjection.

   Then, for every \( B \in J^+ \), there is \( \eta < \kappa \) such that \( |T^*_{\eta}(B)| = \emptyset \).

4. Suppose that \( J \) is \( \kappa \)-complete, \( c \) witnesses onto\((J, \theta + \theta)\), and \( \pi : \theta + \theta \to \theta \) is some 2-to-1 surjection.

   Then, for every \( B \in J^+ \), there is \( \eta < \kappa \) such that \( T^*_{\eta}(B) = \emptyset \).

Proof. Due to constraints of space, we settle for proving Clause (3) as the proof contains all the ideas required to prove all the other clauses.

Towards a contradiction, suppose that \( B \in J^+ \) forms a counterexample. Denote \( B^*_\eta := \{ \beta \in B \setminus (\eta + 1) \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \} \). By the choice of \( B \), for every \( \eta < \kappa \), the set \( T_\eta := \{ \tau < \theta \mid B^*_\eta \in J^+ \} \) has size \( < \theta \). As \( J \) is \( \kappa \)-complete, \( E_\eta := \kappa \setminus \bigcup_{\tau \in \theta \setminus T_\eta} B^*_\eta \) is in \( J^* \) for every \( \eta < \kappa \). By Lemma \ref{lem:covering-lemma} we may find \( B' \subseteq B \in J^+ \) such that, for every \( (\alpha, \beta) \in [B^*]^2 \), \( \beta \in \bigcap_{\eta \leq \alpha} E_\eta \).

By the choice of \( c \), there is an \( \eta < \kappa \) such that the order-type of \( c(\eta) \uparrow B' \) is the cardinal \( \theta + \theta \). Let \( \alpha := \min(B' \setminus (\eta + 1)) \). Note that
\[
|c(\eta) \uparrow B'| \triangle [c(\eta) \times (B' \setminus (\alpha + 1))] | \leq 1.
\]

As \( \pi \) is a 2-to-1 map from \( \theta + \theta \) to \( \theta \), \( \pi[c(\eta) \times (B' \setminus (\alpha + 1))] \) has order-type \( \theta \).
Pick $\tau \in \pi[c\{\eta\} \times (B'(\alpha+1))]|T_\eta$. Pick $\beta \in B'$ above $\alpha$ such that $\pi(c(\eta,\beta)) = \tau$. As $\eta < \alpha < \beta$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in [B']^2$, we have that $\beta \in E_\eta$, and as $\tau \in \theta \setminus T_\eta$, $E_\eta \cap B_\eta^\tau = \emptyset$. This is a contradiction. \hfill $\Box$

**Corollary 2.28.** Suppose that $J$ is a subnormal ideal over $\kappa$ extending $J^{bd}[\kappa]$.

In any of the following cases, every element of $J^+$ can be split into $\theta$-many disjoint elements of $J^+$:

1. $\theta$ is finite and unbounded($J^+, J, \theta$) holds;
2. $\theta < \kappa$ is infinite, $J$ is $\theta^+$-complete and unbounded($J^+, J, \theta$) holds;
3. $J$ is $\kappa$-complete and unbounded($J, \theta$) holds.

**Proof.** (1) and (2) are covered by Proposition 2.27(1).

(3) If $\theta = \kappa$, then this follows from the implication (5) $\implies$ (3) of Lemma 3.4 below. If $\theta < \kappa$, then this follows from Proposition 2.27(3). \hfill $\Box$

### 2.4. Partitioning club-guessing

In this section we mention some applications of our colouring principles to partitioning the club guessing which will appear in the forthcoming [IR21]. We state our results in the simplest forms in order to ease the burden of notation on the reader. In [IR21], we consider stronger forms of guessing such as guessing more points, guessing on a fixed set, as well as guessing with respect to ideals different from the bounded ideals.

**Definition 2.29.** Suppose $S \subseteq \kappa$, and $\vec{h} = \{h_\delta : C_\delta \rightarrow \kappa \mid \delta \in S\}$ is a sequence for which $\vec{C} := \langle C_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ is a $C$-sequence.

1. $\vec{C}$ is $\xi$-bounded iff $\text{otp}(C_\delta) \leq \xi$ for all $\delta \in S$;
2. $\vec{C}$ guesses clubs iff for every club $D \subseteq \kappa$ there is a $\delta \in S$ such that $\text{sup}(\text{nacc}(C_\delta) \cap D) = \delta$;
3. $\vec{h}$ is $\theta$-guesses clubs iff for every club $D \subseteq \kappa$ there is a $\delta \in S$ such that, for every $\tau < \theta$, $\text{sup}(\{\beta \in \text{nacc}(C_\delta) \cap D \mid h_\delta(\beta) = \tau\}) = \delta$.

**Fact 2.30** (Shelah). For regular cardinals $\theta < \theta^+ < \kappa$, there exists a $\theta$-bounded $C$-sequence $\vec{C} = \langle C_\delta \mid \delta \in E^\kappa_\theta \rangle$ that guesses clubs in the following strong sense. For every club $D \subseteq \kappa$, there is $\delta \in E^\kappa_\theta$ such that $C_\delta \subseteq D$.

**Theorem 2.31** ([IR21]). Suppose $\xi < \kappa$ are infinite regular cardinals, $S \subseteq E^\kappa_\xi$, and $\vec{C} = \langle C_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ is a $\xi$-bounded $C$-sequence that guesses clubs.

(i) For every cardinal $\theta < \xi$ such that unbounded($J^{bd}[\xi], \theta$) holds, there exists a corresponding $\langle h_\delta : C_\delta \rightarrow \theta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ that $\theta$-guesses clubs;

(ii) For every cardinal $\theta \leq \xi$ such that onto($J^{bd}[\xi], \theta$) holds, there exists a corresponding $\langle h_\delta : C_\delta \rightarrow \theta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ that $\theta$-guesses clubs.

Note that when $\theta < \xi$, unbounded($J^{bd}[\xi], \theta$) has the exact same powerful effect as its stronger sibling onto($J^{bd}[\xi], \theta$). In particular, in the case that $\xi = \theta^+$ for $\theta$ singular, while the chain of implications

$$\xi \rightarrow [\xi^+]_\theta^\alpha \implies \text{onto}(J^{bd}[\xi], \theta) \implies \text{unbounded}(J^{bd}[\xi], \theta)$$

shows that unbounded($\ldots$) is a double weakening of the classical partition relation, it turns out that the result of Theorem A(1) suffices for the desired application.

We end this subsection with two more results from [IR21].
Corollary 2.32 ([IR21]). Suppose $\xi < \kappa$ are regular uncountable cardinals, and $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta \mid \delta \in E^\xi_\xi \rangle$ is a $\xi$-bounded $C$-sequence that guesses clubs.

In any of the following cases, there exists a corresponding $\langle h_\delta : C_\delta \to \theta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ that $\theta$-guesses clubs:

(i) $\theta < \xi$, and $\xi$ is not weakly compact in $L$;
(ii) $\theta < \xi$, and $\xi$ is not greatly Mahlo;
(iii) $\theta = \xi$ and $\check{\Diamond}(\xi)$ holds;
(iv) $\theta = \xi$ and $\check{\diamond}(S)$ holds for a stationary $S \subseteq \xi$ that does not reflect at regulars;
(v) $\theta = \xi$ is a successor cardinal, and $\check{\downarrow}(\xi)$ holds.

Proof. By Theorem 2.31 using Theorems C and D. □

In the special case of $\xi = \aleph_1$ and $\kappa = \aleph_2$, by putting together Theorem 2.31 Fact 8.1 with some additional progress made in [IR21], we arrive at the following.

Corollary 2.33 ([IR21]). Assuming non$(M) = \aleph_1$, there exists a sequence $\bar{h} = \langle h_\delta : C_\delta \to \aleph_1 \mid \delta \in E^\aleph_1_{\aleph_1} \rangle$ satisfying that, for every club $D \subseteq \aleph_2$, there is a $\delta \in E^\aleph_1_{\aleph_1}$, such that, for every $\tau < \aleph_1$, the following set is stationary in $\delta$:

$$\{\sup(C_\delta \cap \beta) \mid \beta \in \text{nacc}(C_\delta) \cap D \& h_\delta(\beta) = \tau\}.$$

2.5. Kunen’s inconsistency theorem. We end this section by giving yet another proof of Kunen’s celebrated theorem concerning nontrivial elementary embeddings of the universe, using the colouring principles we have introduced. We admit that the proof is highly inefficient, but given the occasion of this paper, we find it appropriate to include this tribute to Kunen.

Theorem 2.34 ([Kun71]). Suppose that $j : V \to M$ is a nontrivial elementary embedding. Then $V \neq M$.

Proof. Let $\theta := \text{crit}(j)$ and let $\lambda$ denote the first fixed-point of $j$ above $\theta$, namely, $\lambda = \sup_{\alpha < \omega} j^\alpha(\theta)$. Set $\kappa := \lambda^+$ and $S := E^\kappa_\omega$. Note that $j(\kappa) = \kappa$ and $j(S) = S$.

Fix a $C$-sequence $\bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle$ such that each $C_\beta$ is a cofinal subset of $\beta$ of order-type $\omega$. Evidently, $\bar{C}$ witnesses that $S \in A_\kappa$ in the sense of Definition 1.3.

Then, by Lemma 1.4 unbounded$(J, \kappa)$ holds for $J := \text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S$. It then follows from Theorem 0.9(b) that onto$^+(J^*, J, \theta)$ holds. In particular, onto$(J^*, J, \theta)$ holds. In simple words, this gives a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ such that for every club $D \subseteq \kappa$ and every stationary $B \subseteq S$, there exists an $\eta \in D \cap S$ such that $c(\{\eta\} @ B) = \theta$.

It follows that $j(c)$ is a colouring from $[\kappa]^2$ to $j(\theta)$ such that for every club $D \subseteq \kappa$ and every stationary $B \subseteq S$, there exists an $\eta \in D \cap S$ such that $c(\{\eta\} @ B) = j(\theta)$.

Towards a contradiction, suppose that $V = M$. In particular, $D := \text{acc}^+(j(\kappa))$ is in $M$. As $D$ is a club in $\kappa$, $B := D \cap S$ is stationary in $\kappa$, and since $\theta < j(\theta)$, we may then find $\eta \in D \cap S = B$ and $\beta \in B$ above $\eta$ such that $j(c)(\eta, \beta) = \theta$.

As $j$ is continuous at ordinals of cofinality $< \theta$, $D \cap E^\kappa_\beta = j^\kappa E^\kappa_\beta$. In particular, $(\eta, \beta) \in [D \cap E^\kappa_\beta]^2 = [j^\kappa E^\kappa_\beta]^2 \subseteq [j^\kappa\kappa]^2$, so we may pick $(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\beta}) \in [\kappa]^2$ such that $j(\tilde{\eta}) = \eta$ and $j(\tilde{\beta}) = \beta$. Then $\theta = j(c)(\eta, \beta) = j(c(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\beta})) = j^\kappa \theta = \theta$. This is a contradiction. □

3. Strongly amenable $C$-sequences

In this section, $\kappa$ denotes a regular uncountable cardinal.
Definition 3.1. Let $S \subseteq \kappa$. A $\mathcal{C}$-sequence $\mathcal{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle$ is strongly amenable in $\kappa$ if for every club $D$ in $\kappa$, the set $\{ \beta \in S \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \}$ is bounded in $\kappa$.

Remark 3.2. As made clear by the proof of Proposition 2.22, a $\mathcal{C}$-sequence over all of $\kappa$ is strongly amenable in $\kappa$ if it is nontrivial in the sense of [Tod07, Definition 6.3.1].

Definition 3.3. $\text{SA}_\kappa := \{ S \subseteq \kappa \mid S$ carries a $\mathcal{C}$-sequence strongly amenable in $\kappa \}$. 

Lemma 3.4. For a cofinal subset $S \subseteq \kappa$, the following are equivalent:

1. $S \in \text{SA}_\kappa$;
2. there exists an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ such that, for every cofinal $B \subseteq S$, there exists $\eta < \kappa$ such that, for every $\eta' \in [\eta, \kappa)$,
   $$\sup\{ \tau < \kappa \mid \sup\{ \beta \in B \mid c(\eta', \beta) = \tau \} = \kappa \} = \kappa;$$
3. there exists an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ such that, for every $\kappa$-complete subnormal ideal $J$ over $S$ extending $\mathcal{J}^{bd}[S]$, for every $B \in J^+$, there exists $\eta < \kappa$, such that, for every $\eta' \in [\eta, \kappa)$,
   $$\sup\{ \tau < \kappa \mid \{ \beta \in B \mid c(\eta', \beta) = \tau \} \in J^+ \} = \kappa;$$
4. unbounded$(J^+, J, \kappa)$ holds for every subnormal $\kappa$-complete ideal $J$ over $S$ extending $\mathcal{J}^{bd}[S]$;
5. unbounded$(\mathcal{J}^{bd}[S], \kappa)$ holds.

Proof. (1) $\implies$ (2): Suppose that $\mathcal{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle$ is a $\mathcal{C}$-sequence, strongly amenable in $\kappa$. Pick an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ such that, for all $\beta \in S$ and $\eta < \beta$, $c(\eta, \beta) = \min(C_\beta \setminus \eta)$.

To see that $c$ is as sought, let $B \subseteq S$ be cofinal. Towards a contradiction, suppose that, for every $\eta < \kappa$, there exist $\eta' \in [\eta, \kappa)$ and $\varsigma_\eta < \kappa$ such that, for every $\tau < \kappa$,
   $$\sup\{ \beta \in B \mid c(\eta', \beta) = \tau \} < \kappa.$$ 

Fix a club $D \subseteq \kappa$ such that, for every $\alpha \in D$:

- for all $\eta < \alpha$, $\eta' < \alpha$ and $\varsigma_\eta < \alpha$;
- for all $\eta < \alpha$ and $\tau \in \alpha \setminus \varsigma_\eta$, $\sup\{ \beta \in B \mid c(\eta', \beta) = \tau \} < \alpha$.

Let $\epsilon := \sup\{ \beta \in S \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \}$, and then fix $\beta \in B$ above $\epsilon$. As $D \cap \beta \not\subseteq C_\beta$, let us pick $\alpha \in D \cap \beta \setminus C_\beta$.

Claim 3.4.1. Let $\eta < \alpha$. Then $c(\eta', \beta) < \alpha$.

Proof. As $c(\eta', \beta) \in C_\beta$ and $\alpha \notin C_\beta$, we infer that $c(\eta', \beta) \neq \alpha$. As $\alpha \in D \cap \beta$, we have that $\varsigma_\eta < \alpha$, and, for every $\tau \in \alpha \setminus \varsigma_\eta$, $\sup\{ \beta \in B \mid c(\eta', \beta) = \tau \} < \alpha$. Altogether, $c(\eta', \beta) \leq \varsigma_\eta < \alpha$.\hspace{1cm}$\blacksquare$

Thus, for every $\eta < \alpha$, $\eta < \eta' \leq \min(C_\beta \setminus \eta') = c(\eta', \beta) < \alpha$. This means that $\{ \min(C_\beta \setminus \eta') \mid \eta < \alpha \}$ is unbounded in $\alpha$, while $\alpha \notin C_\beta$, contradicting the fact that $C_\beta$ is closed.

(2) $\implies$ (3): Let $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ be any colouring witnessing (2). Towards a contradiction, suppose that $J$ is $\kappa$-complete subnormal ideal over $S$ extending $\mathcal{J}^{bd}[S]$, and yet, for some $B \in J^+$, for every $\eta < \kappa$ there are $\eta' \in [\eta, \kappa)$ and $\varsigma_\eta < \kappa$ such that for every $\tau < \kappa$,
   $$\{ \beta \in B \mid c(\eta', \beta) = \tau \} \cap E_\eta^* = \emptyset.$$
As $J$ is $\kappa$-complete, for every $\alpha < \kappa$, $E_\alpha := \cap_{\eta \leq \alpha} \cap_{\tau \leq \alpha} E_{\eta,\tau}^\kappa$ is in $J^\kappa$. As $J$ is subnormal, we may then fix $B' \subseteq B$ in $J^+$ such that, for every $(\alpha, \beta) \in [B']^2$, $\beta \in E_\alpha$. Now, as $B' \subseteq J^+$, it is in particular cofinal in $S$, so there is some $\eta < \kappa$ such that the following set is cofinal in $\kappa$:

$$T := \{ \tau < \kappa \mid \sup\{\beta \in B' \mid c(\eta', \beta) = \tau\} = \kappa\}.$$ 

Fix $\tau \in T \setminus \eta$. Find a pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in [B' \setminus (\eta' + 1)]^2$ such that $c(\eta', \alpha) = \tau = c(\eta', \beta)$. As $c$ is upper-regressive, altogether,

$$c_\eta \leq \tau = c(\eta', \beta) = c(\eta', \alpha) < \alpha < \beta.$$

In particular, $\eta \leq \eta' < \alpha$ and $c_\eta \leq \tau < \alpha$, so $\beta \in E_\alpha \subseteq E_{\eta'}$, contradicting the fact that $c(\eta', \beta) = \tau$.

(3) \implies (4) \implies (5): This is immediate.

(5) \implies (1): Let $c$ witness unbounded$(J^{bd}[S], \kappa)$. By Clauses (1) and (2) of the upcoming Lemma 3.7, it suffices to prove that $S' := S \cap \text{Reg}(\kappa) \setminus \{\aleph_\eta\}$ carries a $C$-sequence strongly amenable in $\kappa$. For any $\beta \in S'$, as $c$ is upper-regressive,

$$C_\beta := \{ \delta < \beta \mid \forall \eta < \delta \in \text{sup}(\{c(\eta, \beta) < \delta\}) \}$$

is a club in $\beta$.

Towards a contradiction, suppose that $\bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S' \rangle$ is not strongly amenable in $\kappa$. Fix a club $D \subseteq \kappa$ for which the set $B := \{ \beta \in S' \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \}$ is cofinal in $\kappa$. Pick $\eta < \kappa$ such that $\sup(c(\eta) \uparrow B) = \kappa$ and then find $\delta \in D$ above $\eta$. Then, for every $\beta \in B$ above $\delta$, we get from $\eta < \delta$ and $\delta \in D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta$ that $c(\eta, \beta) < \delta$. Combined with the regularity of $\kappa$ this gives that $\sup(c(\eta) \uparrow B) < \kappa$, contradicting the choice of $\eta$.

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 3.5.** If unbounded$(J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa)$ holds, then so does unbounded*$(\aleph[\kappa], J^{bd}[\kappa], [\kappa]^\kappa)$.

**Proof.** By the implication (5) \implies (2) of Lemma 3.4 \[ \square \]

**Definition 3.6** (Iterated trace operations). For $S \subseteq \kappa$, for each $\alpha \leq \kappa^+$, define $\text{Tr}^\alpha(S)$ recursively as follows:

- $\text{Tr}^0(S) := S$;
- $\text{Tr}^{\alpha+1}(S) := \text{Tr}(\text{Tr}^\alpha(S))$;
- for $\alpha < \kappa$, $\text{Tr}^\alpha(S) := \bigcap_{\alpha' < \alpha} \text{Tr}^{\alpha'}(S)$;
- for $\kappa \leq \alpha < \kappa^+$ a limit ordinal, let $\pi : \kappa \leftrightarrow \alpha$ be a bijection and then $\text{Tr}^\alpha(S) := \bigcap_{\alpha' < \kappa} \text{Tr}^{\pi(\alpha')}(S)$.

A folklore result is that these operations are well-defined up to equivalence modulo $\text{NS}_\kappa$.

**Lemma 3.7.** (1) $[\kappa]^< \subseteq \text{SA}_\kappa$;
(2) $\{ \beta < \kappa \mid \text{cf}(\beta) < \beta \} \in \text{SA}_\kappa$;
(3) $\text{SA}_\kappa$ is a $\kappa$-complete ideal;
(4) $\text{NS}_\kappa \subseteq \text{SA}_\kappa$;
(5) $\{ \kappa \setminus \text{Tr}(S) \mid S \in (\text{NS}_\kappa)^+ \} \subseteq \text{SA}_\kappa$;
(6) for every $\alpha < \kappa$, $\kappa \setminus \text{Tr}^\alpha(\kappa) \in \text{SA}_\kappa$;
(7) for every $S \in (\text{SA}_\kappa)^+$, $\text{Tr}(S) \in (\text{SA}_\kappa)^+$.
Proof. (1) This is obvious.

(2) Denote \( S := \{ \beta < \kappa \mid \text{cf}(\beta) < \beta \} \), and let \( \bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle \) be any \( C \)-sequence such that \( \min(C_\beta) > \text{otp}(C_\beta) = \text{cf}(\beta) \) for all \( \beta \in S \). Towards a contradiction, suppose that \( D \) is some club in \( \kappa \), for which \( B := \{ \beta \in S \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \} \) is unbounded in \( \kappa \). Pick \( \alpha \in D \), and then pick \( \alpha' < \kappa \) such that \( \text{otp}(D \cap \alpha') > \alpha \). Finally, pick \( \beta \in B \setminus \alpha' \). Then
\[
\min(C_\beta) > \text{otp}(C_\beta) \geq \text{otp}(D \cap \beta) \geq \text{otp}(D \cap \alpha') > \alpha.
\]
However, \( \alpha \in D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \), which is a contradiction.

(3) It is clear that \( \text{SA}_\kappa \) is downward-closed with respect to inclusion. To see that \( \text{SA}_\kappa \) is \( \kappa \)-complete, suppose that \( \{ S_i \mid i < \sigma \} \) is a given family of elements of \( \text{SA}_\kappa \), with \( \sigma < \kappa \). We would like to show that \( S := \bigcup_{i<\sigma} S_i \) is in \( \text{SA}_\kappa \). Since \( \text{SA}_\kappa \) is downward-closed, and by possibly replacing \( S_i \) by \( S_i \setminus \bigcup_{j<i} S_j \), we may assume that the elements of \( \{ S_i \mid i < \sigma \} \) are pairwise disjoint. For each \( i < \sigma \), by \( S_i \in \text{SA}_\kappa \), let \( \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S_i \rangle \) be some \( C \)-sequence strongly amenable in \( \kappa \). We claim that \( \bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle \) is strongly amenable in \( \kappa \). Indeed, for every club \( D \subseteq \kappa \), if \( B := \{ \beta \in S \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \} \) is unbounded in \( \kappa \), then for some \( i < \sigma \), \( B \cap S_i \) is unbounded in \( \kappa \), contradicting the fact that \( \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S_i \rangle \) is strongly amenable in \( \kappa \).

(4) Fix \( S \in \text{NS}_\kappa \), and we shall show that \( S \in \text{SA}_\kappa \). By Clause (2), we may assume that \( S \subseteq \text{Reg}(\kappa) \). As \( S \in \text{NS}_\kappa \), fix a club \( E \subseteq \kappa \) disjoint from \( S \). In particular, \( S \cap \text{acc}(E) = \emptyset \), so for every \( \beta \in S \) we may fix a club \( C_\beta \) in \( \beta \) disjoint from \( E \). We claim that \( \bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle \) is strongly amenable in \( \kappa \). Towards a contradiction, suppose that this is not so, as witnessed by a club \( D \subseteq \kappa \). That is, suppose that the set \( B := \{ \beta \in S \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \} \) is unbounded in \( \kappa \). Then we can find \( \beta \in B \) above \( \min(D \cap E) \). Then \( D \cap E \cap \beta \subseteq D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \) and all three of these sets are nonempty. This implies that \( E \cap C_\beta \) is nonempty, which is a contradiction.

