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Abstract

We show that the product of finitely many subspaces of ordinals is strongly zero-dimensional. In contrast, for each natural number \( n \), there is a subspace of \((\omega + 1) \times c\) of dimension \( n \).
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1. Introduction

All spaces are assumed to be completely regular and \( T_1 \).

A space \( X \) is said to be zero-dimensional if it has a base of clopen sets. A space \( X \) is said to be strongly zero-dimensional if for every disjoint pair of zero-sets \( Z_0 \) and \( Z_1 \), there is a clopen set \( W \) with \( Z_0 \subset W \subset X \setminus Z_1 \). In this situation, we say that \( Z_0 \) and \( Z_1 \) are separated by a clopen set. It is well-known that a space \( X \) is strongly zero-dimensional if and only if \( \beta X \) is zero-dimensional, see [3, 7.1.17]. It is straightforward to verify that a space \( X \) is normal and strongly zero-dimensional if and only if every pair of disjoint closed sets of \( X \) are separated by a clopen set.

In [6], it was proved that for every subspace of the product space of two ordinals, normality, collectionwise normality, and the shrinking property are equivalent. While
extending this equivalence to subspaces $X$ of the product of finitely many ordinals, the first author \[4\] found it convenient to first prove that if $X$ is normal, then $X$ is strongly zero-dimensional. Moreover, it was shown earlier (see \[7\]) that $X \times Y$ is not normal when $X$ and $Y$ are disjoint stationary sets in $\omega_1$. So it is natural to ask if such subspaces are strongly zero-dimensional. More generally, since all subspaces of product spaces of ordinals are zero-dimensional, it is also natural to ask if such subspaces are strongly zero-dimensional.

We answer all these questions in the present paper.

First we generalize the notion of stationary sets in Section 2, and show a Generalized Pressing Down Lemma (Theorem 3.2) in Section 3. One corollary is that if $\kappa_i$, $i < n$, is an $n$-tuple of distinct, regular, uncountable cardinals, then every continuous function $\varphi : [\prod_{i<n} \kappa_i] \to \mathbb{R}$ is constant on a final segment. Example 3.9 shows that this result is not true when the $\kappa_i$’s are not distinct. In Theorem 4.2, we show that after a small clopen set is deleted from the domain, $\varphi$ has finite range. (“Small” is defined precisely in Definition 4.1.)

Using Theorem 4.2, we prove that the product of finitely many subspaces of ordinals is strongly zero-dimensional (Theorem 5.1), thus answering the first question above in the affirmative.

In Section 6, however, we present a negative solution to the second question. Namely, subspaces of the product of finitely many subspaces of ordinals are not necessarily strongly zero-dimensional. More precisely, we prove that for every natural number $n$, there is a subspace $K$ of $(\omega + 1) \times \epsilon$ such that $\dim K = n$ (Theorem 6.11). An important step in proving that theorem is to establish that for every maximal almost disjoint family $\mathcal{R}$ of subsets of $\omega$, $\beta \Psi(\mathcal{R})$ is embedded in the remainder of such a subspace $K$ (Theorem 6.1). Here $\Psi(\mathcal{R})$ is a so-called $\Psi$-space generated by $\mathcal{R}$ (see \[3, 3.6.I\] or \[5, 5.I\]). Section 6 can be read independently of other sections.

We add that this paper is the result of the three authors’ collective efforts, although Section 6 is due to the third author.

2. Generalized stationary sets

We will use set theoretical notation described in \[9, Chapter I\]. For example, $0$ denotes the empty set, an ordinal is the set of smaller ordinals, thus $n = \{0, 1, \ldots, n - 1\}$ for each natural number $n$.

For an $n$-tuple $t = (t_0, \ldots, t_{n-1})$ and an $n'$-tuple $t' = (t'_0, \ldots, t'_{n'-1})$, $t \sim t'$ denotes the $(n+n')$-tuple $s = (s_0, \ldots, s_{n+n'-1})$, where $s_i = t_i$ for $i < n$ and $s_{n+j} = t'_j$ for $i < n'$. The 0-tuple is considered as the empty sequence $0 = \emptyset$ as usual. For an $n$-tuple $t = (t_0, \ldots, t_{n-1})$ of subsets $t_0, \ldots, t_{n-1}$ of ordinals, $\prod t$ denotes the usual product $t_0 \times \cdots \times t_{n-1}$ and $\bigcap t \{ x \in \prod t : x_0 < \cdots < x_{n-1} \}$ its subspace.

For $s \subset n$, $t \upharpoonright s$ denotes the sub-tuple $\{ t_i : i \in s \}$ of $t$. For $A \subset \prod t$, $A \upharpoonright s$ denotes the set $\{ x : x_\upharpoonright s \in A \}$. Note $A \upharpoonright 0 = \{0\}$ if $A \neq \emptyset$. For $m \leq n$ and $x \in \prod_{i<n} t_i$, $A[x]$ denotes the set $\{ y \in \prod_{m \leq i < n} t_i : x_\upharpoonright m = y_\upharpoonright m \in A \}$. Observe that $A[\upharpoonright x] = A$ if $m = 0$ and $A[\upharpoonright x] = \{0\}$ if $m = n$ and $x \in A$. When $m = 1$ and $\alpha \in t_0$, we write $A[\upharpoonright \alpha]$ instead of $A[\upharpoonright \alpha]$.

For $s \subset n$, $x \in \prod_{i \in s} t_i$, $A \subset \prod t$ and $j \not\in s$, we let $\pi_j^s [A] = \{ a_j : a \in A$ and $a \upharpoonright s = x \}$. 

When $s = 0$, this is the usual projection $\pi_j[A]$ of $A$ to the $t_j$-axis.

Let $x = (x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$, $y = (y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1})$ be $n$-tuples of ordinals. If $x_i < y_i$ for each $i < n$, then we write $x < y$. We let $x \leq y$ have the analogous meaning. The generalized intervals $(x, y) = \prod_{i<n}(x_i, y_i)$ and $(x, y] = \prod_{i<n}[x_i, y_i]$ should be understood in terms of these orders. In Sections 4 and 5 we will write $x < y$ when $x \leq y$ and $x \neq y$. All these relations are well-founded on the class of all $n$-tuples of ordinals in the sense of [9, III Definition 5.1].

For a subset $S$ of an ordinal $\mu$, let $\text{Lim}_{\mu}(S) = \{\gamma < \mu: \sup(S \cap \gamma) = \gamma\}$, in other words, $\text{Lim}_{\mu}(S)$ is the closed set of all cluster points of $S$ in the space $\mu$. We will also use the symbol $\text{Succ}_{\mu}(S) = S \setminus \text{Lim}_{\mu}(S)$. When the situation is clear in its context, we simply write $\text{Lim} S$ or $\text{Succ} S$ instead of $\text{Lim}_{\mu}(S)$ or $\text{Succ}_{\mu}(S)$, respectively. Observe that if $\text{cf} \mu \geq \omega_1$ and $S$ is unbounded in $\mu$, then $\text{Lim} S$ is cub (i.e., closed and unbounded) in $\mu$.

Let $C_{\alpha}$, $\alpha \in A \subset \kappa$, be cub sets of an uncountable regular cardinal $\kappa$. Its diagonal intersection is defined by

$$\Delta_{a \in A} C_a = \{\beta \in \kappa: (\forall \alpha \in A \cap \beta)(\beta \in C_a)\}.$$ 

Then $\Delta_{a \in A} C_a$ is a cub set in $\kappa$ (see [9, II Lemma 6.14]).

As usual (see [9, II Definition 6.9]), a subset $Y$ of an uncountable regular cardinal $\kappa$ is called stationary (or $\kappa$-stationary) if it meets every cub subset of $\kappa$. The question arises how we should define $\kappa$-stationary sets when $\kappa = (\kappa_0, \ldots, \kappa_{n-1})$ is not just a cardinal but a finite-tuple of non-decreasing uncountable regular cardinals. There are two ways to do this, namely,

1. (\$\Pi$-type stationary) $Y$ meets every $\prod C$,
2. (\$\bigvee$-type stationary) $Y$ meets every $\bigvee C$,

where $C$ is an $n$-tuple of cub sets $C_i$ of $\kappa_i$. When the $\kappa$ is strictly increasing, the two notions are equivalent (different filter bases generate the same filter) and have a satisfactory theory. When $\kappa_i = \kappa_{i+1}$ for some $i$, however, the notions are not equivalent. The prototypic result, “an open stationary set contains a final segment”, has a useful generalization (Theorem 3.5) for the notion $\bigvee$-type stationary. In contrast, there can be disjoint open $\prod$-type stationary sets—this is the essential idea of Example 3.9.

In the present paper we will develop the theory of $\bigvee$-type stationary sets.

For expository reasons, we prefer to start with concepts equivalent to $\bigvee$-type stationarity. However, we soon prove (Proposition 2.4) that $Y$ is $\kappa$-stationary iff $Y \cap \bigvee C_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $n$-tuple $C$ with $C_i$ a cub subset of $\kappa_i$. Here is our official definition.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $\kappa = (\kappa_0, \kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_{n-1})$ be an $n$-tuple of non-decreasing uncountable regular cardinals.

$Y \subset \prod \kappa$ is called $\kappa$-stationary if there is $Z \subset Y$ such that, for all $z \in Z$ and $i < n$, the set $\pi_i^{-1}[z] = \prod_{i \neq j}^{[\kappa_0, \ldots, \kappa_{j-1}]}[z]$ is $\kappa_i$-stationary.

We call the set $Z$ in the above pruned. $Z$ is obviously itself $\kappa$-stationary. Note that, if $\kappa$ is an uncountable regular cardinal, “$(\kappa)$-stationary” and “$\kappa$-stationary” are synonymous.
In the discussion of κ-stationary sets, it is often useful to use induction on the length of the tuple κ.