(5) Let \( S \subseteq \kappa \) be stationary. By Clause (2), to see that \( \kappa \setminus \text{Tr}(S) \) is in \( \text{SA}_\kappa \), it suffices to show that \( T := \text{Reg}(\kappa) \setminus \text{Tr}(S) \) is in \( \text{SA}_\kappa \). Fix a \( C \)-sequence \( \bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in T \rangle \) such that each \( C_\beta \) is a club in \( \beta \) disjoint from \( S \). Now, if there exists a club \( E \) such that \( \{ \beta \in T \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \} \) is unbounded in \( \kappa \), then we may pick \( \beta \) in this set above \( \min(D \cap S) \). This is a contradiction.

(6) Using \( \kappa \)-completeness of the ideal and Clause (5).

(7) This follows from Clause (5). \( \square \)

Corollary 3.8. If \( \square(\kappa, < \mu) \) holds with \( \mu < \kappa \), then unbounded\( (J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) holds.

In particular, if unbounded\( (J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) fails, then \( \kappa \) is weakly compact in \( L \).

Proof. By \[HLH17\] Theorem 2.13, if \( \square(\kappa, < \mu) \) holds with \( \mu < \kappa \), then there exists a family of \( < \mu \) many stationary sets that do not reflect simultaneously. \( \square \)

Remark 3.9. As made clear by the proof of \[BR19\] Lemma 1.23, in fact, any transversal for a \( \square(\kappa, < \mu) \)-sequence, with \( \mu < \kappa \), is strongly amenable in \( \kappa \).

Corollary 3.10. If unbounded\( (J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) fails, then Refl\( (\kappa, \kappa, \text{Reg}(\kappa)) \) holds and hence \( \kappa \) is greatly Mahlo.

Proof. By Lemma \[3.3\] and Remark \[3.3\] if unbounded\( (J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) fails, then \( \kappa \) does not carry a nontrivial \( C \)-sequence. By \[LHR21\] Lemma 2.12, if \( \kappa \) does not carry a nontrivial \( C \)-sequence, then Refl\( (\kappa, \kappa, \text{Reg}(\kappa)) \) holds and hence \( \kappa \) is greatly Mahlo. \( \square \)
Corollary 3.11. For every stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$, there exists a stationary $S' \subseteq S$ with $S' \in \text{SA}_\kappa$.

Proof. Let $S \subseteq \kappa$ be stationary. By Lemma 3.4 (2), it suffices to consider the case where $S$ consists of regular cardinals. By Lemma 3.7 (5), it then suffices to prove that $S' := S \setminus \text{Tr}(S)$ is stationary, but this is standard. \hfill \Box

In Corollary 10.5 below, we shall show that, assuming $V = L$, for every regular uncountable cardinal $\kappa$, $\kappa \in \text{SA}_\kappa$ iff $\kappa$ is not weakly compact. However, this equivalence does not hold in general: Corollary 2.25 (1) gives the consistency of a strongly inaccessible cardinal $\kappa$ that does not carry a strongly amenable $\kappa$-sequence, and yet $\kappa$ is not weakly compact. Furthermore, and in contrast to Corollary 3.10, we shall soon show that $\kappa \notin \text{SA}_\kappa$ does not even imply that $\kappa$ is strongly inaccessible.

Proposition 3.12. Let $P$ be a $\theta$-cc poset, and $S \subseteq \kappa$.

1. If $\theta \leq \kappa$ and $V^P \models S \notin \text{SA}_\kappa$, then $S \notin \text{SA}_\kappa$;
2. If $\theta < \kappa$ and $V^P \models S \in \text{SA}_\kappa$, then $S \in \text{SA}_\kappa$.

Proof. (1) The proof is exactly the same as that of Corollary 2.25. Namely, by the $\theta$-cc of $P$, any club $D \subseteq \kappa$ in $V^P$ contains a club $D'$ which is in $V$. The result follows.

(2) Suppose $\theta < \kappa$ and $V^P \models S \in \text{SA}_\kappa$; we shall show that $S \in \text{SA}_\kappa$. By Corollary 3.10, we can assume that $\kappa$ is weakly Mahlo. By Lemma 3.7, we can moreover assume that $S$ consists of regular uncountable cardinals greater than $\theta$. By our hypothesis, we may fix in $V^P$ a $C$-sequence $\vec{C} = \{C_\beta \mid \beta \in S\}$ which is strongly amenable in $\kappa$. As $P$ has the $\theta$-cc, and $S$ consists of regular uncountable cardinals greater than $\theta$, there is, in $V$, a $C$-sequence $\vec{c} = \{c_\beta \mid \beta \in S\}$ such that $c_\beta \subseteq C_\beta$ for each $\beta \in S$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that $\vec{c}$ is not a strongly amenable in $\kappa$. Then there is some club $D \subseteq \kappa$ such that the set $\{\beta \in S \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq c_\beta\}$ is unbounded in $\kappa$. Now notice that, in $V^P$,

$$\{\beta \in S \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq c_\beta\} \subseteq \{\beta \in S \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta\}$$

and the former set is unbounded in $\kappa$ whereas the latter set is bounded in $\kappa$ by virtue of $\vec{C}$ being strongly amenable in $\kappa$. This is a contradiction. \hfill \Box

Remark 3.13. Assuming the consistency of a weakly compact (resp. ineffable) cardinal, it is consistent that $\kappa \in \text{SA}_\kappa$ holds, and yet, $\kappa$ is weakly compact (resp. ineffable) in $L$. This is obtained by simply forcing over $L$ to add a $\square(\kappa)$ sequence (see [LH14] pp. 686).

Corollary 3.14. Assuming the consistency of a weakly compact cardinal, it is consistent that $\kappa = 2^{\aleph_0}$, and $\kappa \notin \text{SA}_\kappa$.

Proof. This follows from [LHR21] Corollary 4.9] using Remark 3.2, but here is a short direct proof. By Proposition 2.23 if $\kappa$ is weakly compact, then $\kappa \notin \text{SA}_\kappa$. Now start with $\kappa$ weakly compact and force to add $\kappa$ many Cohen reals. As the forcing poset is $\text{ccc}$, by Proposition 3.12 (1) we must have that $\kappa \notin \text{SA}_\kappa$ in the forcing extension as well. \hfill \Box

4. AMENABLE C-SEQUENCES

In this section, $\kappa$ denotes a regular uncountable cardinal.
Definition 4.1 ([BR19]). Let $S \subseteq \kappa$. A $C$-sequence $\vec{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle$ is amenable in $\kappa$ iff for every club $D \subseteq \kappa$, the set $\{ \beta \in S \mid D \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \}$ is nonstationary in $\kappa$.

The notion of an amenable $C$-sequence is implicit in the elementary proof (see [Jan03, Theorem 8.10]) of Solovay’s theorem that any stationary subset of $\kappa$ may be decomposed into $\kappa$-many stationary sets. It was made explicit in [BR19], in proving that, assuming $\square(\kappa)$, every fat subset of $\kappa$ may be decomposed into $\kappa$-many fat sets.

Fact 4.2 ([BR19]). For a $C$-sequence $\vec{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle$ over a stationary subset $S \subseteq \text{acc}(\kappa)$, the following are equivalent:

1. $\vec{C}$ is amenable;
2. for every club $D \subseteq \kappa$, the set $\{ \beta \in S \mid \sup(D \cap \beta \setminus C_\beta) < \beta \}$ is nonstationary in $\kappa$;
3. for every cofinal $A \subseteq \kappa$, the set $\{ \beta \in S \mid A \cap \beta \subseteq C_\beta \}$ is nonstationary.

Definition 4.3. $A_\kappa := \{ S \subseteq \kappa \mid S \text{ carries a } C\text{-sequence amenable in } \kappa \}$.

Lemma 4.4. For a stationary subset $S \subseteq \kappa$, the following are equivalent:

1. $S \in A_\kappa$;
2. there exists an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ such that, for every normal ideal $J$ over $S$ extending $J^{bd}[S]$, for every $B \in J^+$, there exists $\eta < \kappa$, such that, for every $\eta' \in [\eta, \kappa)$,
   $$\sup\{ \tau < \kappa \mid \{ \beta \in B \mid c(\eta', \beta) = \tau \} \in J^+ \} = \kappa;$$
3. unbounded ($[\kappa]^\kappa, J, \kappa$) holds for every normal ideal $J$ over $S$;
4. unbounded ($\text{NS}_\kappa \mid S, \kappa$) holds.

Proof. (1) $\implies$ (2) Suppose that $\vec{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle$ is a $C$-sequence, amenable in $\kappa$. Pick an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ such that, for all $\beta \in S \cap \text{acc}(\kappa)$ and $\eta < \beta$, $c(\eta, \beta) := \min(C_\beta \setminus \eta)$.

To see that $c$ is as sought, let $J$ be a normal ideal over $S$ extending $J^{bd}[S]$, and let $B \in J^+$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that, for every $\eta < \kappa$, there exist $\eta' \in [\eta, \kappa)$ and $\varsigma_\eta < \kappa$ such that, for every $\tau < \kappa$, $\sup\{ \beta \in B \mid c(\eta', \beta) = \tau \} \notin J$.

Thus, for every $\eta < \kappa$, $\varsigma_\eta < \eta' < \alpha < \beta < \tau$ is in $J^*$. For every $\tau \in \varsigma_\eta$, let $E_{\tau, \eta} := S \setminus B \cup E_{\eta, \tau}$ is in $J^*$. Since $J$ is normal, $E := \bigcup_{\eta < \kappa} E_{\eta, \tau}$ is in $J^*$. Note that $E = \{ \beta \in S \mid \forall \eta < \kappa \forall \tau < \beta \forall \eta' \in \varsigma_\eta (\beta \in E_{\eta, \tau}) \}$.

Consider the club $D := \{ \alpha < \kappa \mid \forall \eta < \alpha (\eta', \varsigma_\eta < \alpha) \}$. As $J$ extends $J^{bd}[S]$, Fact 2 implies that $B \cap E$ is stationary. So, by the amenability of $\vec{C}$, let us fix $\beta \in B \cap E$ with $D \cap \beta \notin C_\beta$. Then pick $\alpha \in D \cap \beta \setminus C_\beta$.

Claim 4.4.1. Let $\eta < \alpha$. Then $c(\eta', \beta) < \alpha$.

Proof. As $c$ is upper-regressive, $\tau := c(\eta', \beta)$ is less than $\beta$. As $\alpha \in D$ and $\eta < \alpha$, we have that $\eta \leq \eta' < \alpha < \beta$. If $\tau \in \varsigma_\beta \setminus \varsigma_\eta$, then $\beta \in B \cap E_{\eta, \tau}$, which is an absurdity. Altogether, $\tau < \varsigma_\eta$. As $\eta < \alpha$ and $\alpha \in D$, furthermore, $c(\eta', \beta) = \tau < \varsigma_\eta < \alpha$. \hfill $\dashv$

Thus, for every $\eta < \alpha$, $\eta \leq \eta' \leq \min(C_\beta \setminus \eta') = c(\eta', \beta) < \alpha$. This means that $\{ \min(C_\beta \setminus \eta') \mid \eta < \alpha \}$ is unbounded in $\alpha$, while $\alpha \notin C_\beta$, contradicting the fact that $C_\beta$ is closed.

(2) $\implies$ (3) $\implies$ (4): This is immediate.

(4) $\implies$ (1): By Lemma 4.4 and Clause (1) of the upcoming Lemma 4.7, it suffices to prove that $S' := S \cap \text{Reg}(\kappa) \setminus \{ \emptyset \}$ carries an amenable $C$-sequence.
Let $c$ witness unbounded$(\text{NS}_κ \upharpoonright S, κ)$. For any $β \in S'$, as $c$ is upper-regressive, $C_β := \{δ < β \mid ∀η < δ[c(η, β) < δ]\}$ is a club in $β$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that $\vec{C} = \langle C_β \mid β \in S'\rangle$ is not amenable in $κ$. Fix a club $D ⊆ κ$ for which the set $B := \{β ∈ S' \mid D ∩ β ⊆ C_β\}$ is stationary. Pick $η < κ$ such that $\sup(c[\langle η \rangle \upharpoonright B]) = κ$. Fix $δ ∈ D$ above $η$. Then, for every $β ∈ B$ above $δ$, we get from $δ ∈ C_β \setminus (η + 1)$ that $c(η, β) < δ$. Since $κ$ is regular, we conclude that $\sup(c[\langle η \rangle \upharpoonright B]) < κ$, contradicting the choice of $η$. ⊓⊔

**Corollary 4.5.** If unbounded$(\text{NS}_κ, κ)$ holds, then so does unbounded$^*([κ]^κ, \text{NS}_κ, [κ]^κ)$.

**Definition 4.6 ([IR21]).** For stationary subsets $S, T$ of $κ$, $CG^*(S, T)$ asserts the existence of a $C$-sequence, $\vec{C} = \langle C_δ \mid δ ∈ S \rangle$ such that, for every club $E ⊆ κ$, there are club many $δ ∈ S$ such that, $\sup(\text{nacc}(C_δ) ∩ E ∩ T) = δ$.

**Lemma 4.7.**
1. $SΑ_κ ⊆ Α_κ$;
2. $Α_κ$ is a $κ$-complete normal ideal;
3. For every $α ∈ κ^+$, $κ \setminus \text{Tr}^α(κ) ∈ SΑ_κ$;
4. $\{S ∈ (\text{NS}_κ)^+ \mid CG^*(S, κ)\} ⊆ Α_κ$;
5. For every $S ∈ (Α_κ)^+$, $\text{Tr}(S) ∈ (Α_κ)^+$.

**Proof.**
(1) This is obvious.

(2) It is clear that $Α_κ$ is downward-closed with respect to inclusion. To see that $Α_κ$ is $κ$-complete, suppose that $\{S_i \mid i < σ\}$ is a given family of elements of $Α_κ$, with $σ < κ$. We would like to show that $S := \bigcup_{i < σ} S_i$ is in $Α_κ$. Since $Α_κ$ is downward-closed, we may assume that the elements of $\langle S_i \mid i < σ\rangle$ are pairwise disjoint. For each $i < σ$, by $S_i ∈ Α_κ$, let $⟨C_β \mid β ∈ S_i⟩$ be some $C$-sequence amenable in $κ$. We claim that $\vec{C} = ⟨C_β \mid β ∈ S⟩$ is amenable in $κ$. Indeed, for every club $D ⊆ κ$, the set $\bigcap E ∈ Α_κ$ is in $κ$. Next, to see that $Α_κ$ is normal, suppose that $\langle S_i \mid i < κ\rangle$ is a $κ$-sequence consisting of elements of $Α_κ$. We would like to show that

$$S := \{β < κ \mid ∃i < κ (β ∈ S_i)\}$$

is in $Α_κ$. By the preceding findings, it suffices to prove that $S' := S \setminus (\{β < κ \mid c(β) < β\} ∪ (κ))$ is in $Α_κ$.

For each $i < κ$, fix a $C$-sequence $⟨C_β^i \mid β ∈ S_i⟩$ amenable in $κ$. Let $β ∈ S'$ be arbitrary. Then $β$ is a regular uncountable cardinal, and $⟨C_β^i \mid i < β & β ∈ S_i⟩$ consists of at most $β$ many clubs in $β$, so that by using a diagonal intersection or any other mean, we may find a club $C_β$ in $β$ such that, for every $i < β$ with $β ∈ S_i$, $C_β \setminus C_β^i$ is bounded in $β$. We claim that $\vec{C} = ⟨C_β \mid β ∈ S⟩$ is amenable in $κ$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that $D$ is a club in $κ$ for which $T := \{β ∈ S' \mid D ∩ β ⊆ C_β\}$ is stationary in $κ$. As $S' ⊆ S$ and by Fodor’s lemma, let us fix some $i < κ$ such that $T ∩ S_i$ is stationary. By another application of Fodor’s lemma, let us fix some $ε < κ$ such that $T_{i, ε} := \{β ∈ T ∩ S_i \mid \sup(C_β \setminus C_β^i) = ε\}$ is stationary. Now, consider the club $D' := D \setminus (ε + 1)$. We claim that $\{β ∈ S_i \mid D' ∩ β ⊆ C_β^i\}$ is stationary in $κ$, contradicting the fact that $⟨C_β^i \mid β ∈ S_i⟩$ is amenable in $κ$. To see this, let $β$ be an arbitrary element of the stationary set $T_{i, ε}$. Then $D ∩ β ⊆ C_β ⊆ C_β^i ∪ (ε + 1)$, so that $D' ∩ β ⊆ C_β^i$.

(3) Since $κ \setminus \text{Tr}(κ) ∈ SΑ_κ ⊆ Α_κ$ and because $Α_κ$ is normal and $κ$-complete.
(4) Suppose $\vec{C}$ witnesses $CG^\ast(S,\kappa)$. Given a club $D \subseteq \kappa$, let $E := \text{acc}(D)$. By the choice of $\vec{C}$, $B := \{ \beta \in S \mid \sup(\text{nacc}(C_\beta) \cap E) = \beta \}$ covers a club relative to $S$. For every $\beta \in B$ and $\epsilon \in \text{nacc}(C_\beta) \cap E$, as $\epsilon \in \text{acc}(D)$, we may find some $\delta_\epsilon \in D$ with $\sup(C_\beta \cap \epsilon) < \delta_\epsilon < \epsilon$, and then $\{ \delta_\epsilon \mid \epsilon \in \text{nacc}(C_\beta) \cap E \}$ is a subset of $D \cap \beta \setminus C_\beta$ which is cofinal in $\beta$. So $\{ \beta \in S \mid \sup(D \cap \beta \setminus C_\beta) < \beta \}$ is disjoint from $B$, and we are done, recalling Fact 4.2.

(5) Let $S \in (A_\kappa)^+$. By Clause (1) and Lemma 3.7(5), $\kappa \setminus \text{Tr}(S) \in S A_\kappa \subseteq A_\kappa$. So if $\text{Tr}(S) \in A_\kappa$, then $\kappa \in A_\kappa$, contradicting the fact that $S \subseteq \kappa$ with $S \notin A_\kappa$. □

**Proposition 4.8.** If $V = L$, then $A_\kappa = \{ S \subseteq \kappa \mid S$ is not ineffable $\}$.

Proof. It is clear from the definitions that for any set $S \subseteq \kappa$, if $S \in A_\kappa$ then it is not ineffable. So we prove the other direction. Suppose that $S \subseteq \kappa$ is not ineffable. By Lemma 4.7(1) and Clauses (2) and (4) of Lemma 3.7, we can assume that $S$ is a stationary set consisting of regular uncountable cardinals. By a theorem of Jensen (see [Sch14 Theorem 5.39]), $V = L$ implies that $\dot{\phi}^*$ holds over every stationary non-ineffable subset of $\kappa$, so let us fix a $\dot{\phi}^\ast(S)$-sequence $\langle A_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle$. This means that each $A_\beta$ is a collection of no more than $\beta$ many subsets of $\beta$, and, for every subset $A$ of $\kappa$, for club many $\beta \in S$, $A \cap \beta \in A_\beta$. Now, for every $\beta \in S$, by taking a diagonal intersection, we can fix a club $C_\beta$ in $\beta$ such that for every $D \in A_\beta$ which is a club in $\beta$, $C_\beta \subseteq^\ast D$. In effect, $\{ C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \}$ is a $CG^\ast(S,\kappa)$-sequence, and then Lemma 4.7(4) implies that $S \in A_\kappa$. □

The preceding characterization of $A_\kappa$ is not true in general, as established by Corollary 3.8.2.

**Proposition 4.9.** Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a $\theta$-cc poset, and $S \subseteq \kappa$.

1. If $\theta \leq \kappa$ and $\mathbb{P} \models S \notin A_\kappa$, then $S \notin A_\kappa$.

2. If $\theta < \kappa$ and $\mathbb{P} \models \kappa \in A_\kappa$, then $S \in A_\kappa$.

Proof. (1) The proof is exactly the same as that of Proposition 3.12(1).

(2) The proof is almost exactly the same as that of Proposition 3.12(2) using only Lemma 4.7(1) and the extra fact that as $\mathbb{P}$ is in particular $\kappa$-cc, stationary subsets of $\kappa$ remain stationary after forcing with $\mathbb{P}$. □

**Corollary 4.10.** Assuming the consistency of an ineffable cardinal, it is consistent that $\kappa = 2^{\aleph_0}$, and $\kappa \notin A_\kappa$.

Proof. As we have already mentioned, if $\kappa$ is ineffable then it follows purely from the definitions that $\kappa \notin A_\kappa$. Now start with $\kappa$ ineffable and force to add $\kappa$ many Cohen reals. As the forcing poset is $\text{ccc}$, by Proposition 4.9(1) we must have that $\kappa \notin A_\kappa$ in the forcing extension as well. □

We end this section with a conjecture in the spirit of Corollary 3.8.

**Conjecture 4.11.** If $\kappa$ is a regular uncountable cardinal and $\kappa \notin A_\kappa$, then $\kappa$ is ineffable in $L$.

5. **Unbounded* and Ulam-type matrices**

An Ulam matrix is a useful tool in proving that various ideals are not saturated. It was introduced by Ulam in [Ula30], who proved that every successor cardinal admits an Ulam matrix. Later, in [Haj69], Hajnal formulated a variation called triangular Ulam matrix which makes sense also for inaccessible cardinals, and has
similar non-saturation consequences. In this section, we shall show that these concepts are captured by the principle unbounded\(^*\)(\ldots) introduced in this paper, and that a couple of standard combinatorial hypotheses give rise to useful instances of unbounded\(^*\)(\ldots) weaker than those corresponding to Ulam matrices.

In this section \(\kappa\) denotes a regular uncountable cardinal.

**Definition 5.1.** An Ulam-type matrix for a cardinal \(\kappa\) is a triangular matrix \(\langle U_{\eta,\tau} \mid \eta < \tau < \kappa \rangle\) satisfying that, for every \(\eta < \kappa\), \(\langle U_{\eta,\tau} \mid \eta < \tau < \kappa \rangle\) consists of pairwise disjoint subsets of \(\kappa\).

**Definition 5.2.** A cardinal \(\kappa\) is said to admit a triangular Ulam matrix iff there exists an Ulam-type matrix \(\langle U_{\eta,\tau} \mid \eta < \tau < \kappa \rangle\) for which the set \(T := \{\tau < \kappa \mid \kappa \setminus (\bigcup_{\eta < \tau} U_{\eta,\tau}) < \kappa\}\) (which we call the support) is stationary in \(\kappa\).

**Lemma 5.3.** For any stationary \(T \subseteq \kappa\), the following are equivalent:

1. unbounded\(^*\)(\(J^{bd}[\kappa], \{T\}\)) holds;
2. unbounded\(^*\)(\(J, \{T\}\)) holds for some normal ideal \(J\) over \(\kappa\) extending \(J^{bd}[\kappa]\);
3. there is a stationary \(S \subseteq \kappa\) such that, for every \(\beta \in S\), there is a function \(f_\beta : T \cap \beta \to \beta\) which is regressive and injective;
4. there is a cofinal \(A \subseteq \kappa\) such that, for every \(\beta \in A\), there is a function \(f_\beta : T \cap \beta \to \beta\) which is regressive and injective;
5. \(\text{Tr}(T) \cap \text{Reg}(\kappa)\) is nonstationary;
6. \(\kappa\) carries a triangular Ulam matrix with support \(T\).

**Proof.** (5) \(\Rightarrow\) (3) \(\Rightarrow\) (6): This is Hajnal’s theorem [Haj69].

(6) \(\Rightarrow\) (1): Let \(\langle U_{\eta,\tau} \mid \eta < \tau < \kappa \rangle\) be a triangular Ulam matrix with support \(T\). Let \(c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa\) be any upper-regressive colouring satisfying that for \(\eta < \beta < \kappa\), if there is a \(\tau\) such that \(\eta < \tau < \beta\) and \(\beta \in U_{\eta,\tau}\) then \(c(\eta, \beta) = \tau\). Note that as \(\langle U_{\eta,\tau} \mid \eta < \tau < \kappa \rangle\) is an Ulam-type matrix, this is well-defined. Now, suppose that \(B \in (J^{bd}[\kappa])^+\) is given. For every \(\tau \in T\) we have that \(B \setminus (\bigcup_{\eta < \tau} U_{\eta,\tau})\) has size less than \(\kappa\). So we can pick a \(\beta \in (\bigcup_{\eta < \tau} U_{\eta,\tau}) \setminus (\tau + 1)\). Then if \(\eta < \tau\) is such that \(\beta \in U_{\eta,\tau}\) then \(c(\eta, \beta) = \tau\).

(1) \(\Rightarrow\) (2): This is trivial.

(2) \(\Rightarrow\) (3) Observe that by Fact 2.4 as \(J\) is a normal ideal extending \(J^{bd}[\kappa]\), \(J\) extends \(\text{NS}_\kappa\). Now let \(c\) witness unbounded\(^*\)(\(J, \{T\}\)) for some ideal \(J\) as above. In particular, for every \(\tau \in T\), the set \(N_\tau := \{\beta < \kappa \mid \forall \eta < \tau (c(\eta, \beta) \neq \tau)\}\) is in \(J\). As \(J\) is normal, \(S := \bigcap_{\tau < \kappa}(\kappa \setminus N_\tau)\) is in its dual filter. In particular, \(S\) is stationary in \(\kappa\). Now, let \(\beta \in S\). Then, for every \(\tau \in T \cap \beta\), \(\beta \notin N_\tau\) and so there is an \(\eta < \tau\) such that \(c(\eta, \beta) = \tau\). So, for every \(\beta \in S\), the function \(f_\beta : T \cap \beta \to \beta\) given by \(f_\beta(\tau) := \min\{\eta < \tau \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau\}\) is well-defined and regressive. It is also clearly injective.

(3) \(\Rightarrow\) (4): This is obvious.

(4) \(\Rightarrow\) (1) Let \(c\) be an upper-regressive colouring satisfying that for every \(\eta < \beta < \kappa\), if there exists a \(\tau \in T \cap \beta\) such that \(f_{\min(A \setminus \beta)}(\tau) = \eta\), then \(c(\eta, \beta) := \tau\). Note that such a \(\tau\) would necessarily be unique so there is no ambiguity in this requirement. To see that \(c\) witnesses unbounded\(^*\)(\(J^{bd}[\kappa], \{T\}\)), let \(\tau \in T\) and \(B \in (J^{bd}[\kappa])^+\) be arbitrary. Fix \(\beta \in B\) above \(\tau\). Let \(\eta := f_{\min(A \setminus \beta)}(\tau)\). Then \(\eta < \tau\) and \(c(\eta, \beta) = \tau\).

(1) \(\Rightarrow\) (5): Let \(c\) witness unbounded\(^*\)(\(J^{bd}[\kappa], \{T\}\)). In particular, for every \(\tau \in T\), the set \(\{\beta < \kappa \mid \forall \eta < \tau (c(\eta, \beta) \neq \tau)\}\) is bounded in \(\kappa\). Thus, we may
define a function $f : T \to \kappa$ via $f(\tau) := \sup\{\beta < \kappa \mid \forall \eta < \tau (c(\eta, \beta) \neq \tau)\}$. Suppose now that $\text{Tr}(T) \cap \text{Reg}(\kappa)$ is a stationary subset of $\kappa$. Then we can pick $\mu \in \text{Reg}(\kappa) \cap \text{Tr}(T)$ such that $f[\mu] \subseteq \mu$. So, the set $\bar{T} := T \cap \mu$ is a stationary subset of $\mu$. As $f[\bar{T}] \subseteq \mu$, we may define a function $g : \bar{T} \to \mu$ via $g(\tau) := \min\{\eta < \tau \mid c(\eta, \mu) = \tau\}$. As $g$ is regressive, there must exist $\tau \neq \tau'$ in $\bar{T}$ and $\eta < \kappa$ such that $g(\tau) = \eta = g(\tau')$. So $\tau = c(\eta, \mu) = \tau'$. This is a contradiction. 

So we arrive at the following reformulation of Ulam’s celebrated theorem.

**Fact 5.4** ([Ulm30]). If $\theta$ is infinite, then $\text{unbounded}^\ast((\theta), J^{bd}[\theta^+], \{\theta^+\})$ holds.

**Lemma 5.5.** If $\square^\ast(S)$ holds, then so does $\text{unbounded}^\ast(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \{\kappa \mid \epsilon < \kappa\})$.

**Proof.** By Proposition 4.5, using Lemma 8.5(1) below.

We remind the reader that $\text{CG}^\ast(S, T)$ was defined in Definition 4.6.

**Lemma 5.6.** If $\text{CG}^\ast(S, T)$ holds, then so does $\text{unbounded}^\ast(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, (\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright T)^+)$.

**Proof.** Let $\bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle$ witness $\text{CG}^\ast(S, T)$. Pick an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ such that, for all $\beta \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \cap S$ and $\eta < \beta$, $c(\eta, \beta) = \min(C_\beta \setminus \eta)$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that $c$ does not witness $\text{unbounded}^\ast(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, (\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright T)^+)$. This means that there is a stationary $B \subseteq S$ for which the following set

$$T' := \{\tau \in T \mid \forall \eta < \tau \forall \beta \in (B \setminus (\eta + 1))(c(\eta, \beta) \neq \tau)\}$$

meets every element of $(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright T)^+$. So we can fix a club $D \subseteq \text{acc}(\kappa)$ such that $D \cap T \subseteq T'$. By the choice $\bar{C}$, we may now find $\beta \in B$ with $\sup(\text{nacc}(C_\beta) \cap D \cap T) = \beta$. Pick $\tau \in \text{nacc}(C_\beta) \cap D \cap T$ and let $\eta := \sup(C_\beta \cap \tau) + 1$. As $\tau \in D \subseteq \text{acc}(\kappa)$, $\eta < \tau$ with $c(\eta, \beta) = \min(C_\beta \setminus \eta) = \tau$. However, $\tau \in D \cap T \subseteq T'$ so we have arrived at a contradiction.

The reader may consult [BR17] for various sufficient conditions for when the hypothesis of the first clause of the following lemma holds.

**Lemma 5.7.**

1. If $P^\ast(\kappa, 1)$ holds, then so does $\text{unbounded}^\ast(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright \kappa^+, \{\kappa \mid \epsilon < \kappa\})$.
2. If $\square(\kappa, 1)$ holds with $\mu < \kappa$, then so does $\text{unbounded}^\ast(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright \kappa^+, (\kappa^+))^\ast$.

**Proof.** According to [BR17] §4.1, $P^\ast(\kappa, 1)$ provides us with a sequence $\langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ satisfying the following:

1. for every $\beta < \kappa$, $C_\beta$ is a nonempty collection of closed subsets $C$ of $\beta$ with $\sup(C) = \sup(\beta)$;
2. for all $\beta < \kappa$, $C_\beta$ and $\alpha \in \text{acc}(C)$, $C \cap \alpha \in C_\alpha$;
3. for every cofinal $\Omega \subseteq \kappa$, there exists $\delta \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$ such that, for every $C \in C_\delta$, $\sup(\text{nacc}(C) \cap \Omega) = \delta$.

Assuming $\square(\kappa, 1)$ with $\mu < \kappa$, by [BR19] Lemma 2.5, we may fix a sequence $\langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ satisfying Clauses (i) and (ii) above, together with:

- for every club $\Omega \subseteq \kappa$, there exists $\delta \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$ such that, for every $C \in C_\delta$, $\sup(\text{nacc}(C) \cap \Omega) = \delta$.

Fix a $C$-sequence $\bar{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ such that $C_\beta \subseteq C_\beta$ for all $\beta < \kappa$. We shall conduct walks on ordinals along $\bar{C}$, following the notation of [LHR18] §4.2] (see [Lod07] for a comprehensive treatment).
Define an upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$, as follows. Given $\eta < \beta < \kappa$, let $\gamma := \min(\text{Im}(\text{tr}(\eta, \beta)))$, so that $\eta \in C_\gamma$, and then let $c(\eta, \beta) := \min(C_\gamma \setminus (\eta + 1))$ provided that the latter is a well-defined ordinal $< \kappa$; otherwise, just let $c(\eta, \beta) := 0$.

Now, let $B \in [\kappa]^\kappa$ be arbitrary. We need to prove that the following set

$$T := \{ \tau < \kappa \mid \exists \beta \in B [ \eta < \tau < \beta \& c(\eta, \beta) = \tau ] \}.$$

is co-bounded (resp. stationary). To this end, let $\Omega$ be an arbitrary cofinal (resp. club) subset of $\kappa$, and we shall show that $T \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$. Find $\delta \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$ such that $\sup(\text{acc}(C) \cap \Omega) = \delta$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}_\delta$. Pick $\beta \in B$ above $\delta$, and then let $\varepsilon := \sup(\delta \cap \{ \sup(C_\gamma \cap \delta) \mid \gamma \in \text{Im}(\text{tr}(\delta, \beta)) \})$.

Then $\varepsilon < \delta$ and by a standard fact (see [LHRS Lemma 4.7]), there are two cases to consider:

- If $\delta \in \text{acc}(C_{\min(\text{Im}(\text{tr}(\delta, \beta)))})$, then, for every $\eta$ with $\varepsilon < \eta < \delta$, $\text{tr}(\eta, \beta) = \text{tr}(\delta, \beta)^\varepsilon \text{tr}(\eta, \delta)$. In this case, pick a large enough $\tau \in \text{acc}(C_\delta) \cap \Omega$ for which $\eta := \sup(C_\delta \cap \tau) > \varepsilon$. Then $\min(\text{Im}(\text{tr}(\eta, \beta))) = \delta$ and hence $c(\eta, \beta) = \min(C_\delta \setminus (\eta + 1)) = \tau$.

- Otherwise, $\delta \in \text{acc}(C_\gamma)$, for $\gamma := \min(\text{Im}(\text{tr}(\delta, \beta)))$, and, for every $\eta$ with $\varepsilon < \eta < \delta$, $\text{tr}(\eta, \beta) = \text{tr}(\gamma, \beta)^\varepsilon \text{tr}(\eta, \gamma)$. As $\delta \in \text{acc}(C_\gamma)$, $C_\gamma \cap \delta$ is in $\mathcal{C}_\delta$, and hence we may pick a large enough $\tau \in \text{acc}(C_\gamma \cap \delta) \cap \Omega$ for which $\eta := \sup(C_\gamma \cap \tau) > \varepsilon$. Then $\min(\text{Im}(\text{tr}(\eta, \beta))) = \gamma$ and $c(\eta, \beta) = \min(C_\gamma \setminus (\eta + 1)) = \tau$. \hfill \qed

**Remark 5.8.** A slightly more elaborate definition of the colouring $c$ shows that $P^-(\kappa, \kappa^+, \subseteq, 1)$ implies $\text{unbounded}^*(([\kappa]\kappa, J^\text{bd}[\kappa], (\text{NS}\kappa)^*))$, and that $\square(\kappa, \kappa^\bullet)$ with $\mu < \kappa$ implies $\text{unbounded}^*(([\kappa]\kappa, J^\text{bd}[\kappa], (\text{NS}\kappa)^*))$. To see this, define $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ by letting $c(\eta, \beta) := \text{Tr}(\bar{n}, \beta)(n)$ where $(\bar{n}, n) \in \kappa \times \omega$ is the unique pair to satisfy $\eta = \bar{n} + n$ and $\bar{n}$ is a limit ordinal. We point out that the binary operator $\text{Tr}$ we have mentioned here is defined in [LHRS §4.2] and has no relation to the unary operator $\text{Tr}$ we have considered previously in Sections 3 and 4.

The next lemma whose easy verification we leave to the reader, makes it clear that $\text{unbounded}^*((\ldots))$ is often times stronger than the other $\text{unbounded}((\ldots))$ principles considered in this paper.

**Lemma 5.9.** If $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ witnesses $\text{unbounded}^*((J, \{T\}))$ for $J$ a $\kappa$-complete ideal over $\kappa$ and $T \subseteq \kappa$ stationary, then the following strong form of $\text{unbounded}^*((J, \kappa))$ holds. For every sequence $(B_\tau \mid \tau < \kappa)$ of $J^+$-sets, for some $\eta < \kappa$, $\{ \tau \in T \mid \{ \beta \in B_\tau \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \} \in J^+ \}$ is stationary in $\kappa$. \hfill \qed

Let us now demonstrate the utility of $\text{unbounded}^*((\ldots))$.

**Lemma 5.10.** Suppose that $\text{unbounded}^*((J, (\text{NS}\kappa \restriction S)^*))$ holds for an ideal $J$ over $\kappa$, and a stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$.

- (i) If $\text{onto}^-(S, \theta)$ holds, then so does $\text{onto}(J, \theta)$;
- (ii) If $\text{unbounded}^-(S, \theta)$ holds, then so does $\text{unbounded}(J, \theta)$.

**Proof.** Fix an upper-regressive map $u : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ witnessing $\text{unbounded}^*(J, (\text{NS}\kappa \restriction S)^*)$. Now, given a (resp. upper-regressive) colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$, pick a (resp. upper-regressive) colouring $d : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ such that, for all $\eta < \beta < \kappa$ with $\eta < u(\eta, \beta)$, $d(\eta, \beta) = c(\eta, u(\eta, \beta))$.

Next, given $B \in J^+$, fix a club $D \subseteq \kappa$ such that, for every $\tau \in S \cap D$, for some $\eta < \tau$ and $\beta \in B$, $u(\eta, \beta) = \tau$. Define $f : S \cap D \to \kappa$ by letting $f(\tau)$ be the least
\( \eta < \tau \) such that, for some \( \beta \in B \), \( u(\eta, \beta) = \tau \). Evidently, \( f \) is regressive. So, assuming that \( c \) witnesses \( \text{onto}^+(S, \theta) \) (resp. \( \text{unbounded}^-(S, \theta) \)), we may find \( \eta < \kappa \) such that, the following set
\[
A := c[\{\eta\} \uplus \{\tau \in S \cap D \mid f(\tau) = \eta\}]
\]
satisfies \( A = \theta \) (resp. \( \text{otp}(A) = \theta \)).

Now, given \( \alpha \in A \), fix \( \tau \in S \cap D \setminus (\eta + 1) \) with \( f(\tau) = \eta \) such that \( c(\eta, \tau) = \alpha \). So \( \eta < \tau = u(\eta, \beta) \) and \( d(\eta, \beta) = c(\eta, \tau) = \alpha \), as sought. \( \square \)

By Corollary 5.10 below, the following lemma is of bigger interest in the case that the cardinal \( \theta \) is singular.

**Lemma 5.11.** Suppose that \( I, J \) are ideals over \( \kappa \), with \( I \) being moreover normal extending \( J^{bd}[\kappa] \), and that \( \text{unbounded}^*(J, I^+) \) holds.

(i) If \( \text{onto}(I, \theta) \) holds, then so does \( \text{onto}(J, \theta) \);

(ii) If \( \text{unbounded}(I, \theta) \) holds, then so does \( \text{unbounded}(J, \theta) \).

**Proof.** Fix an upper-regressive map \( u : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa \) witnessing \( \text{unbounded}^*(J, I^+) \) and a bijection \( \pi : \kappa \leftrightarrow \kappa \times \kappa \). Set \( D := \{\delta < \kappa \mid [\pi][\delta] = \delta \times \delta\} \). Now, given a (resp. upper-regressive) colouring \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \), pick a (resp. upper-regressive) colouring \( d : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \) such that, for all \( \eta < \beta < \kappa \), if \( \pi(\eta) = (\eta_0, \eta_1) \), then \( d(\eta, \beta) = c(\eta, u(\eta_0, \beta)) \).

Next, given \( B \in J^+ \), fix \( T \in I^+ \) such that, for every \( \tau \in T \), for some \( \eta < \tau \) and \( \beta \in B \), \( u(\eta, \beta) = \tau \). As \( I \) is normal, we may find some \( \eta_0 < \kappa \) for which \( T' := \{\tau \in T \cap D \mid \exists \beta \in B \{\eta_0 < \tau < \beta \& u(\eta_0, \beta) = \tau\}\} \) is in \( I^+ \). So, assuming that \( c \) witnesses \( \text{onto}(I, \theta) \) (resp. \( \text{unbounded}(I, \theta) \)), we may find an \( \eta_1 < \kappa \) such that \( A := c[\{\eta_1\} \uplus T'] \) is equal to \( \theta \) (resp. of order-type \( \theta \)). Set \( \eta := \pi^{-1}(\eta_0, \eta_1) \).

**Claim 5.11.1.** \( A \subseteq d[\{\eta\} \uplus B] \).

**Proof.** Let \( \alpha \in A \). Pick \( \tau \in T' \) above \( \eta_1 \) such that \( c(\eta_1, \beta) = \alpha \). As \( \max\{\eta_0, \eta_1\} < \kappa \) and \( \tau \in D, \eta < \tau \). In addition, as \( \tau \in T' \), we may pick \( \beta \in B \) above \( \tau \) such that \( u(\eta_0, \beta) = \tau \). Altogether, \( \eta < \beta \) and \( d(\eta, \beta) = c(\eta, u(\eta_0, \beta)) = c(\eta_1, \tau) = \alpha \), as sought.

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

**Corollary 5.12.** Suppose that \( \text{CG}^+(S, T) \) and \( \text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright T, \theta) \) both hold. Then \( \text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \theta) \) holds, as well.

**Proof.** By Lemmas 5.6 and 5.11. \( \square \)

6. **Pumping-up results**

**Proposition 6.1.** Suppose that \( \theta < \text{cf}(\kappa) < \kappa \).

(i) If \( \text{unbounded}(J^{bd}[\text{cf}(\kappa)], \theta) \) holds, then so does \( \text{unbounded}((\text{cf}(\kappa)), J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta) \);

(ii) If \( \text{onto}(J^{bd}[\text{cf}(\kappa)], \theta) \) holds, then so does \( \text{onto}((\text{cf}(\kappa)), J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta) \).

**Proof.** Clear. \( \square \)

**Lemma 6.2.** Suppose that \( J \) is a subnormal ideal over \( \kappa \) extending \( J^{bd}[\kappa] \) and that \( \theta \) is an infinite cardinal such that \( \theta^+ < \text{cf}(\kappa) \).

If \( \text{unbounded}(J, \theta^+) \) holds, then so does \( \text{unbounded}(J, \theta) \).
Proof. Suppose \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta^+ \) is a colouring witnessing unbounded\((J, \theta^+)\). Fix a bijection \( \pi : \kappa \leftrightarrow \kappa \times \theta^+ \). As \( \theta^+ < \text{cf}(\kappa) \), \( D := \{ \delta < \kappa \mid \pi[\delta] = \delta \times \theta^+ \} \) is cofinal in \( \kappa \). For every \( \tau < \theta^+ \), fix an injection \( c_\tau : \tau \to \theta \). Pick any upper-regressive colouring \( d : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \) such that for all \( \eta < \beta < \kappa \), if \( \pi(\eta) = (\eta', \tau) \), \( \eta' < \beta \), and \( c(\eta', \beta) < \tau \), then \( d(\eta, \beta) = e_\tau(c(\eta', \beta)) \).

To see that \( d \) witnesses unbounded\((J, \theta)\), let \( B \in J^+ \) be arbitrary. By Lemma \( 2.12 \) and by possibly passing to a positive subset of \( B \), we may assume that \( B \) is \( D \)-separated. Now, by the choice of \( c \), fix \( \eta' < \kappa \) such that \( c([\eta']) \oplus B \) has order-type \( \theta^+ \). Set \( \beta := \min(B \setminus (\eta' + 1)) \) and \( B' := B \setminus (\beta + 1) \). As \( B \) is \( D \)-separated, we may fix \( \delta \in D \) such that \( \beta < \delta < \min(B') \). As \( |B' \triangle B| = 1 \), \( T := c([\eta'] \times B') \) has order-type \( \theta^+ \), so we may fix \( \tau \in T \) such that \( \text{otp}(T \cap \tau) = \theta \), and let \( \eta := \pi^{-1}(\eta', \tau) \).

As \( \eta' < \beta < \delta \), we infer that \( \eta < \delta < \min(B') \), so \( d([\eta] \oplus B) \supseteq d([\eta] \times (B' \cap \tau)) = e_\tau[T] \) which is a subset of \( \theta \) of order-type \( \theta \).

**Definition 6.3** ([LHRS]). \( U(\kappa, \mu, \theta, \chi) \) asserts the existence of a colouring \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \) such that for every \( \sigma < \chi \), every pairwise disjoint subfamily \( A \subseteq [\kappa]^\sigma \) of size \( \kappa \), and every \( i < \theta \), there exists \( B \in [A]^\mu \) such that \( \min(c[a \times b]) > i \) for all \( (a, b) \in [B]^2 \).

**Proposition 6.4.** Suppose \( \theta < \kappa, c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \) is a colouring and \( S \subseteq \kappa \).

1. Suppose that \( \text{cf}(\theta) = \theta < \text{cf}(\kappa) \) and \( c \) satisfies that for every cofinal \( B \subseteq \kappa, \sup(c[B]) = \theta \). Then \( c \) witnesses that unbounded\((J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta) \) holds;
2. Suppose that \( \kappa \) is regular uncountable, \( S \) is stationary, and \( c \) satisfies that for every stationary \( B \subseteq S, c[B] = \theta \). Then \( c \) witnesses that onto\((\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \theta) \) holds;
3. Suppose \( \theta < \text{cf}(\kappa) \) and that \( c \) satisfies that for every cofinal \( B \subseteq \kappa, c[B] = \theta \). Then \( c \) witnesses that onto\((J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta) \) holds.