**Proposition 2.2.** For an n-tuple κ = ⟨κ₀, κ₁, . . . , κₙ₋₁⟩ and Y ⊂ ⋂κ, the following are equivalent.

1. Y is κ-stationary,
2. there are a κ₀-stationary set K and, for each γ ∈ K, ⟨κ₁, . . . , κₙ₋₁⟩-stationary set Lγ such that [γ] × Lγ ⊂ Y for each γ ∈ K,
3. there are a ⟨κ₀, . . . , κₙ₋₂⟩-stationary set S and, for each s ∈ S, a κₙ₋₁-stationary set Tₛ such that [s] × Tₛ ⊂ Y for each s ∈ S.

**Proof.** We show the equivalence of (1) and (2). The equivalence of (1) and (3) is seen quite similarly.

We proceed by induction and suppose that (1) and (2) are shown to be equivalent for κ of length ≤ (n − 1).

Let κ be of length n, and suppose Y is κ-stationary. Let Z ⊂ Y be pruned and K = π₀[Z]. Then K is κ₀-stationary. For each γ ∈ K, let Lγ = Z[γ]. Then, for each ζ ∈ Lγ, and 0 < i ⩽ n, πᵢ(ζ₁, . . . , ζₙ₋₁)[Lγ] = πᵢ[γζ₀, . . . , ζₙ₋₂] [Z] = πᵢ[|γ|]⁻¹[Z] is κᵢ-stationary. Hence, by the definition, each Lγ is ⟨κ₁, . . . , κₙ₋₁⟩-stationary.

Suppose that (2) holds. Then, by induction hypothesis, there is a set Zγ ⊂ Lγ so that, for each ζ ∈ Zγ, and 0 < i < n, πᵢ[ζ₁, . . . , ζₙ₋₂] [Zγ] is κᵢ-stationary. This set is identical to πᵢ[γζ₀, . . . , ζₙ₋₂] [Z] where Z = ⋃γ∈K [γ] × Zγ. Obviously Z ⊂ Y holds and hence, the induction is complete. □

For convenience we will call singletons 0-stationary for the 0-tuple.

**Proposition 2.3.** Let κ = ⟨κ₀, . . . , κₙ₋₁⟩ be an n-tuple and Y κ-stationary.

1. If Y ⊂ X, then X is also κ-stationary,
2. If Y = ⋃ₐ<κ Zₐ and λ < κ₀, then some Zₐ is κ-stationary.
3. If Cᵢ is cub in κᵢ for each i < n, then Y ∩ ⋂ᵢ<κ Cᵢ is also κ-stationary. In particular, if s < κ is an n-tuple, then Y ∩ (s, κ) is also κ-stationary.
4. Y ∩ ∇κ is κ-stationary.

**Proof.** We prove this by induction on n. Suppose this is true for i-tuples for all i < n. Let κ′ = ⟨κ₁, . . . , κₙ₋₁⟩, and take K and Lγ as in Proposition 2.2(2). Then K is κ₀-stationary and each Lγ is κ′-stationary.

(1) Obvious from the definition.

(2) For each γ ∈ K, let Zₐ,γ = Zₐ[γ]. Then Lγ ⊂ ⋃ₐ Zₐ,γ and hence, by induction hypothesis, Zₐ,γ is κ′-stationary for some α = α(γ). Since K = ⋃ₐ∈K{γ: α(γ) = α} is κ₀-stationary and λ < κ₀, there is a δ so that [γ: α(γ) = δ] = H is κ₀-stationary [9, II Lemma 6.8]. Then, by definition, Zₐ ⊂ ⋃γ∈H [γ] × Zₐ,γ is κ-stationary.
It suffices to show only the sufficiency part, the necessity part being included in Proof.

Proposition 2.3. The usual Pressing Down Lemma \[9, II Lemma 6.15\] says that a function \( f : S \to \kappa \) defined on a stationary subset \( S \) of an uncountable regular cardinal \( \kappa \) is constant on a stationary subset of \( S \) if \( f(\alpha) < \alpha \) for each \( \alpha \). We now generalize this.

Definition 3.1. Let \( \alpha = \langle \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1} \rangle \) be an \( n \)-tuple of ordinals, and suppose that a function \( f \) sends \( x \in \prod \alpha \) to \( f(x) \in \prod \alpha \).

We call \( f \) regressive if \( f(x) < x \) for all \( x \in \text{dom} \, f \), and a stem function if \( f(x)_j = f(x')_j \) whenever \( x \upharpoonright j = x' \upharpoonright j \).

Observe that if \( f \) is a stem function then \( f(x)_0 \) is constant, and that a stem function defined on a set of 1-tuples is constant. Hence the \( n = 1 \) case of the following theorem is the Pressing Down Lemma.