In particular, each of the following implies unbounded\((J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta) \) holds:

- \( U(\kappa, 2, \theta, 2) \);
- \( \kappa \to [\text{Stat}(\kappa)]^2 \)\_;
- the existence of a \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree.

**Proof.** We focus on Clause (1). So, suppose that \( c \) is as above, and yet, there exists a cofinal \( B \subseteq \kappa \) such that, for every \( \eta < \kappa, c_B := \sup(c[B]) \) is \( \epsilon < \theta \). As \( \theta < \text{cf}(\kappa) \), we may now fix some \( \zeta < \theta \) for which \( B_\zeta := \{ \eta \in B \mid c_\eta = \zeta \} \) is cofinal. Appealing to the property of \( c \), we have that \( \sup(c[B]) = \theta \), so there must exist \( (\eta, \beta) \in [B_\zeta]^2 \) with \( c(\eta, \beta) > \zeta \), contradicting the fact that \( \zeta = c_\zeta \geq c(\eta, \beta) \).

**Proposition 6.5.** Suppose that \( \text{cf}(\theta) = \theta < \text{cf}(\kappa) \) and there is a tree \( T \) of height \( \theta \) with at least \( \kappa \) many branches, all of whose levels have size less than \( \kappa \). Then \( U(\kappa, 2, \theta, 2) \) holds.

In particular, each of the following implies \( U(\kappa, 2, \theta, 2) \) and hence unbounded\((J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta) \) as well:

- \( i \) there is a cardinal \( \lambda < \kappa \) for which \( \lambda^{< \theta} < \text{cf}(\kappa) \leq \lambda^\theta \);
- \( ii \) there is a cardinal \( \lambda < \kappa \) for which \( \lambda^{< \theta} = \kappa \) and for every \( \xi < \theta, \lambda^{< \xi} < \text{cf}(\kappa) \);
- \( iii \) \( \theta = \aleph_0 < \kappa \leq 2^{\aleph_0} \);
- \( iv \) \( \theta = \aleph_0 < \text{cf}(\kappa) \leq \kappa < \kappa^{\aleph_0} \).

**Proof.** Same argument as in [LHRS] Lemma 2.7. Now appeal to Proposition 6.4. \( \square \)
The next proposition should be well-known, and is probably due to Erdős and Hajnal.

**Proposition 6.6.** Suppose that \( \theta < \text{cf}(\kappa) = \kappa \). Then the following are equivalent:

1. \( \kappa \rightarrow [\kappa; \kappa]_\beta^2 \);
2. There is a colouring \( c : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta \) simultaneously witnessing that onto\(^+(J^+, J, \theta)\) holds for every \( \theta^+ \)-complete subnormal ideal \( J \) over \( \kappa \) extending \( J^\text{bd}[\kappa] \);
3. onto\([ [\kappa]_\kappa, J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta ] \).

**Proof.** (1) \( \implies \) (2): Let a colouring \( c \) be a witness to \( \kappa \rightarrow [\kappa; \kappa]_\beta^2 \). Suppose that we are given a \( \theta^+ \)-complete subnormal ideal \( J \) over \( \kappa \) extending \( J^\text{bd}[\kappa] \), a set \( A \in J^+ \) and a sequence \( \langle B_\tau \mid \tau < \theta \rangle \) of \( J^+ \)-sets. Towards a contradiction, suppose that for every \( \eta \in A \), there exists a \( \tau < \theta \) for which \( \{ \beta \in B_\tau \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \} \in J \). Then, by the \( \theta^+ \)-completeness of \( J \), we may fix a \( \tau < \theta \) for which

\[
A := \{ \eta \in A \mid \{ \beta \in B_\tau \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \} \in J \}
\]

is in \( J^+ \). For every \( \eta \in A \), let \( E_\eta := \{ \beta < \kappa \mid \beta \notin B_\tau \text{ or } c(\eta, \beta) \neq \tau \} \). Now, by subnormality of \( J \), we may find \( A' \subseteq A \) and \( B' \subseteq B_\tau \) both in \( J^+ \) such that, for every \( (\eta, \beta) \in A' \times B' \), \( \beta \in E_\eta \). By the choice of \( c \) and because \( J \) extends \( J^\text{bd}[\kappa] \), there are \( (\eta, \beta) \in A' \times B' \) such that \( c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \). This contradicts the fact that \( \beta \in B_\tau \cap E_\eta \).

(2) \( \implies \) (3) \( \implies \) (1): This is trivial. \( \square \)

A similar proof as in Proposition 6.6 gives the following result.

**Lemma 6.7.** Suppose that \( \theta < \text{cf}(\kappa) = \kappa \). Suppose that unbounded\([ [\kappa]_\kappa, J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta ] \) holds as witnessed by \( c : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta \). Then, for every \( \kappa \)-complete subnormal ideal \( J \) over \( \kappa \) extending \( J^\text{bd}[\kappa] \), \( c \) witnesses unbounded\(^+(J^+, J, \theta) \).

We come now to the first of three theorems, Theorem 6.8, Theorem 6.9 and Theorem 6.12 which are dedicated to pumping from unbounded\((\cdots, \kappa)\) to an instance of onto with \( \theta \)-many colours where \( \theta \leq \kappa \leq \kappa \). Each of them proceed by slicing up the available cases in a similar way. The next theorem considers the simplest case.

**Theorem 6.8.** Suppose that \( \theta < \kappa < \kappa \) are infinite cardinals, with \( \theta \) and \( \kappa \) regular, and \( J \) is a subnormal ideal over a cofinal subset \( S \subseteq \kappa \), extending \( J^\text{bd}[S] \). If unbounded\((J, \kappa)\) holds, then so does onto\((J, \theta)\).

**Proof.** Suppose that \( c : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \kappa \) is a colouring witnessing unbounded\((J, \kappa)\). There are three cases to consider. In each of the cases, we shall also define a regular cardinal \( \bar{\kappa} \) with \( \theta^+ < \bar{\kappa} \leq \kappa \).

\begin{itemize}
  \item If \( \theta^+ = \kappa \), then \( \kappa \rightarrow [\kappa; \kappa]_\beta^2 \) holds (see [RT13]), so, by Proposition 6.6, we may fix a colouring \( d : [\bar{\kappa}]^2 \rightarrow \theta \) witnessing onto\((J^\text{bd}[\bar{\kappa}], \theta) \). Set also \( \bar{\kappa} := \kappa \).
  \item If \( \theta^+ < \kappa \) and \( \kappa \) is regular, then set \( \bar{\kappa} := \kappa \). By Fact 2.3B, we may fix a \( C \)-sequence \( \langle C_\delta \mid \delta \in E^\kappa_{\kappa} \rangle \) with \( \text{otp}(C_\delta) = \theta \) for all \( \delta \in E^\kappa_{\kappa} \), such that, for any club \( D \subseteq \bar{\kappa} \), there exists \( \delta \in E^\kappa_{\kappa} \) with \( C_\delta \subseteq D \). Then, pick any colouring \( d : [\bar{\kappa}]^2 \rightarrow \theta \) such that for all \( \beta < \delta < \kappa \) with \( \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta \), \( d(\beta, \delta) = \sup(\text{otp}(C_\delta \cap \beta)) \).
  \item If \( \theta^+ < \kappa \) and \( \kappa \) is singular, then set \( \bar{\kappa} := \theta^+ \). Fix a \( C \)-sequence \( \langle C_\delta \mid \delta \in E^\kappa_{\kappa} \rangle \), and a colouring \( d : [\bar{\kappa}]^2 \rightarrow \theta \) as in the previous case. In addition, fix a \( C \)-sequence \( \langle C_\delta \mid \delta \in E^\kappa_{\kappa} \rangle \) with \( \text{otp}(C_\delta) = \bar{\kappa} \) for all \( \delta \in E^\kappa_{\kappa} \).

  Fix three maps \( \pi_0 : \kappa \rightarrow \bar{\kappa} \), \( \pi_1 : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa \) and \( \pi_2 : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa \) such that, for every \( (i, j, k) \in \bar{\kappa} \times \kappa \times \kappa \), there exists \( \eta < \kappa \) such that \( \pi_0(\eta) = i \), \( \pi_1(\eta) = j \) and \( \pi_2(\eta) = k \).
Fix a club $E \subseteq \kappa$ such that, for every $\epsilon \in E$ and $(i, j, k) \in \check{\alpha} \times \beta \times \epsilon$, there exists

$\eta < \epsilon$ such that $\pi_0(\eta) = i$, $\pi_1(\eta) = j$ and $\pi_2(\eta) = k$. 

Finally, pick a colouring $e : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ such that, for all $\eta < \beta < \kappa$, if $\pi_0(\eta) = i$, $\pi_1(\eta) = j$ and $\pi_2(\eta) = k$, then

$$e(\eta, \beta) := \begin{cases} 
   d(\{i, \text{otp}(C_j \cap c(k, \beta))\}), & \text{if } j \in E^*_2; \\
   d(\{i, c(k, \beta)\}), & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}$$

We claim that this colouring works. To see why, let $B \in J^+$. We can assume without the loss of any generality that $B \subseteq \kappa \setminus \check{\alpha}$. By Lemma 7.12 we may also assume that for every $(\alpha, \beta) \in [B]^2$, there is an $\epsilon \in E$ with $\alpha < \epsilon < \beta$. By the choice of $c$, pick $\eta^* < \kappa$ such that $c(\eta^*) \oplus B$ has order-type $\check{\alpha}$. Let $\alpha := \min(B \setminus (\eta^* + 1))$ and $B' := B \setminus (\alpha + 1)$. Clearly, $X := c(\eta^*) \times B'$ has order-type $\check{\alpha}$.

- If $\theta^+ = \check{\alpha}$, then as $d$ witnesses onto $(J^{bd}[\check{\alpha}], \theta)$, we may pick $\delta < \check{\alpha}$ such that $d([\delta] \upharpoonright X) = \theta$. 
- If $\theta^+ < \check{\alpha}$ and $\check{\alpha} = \check{\alpha}$, then $D := \text{acc}^+(X)$ is a club in $\check{\alpha}$, so we may pick $\delta \in E^*_2$ such that $C_\delta \subseteq D$. We claim that $d[X \upharpoonright [\delta]] = \theta$. Indeed, for every $\tau < \theta$, pick $\gamma \in C_\delta$ such that $\text{otp}(C_\delta \cap \gamma) = \tau + 1$, and then, since $C_\delta \subseteq \text{acc}^+(X)$, find $\xi \in X$ such that $\text{sup}(C_\delta \cap \gamma) < \xi < \gamma$. In effect, $\text{d}(\xi, \delta) = \text{sup}(\text{otp}(C_\delta \cap \xi)) = \text{sup}(\tau + 1) = \tau$. 
- If $\theta^+ < \check{\alpha}$ and $\check{\alpha} > \check{\alpha}$, then let $j \in E^*_2$ denote the unique ordinal to satisfy $\text{otp}(X \cap j) = \check{\alpha}$. So, $X := \{\text{otp}(C_j \cap \xi) \mid \xi \in X\}$ is a cofinal subset of $\check{\alpha}$, and then, as in the previous case, we may pick $\delta \in E^*_2$ such that $d[X \upharpoonright [\delta]] = \theta$.

Fix $\epsilon \in E$ with $\alpha < \epsilon < \min(B')$. As $\eta^* < \alpha$, we may find $\eta < \epsilon$ such that $\pi_0(\eta) = \delta$ and $\pi_2(\eta) = \eta^*$. If $\check{\alpha} > \check{\alpha}$, then we may also require that $\pi_1(\delta) = j$.

**Claim 6.8.1.** $e([\eta] \upharpoonright B) = \theta$.

**Proof.** Let $\tau < \theta$.

- If $\theta^+ = \check{\alpha}$, then pick $\xi \in X \setminus (\delta + 1)$ such that $d(\delta, \xi) = \tau$. Then pick $\beta \in B'$ such that $c(\eta^*, \beta) = \xi$. As $\check{\alpha} = \check{\alpha}$, it follows that $e(\eta, \beta) = d(\delta, \text{otp}(C_j \cap c(k, \beta))) = d(\delta, \xi) = \tau$.
- If $\theta^+ < \check{\alpha}$, then pick $\xi \in X \setminus (\delta + 1)$ such that $d(\xi, \delta) = \tau$. Then pick $\beta \in B'$ such that $c(\eta^*, \beta, \xi) < \gamma$. Evidently, $e(\eta, \beta) = d(c(\eta^*, \beta), \xi) = d(\xi, \delta) = \tau$.
- Otherwise, pick $\xi \in X$ such that $d(\xi, \delta) = \tau$, then pick $\xi \in X$ such that $\text{otp}(C_j \cap \xi) = \xi$, and then pick $\beta \in B'$ such that $c(\eta^*, \beta) = \xi$. It follows that $e(\eta, \beta) = d(\text{otp}(C_j \cap c(\eta^*, \beta)), \xi) = d(\text{otp}(C_j \cap \xi), \delta) = d(\xi, \delta) = \tau$. 

This completes the proof. \hfill \Box

Compared to the preceding theorem, in the next theorem we obtain the stronger colouring principle onto$^+(\ldots)$, but we shall also be assuming that $\check{\alpha}$ is regular.

**Theorem 6.9.** Suppose that $\theta < \check{\alpha} \leq \kappa$ are infinite regular cardinals, $F$ is a filter on $\kappa$ that is not $\kappa$-weakly saturated, and $J$ is a normal ideal over some stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$.

1. If $\text{unbounded}([\kappa]^{\kappa}, J^{bd}[\kappa], \check{\alpha})$ holds, then so does onto$^+(F, J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$;
2. If $\text{unbounded}([\kappa]^{\kappa}, \text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \check{\alpha})$ holds, then so does onto$^+(F, J, \theta)$;
3. If $J^{bd}[S] \subseteq J$ and $\text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \kappa)$ holds, then so does onto$^+(J^+, J, \theta)$.

**Proof.** The proof will be similar to, but a little more elaborate than, that of Theorem 6.78

**Step 1.** In Clause (1), if $\check{\alpha} = \kappa$, then fix a colouring $c$ as in Lemma 3.3(2); otherwise, fix any colouring $c$ witnessing $\text{unbounded}([\kappa]^{\kappa}, J^{bd}[\kappa], \check{\alpha})$. 
In Clause (2), if $\kappa = \kappa$, then fix a colouring $c$ as in Lemma 4.4(2); otherwise, fix any colouring $c$ witnessing \textit{unbounded}([$\kappa$]$^\kappa$, NS$_\kappa$ | $\kappa$).

In Clause (3), fix a colouring $c$ as in Lemma 4.4(2).

Step 2. If $\kappa = \theta^+$, then $\kappa \rightarrow ([\kappa]^2)_{< \kappa}$ holds, so, by Proposition 6.6, we may fix a colouring $\delta : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ witnessing onto([$\kappa$]$^\kappa$, $J^\bd([\kappa], \theta)$). If $\kappa \neq \theta^+$, then we define a colouring $d : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ as follows. Fix a $C$-sequence $(C_\delta \mid \delta \in E^\kappa_\theta)$ with otp($C_\delta$) = $\theta$ for all $\delta \in E^\kappa_\theta$, such that, for any club $D \subseteq \kappa$, there exists $\delta \in E^\kappa_\theta$ with $C_\delta \subseteq D$.

Then, pick any colouring $d : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ such that for all $\beta < \delta < \kappa$ with cf($\delta$) = $\theta$, $d(\beta, \delta) = \sup(\text{otp}(C_\delta \cap \beta))$.

Step 3. In Clauses (1) and (2), as $F$ is a filter on $\kappa$ that is not $\kappa$-weakly saturated, we may fix two maps $\pi_0 : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ and $\pi_1 : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ such that, for every $(i, j) \in \kappa \times \kappa$, the set

$$P_{i,j} := \{ \eta < \kappa \mid \pi_0(\eta) = i \& \pi_1(\eta) = j \}$$

is in $F^+$. In Clause (3), we ignore $F$ and do the following. The hypothesis of Clause (3) implies, via Lemma 4.4(2) that \textit{unbounded}($J, \kappa$) holds, and then Proposition 2.20 implies that $J^*$ is not $\kappa$-weakly saturated. So, in this case, we fix two maps $\pi_0 : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ and $\pi_1 : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ such that the corresponding sets $P_{i,j}$ are in $J^+$ for every $(i, j) \in \kappa \times \kappa$.

Step 4. Pick a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ such that, for all $\eta < \beta < \kappa$, if $\pi_0(\eta) = i$ and $\pi_1(\eta) = j$, then $c(\eta, \beta) = d(\{ i, c(j, \beta) \}$). We claim this colouring works.

Step 5. In Clause (1), denote $J := J^\bd([\kappa])$, and assume we are given $A \in F$ and a sequence $(B_{\tau} \mid \tau < \theta)$ of sets in $J^*$. In Clause (2), we assume we are given $A \in F$ and a sequence $(B_{\tau} \mid \tau < \theta)$ of sets in $J^*$. If $\kappa = \kappa$, then by the choice of $c$, we may fix large enough $\eta^* < \kappa$ such that, for every $\tau < \theta$,

$$X_{\tau} := \{ \xi < \kappa \mid \{ \beta \in B_{\tau} \mid c(\eta^*, \beta) = \xi \} \in J^+ \}$$

is cofinal in $\kappa$.

If $\kappa < \kappa$, then by Proposition 2.27(1), we may fix large enough $\eta^* < \kappa$ such that, for every $\tau < \theta$, the corresponding set $X_{\tau}$ is cofinal in $\kappa$.

In Clause (2), we assume we are given $A \in F$ and a sequence $(B_{\tau} \mid \tau < \theta)$ of sets in $J^*$. If $\kappa = \kappa$, then by the choice of $c$, we may fix a large enough $\eta^* < \kappa$ such that, for every $\tau < \theta$, the corresponding set $X_{\tau}$ is cofinal in $\kappa$. Otherwise, by Proposition 2.27(1), we may fix large enough $\eta^* < \kappa$ such that, for every $\tau < \theta$, the corresponding set $X_{\tau}$ is cofinal in $\kappa$.

In Clause (3), we assume we are given $A \in J^*$ and a sequence $(B_{\tau} \mid \tau < \theta)$ of sets in $J^*$. By the choice of $c$, fix a large enough $\eta^* < \kappa$ such that, for every $\tau < \theta$, the corresponding set $X_{\tau}$ is cofinal in $\kappa$.

Step 6. If $\theta^+ = \kappa$, then as $d$ witnesses onto([$\kappa$]$^\kappa$, $J^\bd([\kappa], \theta)$), we may find a large enough $\delta < \kappa$ such that $d(\{ \delta \} \oplus X_{\tau}) = \theta$ for all $\tau < \theta$.

If $\theta^+ < \kappa$, then $D := \bigcap_{\tau < \theta} \text{acc}^+(X_{\tau})$ is a club in $\kappa$, and by the choice of $\bar{C}$, we may pick $\delta \in E^\kappa_\theta$ such that $C_\delta \subseteq D$. Consequently, $d[X_{\tau} \oplus \{ \delta \}] = \theta$ for all $\tau < \theta$.

So, in all cases, for every $\tau < \theta$, we may fix $\xi_{\tau} \in X_{\tau}$ such that $d(\{ \delta, \xi_{\tau} \}) = \tau$.

Step 7. Fix $\eta \in A \cap P_{\kappa^+}$, so that $\pi_0(\eta) = \delta$ and $\pi_1(\eta) = \eta^*$. For every $\tau < \theta$, as $\xi_{\tau} \in X_{\tau}$, $B_{\tau}^\ast := \{ \beta \in B_{\tau} \mid (\eta + 1) \mid c(\eta^*, \beta) = \xi_{\tau} \}$ is in $J^+$. Clearly, for all $\tau < \theta$ and $\beta \in B_{\tau}^\ast$, $c(\eta, \beta) = d(\{ \delta, c(\eta^*, \beta) \}) = \tau$, as sought. □
Corollary 6.10. Suppose that $\kappa$ is a regular uncountable cardinal, and let $J$ denote either $J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa]$ or $\text{NS}_\kappa \restriction S$ for some stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$.

If unbounded$(J, \kappa)$ holds, then onto$^+(J, \theta)$ holds for all regular $\theta < \kappa$.

Proof. By Theorem 6.9, using Lemma 3.4 or Lemma 4.4.

Recall that $C(\kappa, \theta)$ denotes the least cardinality of a family of sets $\mathcal{X} \subseteq [\kappa]^{\theta}$ with the property that for every closed and unbounded subset $C$ of $\kappa$, there exists $X \in \mathcal{X}$ with $X \subseteq C$. Whether $C(\theta^+, \theta) = \theta^+$ holds for every singular cardinal $\theta$ is an open problem, but, by [LR20] Lemma 3.1, $C(\theta^+, \theta) \leq \text{cf}(\theta^+)^{\text{cf}(\theta)} \leq \theta^\text{cf}(\theta)$.

Proposition 6.11. If $\kappa = \theta^+$, then $C(\kappa, \theta) = \kappa$ implies onto$^+(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \theta)$.

Proof sketch. This is very similar to the proof of Theorem 6.9 (and only of interest in the case that $\theta$ is singular). Fix a sequence $\langle C_\delta \mid \delta < \kappa \rangle$ of subsets of $\kappa$, each of order-type $\theta$, such that, for every club $D$ in $\kappa$, for some $\delta < \kappa$, $C_\delta \subseteq D$. Define a colouring $d : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ via $d(\beta, \delta) := \text{otp}(C_\delta \cap \beta)$. As $\kappa$ is a successor cardinal, fix a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ as in Lemma 5.4(2). Fix a bijection $\pi : \kappa \leftrightarrow \kappa \times \kappa$, and finally pick a colouring $e : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ such that, for all $\eta < \beta < \kappa$, if $\pi(\eta) = (i, j)$, then $e(\eta, \beta) = d\{\{i, c(j, \beta)\}\}$. By now, it should be clear that this works.

Note that in the upcoming theorem, we allow $\theta$ to be finite. Unlike the similar Theorem 6.8 and Theorem 6.9, below the focus is on obtaining an instance of onto$(\{\nu\}, \cdots)$ for a fixed in advance $\nu \leq \kappa$.

Theorem 6.12. Suppose that $\theta \leq \kappa \leq \nu \leq \kappa$ are cardinals, $J$ is an ideal over $\kappa$ extending $J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa]$, and unbounded$(\{\nu\}, J, \kappa)$ holds. If $\nu = \kappa$, suppose also that $\kappa$ is regular, and that $J$ is subnormal.

Any of the following hypotheses imply that onto$(\{\nu\}, J, \theta)$ holds:

(1) onto$(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \theta)$ holds;
(2) $C(\kappa, \theta) < \nu = \kappa$;
(3) $C(\kappa, \theta) \leq \nu < \kappa$.

Proof. Fix a colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ witnessing unbounded$(\{\nu\}, J, \kappa)$.

In Case (1), if $\kappa = \kappa$, then $\nu = \kappa$, and then onto$(\{\nu\}, J, \theta)$ holds. So, in Case (1), we may moreover assume that $\kappa < \kappa \leq \kappa$. Fix a map $d : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ witnessing onto$(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \theta)$. Set $\chi := \kappa$, and notice that either $\chi < \nu = \kappa$ or $\chi \leq \nu < \kappa$.

In Cases (2) and (3), let $\chi := C(\kappa, \theta)$, and fix a sequence $\langle X_i \mid i < \chi \rangle$ of subsets of $\kappa$, each of order-type $\theta$, such that, for every club $C$ in $\kappa$, for some $i < \chi$, $X_i \subseteq C$. Then, define a map $d : \chi \times \kappa \to \theta$ via $d(i, \gamma) = \text{otp}(X_i \cap \gamma)$. Notice that either $\chi < \nu = \kappa$ or $\chi \leq \nu < \kappa$.

Fix a bijection $\pi : \nu \leftrightarrow \nu \times \chi$. Finally, fix any colouring $e : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ satisfying the following. For every $\eta < \beta < \kappa$, if $\eta < \nu$, $\pi(\eta) = (\eta', i)$ and $(i, c(\eta', \beta)) \in \text{dom}(d)$, then $e(\eta, \beta) = d(i, c(\eta', \beta))$.

To see that $d$ witnesses onto$(\{\nu\}, J, \theta)$, let $B \in J^+$ be arbitrary. Note:

- If $\chi \leq \nu < \kappa$, then we may assume that min$(B) \geq \nu$.
- If $\chi < \nu = \kappa$, then $D := \{\delta < \kappa \mid \pi(\delta) = \delta \times \chi\}$ is a club in $\kappa$, and, by Lemma 2.12, we may assume that for every pair $\tilde{\beta} < \beta$ of points from $B$, there is $\delta \in D$ with $\beta < \delta < \beta$.

Next, by the choice of $c$, find $\eta' < \nu$ such that $c(\eta') + B$ is cofinal in $\kappa$. Set $\tilde{\beta} := \text{min}(B \setminus (\eta' + 1))$ and $B' := B \setminus (\tilde{\beta} + 1)$. Evidently, $\Gamma := c(\eta') + B'$ is a
cofinal subset of \( \kappa \). In Case (1), find \( i < \kappa \) such that \( d([i] \odot \Gamma) = \theta \). In Cases (2) and (3), find \( i < \chi \) such that \( X_i \subseteq \operatorname{acc}^+(\Gamma) \).

**Claim 6.12.1.** \( \{i\} \odot \Gamma \subseteq \operatorname{dom}(d) \) and \( d([i] \odot \Gamma) = \theta \).

**Proof.** In Case (1), \( \chi = \kappa \), so we may assume that we are in Case (2). Let \( \tau < \theta \) be arbitrary. Pick \( \xi \in X_i \) such that \( \operatorname{otp}(X_i \cap \xi) = \tau \). Let \( \gamma := \min(\Gamma \setminus (\xi + 1)) \). As \( X \subseteq \operatorname{acc}^+(\Gamma) \), \( \operatorname{otp}(X_i \cap \gamma) = \operatorname{otp}(X_i \cap (\xi + 1)) = \tau + 1 \), and hence \( d(i, \gamma) = \sup(\operatorname{otp}(X_i \cap \gamma)) = \tau \).

Let \( \eta < \nu \) be such that \( \pi(\eta) = \langle \eta', \iota \rangle \).

**Claim 6.12.2.** \( \min(B') > \eta \).

**Proof.** Let \( \beta \in B' \) be arbitrary.

- If \( \chi \leq \nu < \kappa \), then \( \eta < \nu \leq \beta \).
- If \( \chi < \nu = \kappa \), then there exists some \( \delta \in D \) such that \( \eta' < \tilde{\beta} < \delta < \beta \), and hence \( \eta < \delta < \beta \).

To verify that \( e([\eta] \odot B) = \theta \), let \( \tau < \theta \) be arbitrary. By Claim 6.12.1, we may fix \( \gamma \in \Gamma \) such that \( (i, \gamma) \in \operatorname{dom}(d) \) and \( d(i, \gamma) = \tau \). As \( \gamma \in \Gamma \), fix \( \beta \in B' \) such that \( c(\eta', \beta) = \gamma \). Then \( e(\eta, \beta) = d(i, c(\eta', \beta)) = d(i, \gamma) = \tau \), as sought.

**Corollary 6.13.** If \( \kappa > 2^\theta \), then unbounded\( (J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \theta) \) iff onto\( (J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \theta) \).

**Proof.** Appeal to Theorem 6.12(2) with \( \kappa := \theta \) and \( \nu := \kappa \).

The next lemma shows at the level of successors cardinals, the choice of the ideal hardly makes any difference. It also gives a sufficient condition for pumping-up from \( \theta \) colours into \( \theta^+ \) colours.

**Lemma 6.14.** Suppose that \( \kappa = \mu^+ \) is a successor cardinal, \( \mu \leq \nu \leq \kappa \), and \( J \) is \( \kappa \)-complete proper ideal over \( \kappa \) extending \( J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa] \).

1. If onto\( (\nu, J, \theta) \) holds, then so does onto\( (\nu, J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \theta) \);
2. If unbounded\( (\nu, J, \theta) \) holds, then so does unbounded\( (\nu, J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \theta) \);
3. If onto\( (\nu, J, \theta) \) holds with \( \theta = \mu = \nu \), then so does onto\( (\nu, J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \kappa) \).

**Proof.** Fix a bijection \( \pi : \nu \leftrightarrow \mu \times \nu \). For every \( \beta \in [\mu, \kappa) \), fix a surjection \( e_\beta : \mu \to \beta \). For every subset \( B \subseteq \kappa \), and for all \( i < \mu \) and \( \gamma < \kappa \), let \( B'_\gamma := \{ \beta \in B \setminus \mu \mid e_\beta(i) = \gamma \} \), and then let \( \Gamma'(B) := \{ \gamma \in \kappa \setminus \mu \mid B'_\gamma \in J^+ \} \).

**Claim 6.14.1.** Let \( B \in [\kappa]^{\kappa} \). Then there exists \( i < \mu \) such that \( \Gamma'(B) \in J^+ \).

**Proof.** As \( J \) is proper and \( \kappa \)-complete, for every \( \gamma < \kappa \), there exists some \( i < \mu \) such that \( B'_\gamma \in J^+ \). Then, as \( J \) is \( \kappa \)-complete, there exists some \( i < \mu \) such that \( \Gamma'(B) \in J^+ \).

1. Suppose that \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \) is a colouring witnessing onto\( (\nu, J, \theta) \). Pick any colouring \( d : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \) such that, for all \( \eta < \beta < \kappa \), if \( \eta \in \nu \), \( \pi(\eta) = (i, j) \) and \( j < e_\beta(i) \), then \( d(\eta, \beta) = c(\{j, e_\beta(i)\}) \). To see this works, let \( B \in (J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa])^+ \). Pick \( i < \mu \) such that \( \Gamma'(B) \in J^+ \). Find \( j < \nu \) such that \( c(\{j\} \odot \Gamma'(B)) = \theta \). Find \( \eta < \nu \) such that \( \pi(\eta) = (i, j) \). To see that \( D([\eta] \odot B) = \theta \), let \( \tau < \theta \) be arbitrary. Pick \( \gamma \in \Gamma'(B) \) above \( j \) such that \( c(j, \gamma) = \tau \) and pick a large enough \( \beta \in B'_\gamma \) above \( \eta \). Then \( d(\eta, \beta) = c(j, \beta(i)) = c(j, \gamma) = \tau \).

2. This is almost the exact same proof as that of Clause (1).
Proof. By Theorem 6.12, using $\kappa$ as sought.

Suppose that $\eta \leq \nu < \theta < \kappa$, if $\pi(\eta) = (i, j)$, then $d(\eta, \beta) = e_{e_{\beta}(i)}(c(j, \beta))$. To see this works, let $B \in (J^{d[\kappa]})^\chi$.

Pick $i < \mu$ such that $\Gamma^i(B) \in J^\chi$. For each $\gamma \in \Gamma^i(B)$, pick $j_\gamma < \nu$ such that $c([j_\gamma] \ast B^i_j) = \theta$. As $\nu < \kappa$, find $j < \nu$ such that $\Gamma := \{ \gamma \in \Gamma^i(B) \mid j_\gamma = j \}$ is cofinal in $\kappa$. Find $\eta < \nu$ such that $\pi(\eta) = (i, j)$. To see that $d(\eta) \ast B = \kappa$, let $\tau < \kappa$ be some prescribed colour. Fix $\gamma \in \Gamma$ above $\tau$. Find $\epsilon < \mu$ such that $e_\gamma(\epsilon) = \tau$. As $c([j] \ast B^i_j) = \theta$, we may fix $\beta \in B^i_j$ such that $c(j, \beta) = \delta$. Then

$$d(\eta, \beta) = e_{e_{\beta}(i)}(c(j, \beta)) = e_\gamma(\delta) = \tau,$$

as sought. \hfill \Box

**Corollary 6.15.** Suppose that $\text{onto}(J^{d[\theta]}, \theta)$ and unbounded$(\{\theta\}, J^{d[\theta^+]}, \theta)$ both hold. Set $\kappa := \theta^\chi$. Then, for any $\kappa$-complete ideal $J$ over $\kappa$ extending $J^{d[\kappa]}$, $\text{onto}(\{\theta\}, J, \kappa)$ holds.

**Proof.** By Theorem 6.12 using $\mu = \kappa = \theta$, the hypotheses imply that $\text{onto}(\{\theta\}, J, \theta)$ holds. Then, by Lemma 6.14 for any $\kappa$-complete ideal $J$ over $\kappa$ extending $J^{d[\kappa]}$, $\text{onto}(\{\theta\}, J, \kappa)$ holds. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 6.16.** Suppose that $\theta < \theta^\chi < \text{cf}(\kappa) = \kappa$ are infinite cardinals, and $J$ is a $\kappa$-complete subnormal proper ideal over $\kappa$ extending $J^{d[\kappa]}$. If $\text{onto}(\kappa^\kappa), J, \theta)$ and unbounded$(J, \theta^\chi)$ both hold, then so does $\text{onto}(J, \theta^\chi)$.

**Proof.** Suppose that $\text{onto}(\kappa^\kappa), J, \theta)$ and unbounded$(J, \theta^\chi)$ both hold. By Clauses (2) and (3) of Proposition 2.27, we may fix colourings $c : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ and $d : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta^\chi$ such that, if we denote

- $B^i_j(\epsilon) := \{ \beta \in B \mid (i + 1) \ast e(i, \beta) = \epsilon \}$,
- $A_j(B) := \{ \alpha < \theta^\chi \ast B^d(\alpha) \in J^+ \}$, and
- $D_k(B) := \{ \delta < \theta \ast B^d(\delta) \in J^+ \}$,

then, for every for every $B \in J^+$, there is $j < \kappa$ for which $|A_j(B)| = \theta^\chi$, and there is a tail of $k < \kappa$ for which $D_k(B) = \theta$.

Next, for every $\alpha < \theta^\chi$, fix a surjection $e_{\alpha} : \theta \rightarrow \alpha + 1$. Fix a bijection $\pi : \kappa \leftrightarrow \theta \times \kappa \times \kappa$. Define $f : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta^\chi$ as follows. Given $\eta < \beta < \kappa$, let $(i, j, k) := \pi(\eta)$ and then set $f(\eta, \beta) := e_{e_{d(j, \beta)}(i)}(c(k, \beta))$.

To see this works, let $B \in J^+$ be arbitrary. Fix $j < \kappa$ such that $|A_j(B)| = \theta^\chi$. Set $B_{i, \gamma} := \{ \beta \in B \mid e_{d(j, \beta)}(i) = \gamma \}$.

**Claim 6.16.1.** Let $\gamma < \theta^\chi$. Then there exists $i < \theta$ such that $B_{i, \gamma} \in J^+.$

**Proof.** Fix $\alpha \in A_j(B)$ above $\gamma$. Find $i < \theta$ such that $e_\gamma(i) = \alpha$. For every $\beta \in B^d_j(\alpha)$, $e_{d(j, \beta)}(i) = e_\alpha(i) = \gamma$. So $B^d_j(\alpha) \subseteq B_{i, \gamma}$ and the former is in $J^+$, since $\alpha \in A_j(B)$. \hfill \Box

Fix $i < \theta$ for which $\Gamma^i(B) := \{ \gamma < \theta^+ \ast B_{i, \gamma} \in J^+ \}$ is cofinal in $\theta^+$. As $\theta^+ < \kappa$, we may find a large enough $k < \kappa$ such that $D_k(B_{i, \gamma}) = \theta$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Find $\eta < \kappa$ such that $\pi(\eta) = (i, j, k)$. Now, given any $\tau < \theta^\chi$, pick $\gamma \in \Gamma$ above $\tau$. Find $\delta < \theta$ such that $e_\gamma(\delta) = \tau$. Pick $\beta \in B_{i, \gamma}$ above $\eta$ such that $c(k, \beta) = \delta$. Then

$$f(\eta, \beta) = e_{e_{d(j, \beta)}(i)}(c(k, \beta)) = e_\gamma(\delta) = \tau,$$

as sought. \hfill \Box
7. ZFC Results

Corollary 7.1. For every pair of infinite regular cardinals \( \theta < \kappa \), and every stationary \( S \subseteq \kappa \), there exists a stationary \( S' \subseteq \kappa \) such that \( \text{onto}^+(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S', \theta) \) holds.

Proof. Let \( S \subseteq \kappa \) be a stationary set. By Corollary 3.11, there is \( S' \subseteq S \) stationary which carries an amenable \( C \)-sequence (in fact even a strongly amenable \( C \)-sequence). So \( \text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S', \kappa) \) holds, and so by Theorem 6.9 so does \( \text{onto}^+(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S', \theta) \). \( \square \)

Corollary 7.2. Suppose that \( \kappa = \theta^+ \) for a regular cardinal \( \theta \). Then there exists a colouring \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \) such that for every \( \kappa \)-complete subnormal ideal \( J \) over \( \kappa \) extending \( J^\bd[\kappa] \), \( c \) witnesses \( \text{onto}^+(J^+, J, \theta) \).

Proof. By Proposition 6.6 using [RT13]. \( \square \)

Theorem 7.3. Suppose that \( \kappa = \theta^+ \) for a singular cardinal \( \theta \). Then there exists a colouring \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \) such that for every \( \kappa \)-complete subnormal ideal \( J \) over \( \kappa \) extending \( J^\bd[\kappa] \), \( c \) witnesses \( \text{unbounded}^+(J^+, J, \theta) \).

Proof. By Lemma 6.7, it suffices to prove that \( \text{unbounded}(J, J^+, \theta) \) holds for \( J := J^\bd[\kappa] \). By a theorem of Shelah (see [Eis10] Theorem 3.53), we may fix a sequence of regular uncountable cardinals \( \{ \theta_i \mid i < \text{cf}(\theta) \} \) converging to \( \theta \) such that \( \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \text{cf}(\theta)} \theta_i, <^*) = \kappa \). Fix a scale \( \{ f_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \} \) witnessing the preceding. By another theorem of Shelah (see [Eis10] Theorem 5.16), fix a colouring \( d : [\kappa]^2 \to \text{cf}(\theta) \) witnessing \( \kappa \rightarrow [\kappa ; \kappa]^2_{\text{cf}(\theta)} \). Let \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta \) be any upper-regressive colouring such that, for all \( \theta \leq \eta < \beta < \kappa \),

\[
c(\eta, \beta) = f_\beta(d(\eta, \beta)).
\]

Towards a contradiction, suppose that we are given \( A, B \in [\kappa]^{< \kappa} \) demonstrating that \( c \) does not witness \( \text{unbounded}([\kappa]^{< \kappa}, J^\bd[\kappa], \theta) \). So, for every \( \eta \in A \) there is \( \epsilon_\eta < \theta \) such that \( \text{otp}(c(\{ \eta \} \upharpoonright B)) < \epsilon_\eta \). By stabilising, we can find an \( \epsilon^* < \theta \) and \( A' \subseteq A \setminus \theta \) of size \( \kappa \) such that for every \( \eta \in A' \) we have \( \epsilon_\eta = \epsilon^* \).

Claim 7.3.1. There exists \( i < \text{cf}(\theta) \) with \( \theta_i > \epsilon^* \) such that

\[
\sup \{ \xi < \theta_i \mid \{ \beta \in B_i \mid f_\beta(i) = \xi \} \in J^+ \} = \theta_i.
\]

Proof. Suppose not. Fix the least \( j < \text{cf}(\theta) \) such that \( \theta_j > \epsilon^* \). Then there exists a function \( g \in \prod_{i < \text{cf}(\theta)} \theta_i \) such that, for every \( i \in [j, \text{cf}(\theta)) \),

\[
g(i) = \sup \{ \xi < \theta_i \mid \{ \beta \in B \mid f_\beta(i) = \xi \} \in J^+ \}.
\]

It follows that, for every \( i \in [j, \text{cf}(\theta)) \), \( B' := \{ \beta \in B \mid g(i) < f_\beta(i) \} \) is in \( J \). Find \( \alpha < \kappa \) such that \( g <^* f_\alpha \). As \( \bigcup_{i \in [j, \text{cf}(\theta))} B' \) is in \( J \), we may let \( \beta := \min(B \setminus (\bigcup_{i \in [j, \text{cf}(\theta))} B' \cup \{ \alpha \})) \). Then \( \alpha \leq \beta \), so that \( g <^* f_\beta \). In particular, there exists \( i \in [j, \text{cf}(\theta)) \) with \( g(i) < f_\beta(i) \), contradicting the fact that \( \beta \notin B' \).

Fix \( i \) as in the claim. Since \( \epsilon^* < \theta_i \), and recalling the definition of \( A' \), we may find \( \varsigma < \theta_i \) such that the following set has size \( \kappa \):

\[
A'' := \{ \eta \in A' \mid \sup(c(\{ \eta \} \upharpoonright B) \cap \theta_i) = \varsigma \}.
\]

By the choice of \( i \), we may find \( \xi \in (\varsigma, \theta_i) \) such that the following set is in \( J^+ \):

\[
B' := \{ \beta \in B \mid f_\beta(i) = \xi \}.
\]
Finally, by the choice of $d$, we may find $(\eta, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}' \oplus \mathcal{B}'$ such that $d(\eta, \beta) = i$. Altogether, $c(\eta, \beta) = f_\beta(d(\eta, \beta)) = f_\beta(i) = \xi \in (s, \theta_k)$, contradicting the fact that $\eta \in \mathcal{A}'$.

**Corollary 7.4 (monotonicity).** For any stationary $S \subseteq \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > \aleph_0$ and an infinite cardinal $\theta < \kappa$:

1. If unbounded($J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \kappa$) or unbounded($J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta^+$) hold, then so does unbounded($J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta$);
2. If unbounded($\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \kappa$) or unbounded($\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \theta^+$) hold, then so does unbounded($\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \theta$).

**Proof.** By Corollary 7.2 and Theorem 7.3 we may assume that $\theta^+ < \kappa$. The results now follow from Theorem 6.9 and Lemma 6.2.

**Proposition 7.5.** Suppose $\aleph_0 < \kappa \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$. Then onto($\{\aleph_0\}, J^\text{bd}[\kappa], n$) holds for every positive integer $n$.

**Proof.** Fix an injective enumeration $\langle r_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ of elements of $\omega^2$. For all $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$, let $\Delta(\alpha, \beta)$ denote the first $k < \omega$ such that $r_\alpha(k) \neq r_\beta(k)$.

Let $n$ be a positive integer, and fix a bijection $\pi : \omega \leftrightarrow n_\omega \times n_2$. Now let $c : [\kappa]^2 \to n$ be any colouring that satisfies that for all $\eta \in \omega < \beta < \kappa$, $\pi(\eta) = \langle (m_0, i_0), \ldots, (m_{n-1}, i_{n-1}) \rangle$ and there is $j < n$ such that $r_\beta(m_j) \neq i_j$, then $c(\eta, \beta)$ is equal to the least such $j$.

To see this works, let $B$ be some cofinal subset of $\kappa$. Without the loss of generality, $\min(B) \geq \omega$. For any $x \in \omega^2$, denote:

$$B_x := \{ \beta \in B \mid x \subseteq r_\beta \},$$

and then let

$$\mathbf{T}(B) := \{ x \in \omega^2 \mid \forall i < |2 B_x^{-1}(i) \neq \emptyset \}. $$

Note that if there exists a large enough $l < \omega$ such that $\Delta[l, B]^2 \subseteq l$, then $\beta \mapsto (r_\beta \upharpoonright l)$ would form an injection from the infinite set $B$ to the finite set $l_2$, which is impossible. It thus follows that $(\mathbf{T}(B), \subseteq)$ is a finitely-splitting infinite tree, and then, by König’s lemma, it admits an infinite chain. In particular, we may pick $y \in \mathbf{T}(B)$ for which the set $\{ x \in \mathbf{T}(B) \mid x \subseteq y \}$ has size $n + 1$. Let $\langle m_0, \ldots, m_{n-1} \rangle$ denote the increasing enumeration of the following set

$$\{ m < \text{dom}(y) \mid (y \upharpoonright m) \in \mathbf{T}(B) \}.$$

For each $j < n$, set $i_j := y(m_j)$. Set $\eta := \pi^{-1}(\langle (m_0, i_0), \ldots, (m_{n-1}, i_{n-1}) \rangle)$. To see that $c[\eta] \upharpoonright B = n$, let $j < n$ be arbitrary. As $x := y \upharpoonright m_j$ is in $\mathbf{T}(B)$, so is $x' := x^{-1}(1 - i_k)$. Pick $\beta \in B_x$. Then $c(\eta, \beta) = j$.

**Proposition 7.6.** unbounded($[\aleph_0]^1, J^\text{bd}[\aleph_0], \aleph_0$) holds.

**Proof.** Let $c : [\omega]^2 \to \omega$ be the colouring obtained by declaring that for all $n < m < \omega$, $c(n, m)$ is the floor of $\frac{1}{2}$. It is clear that this works.

**Theorem 7.7.** Suppose that $\kappa$ is a singular cardinal. Then:

1. unbounded($[\kappa]^1, J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \text{cf}(\kappa)$) holds;
2. unbounded($\{ \text{cf}(\kappa) \}, J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta$) holds for every $\theta < \text{cf}(\kappa)$;
3. onto($\{ \text{cf}(\kappa) \}, J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta$) holds for every regular $\theta < \text{cf}(\kappa)$;
4. onto($\{ \nu \}, J^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta$) holds for every $\lambda \leq \text{cf}(\kappa)$ such that $\nu := \mathcal{C}(\text{cf}(\kappa), \theta)$ is $< \kappa$. 

\[ \square \]
Proof. Set $\mathfrak{r} := \text{cf}(\kappa)$. Fix a cofinal subset $x \subseteq \kappa \setminus \mathfrak{r}$ of order-type $\mathfrak{r}$. Define a map $\pi : \kappa \to \mathfrak{r}$ via $\pi(\beta) := \text{otp}(x \cap \beta)$. Note that $\pi(\beta) < \beta$ for all $\beta < \kappa$, and that, for every $B \in (\mathbb{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa])^+ \setminus [\mathfrak{r}]^\omega$, $\pi[B]$ is unbounded in $\mathfrak{r}$.