Proposition 2.4. \( Y \) is \( \kappa \)-stationary iff \( Y \cap \nabla C \neq \emptyset \) for every \( n \)-tuple \( C \) with \( \kappa \) a cub subset of \( \kappa_i \). Therefore the collection of all non-\( \kappa \)-stationary subsets of \( \prod \kappa \) forms a \( \sigma \)-complete ideal.

Proof. It suffices to show only the sufficiency part, the necessity part being included in Proposition 2.3.

Assume the sufficiency part for \( i \)-tuples for all \( i < n \) and let \( \kappa' = \langle \kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_{n-1} \rangle \).

Suppose that \( Y \) is not \( \kappa \)-stationary. For each \( \alpha \in \pi_0[Y] \), let us consider the subset \( L_\alpha = Y[\alpha] \), and let \( K = \{ \alpha : L_\alpha \text{ is } \kappa' \text{-stationary} \} \). Since \( K \) is not \( \kappa_0 \)-stationary by Proposition 2.2(2), there is a cub set \( C_0 \) disjoint from \( K \). For each \( \alpha \in C_0 \), \( L_\alpha \) is not \( \kappa' \)-stationary. Then, by induction hypothesis, there is a cub set \( C_{\alpha,i} \subset \kappa_i \) for each \( 0 < i < n \) such that \( L_\alpha \cap \nabla_0^{<i} C_{\alpha,i} = \emptyset \). Let \( \kappa_0 = \cdots = \kappa_{m-1} < \kappa_m \). Then define \( C_i = \Delta_{\alpha \in C_0} C_{\alpha,i} \) for \( 0 < i < m \), and \( C_i = \bigcap_{\alpha \in C_0} C_{\alpha,i} \) for \( m \leq i < n \). Obviously each \( C_i \) is cub in \( \kappa_i \).

To show \( Y \cap \nabla_{<n} C_i = \emptyset \), suppose \( t = (t_0, \ldots, t_{n-1}) \in Y \cap \nabla_{<n} C_i \). Then \( (t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1}) \in L_{t_0} \cap \nabla_0^{<i} C_i \). Thus \( t_0 < t_i \in C_i = \Delta_{\alpha \in C_0} C_{\alpha,i} \) for \( 0 < i < m \), and \( t_0 < t_i \in C_i = \bigcap_{\alpha \in C_0} C_{\alpha,i} \) for \( m \leq i < n \). This implies that \( t_i \in C_{t_0,i} \) for \( 0 < i < n \), and hence \( (t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1}) \in L_{t_0} \cap \nabla_0^{<i} C_{t_0,i} \), a contradiction. Thus \( Y \cap \nabla_{<n} C_i = \emptyset \). □

Corollary 2.5. Let \( \kappa = \langle \kappa_0, \ldots, \kappa_{n-1} \rangle \) be an \( n \)-tuple and \( A_i \subset \kappa_i \) for each \( i < n \). Then \( Y = \prod_{i < n} A_i \) is \( \kappa \)-stationary iff each \( A_i \) is \( \kappa_i \)-stationary.

3. Generalized Pressing Down Lemma

The usual Pressing Down Lemma \[9, II Lemma 6.15\] says that a function \( f : S \to \kappa \) defined on a stationary subset \( S \) of an uncountable regular cardinal \( \kappa \) is constant on a stationary subset of \( S \) if \( f(\alpha) < \alpha \) for each \( \alpha \). We now generalize this.

Definition 3.1. Let \( \alpha = \langle \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1} \rangle \) be an \( n \)-tuple of ordinals, and suppose that a function \( f \) sends \( x \in \prod \alpha \) to \( f(x) \in \prod \alpha \).

We call \( f \) regressive if \( f(x) < x \) for all \( x \in \text{dom} \, f \), and a stem function if \( f(x)_j = f(x')_j \) whenever \( x \upharpoonright j = x' \upharpoonright j \).

Observe that if \( f \) is a stem function then \( f(x)_0 \) is constant, and that a stem function defined on a set of 1-tuples is constant. Hence the \( n = 1 \) case of the following theorem is the Pressing Down Lemma.
Theorem 3.2 (Generalized Pressing Down Lemma). Let $\kappa$ be an $n$-tuple, $R$ a $\kappa$-stationary subset of $\prod_\kappa$, and $f : R \to \prod_\kappa$ regressive. Then there is a $\kappa$-stationary subset $Y$ of $R$ so that $f$ restricted to $Y$ is a stem function.

Proof. Assume this theorem for $i$-tuples for all $i < n$, and let us consider $\kappa = \langle \kappa_0, \ldots, \kappa_{n-1} \rangle$. Let $\kappa' = \kappa \upharpoonright (n-1)$.

By Proposition 2.2(3), there are a $\kappa'$-stationary subset $S$, and $\kappa_{n-1}$-stationary sets $T_s$, $s \in S$, so that $\{s \times T_s \subset R$.