1. Define an upper-regressive map $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \mathfrak{r}$ via $c(\eta, \beta) := \pi(\beta)$. Evidently, $c$ witnesses that $\text{unbounded}([\kappa]^2 \setminus \mathfrak{r})$, $\mathbb{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], \mathfrak{r})$ holds.

2. Let $\theta < \mathfrak{r}$ be some cardinal. By Clause (4), we may assume that $\theta$ is infinite.

3. Let $\mathfrak{r}$ be any function that satisfies $c(\eta, \beta) < \beta$ for all $\eta < \lambda$, $\beta < \kappa$. To see this works, let $\langle B_\tau \mid \tau < \theta \rangle$ be any sequence of cofinal subsets of $\kappa$. For every $\epsilon < \kappa$, since $\theta < \text{cf}(\kappa)$, we may fix an injection $f_\epsilon : \prod_{\tau < \theta} B_\tau \setminus \epsilon$, and then we find $\eta_\epsilon < \lambda$ such that $f_\epsilon^{-1}[\eta_\epsilon] \subseteq g_{\eta_\epsilon}$. As $\lambda < \text{cf}(\kappa)$, find $\eta < \lambda$ for which $\sup\{\epsilon < \kappa \mid \eta_\epsilon = \eta\} = \kappa$. A moment’s reflection makes it clear that $\sup\{\beta \in B_\tau \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau\} = \kappa$ for every $\tau < \theta$.

4. Should be clear at this stage.

\[ \square \]

Corollary 7.8. Suppose that $\kappa$ is a singular cardinal. Then:

- $\text{unbounded}(\mathbb{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$ holds for every $\theta < \text{cf}(\kappa)$.
- If $2^{\text{cf}(\kappa)} < \kappa$, then $\text{onto}(\mathbb{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$ holds for every $\theta < \text{cf}(\kappa)$.

\[ \square \]

Lemma 7.9. Suppose that $\theta < \lambda = \lambda^0 < \text{cf}(\kappa) \leq 2^\lambda$ is a given tuple of cardinals. Then $\text{onto}^+(\lambda, \mathbb{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$ holds.

Proof. By the Engelking-Karlowicz theorem, we may fix a sequence of functions $\langle g_\eta \mid \eta < \lambda \rangle$ such that:

- for every $\eta < \kappa$, $g_\eta \in \kappa^\theta$;
- for every $X \in [\kappa]^\theta$ and for every function $g : X \to \theta$, for some $\eta < \lambda$, $g \subseteq g_\eta$.

Let $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ be any function that satisfies $c(\eta, \beta) = g_\beta(\beta)$ for all $\eta < \lambda \leq \beta < \kappa$. To see this works, let $\langle B_\tau \mid \tau < \theta \rangle$ be any sequence of cofinal subsets of $\kappa$. For every $\epsilon < \kappa$, since $\theta < \text{cf}(\kappa)$, we may fix an injection $f_\epsilon : \prod_{\tau < \theta} B_\tau \setminus \epsilon$, and then we find $\eta_\epsilon < \lambda$ such that $f_\epsilon^{-1}[\eta_\epsilon] \subseteq g_{\eta_\epsilon}$. As $\lambda < \text{cf}(\kappa)$, find $\eta < \lambda$ for which $\sup\{\epsilon < \kappa \mid \eta_\epsilon = \eta\} = \kappa$. A moment’s reflection makes it clear that $\sup\{\beta \in B_\tau \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau\} = \kappa$ for every $\tau < \theta$.

\[ \square \]

Corollary 7.10. Suppose that $\theta \leq \mu < \mu^0 < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ is a given tuple of cardinals, and $\mathfrak{I}$ is a subnormal ideal over $\kappa$ extending $\mathbb{J}^\text{bd}[\kappa]$.

If $2^\mu \geq \kappa$ or if $\text{unbounded}(\mathfrak{I}, \mu)$ holds, then $\text{onto}(\mathfrak{I}, \theta)$ holds.
Lemma 7.11. Suppose that $\aleph_0 \leq \operatorname{cf}(\theta) = \theta < \operatorname{cf}(\kappa)$. The following are equivalent:

1. $\operatorname{unbounded}(\{\theta\}, J^\bd[\kappa], \theta)$ holds;
2. There exists a sequence $\langle g_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ of functions from $\theta$ to $\theta$, such that, for every cofinal $B \subseteq \kappa$, $\{g_\beta \mid \beta \in B\}$ is unbounded in $(\theta, <^*)$.

Proof. (1) $\implies$ (2): Suppose that $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ is a colouring witnessing $\operatorname{unbounded}(\{\theta\}, J^\bd[\kappa], \theta)$. For every $\beta < \kappa$, derive $g_\beta : \theta \to \theta$ via $g_\beta(\eta) := c(\{\eta, \beta\})$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that there exists a cofinal $B \subseteq \kappa$ such that $\{g_\beta \mid \beta \in B\}$ is bounded in $(\theta, <^*)$. Pick a function $g : \theta \to \theta$ such that, for every $\beta \in B$, for some $i_\beta < \theta$, $g_\beta(\eta) < g(\eta)$ whenever $i_\beta \leq \eta < \theta$. As $\theta < \operatorname{cf}(\kappa)$, we may pick $i, \tau < \theta$ for which $B' := \{\beta \in B \mid i_\beta = i \land \sup(g_\beta[i_\beta]) = \tau\}$ is cofinal in $\kappa$. Now, for every $\eta < \theta$, $\operatorname{otp}(c(\{\eta\}) \circ B)] \leq \max(\tau, g(\eta)) < \theta$. This is a contradiction.

(2) $\implies$ (1): Given a sequence $\langle g_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ as above, pick any upper-regressive colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \theta$ such that, for all $\eta \leq \theta \leq \beta < \kappa$, $c(\eta, \beta) = g_\beta(\eta)$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that $c$ fails to be a witness to $\operatorname{unbounded}(\{\theta\}, J^\bd[\kappa], \theta)$. Then there exists a cofinal $B \subseteq \kappa$ and a function $g : \theta \to \theta$ such that, for every $\eta < \theta$,

$$\sup(c(\{\eta\} \circ B)] < g(\eta).$$

In particular, $g$ witnesses that $\{g_\beta \mid \beta \in B\}$ is bounded. □

We point out that the requirement that $\theta < \operatorname{cf}(\kappa)$ in the lemma is necessary. Indeed, by Proposition 6.12 if $\operatorname{cf}(\theta) = \theta = \operatorname{cf}(\kappa) < \kappa$ and $\operatorname{unbounded}(J^\bd[\theta], \theta)$ holds and $b_\theta > \kappa$ then Clause (1) of the lemma holds whereas Clause (2) fails.

Corollary 7.12. Suppose that $\theta$ is an infinite regular cardinal.

1. $\operatorname{unbounded}(\{\theta\}, J^\bd[b_\theta], \theta)$ holds;
2. $\operatorname{unbounded}(\{\theta\}, J^\bd[\theta^+], \theta)$ holds;
3. $\operatorname{unbounded}(\{\theta\}, J^\bd[\theta^+], \theta)$ holds iff $b_\theta = \theta^+$.

Proof. (1) Denote $\kappa := b_\theta$ and note that $\kappa \geq \operatorname{cf}(\kappa) > \theta$. Let $\tilde{f} = \langle f_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ denote an enumeration of some unbounded family in $(\theta, <^*)$. For every $\beta < \kappa$, as $\beta < b_\theta$, let us fix $g_\beta : \theta \to \theta$ such that, for every $\alpha \leq \beta$, $f_\alpha <^* g_\beta$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that we may fix a cofinal $B \subseteq \kappa$ such that $\{g_\beta \mid \beta \in B\}$ is bounded in $(\theta, <^*)$. Pick a function $g : \theta \to \theta$ such that $g_\beta <^* g$ for every $\beta \in B$. By the choice of $\tilde{f}$, find $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $\neg(g_\alpha <^* g)$, and then fix $\beta \in B$ above $\alpha$. As $\neg(f_\alpha <^* g)$ and $f_\alpha <^* g_\beta$, we infer that $\neg(g_\beta <^* g)$. This is a contradiction.

(2) Denote $\kappa := \mathfrak{d}_\theta$ and note that $\kappa \geq \operatorname{cf}(\kappa) > \theta$. Let $\tilde{f} = \langle f_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ denote an enumeration of some dominating family in $(\theta, <^*)$. For every $\beta < \kappa$, as $\beta < \mathfrak{d}_\theta$, let us fix $g_\beta : \theta \to \theta$ such that, for every $\alpha \leq \beta$, $\neg(g_\beta <^* f_\alpha)$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that we may fix a cofinal $B \subseteq \kappa$ such that $\{g_\beta \mid \beta \in B\}$ is bounded in $(\theta, <^*)$. Pick a function $g : \theta \to \theta$ such that $g_\beta <^* g$ for every $\beta \in B$. By the choice of $\tilde{f}$, find $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $g <^* f_\alpha$, and then fix $\beta \in B$ above $\alpha$. As $g <^* f_\alpha$ and $\neg(g_\beta <^* f_\alpha)$, we infer that $\neg(g_\beta <^* g)$. This is a contradiction.

(3) Clear. □
Corollary 7.13. For \( \theta \) an infinite regular cardinal, if \( \text{onto}(J^{bd}[\theta], \theta) \) holds, then so do \( \text{onto}(\{\theta\}, J^{bd}[\theta], \theta) \) and \( \text{onto}(\{\theta\}, J^{bd}[\theta], \theta) \).

Proof. By Theorem 6.12, using \( \nu = \omega = \theta \) and \( \kappa = b_\theta \).

Theorem 7.14. Suppose that \( \text{cf}(\theta) = \theta < \omega \leq \text{cf}(\kappa) \leq \kappa \) are infinite cardinals, and \( S \subseteq \kappa \).

(i) If unbounded\( (J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega) \) holds, then so does \( \text{onto}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta) \);

(ii) If \( R_\theta < \text{cf}(\kappa) = \kappa \) and unbounded\( (\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \omega) \) holds, then so does \( \text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \theta) \).

Proof. The case in which \( \omega \) and \( \kappa \) are both regular is covered by Theorem 6.9 thanks to Lemmas 3.4 and 4.4.

The case in which \( \omega \) is singular and \( \kappa \) is regular is covered by Theorem 6.8. In case \( \omega \) and \( \kappa \) are both singular, then \( \text{cf}(\theta) = \theta < \omega < \kappa < \text{cf}(\kappa) < \kappa \). In this case, by Theorem 7.7(3) we know that even \( \text{onto}(\{\text{cf}(\kappa)\}, J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta) \) holds.

8. ONTO WITH MAXIMAL COLOURS

Fact 8.1. The following are equivalent:

1. \( \text{non}(M) = \aleph_1 \);
2. \( \text{onto}(\{\aleph_0\}, J^{bd}[\aleph_1], \aleph_1) \);
3. \( \text{onto}(\aleph_0, J^{bd}[\aleph_1], \aleph_1) \);
4. \( \text{onto}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0, J^{bd}[\aleph_1], \aleph_1) \).

Remark 8.2. The above equivalence is due to various authors. Sierpiński [Sie34] showed that (2) follows from \( 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1 \) and this principle is called Sierpiński’s onto mapping principle. An argument of Todorčević [Tod87, pp. 290–291] shows that for every infinite regular cardinal \( \lambda \), \( \text{onto}(\lambda^\lambda, J^{bd}[\lambda^+], \lambda^+) \) implies the a priori stronger \( \text{onto}(\lambda^+, J^{bd}[\lambda^+], \lambda^+) \). Miller [Mil14] showed that (2) and (3) are equivalent and that both imply (1). Guzmán [Guz17] showed that (1) implies (3) and hence that Sierpiński’s onto mapping principle is equivalent to another classical statement in set theory. See [KRS21, §3] for a detailed treatment of Sierpiński’s onto mapping principle including more equivalent versions.

Corollary 8.3. For every infinite regular cardinal \( \theta \), if \( \text{onto}(J^{bd}[\theta], \theta) \) and \( b_\theta = \theta^+ \) both hold, then so does \( \text{onto}(J^{bd}[\theta^+], \theta^+) \).


Lemma 8.4 (implicit in [EHM66, Lemma 14.1]). If \( \kappa \) is a successor cardinal and \( \text{\langle} \langle\kappa\rangle\rangle \) holds, then \( \text{onto}(\kappa, J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) holds.

Proof. Let \( \mu \) denote the predecessor of \( \kappa \). As \( \text{\langle} \langle\kappa\rangle\rangle \) holds, we may fix a collection of functions \( \langle g_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \) such that:

- for every \( \alpha < \kappa \), \( \text{dom}(g_\alpha) \in [\alpha]^{\mu} \);
- for every function \( g : A \to \kappa \) with \( A \in [\kappa]^{\kappa} \), for some \( \alpha < \kappa \), \( g_\alpha \subseteq g \).

Now, for every ordinal \( \beta \) with \( \mu \leq \beta < \kappa \), fix a surjection \( e_\beta : \mu \to \beta \), and then define an injective sequence \( \langle \eta_\beta^j \mid j < \mu \rangle \) of ordinals in \( \beta \), by recursion on \( j < \mu \):

\[ \eta_\beta^j := \min(\text{dom}(g_{e_\beta}(j)) \setminus \{ \eta_\beta^i \mid i < j \})\].
Pick \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa \) that satisfies that for all \( \mu \leq \beta < \kappa \) and \( j < \mu \),
\[
c(\eta_j^\beta, \beta) = g_{e_\beta(j)}(\eta_j^\beta).
\]

We claim that \( c \) witnesses \( \text{onto}([\kappa]^\kappa, J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \). So, towards a contradiction, suppose that \( A, B \) are cofinal subsets of \( \kappa \), and yet for every \( \eta \in A, c([\eta] \circ B) \neq \kappa \). Define \( g : A \to \kappa \) via \( g(\eta) := \min(\kappa \setminus c([\eta] \circ B)) \). Pick \( \alpha < \kappa \) such that \( g_{\alpha} \subseteq g \), and then let \( \beta \in B \) be above \( \alpha \) and \( \mu \). Let \( j < \mu \) be such that \( e_{\beta}(j) = \alpha \). Write \( \eta := \eta_j^\beta \). Then \( \eta \in \text{dom}(g_{\alpha}) \subseteq \text{dom}(g) = A \) and
\[
c(\eta, \beta) = g_{e_\beta(j)}(\eta_j^\beta) = g_{\alpha}(\eta) = g(\eta),
\]
contradicting the fact that \( g(\eta) \notin c([\eta] \circ B) \).

\[\blacksquare\]

**Lemma 8.5.** Suppose \( S \) is a stationary subset of a regular uncountable cardinal \( \kappa \).

\(\quad 1\) If \( \bigodot^*(S) \) holds, then so does \( \text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \kappa) \);

\(\quad 2\) If \( \bigodot(S) \) holds, then so does \( \text{onto}^{-}(S, \kappa) \).

**Proof.** (1) Assuming \( \bigodot^*(S) \), we may fix a matrix \( \langle g_{\beta} : \beta \to \beta \mid \beta \in S, \eta < \beta \rangle \) with the property that, for every function \( g : \kappa \to \kappa \), there are club many \( \beta \in S \) for which, for some \( \eta < \beta \), \( g \upharpoonright \beta = g_{\beta} \). Pick \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa \) that satisfies \( c(\eta, \beta) = g_{\beta}(\eta) \) for all \( \beta \in S \) and \( \eta < \beta \).

We claim that \( c \) witnesses \( \text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \kappa) \). So, towards a contradiction, suppose that \( B \subseteq S \) is a stationary set such that, for every \( \eta < \kappa \), \( c([\eta] \circ B) \neq \kappa \). Define \( g : \kappa \to \kappa \) via \( g(\eta) := \min(\kappa \setminus c([\eta] \circ B)) \). Now, pick \( \beta \in B \) and \( \eta < \beta \) such that \( g \upharpoonright \beta = g_{\beta} \). Then \( c(\eta, \beta) = g_{\beta}(\eta) = g(\eta) \), contradicting the fact that \( g(\eta) \notin c([\eta] \circ B) \).

(2) Assuming \( \bigodot(S) \), we may fix a sequence of functions \( \langle g_{\beta} : \beta \to \beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle \) with the property that, for every function \( g : \kappa \to \kappa \), there are stationarily many \( \beta \in S \) with \( g_{\beta} = g \upharpoonright \beta \). Pick \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa \) that satisfies \( c(\eta, \beta) = g_{\beta}(\eta) \) for all \( \beta \in S \) and \( \eta \in \text{dom}(g_{\beta}) \). We claim that \( c \) witnesses \( \text{onto}^{-}(S, \kappa) \).

Towards a contradiction, suppose that we are given a club \( D \subseteq \kappa \) and a regressive map \( f : S \cap D \to \kappa \) such that, for any \( \eta < \kappa \),
\[
c([\eta] \circ \{ \beta \in S \cap D \mid f(\beta) = \eta \}) \neq \kappa.
\]
Define a function \( g : \kappa \to \kappa \) via
\[
g(\eta) := \min(\kappa \setminus c([\eta] \circ \{ \beta \in S \cap D \mid f(\beta) = \eta \})).
\]
Now, pick a nonzero \( \beta \in S \cap D \) such that \( g_{\beta} = g \upharpoonright \beta \). Set \( \eta := f(\beta) \). Then \( c(\eta, \beta) = g_{\beta}(\eta) = g(\eta) \), contradicting the fact that \( g(\eta) \notin c([\eta] \circ \{ \beta \in S \cap D \mid f(\beta) = \eta \}) \).

\[\blacksquare\]

**Lemma 8.6.** Suppose that \( \kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa} \) is a limit cardinal.

For any ideal \( J \) over \( \kappa \), \( \text{onto}(J, \kappa) \) iff \( \text{onto}([\kappa]^\kappa, J, \kappa) \).

**Proof.** Fix a sequence \( \langle \kappa_\eta \mid \eta < \kappa \rangle \) of cardinals such that, for every \( \eta < \kappa \),
\[
(\sum_{\eta < \kappa} \kappa_\xi) < \kappa_\eta < \kappa. \quad \text{(For every } \eta < \kappa, \text{ let } \Phi_\eta := \bigcup \{ A^\kappa \mid A \in [\kappa]^\kappa_\eta \}, \text{ and then fix an injective enumeration } \langle \phi_\eta^\tau \mid \tau < \kappa \rangle \text{ of } \Phi_\eta \}. \text{ Fix a surjection } \sigma : \kappa \to \kappa \text{ such that the preimage of any singleton is cofinal in } \kappa \).

Next, suppose that \( J \) is an ideal over \( \kappa \), and \( \text{onto}(J, \kappa) \) holds, as witnessed by a colouring \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa \). For all \( \eta < \beta < \kappa \), set \( \psi_\eta^\beta := \phi_\eta^{c(\eta, \beta)} \). Pick an upper-regressive map \( d : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa \) satisfying that, for all \( \alpha < \beta < \kappa \), if there exists an
ordinal \( \eta < \kappa \) such that \( \alpha \in \text{dom}(\psi_\eta^\beta) \) and \( \psi_\eta^\beta(\alpha) < \beta \), then \( d(\alpha, \beta) = \psi_\eta^\beta(\alpha) \) for the least such \( \eta \).

To see that \( d \) witnesses \( \text{onto}([\kappa]^\kappa, J, \kappa) \), fix arbitrary \( A \in [\kappa]^\kappa \) and \( B \in J^+ \). Towards a contradiction, suppose that there exists a function \( f : A \to \kappa \) such that \( f(\alpha) \notin d(\{\alpha\} \uplus B) \) for all \( \alpha \in A \). As \( B \in J^+ \), let us fix \( \eta < \kappa \) with \( c(\{\eta\} \uplus B) = \kappa \). Pick \( A' \in [\kappa]^{\kappa\kappa} \) and then find \( \tau < \kappa \) such that \( \phi_\eta^\tau = f \upharpoonright A' \). Let \( \epsilon := \max\{\eta, \sup(A'), \sup(f[A'])\} + 1 \). By the choice of \( \eta \), \( c(\{\eta\} \times (B \setminus \epsilon)) \) is co-bounded in \( \kappa \), so we may fix \( \beta \in B \setminus \epsilon \) with \( \sigma(c(\eta, \beta)) = \tau \).

As \( |\bigcup_{\zeta<\eta} \text{dom}(\psi_\zeta^\beta)| \leq (\sum_{\zeta<\eta} \kappa_\zeta) = \kappa_\eta = |A'| \), it follows that we may pick \( \alpha \in A' \setminus \bigcup_{\zeta<\eta} \text{dom}(\psi_\zeta^\beta) \), so that \( \eta \) is the least ordinal to satisfy \( \alpha \in \text{dom}(\psi_\eta^\beta) \). We have that \( \psi_\eta^\beta(\alpha) = \phi_\eta^{\sigma(c(\eta, \beta))}(\alpha) = \phi_\eta^\tau(\alpha) = f(\alpha) < \epsilon \leq \beta \), and hence \( d(\alpha, \beta) = f(\alpha) \), contradicting the choice of \( f \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 8.7.** Suppose that \( \kappa \) is a regular uncountable cardinal.

- If there exists a stationary \( S \subseteq \kappa \) that does not reflect at regulars and \( \diamond(S) \) holds, then \( \text{onto}([\kappa]^\kappa, J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) holds. In particular:
- If \( \kappa \) is a non-Mahlo cardinal and \( \diamond(\kappa) \) holds, then so does \( \text{onto}([\kappa]^\kappa, J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \).

**Proof.** Suppose that \( S \subseteq \kappa \) is stationary and \( \diamond(S) \) holds. In particular, if \( \kappa \) is a successor cardinal, then by Lemma 8.4 \( \text{onto}([\kappa]^\kappa, J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) holds, and we are done. From now on, suppose that \( \kappa \) is a limit cardinal, so, by Lemma 8.6 it suffices to prove that \( \text{onto}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) holds.

By Lemma 8.6, in particular, \( \text{onto}^{-}(S, \kappa) \) holds. Suppose that \( S \) does not reflect at regulars. Then, by Lemma 5.3 \( \text{unbounded}^*(J^{bd}[\kappa], \{S\}) \) holds. Finally, by Lemma 6.10 \( \text{onto}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) holds, and we are done. \( \square \)

**Remark 8.8.** The preceding finding plays a key role in the proof of one clause of [BR21, Theorem B].

For a list of sufficient conditions for the hypotheses of the following lemma to hold, the reader may consult [BR21, Theorem 6.1].

**Lemma 8.9.** Suppose that \( \kappa \) is a regular uncountable cardinal. If \( P^*(\kappa, \kappa^+, \subseteq, 1) \) holds, then so does \( \text{onto}([\kappa]^\kappa, J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \).