For each $s \in S$ and each $\tau \in T_s$, note that the point $f(s \upharpoonright \tau)$ consists of the first $(n-1)$ coordinates $f_1(s \upharpoonright \tau)$ and the last coordinate $f_2(s \upharpoonright \tau)$. We have $f_1(s \upharpoonright \tau) < s$ and $f_2(s \upharpoonright \tau) < \tau$. Since $|S| \leq \kappa_{n-2}$, the set of all $f_1(s \upharpoonright \tau)$ has cardinality $< \kappa_{n-1}$. By Proposition 3.2(2) and the Pressing Down Lemma applied to $T_s$, there are a stationary subset $Y_s$ of $T_s$, $g(s) \in \prod_\kappa'$ and $\gamma_s \in \kappa_{n-1}$ such that $f_1(s \upharpoonright \tau) = g(s)$ and $f_2(s \upharpoonright \tau) = \gamma_s$, that is, $f(s \upharpoonright \tau) = (g(s), \gamma_s)$ for all $s \in S$ and $\tau \in Y_s$.

Apply the induction hypothesis to the regressive function $g$ to get a stationary subset $Y'$ of $S$ so that $g$ restricted to $Y'$ is a stem function. Let $Y = \bigcup_{s \in Y'} \{s \times Y_s$. To verify that $f$ restricted to $Y$ is a stem function, let $z, z' \in Y$. If $z \upharpoonright j = z' \upharpoonright j$ and $j < n-1$, then $f(z)_j = g(z \upharpoonright n-1)_j = g(z' \upharpoonright n-1)_j = f(z')_j$. If $z \upharpoonright n-1 = z' \upharpoonright n-1 = s$, then $f(z)_n-1 = \gamma_s = f(z')_n-1$ holds. \square

A consequence of the Pressing Down Lemma is that a real-valued continuous function on a stationary subset of a regular uncountable cardinal is constant on its tail (= its intersection with a final segment). We can generalize this result for a non-decreasing $n$-tuple of regular uncountable cardinals (Theorem 3.7).

We begin with definitions.

Definition 3.3. Let $\kappa = \langle \kappa_0, \ldots, \kappa_{n-1} \rangle$ be an $n$-tuple. Let us say that an $n$-tuple $C = \langle C_0, \ldots, C_{n-1} \rangle$ of cub sets $C_j$ of $\kappa_j$ is attuned to $\kappa$, or simply, $\kappa$-attuned, if the following holds:

(1) $C_j \subset \text{Lim}\kappa_j$ for all $j < n$.
(2) if $\kappa_j < \kappa_{j+1}$, then $C_{j+1} \subset (\kappa_j, \kappa_{j+1})$.
(3) if $\kappa_j = \kappa_{j+1}$, then $C_j = C_{j+1}$.

Note that every $n$-tuple $\langle D_0, \ldots, D_{n-1} \rangle$ of cub sets can be attuned to $\kappa$, that is, there is a $\kappa$-attuned tuple $\langle C_0, \ldots, C_{n-1} \rangle$ such that $C_j \subset D_j$ for each $j$. In fact, when $\kappa_{\ell-1} < \kappa_{\ell} = \cdots = \kappa_m < \kappa_{m+1}$, let $C_{\ell} = \cdots = C_m = \bigcap_{\ell \leq j < m} D_j \cap (\kappa_{\ell-1}, \kappa_{\ell}) \cap \text{Lim}\kappa_{\ell}$.

Definition 3.4. We say that an $n$-tuple $x$ is entwined with another $n$-tuple $c$ if

$c_0 < x_0 < c_1 < \cdots < c_j < x_j < c_{j+1} < \cdots < c_{n-1} < x_{n-1}$.

Let $\kappa$ be a non-decreasing $n$-tuple of uncountable regular cardinals, and $C$ be an attuned $n$-tuple of cubes. Then we let $E(C)$ denote the collection of all $x \in \bigcap\kappa$ which are entwined with some $c \in \prod C$. 
Observe that the set of $x$ which are entwined with a specific $c$ is an open set. Hence $E(C)$ is an open set. Further observe that, if $\kappa_0 < \cdots < \kappa_{n-1}$, then $x \in E(C)$ iff $\min C_j < x_j$ for all $j$, that is, $E(C) = (s, \kappa)$ is a final segment where $s = \min(\prod C)$ denotes the minimum of the set $\prod C$ in the sense of the order $\leq$.

It is easily seen that the set $E(C)$ is never empty. More precisely, by taking $D_j = \lim C_j$ for each $j$, we have $E(C) \supseteq \nabla D = \prod D \cap \nabla \kappa$.Thus by Proposition 2.3, for a $\kappa$-stationary set $Y$, $Y \cap E(C)$ is always $\kappa$-stationary.

**Theorem 3.5.** Let $\kappa$ be an $n$-tuple and $U$ an open $\kappa$-stationary subset of $\prod \kappa$. Then there is an attuned $n$-tuple $C$ of cub sets, so that $E(C)$ is contained in $U$.

**Proof.** Let $f : U \to \prod \kappa$ be regressive so that for each $u \in U$, the half-open interval $(f(u), u] \subset U$. By our definition and Theorem 3.2, there is a pruned stationary subset $Y$ of $U$ so that $f \upharpoonright Y$ is a stem function. For each $j < n$, let $D_j$ be the set of $\gamma < \kappa_j$ satisfying: if $y \in Y$ and $y_0, \ldots, y_{j-1} < \gamma$, then

1. $f(y)_j < \gamma$,
2. $\lim(\pi_j^{\gamma}[Y]) \ni \gamma$.

Note that, because $f \upharpoonright Y$ is a stem function, to know $f(y)_j$ it suffices to know $y \upharpoonright j$; in particular, we know the constant value $f(y)_0$ at the start. Also note that each $\lim(\pi_j^{\gamma}[Y])$ is cub. Then $D_j$ is a cub set of $\kappa_j$ (see, e.g., the proof of [9, II Lemma 6.13]). Let $C$ be attuned to $\kappa$ with $D_j \supseteq C_j$ for each $j < n$. To verify the conclusion, let $x \in \prod \kappa$ be entwined with $c \in \prod C$. By induction on $j < n$, we shall define $y_j$ and verify that

$$f(y)_j < c_j < x_j < y_j < c_{j+1}.$$  

Let $y_j$ be the least element of $\pi_j^{(y_0, \ldots, y_{j-1})}[Y]$ greater than $x_j$. This is possible because $\pi_j^{(y_0, \ldots, y_{j-1})}[Y] = \pi_j^{z}[Y]$ for any $z \in Y$ with $z \upharpoonright j = (y_0, \ldots, y_{j-1})$, and is $\kappa_j$-stationary.

We verify the inequalities left to right. First, $f(y)_j < c_j$ because of (1). Second, $c_j < x_j$ because $x$ is entwined with $c$. Third, $x_j < y_j$ by our choice of $y_j$. Finally, $y_j < c_{j+1}$ is seen in the following way. It is obvious if $\kappa_j < \kappa_{j+1}$. If $\kappa_j = \kappa_{j+1}$, then (2) implies this because $c_{j+1} \in C_{j+1} = C_j \subset D_j$. Thus, we have verified that $x \in (f(y), y] \subset U$, as required. 

**Corollary 3.6.** Let $\kappa$ be a strictly increasing $n$-tuple and $U$ an open $\kappa$-stationary subset of $\prod \kappa$. Then there is an $s \in \nabla \kappa$ so that the final segment $(s, \kappa)$ is contained in $U$.

**Theorem 3.7.** If $\kappa$ is an $n$-tuple, and $\varphi : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function defined on a $\kappa$-stationary set $Y$, then there is a $\kappa$-attuned $n$-tuple $C$ so that $\varphi$ is constant on $E(C) \cap Y$.

**Proof.** For each $i \in \omega$, $\mathbb{R}$ is covered by countably many open sets $B(i, k)$, $k \in \omega$, of diameter $\leq 1/(i + 1)$. By Proposition 2.3, for each $i$, there is a $k_i$ such that $\varphi^{-1}[B(i, k_i)]$ is $\kappa$-stationary. Let $U(i)$ be an open set of $\prod \kappa$ in which $\varphi^{-1}[B(i, k_i)] = U(i) \cap Y$. Obviously,
$U(i)$ is $\kappa$-stationary, and by Theorem 3.5, there is a $\kappa$-attuned $n$-tuple $C(i)$ of cub sets such that $E(C(i)) \subset U(i)$.

Define $C_j = \bigcap_i C(i)_j$. Then $C = \langle C_0, \ldots, C_{n-1} \rangle$ is attuned to $\kappa$ and $E(C) \subset \bigcap_i E(C(i)) \subset \bigcap_i U(i)$. Thus we have $E(C) \cap Y \subset \bigcap_i \varphi^{-1}[B(i, k_i)] = \varphi^{-1}[\bigcap_i B(i, k_i)]$. Since $E(C) \cap Y$ is $\kappa$-stationary and hence non-empty as we have noted above, $\bigcap_i B(i, k_i)$ is a singleton. This means that $\varphi \upharpoonright E(C) \cap Y$ is constant.

In case the tuple $\kappa$ is strictly increasing, we have

**Corollary 3.8.** If $\kappa$ is a strictly increasing $n$-tuple and $\varphi : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function defined on a $\kappa$-stationary set $Y$, then there is an $s \in \nabla \kappa$ so that $\varphi$ is constant on the final segment $(s, \kappa) \cap Y$ of $Y$.