**Proof.** According to [BR21, §5], \( P^*(\kappa, \kappa^+, \subseteq, 1) \) provides us with a sequence \( \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \) satisfying the following:

(i) for every \( \beta < \kappa \), \( C_\beta \) is a nonempty collection of functions \( C : \dot{C} \to H_\kappa \) such that \( \dot{C} \) is a closed subset of \( \beta \) with \( \sup(\dot{C}) = \sup(\beta) \);

(ii) for all \( \beta < \kappa \), \( C \subseteq C_\beta \) and \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\dot{C}) \), \( C \upharpoonright \alpha \in C_\alpha \);

(iii) for all \( \Omega \subseteq H_\kappa \) and \( p \in H_{\kappa^+} \), there exists \( \delta \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \) such that, for all \( C \in C_\beta \) and \( \epsilon < \delta \), there exists an elementary submodel \( \mathcal{M} \prec H_{\kappa^+} \) with \( \{\epsilon, p\} \in \mathcal{M} \) such that \( \tau := \mathcal{M} \cap \kappa \) is in nacc(\dot{C}) and \( C(\tau) = \mathcal{M} \cap \Omega \).

For our purposes, it suffices to consider the following special case of (iii):

(iii') for every function \( g : \kappa \to \kappa \), there exists \( \delta \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \) such that, for all \( C \in C_\delta \),

\[ \sup\{\tau \in \text{nacc}(\dot{C}) \mid g[\tau] \subseteq \tau \ & \& C(\tau) = g \upharpoonright \tau \} = \delta. \]

In particular, \( \kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa \). So, by Lemma 8.3 we may assume that \( \kappa \) is a limit cardinal, and then, by Lemma 8.6 it suffices to verify that \( \text{onto}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) holds.
Fix a sequence $\vec{C} = \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ such that, $C_\beta \in C_\beta$ for all $\beta < \kappa$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 8.10, we shall conduct walks on ordinals along $\vec{C} := \langle C_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$.

Define an upper-regressive coloring $c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa$ as follows. Given $\eta < \beta < \kappa$, let $\gamma := \min(\text{Im}(\text{tr}(\eta, \beta)))$ and then let $c(\eta, \beta) := C_\gamma(\min(C_\gamma \setminus (\eta + 1)))(\eta)$ provided that the latter is a well-defined ordinal less than $\beta$; otherwise, let $c(\eta, \beta) := 0$.

Now, let $B \in [\kappa]^{\kappa}$ be arbitrary. Towards a contradiction, suppose that there exists a function $g : \kappa \to \kappa$ such that, for every $\eta < \kappa$, $g(\eta) \notin c(\eta) \cap B$. Fix $\delta \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$ as in Clause (iii'), and then let $\varepsilon := \sup(\delta \cap \{\sup(\vec{C}_\gamma \cap \delta) \mid \gamma \in \text{Im}(\text{tr}(\delta, \beta))\}$.

As in the proof of Lemma 8.9, $\varepsilon < \delta$ and there are two cases to consider:

- If $\delta \in \text{nacc}(\vec{C}_{\min(\text{Im}(\text{tr}(\delta, \beta)))})$, then, for every $\eta$ with $\varepsilon < \eta < \delta$, $\text{tr}(\eta, \beta) = \text{tr}(\delta, \beta) \cap \text{tr}(\eta, \delta)$. In this case, pick a large enough $\tau \in \text{nacc}(C_\delta)$ with $g[\tau] \subseteq \tau$ and $C_\eta(\tau) = g \upharpoonright \tau$ for which $\eta := \sup(C_\delta \cap \tau)$ is $> \varepsilon$. Then $\min(\text{Im}(\text{tr}(\eta, \beta))) = \delta$, $g(\eta) < \tau < \beta$, and hence $c(\eta, \beta) = C_\delta(\min(C_\delta \setminus (\eta + 1)))(\eta) = C_\delta(\tau)(\eta) = g(\eta)$.

- Otherwise, $\delta \in \text{acc}(\vec{C}_\gamma)$, for $\gamma := \min(\text{Im}(\text{tr}(\delta, \beta)))$, and, for every $\eta$ with $\varepsilon < \eta < \delta$, $\text{tr}(\eta, \beta) = \text{tr}(\gamma, \beta) \cap \text{tr}(\eta, \gamma)$. As $\delta \in \text{acc}(\vec{C}_\gamma)$, $C_\gamma \cap \delta$ is in $C_\delta$, and hence we may pick $\tau \in \text{nacc}(C_\gamma \cap \delta)$ with $g[\tau] \subseteq \tau$ and $C_\tau(\tau) = g \upharpoonright \tau$ for which $\eta := \sup(C_\gamma \cap \tau)$ is $> \varepsilon$. Then $\min(\text{Im}(\text{tr}(\eta, \beta))) = \gamma$, $g(\eta) < \tau < \beta$, and hence $c(\eta, \beta) = C_\delta(\min(C_\delta \setminus (\eta + 1)))(\eta) = C_\gamma(\tau)(\eta) = g(\eta)$.

By the next lemma, for every singular strong limit cardinal $\lambda$, $\text{onto}(\langle \lambda \rangle, J^{bd}[\lambda^+], \lambda)$ implies $\lambda^+ = [\lambda; \lambda^+]^2_\kappa$.

**Lemma 8.10.** Suppose that $\kappa$ is an infinite cardinal for which there exists a sequence of cardinals $\langle \kappa_\eta \mid \eta < \kappa \rangle$ and a family $A \subseteq [\kappa]^\kappa$ of size $\kappa$ such that, for every $\eta < \kappa$:

- $\sum_{\zeta < \eta} \kappa_\zeta < \kappa_\eta$;
- for every $A \in [\kappa]^\kappa$, there exists $A' \in A$ with $|A' \cap A| = |A'| = \kappa_\eta$.

Then:

1. If $\kappa$ is regular and $\text{onto}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa)$ holds, then so $\kappa \to [\kappa; \kappa]^2_\kappa$;
2. If $\text{onto}(\langle \kappa \rangle, J^{bd}[\kappa^+], \kappa)$ holds, then so $\kappa^+ \to [\kappa; \kappa]^2_\kappa$.

**Proof.** The proof is similar to that of Lemma 8.9. For conciseness, we focus on proving Clause (2). First, note that the hypothesis implies that we may fix $A \subseteq [\kappa^+]^\kappa$ of size $\kappa^+$ such that, for every $A \in [\kappa^+]^\kappa$, there exists $A' \in A$ with $|A' \cap A| = |A'| = \kappa_\eta$. For every $\eta < \kappa^+$, let $\Phi_\eta := \{A' \times \{\gamma\} \mid A' \in A \cap [\kappa^+]^{\kappa_\eta}, \gamma < \kappa^+\}$ and note that these are all constant functions with domains in $A \cap [\kappa^+]^{\kappa_\eta}$. Fix an injective enumeration $\langle \phi_\eta^\gamma \mid \gamma < \kappa^+ \rangle$ of $\Phi_\eta$. Fix a surjection $\sigma : \kappa^+ \to \kappa^+$ such that the preimage of any singleton is cofinal in $\kappa^+$. Now, assuming that $\text{onto}(\{\kappa\}, J^{bd}[\kappa^+], \kappa)$ holds, by Lemma 6.11(3), we may fix a colouring $c : \kappa \times \kappa^+ \to \kappa^+$ witnessing $\text{onto}(\{\kappa\}, J^{bd}[\kappa^+], \kappa)$. For every pair $(\eta, \beta) \in \kappa \times \kappa^+$, set $\psi^\beta_\eta := \phi_\eta^{c(\eta, \beta)}$. Finally, define a colouring $d : [\kappa^+]^2 \to \kappa^+$ by letting, for all $\alpha < \beta < \kappa^+$:

$$d(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \alpha \notin \bigcup_{\zeta < \kappa} \text{dom}(\psi^\beta_\zeta); \\ \psi^\beta_\eta(\alpha), & \text{if } \eta = \min(\zeta < \kappa \mid \alpha \in \text{dom}(\psi^\beta_\zeta)). \end{cases}$$

To see that $d$ witnesses $\kappa^+ \to [\kappa; \kappa]^2_\kappa$, fix arbitrary $A \in [\kappa^+]^\kappa$ and $B \in [\kappa^+]^\kappa$ and a prescribed colour $\gamma < \kappa^+$; we shall find $(\alpha, \beta) \in A \cap B$ for which $d(\alpha, \beta) = \gamma$. 
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As $B \notin J^{|\kappa^n|}$, let us fix $\eta < \kappa$ with $\operatorname{cf}\{\eta\} \oplus B = \kappa^n$. Pick $A' \in A$ with $|A' \cap A| = |A'| = \kappa^\eta$. Find $\tau < \kappa^+$ such that $\phi^\gamma_\eta = A' \times \{\gamma\}$. Let $\epsilon := \sup(A') + \kappa$. By the choice of $\eta$, $\operatorname{cf}\{\eta\} \times (B \setminus \epsilon)$ is co-bounded in $\kappa^+$, so we may fix $\beta \in B \setminus \epsilon$ with $\sigma(\epsilon, \beta)) = \tau$.

As $|\bigcup_{\zeta<\eta} \operatorname{dom}(\psi^\beta_\zeta)| \leq (\sum_{\zeta<\eta} \kappa^\zeta) < \kappa^\eta = |A' \cap A|$, it follows that we may pick $\alpha \in (A' \cap A) \setminus (\bigcup_{\zeta<\eta} \operatorname{dom}(\psi^\beta_\zeta))$, so that $d(\alpha, \beta) = \psi^\beta_\eta(\alpha)$. Altogether $\alpha \in \operatorname{dom}(\psi^\beta_\zeta) \cap A' \cap A \cap \beta$ and

$$d(\alpha, \beta) = \psi^\beta_\eta(\alpha) = \phi_\eta^\sigma(\epsilon, \beta)(\alpha) = \phi_\eta^\sigma(\alpha) = \gamma,$$

as sought. \qed

9. Failures and consistent failures

In contrast to Proposition 7.6, we have:

**Corollary 9.1.** \textit{onto}(J$^{|\kappa^n|}$, $[\eta_0], N_0$) fails.

**Proof.** By Lemma 8.6 and Ramsey’s theorem. \qed

**Fact 9.2** (Lar07, Corollary 6.8). \textit{onto}(NS$\kappa_1$, $N_1$) may consistently fail.

**Remark 9.3.** Evidently, \textit{onto}(J$^{|\kappa^n|}$, $[\eta_1], N_1$) $\implies$ \textit{onto}(NS$\kappa_1$, $N_1$) $\implies$ \textit{onto}$^-$($N_1$, $N_1$).

By Lemmas 5.3 and 5.10, the last two are equivalent, and, by Lemma 6.11, the first two are equivalent, as well. In contrast, in Section 11 we shall show that if $\kappa$ is an ineffable cardinal, then \textit{onto}(NS$\kappa_1$, 2) fails, yet \textit{onto}$^-$($\kappa$, $\kappa$) holds.

**Proposition 9.4.** unbounded(J$^{|\kappa^n|}$, $[\theta]$) fails whenever $\operatorname{cf}(\kappa) < \theta < \kappa$.

In particular, \textit{onto}(J$^{|\kappa^n|}$, $[\kappa]$) fails for every singular cardinal $\kappa$.

**Proof.** Some positive sets with respect to the ideal J$^{|\kappa^n|}$ have size $\operatorname{cf}(\kappa)$. \qed

**Proposition 9.5** (anti-monotonicity). For every infinite cardinal $\theta = \theta^\theta$, in some cofinality-preserving forcing extension, unbounded($\{\theta\}$, J$^{|\kappa^n|}$, $\theta^+$) holds, but unbounded($\{\theta\}$, J$^{|\kappa^n|}$, $\theta^+$) fails.

**Proof.** It is easy to see (and it also follows from Fact 5.4) that unbounded($\{\theta\}$, J$^{|\kappa^n|}$, $\theta^+$) is a theorem of ZFC. Now, use the forcing of [CS95] to make $b_\theta$ greater than $\theta^+$. Then, by Lemma 7.11 unbounded($\{\theta\}$, J$^{|\kappa^n|}$, $\theta^+$) fails. \qed

The next theorem shows that \textit{onto}$^-$($\kappa$, $\kappa$) does not imply \textit{onto}(NS$\kappa_1$, $\kappa$), and neither does $\sup\{\theta < \kappa | \text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa, \theta) \text{ holds}\} = \kappa$.

**Theorem 9.6.** If $\kappa$ is ineffable, then in some cofinality-preserving forcing extension:

1. $\kappa$ is strongly inaccessible;
2. \textit{onto}$^+$([\kappa]^\kappa, J$^{|\kappa^n|}$, $[\theta]$) holds for all $\theta < \kappa$;
3. \textit{onto}$^-$($\kappa$, $\kappa$) holds;
4. unbounded(NS$\kappa_1$, $\kappa$) fails.

**Proof.** The aforementioned Kunen’s model $V^\mathbb{R}$ from [Kun78 §3] where we start from an ineffable cardinal $\kappa$ has the following properties:

(i) $\kappa$ is strongly inaccessible;
(ii) there is a $\kappa$-Souslin tree $T$;
(iii) $\phi(\kappa)$ holds;
(iv) $V^{R,T} \models \text{"k is ineffable".}$

As there is a $\kappa$-Souslin tree, $\kappa \rightarrow [\kappa]^2_2$ holds, so by Proposition 4.10, onto$^+(\kappa^\kappa)$, $J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta$ holds for all $\theta < \kappa$. By Lemma 8.5(2), onto$^-(\kappa, \kappa)$ holds in $V^R$. Finally, since $T$ has the $\kappa$-cc and $V^{R,T} \models \text{"k is not A}_\kappa"$, we conclude that $V^R \models \text{"k is not A}_\kappa"$ by Proposition 1.9 and hence unbounded$(\text{NS}, \kappa)$ fails in $V^R$ by Lemma 4.4. 

\textbf{Theorem 9.7.} If $\kappa$ is weakly compact, then in some cofinality-preserving forcing extension, (1)—(3) of Theorem 9.6 hold, and so does

(4) unbounded$(J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa)$ fails.

\textbf{Proof.} The proof is almost exactly the same as that of Theorem 9.6. In Kunen’s model $V^R$ from [Kun78 §3] where we start from an weakly compact cardinal $\kappa$ has properties (i)—(iii), together with

(iv) $V^{R,T} \models \text{"k is weakly compact".}$

So as $V^{R,T} \models \text{"k is not A}_\kappa"$, we conclude that $V^R \models \text{"k is not A}_\kappa"$ by Proposition 3.12 and hence unbounded$(J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa)$ fails in $V^R$ by Lemma 3.4. 

\textbf{Theorem 9.8.} Assuming the consistency of a weakly compact cardinal, the following is consistent:

- $\kappa$ is strongly inaccessible;
- onto$(\text{NS}, \kappa)$ holds;
- unbounded$(J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega)$ fails.

\textbf{Proof.} Work in $\mathbb{L}$ and suppose that $\kappa$ is a weakly compact cardinal which is not ineffable (e.g., the first weakly compact cardinal). As $\kappa$ is not ineffable, a result of Jensen [JK69] (see [Sch14 Theorem 5.39]) states that $\check{\Diamond}(\kappa)$ holds. So by Lemma 8.4(1) we have that onto$(\text{NS}, \kappa)$ holds. In addition, since $\kappa$ is weakly compact, by Corollary 10.2 below, unbounded$(J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega)$ fails.

\textbf{Lemma 9.9.} Suppose that $\kappa$ is uncountable, $\theta \leq \kappa$ is infinite and regular, $\mathbb{P}$ is a $\theta$-cc poset, and $S \subseteq \kappa$ is stationary.

- If unbounded$(J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$ fails, then it remains to fail in $V^\mathbb{P}$;
- If unbounded$(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \theta)$ fails, then it remains to fail in $V^\mathbb{P}$.

\textbf{Proof.} Since $\mathbb{P}$ has the $\theta$-cc, for every colouring $c : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ in $V^\mathbb{P}$, there exists a colouring $d : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ such that $c(\alpha, \beta) \leq d(\alpha, \beta)$ for every $(\alpha, \beta) \in [\kappa]^2$.

- If unbounded$(J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$ fails, then we may fix $B \in [\kappa]^\kappa$ such that $d^*(B)^2$ is bounded in $\theta$, and then, in $V^\mathbb{P}$, $B$ is a $J^{bd}[\kappa]$-positive such that $c^*(B)^2$ is bounded in $\theta$, so $B$ demonstrates that $c$ is not a witness to unbounded$(J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$.

- If unbounded$(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \theta)$ fails, then we may fix a stationary $B \subseteq S$ such that $d^*(B)^2$ is bounded in $\theta$. As $\mathbb{P}$ has the $\kappa$-cc, $B$ remains stationary in $V^\mathbb{P}$, so it demonstrates that $c$ is not a witness to unbounded$(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \theta)$.

\textbf{Theorem 9.10.} If $\kappa$ is ineffable, then for every cardinal $\theta = \theta^{<\theta} < \kappa$, there is a cofinality-preserving forcing extension in which:

- $\kappa = 2^\theta$;
- onto$(\{\emptyset\}, J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta)$ holds;
- unbounded$(\text{NS}_\kappa, \theta^+)$ fails.

\textbf{Proof.} Let $\mathbb{P}$ be Cohen’s notion of forcing for adding $\kappa$ many subsets of $\theta$. So, the conditions in $\mathbb{P}$ are functions $p : a \rightarrow \theta$ with $a \subseteq \theta \times \kappa$ and $|a| < \theta$. This is a
θ-closed notion of forcing, and since θ^{<θ} = θ, it has the θ^{+}-cc, so that P preserves the cardinal structure. By Fact 2.17, as κ is ineffable, unbounded(\text{NS}_κ, θ^+) fails, and then, by Lemma 9.9, unbounded(\text{NS}_κ, θ^+) fails in the extension, as well.

Let G be P-generic over V, and work in V[G]. Let c := ∪G, so that c is a function from θ × κ to θ. Towards a contradiction, suppose that onto(\{θ\}, J^{bd}[κ], θ) fails, as witnessed by some B ∈ [κ]κ. In particular, there exists a function g : θ → θ such that g(η) ∉ c(\{θ\} ⊕ B) for all η < κ.

However, by a standard density argument (see the proof of [CKS20, Theorem 27]), in V[G], for all A ∈ [θ]^θ and B ∈ [κ]^κ, for every function g : A → θ, there exist η ∈ A and β ∈ B \ θ such that g(η) = c(η, β). This is a contradiction.

**Theorem 9.11.** If κ is weakly compact, then for every cardinal θ = θ^{<θ} < κ, there is a cofinality-preserving forcing extension in which:

- κ = 2^θ;
- onto(\{θ\}, J^{bd}[κ], θ) holds;
- unbounded(J^{bd}[κ], θ^+) fails.

**Proof.** As in the proof of Theorem 9.10 we let P be Cohen’s notion of forcing for adding κ many subsets of θ, so that κ = 2^θ and onto(\{θ\}, J^{bd}[κ], θ) holds in the extension. Let us see now why unbounded(J^{bd}[κ], θ^+) fails.

Since we were using a θ^{+}-cc forcing, given a colouring c : [κ]^2 → θ^+ in the extension, we may find d : [κ]^2 → θ^+ in the ground-model such that, for every α < β < κ, c(α, β) ≤ d(α, β). Appealing to Proposition 2.18 we find a cofinality set B ⊆ κ such that for every η < κ, |d(\{η\} ⊕ B)| ≤ 2. So, for every η < κ,

$$\text{sup}(c(\{η\} ⊕ B)) ≤ \text{sup}(d(\{η\} ⊕ B)) < θ^+.$$ 

Here the last inequality follows as we take the supremum over a two element set. □

It follows from Proposition 6.6 that, in ZFC, onto^+(J^{bd}[κ], θ) holds for many pairs θ < κ of infinite regular cardinals. The next proposition rules out the case θ = κ.

**Proposition 9.12.** Suppose that J is a proper ideal over κ. Then onto^+(J, κ) fails. Furthermore:

1. There is no colouring c : [κ]^2 → κ with the property that, for every sequence (B_τ | τ < κ) of elements of J^+, there is an η < κ and an injection h : κ → κ such that, for every τ < κ, \{β ∈ B_τ | c(η, β) = h(τ)\} ∈ J^+.

2. If [κ]^{<κ} ⊆ J, then there is no colouring c : [κ]^2 → κ with the property that, for every sequence (B_τ | τ < κ) of elements of J^+, there is an η < κ and an injection h : κ → κ such that,

\{τ < κ | \{β ∈ B_τ | c(η, β) = h(τ)\} ∈ J^+\} ∈ J^*.

**Proof.** Due to constraints of space, we settle for proving Clause (2).

Towards a contradiction, suppose that any J^+ set is of size κ, and yet some colouring c : [κ]^2 → κ does satisfy the conclusion. In particular, by invoking it with the constant κ-sequence in which all B_τ sets are equal to κ, there exists η^* < κ for which \{|τ < κ | \{β < κ | c(η^*, β) = τ\} ∈ J^+\} = κ. It follows that we may fix a surjection f : κ → κ such that the preimage of any singleton is in J^+.
Next, for every \( \eta < \kappa \), if there exists \( \tau < \kappa \) for which \( \{ \beta < \kappa \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \tau \} \) is in \( J^+ \), then let \( \xi_\eta \) be the least such \( \tau \), and then let \( B^\eta := \{ \beta < \kappa \mid c(\eta, \beta) = \xi_\eta \} \).

Otherwise, let \( \xi_\eta := 0 \) and \( B^\eta := \kappa \). Finally, for every \( \tau < \kappa \), let \( B_\tau := B^{f(\tau)} \).

Towards a contradiction, suppose that there exists \( \eta < \kappa \) and an injection \( h : \kappa \to \kappa \) for which the following set is in \( J^+ \):

\[
T := \{ \tau < \kappa \mid \{ \beta \in B_\tau \mid c(\eta, \beta) = h(\tau) \} \in J^+ \}.
\]

In particular, \( B^\eta \in J^+ \setminus \{ \kappa \} \). Now, recalling the choice of \( f \), we may find \( \tau_0 \neq \tau_1 \) in \( T \) such that \( f(\tau_0) = \tau = f(\tau_1) \). For each \( i < 2 \):

\[
\{ \beta \in B^\eta \mid c(\eta, \beta) = h(\xi_\eta) \} = \{ \beta \in B_{\tau_i} \mid c(\eta, \beta) = h(\tau_i) \} \in J^+.
\]

It follows that \( h(\tau_i) = \xi_\eta \). So \( h(\tau_0) = h(\tau_1) \), contradicting the fact that \( h \) is injective. \( \Box \)

Remark 9.13. By weakening \( J^+ \) to \( J^+ \) at the end of Clause (2) we arrive at a principle which is consistent even with familiar ideals like \( J = \text{NS}_\kappa \). See Lemmas 5.9 and 5.3

10. Weakly compact cardinals

**Theorem 10.1.** Suppose \( \kappa = \kappa^{\aleph_0} \) is a regular cardinal which is not weakly compact. Then onto(\( J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \omega \)) holds.

**Proof.** Since \( \kappa \) is not weakly compact, we may fix a colouring \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to 2 \) witnessing \( \kappa \to [\kappa]^2_2 \). We also fix \( \langle x_\eta \mid \eta < \kappa \rangle \) an enumeration of \( ^\omega \kappa \). Define a colouring \( d : [\kappa]^2 \to \omega \) as follows: \( d(\eta, \beta) \) is the least \( n \) such that \( c(x_\eta(n), \beta) = 1 \) if such an \( n \) exists, and if not, \( d(\eta, \beta) := 0 \).

To see that this colouring is a required, let \( B \subseteq \kappa \) be cofinal in \( \kappa \). For \( n < \omega \) and \( x : n \to \kappa \) and \( y : n \to 2 \) denote:

\[
B_{x,y} := \{ \beta \in B \mid \forall i < n(c(x(i), \beta) = y(i)) \},
\]

and also

\[
T(B) := \{ (x, y) \in \kappa^n \times \omega^n \mid n < \omega \ & \ & \sup(B_{x,y}) = \kappa \}.
\]

Then it is clear that \( T(B) \) is a subset of \( ^{<\omega} \kappa \times ^{<\omega} \omega \) consisting of pairs of tuples of the same length and closed under initial segments. That is, it is a subtree of \( \bigcup_{n<\omega} (^{n} \kappa \times ^{n} \omega) \) where the order is given by the end-extension relation. Since \( B \) has size \( \kappa \), it is clear that \( (\emptyset, \emptyset) \in T(B) \), so in particular that \( T(B) \) is nonempty.

**Claim 10.1.1.** Let \( n < \omega \) and let \( x \in ^n 2 \) and \( y \in ^n 2 \) be such that \( (x, y) \in T(B) \). Then there exists \( \eta < \kappa \) such that, for all \( i < 2 \), \( (x^\gamma(\eta), y^\gamma(i)) \in T(B) \).

**Proof.** In fact our proof will show that there is such an \( \eta \) in \( B_{x,y} \) which we note is a set of size \( \kappa \). So suppose our claim does not hold. This means that for every \( \eta < \kappa \) we can pick an \( i_\eta < 2 \) and an \( \epsilon_\eta < \kappa \) such that

\[
\sup(B_{x^\gamma(\eta), y^\gamma(i_\eta)}) = \epsilon_\eta.
\]

Consider the following set which is a club in \( \kappa \):

\[
E := \{ \gamma < \kappa \mid \forall \eta < \gamma (\epsilon_\eta < \gamma) \}.
\]

Let \( B' \) be a sparse enough cofinal subset of \( B_{x,y} \) such that, for every \( \alpha < \beta \) both from \( B' \), there is some \( \gamma \in E \) such that \( \alpha < \gamma < \beta \). By the pigeonhole principle fix \( i^* < 2 \) for which \( B'' := \{ \beta \in B' \mid i_\eta = i^* \} \) is cofinal in \( \kappa \).
By the choice of $c$, we can now find $\eta < \beta$ both from $B''$ such that $c(\eta, \beta) = i^*$. Let $\gamma \in E$ be such that $\eta < \gamma < \beta$. Since $\eta < \gamma$, we have that
\[
\text{sup}(B_{x, y} \setminus B_{x, y} (\eta, y, n)) = \epsilon_\eta < \gamma < \beta.
\]
Altogether $\beta \in B_{x, y} \setminus B_{x, y} (\eta, y, n)$ holds. So $c(\eta, \beta) \neq i_\eta$, contradicting the fact that $i_\eta = i^*$.

For $n < \omega$ let $y_n : n \to \{0\}$ denote the constant function with value 0. Now using the claim we can inductively find an $x \in \omega \kappa$ such that, for every $n < \omega$, $(x \restriction (n + 1), y_n (1)) \in T(B)$. Note that since $T(B)$ is closed under initial segments this implies that for every $n < \omega$ we also have that $(x \restriction n, y_n) \in T(B)$. We shall call such an $x \in \omega \kappa$ a canonical branch for $B$. Let us see the details of its construction.

Set $(x_0, y_0) := (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ which we know is in $T(B)$. Suppose that $n < \omega$ and we have already found an $x_n \in \omega \kappa$ such that $(x_n, y_n) \in T(B)$, so in particular such that $\text{sup}(B_{x_n, y_n}) = \kappa$. By the preceding claim, we now find $\eta < \kappa$ such that $\text{sup}(B_{x_n, y_n} (\eta)) = \kappa$ and $\text{sup}(B_{x_n, y_n} (0)) = \kappa$. Then, let $x_{n+1} := x_n \langle \eta \rangle$. In this way we can find a canonical branch by discovering its initial segments.

Now suppose that $x \in \omega \kappa$ is a canonical branch. Then there is some $\eta < \kappa$ such that $x = x_\eta$. Since $x_\eta$ is a canonical branch for $B$, the set $B_{x_{\eta} \restriction (n+1), y_n \restriction (1)}$ is a cofinal subset of $B$. For every $\beta$ in this set, $c(x_\eta(n), \beta) = 1$ and for every $i < n$ it is the case that $c(x_\eta(i), \beta) = 0$. So for every $\beta \in B_{x_{\eta} \restriction (n+1), y_n \restriction (1)}$ above $\eta$, $d(\eta, \beta) = n$, as sought.

**Corollary 10.2.** The following are equivalent:

1. $\kappa$ is not weakly compact;
2. unbounded($J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega$) holds.

**Proof.** The implication (2) $\implies$ (1) follows by Proposition 2.13 so we assume that $\kappa$ is not weakly compact, and prove that unbounded($J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega$) holds:

- If $\kappa = \omega$ this follows by Proposition 7.6.
- If $\kappa$ is a singular cardinal this follows by Theorem 7.7.
- If $\kappa$ is regular and $\kappa^{\aleph_0} = \kappa$, then by the preceding theorem onto($J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega$) holds. So in particular unbounded($J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega$) holds.
- Otherwise, this follows from Proposition 6.3 (iv). □

**Corollary 10.3.** For every cardinal $\kappa \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$, the following are equivalent:

1. $\kappa$ is not weakly compact;
2. onto($J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega$) holds.

**Proof.** Galvin and Shelah [GS76] proved that $\text{cf}(2^{\aleph_0}) \to [\text{cf}(2^{\aleph_0})]_2^{\aleph_0}$ holds. So, appealing to Propositions 6.1 and 6.4, this settles the case $\kappa = 2^{\aleph_0}$. As for $\kappa > 2^{\aleph_0}$, this follows from Corollaries 10.2 and 6.14. □

In contrast to the fact that onto($J^{bd}[2^{\aleph_0}], \aleph_0$) holds, Theorem 9.11 shows that onto($J^{bd}[2^{\aleph_1}], \aleph_1$) and even unbounded($J^{bd}[2^{\aleph_1}], \aleph_1$) may consistently fail.²

**Corollary 10.4.** If $\kappa$ is an uncountable cardinal such that onto($J^{bd}[\kappa], \omega$) fails, then $\kappa < 2^{\aleph_0}$ and one of the following must be true:

1. $\kappa$ is a singular cardinal of countable cofinality;

²Start with a model of GCH and $\kappa$ weakly compact, and appeal to Theorem 9.11 with $\theta := \aleph_0$. Note that $2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1} = \kappa$ will hold in the extension.
(2) $\kappa$ is a greatly Mahlo cardinal which is weakly compact in $\mathcal{L}$.

Proof. By Corollary 10.3, if $\text{onto}(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \omega)$ fails, then $\kappa < 2^{\aleph_0}$.

(1) By Theorem 7.7(3), $\text{onto}(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \omega)$ holds for every singular cardinal $\kappa$ of uncountable cofinality.

(2) By Corollary 6.10, if $\kappa$ is a regular uncountable cardinal such that $\text{onto}(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \omega)$ fails, then $\text{unbounded}((J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \omega))$ fails, as well. Then, by Corollary 3.10, $\kappa$ is greatly Mahlo, and, by Corollary 3.8, $\kappa$ is weakly compact in $\mathcal{L}$.

\begin{corollary}
Assuming $V = L$, for every regular uncountable cardinal $\kappa$, the following are equivalent:

(1) $\kappa$ is not weakly compact;

(2) $\text{unbounded}^*(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \{T\})$ holds for some stationary $T \subseteq \kappa$;

(3) $\text{unbounded}(\kappa, J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \kappa)$ holds;

(4) $\text{onto}([\kappa]^\kappa, J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \kappa)$ holds;

(5) $\kappa \in \text{SA}_\kappa$.

\end{corollary}

Proof. As proved by Jensen [Jen72], assuming $V = L$, a regular uncountable cardinal $\kappa$ admits a nonreflecting stationary set iff it is not weakly compact. So (1) $\iff$ (2) by Lemma 5.3. By another theorem of Jensen [Jen72], assuming $V = L$, ♠ holds over any stationary subset of any regular uncountable cardinal. Putting this together with the previous fact, we get (1) $\implies$ (4) from Corollary 8.7. It is clear that (4) $\implies$ (3), and (3) $\iff$ (5) is given by Lemma 3.4. Finally, the implication (5) $\implies$ (1) is given by Proposition 2.23.

By Remark 11.2 below, $\text{onto}(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], 2)$ holds iff $\kappa$ is not almost ineffable. Moving from 2 to 3, we arrive at the following.

\begin{corollary}
The following are equivalent for every uncountable cardinal $\kappa$:

(1) $\text{onto}(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], 3)$ holds;

(2) $\kappa$ is not weakly compact.

\end{corollary}

Proof. (1) $\implies$ (2) This follows by Proposition 2.18.

(2) $\implies$ (1) In case $\kappa \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ this follows by Corollary 10.3. In case $\aleph_0 < \kappa \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ this follows by Proposition 7.5.

When put together with Proposition 2.18, the preceding shows that for every infinite cardinal $\kappa$:

$$
\text{onto}(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], 3) \iff \kappa \rightarrow [\kappa]^2 \iff \bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{onto}(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], n).
$$

11. Ineffable Cardinals

In this section $\kappa$ denotes a regular uncountable cardinal.

\begin{lemma}
For any stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$, the following are equivalent:

(1) $\text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, 2)$ holds;

(2) $S$ is non-ineffable;

(3) there exists a sequence of functions $\langle g_\beta : \beta \rightarrow 2 \mid \beta \in S \rangle$ with the property that, for every $g : \kappa \rightarrow 2$, the following set is nonstationary:

$$
\{ \beta \in S \mid \forall \eta < \beta(g(\eta) \neq g_\beta(\eta)) \}.
$$

\end{lemma}
Proof. (1) \(\Rightarrow\) (2) Given a colouring \(c : [\kappa]^2 \to 2\) and an ineffable set \(S\), we can consider \(c(\cdot, \beta) : \beta \to 2\) as the indicator function of a subset of \(\beta\). Appealing then to the ineffability of \(S\), we see that there must exist a \(f : \kappa \to 2\) such that the set \(B := \{ \beta \in S \mid c(\cdot, \beta) = f[\beta] \}\) is stationary. So, for every \(\eta < \kappa\), \(c(\eta, (B(y)(\eta + 1)) = \{ f(\eta) \}\). So \(c\) cannot be a witness to \(\text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, 2)\).

(2) \(\Rightarrow\) (3) Assuming \(S\) is non-ineffable, we may find a sequence \(\langle A_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle\) such that, for every \(\beta \in S\), \(A_\beta \subseteq \beta\) and such that, for every \(\alpha \subseteq \kappa\), the set \(\{ \beta \in S \mid A_\beta = A \cap \beta \}\) is nonstationary. For each \(\beta \in S\), let \(g_\beta : \beta \to 2\) denote the characteristic function of \(A_\beta\). Now, given \(g : \kappa \to 2\), let \(A := \{ \eta < \kappa \mid g(\eta) = 0 \}\). Fix a club \(C \subseteq \kappa\) such that \(C \cap S \subseteq \{ \beta \in S \mid A_\beta \neq A \cap \beta \}\). Let \(B \in S \cap C\). Now, pick \(\eta \in (A \cap \beta) \triangle A_\beta\).

\(\uparrow\) If \(\eta \in A \cap \beta\), then \(\eta \notin A_\beta\), so that \(g(\eta) = 0 = g_\beta(\eta)\).

\(\uparrow\) If \(\eta \in A_\beta\), then \(\eta \notin A \cap \beta\), so that \(g(\eta) = 1 = g_\beta(\eta)\).

(3) \(\Rightarrow\) (1) Pick \(c : [\kappa]^2 \to 2\) that satisfies \(c(\eta, \beta) = g_\beta(\eta)\) for all \(\eta < \beta < \kappa\) with \(\beta \in S\). Towards a contradiction, suppose that \(B \subseteq S\) is a stationary set such that, for every \(\eta < \kappa\), \(c(\eta, B) \neq 2\). Define \(g : \kappa \to 2\) via \(g(\eta) := \min(2 \setminus c(\eta) \uplus B)\). Now, pick \(\beta \in B\) and \(\eta < \beta\) such that \(g(\eta) = g_\beta(\eta)\). Then \(c(\eta, \beta) = g_\beta(\eta) = g(\eta)\), contradicting the fact that \(g(\eta) \notin c(\eta) \uplus B\)\). \(\Box\)

Remark 11.2. A similar argument shows that \(\text{onto}(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], 2)\) holds iff \(\kappa\) is not almost ineffable.

In contrast, \(\text{onto}^{-}(S, 2)\) is not refuted by \(S\) being ineffable.

Definition 11.3 ([IK69]). A subset \(S \subseteq \kappa\) is called a \textit{subtle} subset of \(\kappa\) if for every sequence \(\langle A_\beta \mid \beta \in S \rangle\) and \(D \subseteq \kappa\) a club, there are \(\alpha < \beta\) in \(D \cap S\) such that \(A_\alpha \cap \alpha = A_\beta \cap \alpha\).

It is easily seen that an ineffable set is subtle. In fact, any almost ineffable set is subtle. The following fact by Kunen together with Lemma 10.11 shows that \(\text{onto}^{-}(S, \kappa)\) holds for any ineffable set \(S\).

Fact 11.4 ([IK69]). For every subtle \(S \subseteq \kappa\), \(\Diamond(S)\) holds.

The following theorem has a proof which is almost exactly the same as that of Theorem 11.1, so we will be somewhat more terse.

Theorem 11.5. Suppose \(\kappa = \kappa^{\aleph_0}\) and \(S \subseteq \kappa\) is a stationary set that is not ineffable. Then \(\text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S, \omega)\) holds.

Proof. Fix \(c : [\kappa]^2 \to 2\) that witnesses \(\kappa \rightarrow (\text{Stat}(S))^2\). Let also \(\langle x_\eta \mid \eta < \kappa \rangle\) be an enumeration of all the elements in \(\omega^\kappa\). Consider the colouring \(d : [\kappa]^2 \to \omega\) as follows: \(d(\eta, \beta)\) is the least \(n\) such that \(c(x_\beta(n), \beta) = 1\) if such an \(n\) exists, and if not, \(d(\eta, \beta) = 0\).

To see that the colouring works, let \(B\) be an arbitrary stationary subset of \(S\). For \(n < \omega\), \(x : n \to \kappa\) and \(y : n \to 2\) denote:

\[B_{x,y} := \{ \beta \in B \mid \forall i < n(c(x(i), \beta) = y(i)) \}\],

and also

\(T(B) := \{ (x, y) \in \omega^\kappa \times \omega^2 \mid n < \omega \& B_{x,y} \in (\text{NS}_\kappa \upharpoonright S)^++ \}\).

Then \(T(B)\) is a subtree of \(\bigcup_{n<\omega}(\kappa \times \omega^2)\) closed under initial segments. As \(B\) is a stationary subset of \(S\), \((\emptyset, \emptyset) \in T(B)\), so \(T(B)\) is nonempty.
Claim 11.5.1. Let \( n < \omega \) and let \( x \in \omega^2 \) and \( y \in \omega^2 \) be such that \( (x,y) \in T(B) \). Then there exists \( \eta < \kappa \) such that, for all \( i < 2 \), \( (x^\frown \langle \eta \rangle, y^\frown \langle i \rangle) \in T(B) \).

Proof. In fact our proof will show that there is such an \( \eta \) in \( B_{x,y} \) which is a stationary subset of \( S \). Supposing our claim does not hold we can pick for every \( \eta < \kappa \) an \( i_\eta < 2 \) and \( E_\eta \) a club in \( \kappa \) such that

\[
B_{x^\frown \langle \eta \rangle, y^\frown \langle i_\eta \rangle} \cap E_\eta = \emptyset.
\]

Let \( E := \bigtriangleup_{\eta < \kappa} E_\eta \) which is again a club in \( \kappa \). Let \( B' := B_{x,y} \cap E \) which is again a stationary subset of \( S \). Fix \( i^* < 2 \) for which \( B'' := \{ \beta \in B' \mid i_\beta = i^* \} \) is a stationary subset of \( S \).

By the choice of \( c \) there are \( \eta < \beta \) both from \( B'' \) such that \( c(\eta, \beta) = i^* \). As \( \beta \in E \), we have that \( \beta \in E_\eta \). So \( \beta \in B_{x,y} \setminus B_{x^\frown \langle \eta \rangle, y^\frown \langle i_\eta \rangle} \). So \( c(\eta, \beta) \neq i_\eta \), contradicting the fact that \( i_\eta = i^* \).

For \( n < \omega \) let \( y_n : n \rightarrow \{0\} \) denote the constant function with value 0. Using the claim, we inductively find an \( x \in \omega^\kappa \), such that \( (x \upharpoonright (n+1), y_n^\frown (1)) \in T(B) \) for every \( n < \omega \). Since \( T(B) \) is closed under initial segments this also implies that \( (x \upharpoonright n, y_n) \in T(B) \) for every \( n < \omega \). We shall call such an \( x \in \omega^\kappa \) a canonical branch for \( B \).

Now suppose that \( x \in \omega^\kappa \) is a canonical branch. Then there is some \( \eta < \kappa \) such that \( x = x_\eta \). Since \( x_\eta \) is a canonical branch for \( B \), the set \( B_{x_\eta, n+1, y_n^\frown (1)} \) is a stationary subset of \( B \). For every \( \beta \) in this set, \( c(x_\eta(n), \beta) = 1 \) and for every \( i < n \) it is the case that \( c(x_\eta(i), \beta) = 0 \). So for every \( \beta \in B_{x_\eta, n+1, y_n^\frown (1)} \) above \( \eta \), \( d(\eta, \beta) = n \), as sought. \( \square \)

Corollary 11.6. For every regular uncountable cardinal \( \kappa \), and every stationary \( S \subseteq \kappa \), the following are equivalent:

1. \( S \) is not ineffable;
2. \( \text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_{\kappa} \upharpoonright S, \omega) \) holds.

Proof. \( (1) \implies (2) \) Suppose that \( S \subseteq \kappa \) is a non-ineffable set.

\( \Rightarrow \) If \( \kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa \), then by the preceding theorem, \( \text{onto}(\text{NS}_{\kappa} \upharpoonright S, \omega) \) holds. In particular, \( \text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_{\kappa} \upharpoonright S, \omega) \) holds.

\( \Rightarrow \) If \( \kappa^{<\kappa} > \kappa \), then \( \kappa \) is not weakly compact, and then, by Proposition 6.5, \( \text{unbounded}(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \omega) \) and even \( U(\kappa, 2, \kappa^0, 2) \) holds.

\( (2) \implies (1) \) Suppose that \( S \) is ineffable. Let \( c : [|\kappa|^2] \rightarrow \omega \) be an arbitrary colouring. Fix a bijection \( \pi : \kappa \times \omega \leftrightarrow \kappa \), and consider the club \( D := \{ \delta < \kappa \mid \pi[\delta \times \omega] = \delta \} \). By the ineffability of \( S \) there is a set \( A \subseteq \kappa \) with the property that \( B := \{ \beta \in S \cap D \mid \pi[c(\cdot, \beta)] \cap \beta = A \cap \beta \} \) is stationary. In effect, \( \{c(\cdot, \beta) \mid \beta \in B \} \) is a chain converging to some function \( f : \kappa \rightarrow \omega \), and hence \( c[\{\eta\} \times (B \setminus (n+1))] = \{f(\eta)\} \) for every \( \eta < \kappa \). So \( c \) cannot be a witness to \( \text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_{\kappa} \upharpoonright S, \omega) \).

Corollary 11.7. For every regular cardinal \( \kappa \geq 2^{\kappa_0} \), and every \( S \subseteq \kappa \), the following are equivalent:

1. \( S \) is not ineffable;
2. \( \text{onto}(\text{NS}_{\kappa} \upharpoonright S, \omega) \) holds.

Proof. For \( \kappa > 2^{\kappa_0} \) this follows from Theorem 6.12(2).

For \( \kappa = 2^{\kappa_0} \), by Corollary 10.3 we even have \( \text{onto}(J^{\text{bd}}[\kappa], \omega) \). \( \square \)

The preceding is optimal:
Proposition 11.8. Assuming the consistency of an ineffable cardinal, it is consistent that \( \kappa = 2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1} \) is a non-ineffable cardinal, and hence \( \text{onto}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \aleph_0) \) holds and yet \( \text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_\kappa, \aleph_1) \) fails.

Proof. By invoking Theorem 9.10 with \( \theta := \aleph_0 \) in a model of GCH (such as \( L \)). \( \square \)

Corollary 11.9. Let \( \kappa \) be an infinite regular cardinal such that \( \text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa, \omega) \) fails. Then \( \kappa < 2^{\aleph_0} \) and \( \kappa \) is weakly compact in \( L \).

Proof. By Corollary 11.6 we know that \( \kappa < 2^{\aleph_0} \). Lemma 3.4 combined with Theorem 6.9 we must have that \( \text{unbounded}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) \) fails, which by Corollary 3.8 implies that \( \kappa \) is weakly compact in \( L \). \( \square \)

The above would be improved in case Conjecture 4.11 has a positive answer.
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APPENDIX: DIAGRAM OF IMPLICATIONS

In the diagram below, $\kappa$ is an uncountable cardinal and all unidirectional arrows are irreversible and we have indicated next to each arrow where to find the relevant proofs except for most of the arrows from left to right which follow by the definitions. The diagram shows how the well-known analogy that weakly compact cardinals are to $J^{bd}[\kappa]$ as ineffable cardinals are to $\text{NS}_\kappa$ manifests itself in our principles as well as the importance of Conjecture 4.11 which is one of two points of asymmetry. The other is the fact that $\text{onto}(J^{bd}[\kappa], 2)$ characterises not the weakly compact cardinals, but rather the almost ineffable cardinals by Remark 11.2.

\[
\begin{align*}
\kappa \text{ is not weakly compact in } L & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \kappa \text{ is not ineffable in } L \\
\kappa \in \text{SA}_\kappa & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \kappa \in \text{A}_\kappa \\
\text{unbounded}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \kappa) & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_\kappa, \kappa) \\
\forall \theta < \kappa \text{ unbounded}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \theta) & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \forall \theta < \kappa \text{ unbounded}(\text{NS}_\kappa, \theta) \\
\text{unbounded}(J^{bd}[\kappa], \aleph_0) & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{unbounded}(\text{NS}_\kappa, \aleph_0) \\
\kappa \text{ is not weakly compact} & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \kappa \text{ is not ineffable} \\
\text{onto}(J^{bd}[\kappa], 3) & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{onto}(\text{NS}_\kappa, 2)
\end{align*}
\]