As Proposition 2.3(4) shows, the essential part of a $\kappa$-stationary set lies in its intersection with $\nabla \kappa$. The above set $E(C)$ also lies in $\nabla \kappa$. In particular, if $\kappa$ is strictly increasing, $E(C)$ is a final segment itself and its complement is seen to be small (i.e., related to smaller cardinals). If $k_i = k_{i+1}$ for some $i < n$, however, the complement is not small enough and we must partition $\prod \kappa$. The partition is suggested by the following two examples. We will develop the idea of partitioning in the next section. (The idea of partitioning $\omega^\omega$ appears in \[8\], which also contains the equivalence of “inductively” stationary and $\nabla$-type stationary for $\kappa = \langle \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_1 \rangle$).

**Example 3.9.** Let $X = A_0 \times A_1$, where each $A_i$ is stationary in $\omega_1$ and $A_0 \cap A_1 = \{\xi + 1 : \xi \in \omega_1\}$, call it $N$. Let $\widehat{\varphi} : N \to \mathbb{R}$ have uncountable range. Define $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ by cases: $\varphi(x_0, x_1) = 0$ if $x_0 < x_1$; $\varphi(x_0, x_1) = 1$ if $x_0 > x_1$; $\varphi(x_0, x_1) = \varphi(\xi + 1)$ if $x_0 = x_1 = \xi + 1$. Now $\varphi$ is continuous, but is not constant on any final segment. That is, the conclusion of Corollary 3.8 fails for $\varphi$. Theorem 4.2 will give more information on this; we must be able to discard the diagonal from a final segment and be satisfied with a finite range.

Here is a space on which every real-valued continuous function is constant on a final segment. The technique of applying the Pressing Down Lemma on a subset of our space to obtain a final segment of the whole space will reappear in Lemma 4.4.

**Example 3.10.** Let $\kappa = \langle \omega_1, \omega_1 \rangle$. Let $X = \prod \kappa = \omega_1 \times \omega_1$. Let $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Define $\delta : \omega_1 \to X$ by $\delta(\xi) = (\xi, \xi)$. To prove that $\varphi$ is constant on a final segment of $X$, it suffices (by the proof of Theorem 3.7) to assume that $U$ is open in $X$ and $\delta^* \upharpoonright [U]$ is stationary, and then show that $U$ contains a final segment $(s, \kappa)$ of $X$.

For each $\xi$ such that $\delta(\xi) \in U$, define $f(\xi) < \xi$ so that $((f(\xi), f(\xi)) \times (f(\xi), f(\xi))) \subset U$. By the Pressing Down Lemma, there is $\zeta$ so that $f(\xi) = \zeta$ for a stationary set of $\xi$’s. Now $U$ contains the final segment $(\delta(\zeta), \kappa)$. 
4. Finite range

We begin with the promised precise definition of small. It includes not only sets bounded in (at least) one coordinate, but also sets like the diagonal in Example 3.9.

**Definition 4.1.** Let $X \subseteq \prod \alpha (= \prod_{{i \in \omega \setminus \omega_1}} \alpha_i)$. We say that a clopen subset $V$ of $X$ is bounded if $V \subseteq \prod \beta$ for some $n$-tuple $\beta < \alpha$ (i.e., $\beta \leq \alpha$ but $\beta \neq \alpha$). Moreover $V$ is small if $V$ is represented as the union of a locally finite family of bounded clopen subsets of $X$.

Note that when $n = 1$, the complement of a small set contains a final segment. So the next theorem is the promised generalization. We devote this section to its proof.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let $X = \prod_{{i < n}} A_i$, where each $A_i$ is stationary. Let $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Then there is a small clopen subset $V$ of $X$ such that $\varphi \mid (X \setminus V)$ has finite range.

The strategy of the proof is as follows. After more notation, we partition the space $X$ into a small clopen subset $V$ and finitely many subspaces $X_\theta$, $\theta \in \Theta$, and classify these subspaces. A first approximation to the desired small set $V$ is $V^*$ together with the subspaces of Type 1. We prove that $\varphi$ is constant on “almost all” of each subspace of Type 2. Finally, we define $V$ and verify the conclusion of our theorem.

Throughout this section, we fix $\alpha$, an $n$-tuple of ordinals of uncountable cofinality. For each $i < n$, let $A_i$ be a stationary subset of $\alpha_i$, and define the $n$-tuple $\kappa$ via $\kappa_i = \text{cf} \alpha_i$. We fix the space $X = \prod_{{i < n}} A_i$.

For each $i$, let $M_i : \text{cf} \alpha_i = \kappa_i \to \alpha_i$ be a strictly increasing continuous function whose range is cofinal in $\alpha_i$. We call $M_i$ normal functions. For each $i < n$, let $\mu_i : \alpha_i \to \kappa_i$ be the function defined by $\mu_i(\gamma) = \min(\beta < \kappa_i : \gamma \leq M_i(\beta))$. Observe that $\mu_i$ almost is an inverse to $M_i$. In particular, $\mu_i(M_i(\xi)) = \xi$ and $\gamma \leq M_i(\mu_i(\gamma))$ always hold, and $\gamma = M_i(\mu_i(\gamma))$ holds whenever $\mu_i(\gamma) \in \text{ran} M_i$. Note that each $\mu_i$ is continuous. Therefore the product map $\mu : \prod \alpha \to \prod \kappa$ defined by $\mu(x)_i = \mu_i(x)_i$ is continuous.

For each $i < n$, set $\kappa_i^\prime = \sup(\kappa_i^\prime \mid \kappa_i < \kappa_i)$ (by convention, $\sup \emptyset = 0$). Then $V^* = \{x \in X : (\exists i < n)(\mu(x)_i < \kappa_i^\prime)\}$ is a small clopen set. Because $V^*$ will be part of the small clopen set $V$ discarded in the conclusion of Theorem 4.2, from now on we assume that $\mu(x)_i > \kappa_i^\prime$ for all $i$ and $x$.

Let $\Theta$ be the family of functions $\theta$ from $n$ onto some $m_\theta$, (necessarily $m_\theta \leq n$), which additionally satisfy

if $\kappa_i < \kappa_i^\prime$, then $\theta(i) < \theta(i^\prime)$.

We say that $\theta$ is coarser than $\theta^\prime$, or $\theta^\prime$ is finer than $\theta$, if $\theta(i) < \theta(i^\prime)$ implies that $\theta^\prime(i) < \theta^\prime(i^\prime)$.

For example, when all the $\kappa$’s are equal, then the constant 0 function is the coarsest $\theta$, the permutations are the finest $\theta$’s. At the other extreme, if the $\kappa_i$’s are distinct, then $\Theta$ has only one element: the permutation of $n$ which arranges the $\kappa_i$’s in increasing order.

Now we can define the partition. For $\theta \in \Theta$, let

$$X_\theta = \{x \in X : \theta(i) < \theta(i^\prime) \iff \mu(x)_i < \mu(x)_i^\prime\}.$$
Observe that $X = \bigcup \{ X_\theta : \theta \in \Theta \}$. Next, we define the $m_\theta$-tuple $\kappa^\theta$ by $\kappa^\theta_{\mu(i)} = \kappa_i$. (So $\kappa^\theta$ is formed from $\kappa$ by possibly identifying some equal coordinates.) And we define, for $x \in X$ and $j < m_\theta$,

$$\mu^-_\theta (x) = \min \{ \mu(x)_i : \theta(i) = j \} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^+_\theta (x) = \max \{ \mu(x)_i : \theta(i) = j \}.$$ 

Then the maps $\mu^-_\theta : X \to \prod \kappa^\theta$ are continuous. By the definition, these maps coincide on $X_\theta$ and give us a map $\mu^-_\theta : X_\theta \to \nabla \kappa^\theta$.

The next lemma basically repeats Theorem 3.5 with more notation and a stronger conclusion. The prototype is Example 3.10 above. Note that it is true for all $X \subset \prod \alpha$, not just those of the form $\prod A$. We need the following notation to express this stronger conclusion in a general setting.

**Definition 4.3.** For $C$, a $m_\theta$-tuple of cub sets attuned to $\kappa^\theta$, let $E_\theta(C)$ be the set of $x \in X$ such that there is $c \in \prod C$ satisfying

$$c_0 < \mu^-_\theta (x) < c_1 < \cdots < c_{m_\theta - 1} < \mu^+_\theta (x) < c_{m_\theta}.$$

In this case we say that $x$ is $\theta$-entwined with $c$. Notice that $E_\theta(C) \subset \Sigma \cap X$ because $C$ is attuned. Observe that $E_\theta(D) \subset E_\theta(C)$ if $D_j \subset C_j$ for all $j < m_\theta$. Note that the set of $x \in X$ which are $\theta$-entwined with a specific $c \in \prod C$ is an open subset of $X$; hence $E_\theta(C)$ is open in $X$.

**Lemma 4.4.** Let $U$ be an open subset of $X$ such that $\mu^-_\theta [U \cap X_\theta]$ is a $\kappa^\theta$-stationary subset of $\nabla \kappa^\theta$. Then there is an attuned $m_\theta$-tuple $C$ of cub sets so that $E_\theta(C)$ is contained in $U$.

**Proof.** Let $Y$ be the set of elements $y$ of $\mu^-_\theta [U \cap X_\theta]$ such that every coordinate $y_j$ is a limit ordinal. By Proposition 2.3, $Y$ is $\kappa^\theta$-stationary. Because each $y_j$ is limit, there is a unique $\tilde{y} \in X_\theta$ such that $\mu^-_\theta (\tilde{y}) = y$. Choose $b(\tilde{y}) < \tilde{y}$ so that $(b(\tilde{y}), \tilde{y}) \cap X \subset U$. Define $f(y) \in \nabla \kappa^\theta$ via $f(y)_j = \mu^+_\theta (b(\tilde{y}))_j$. Because each $y_j$ is a limit, $f(y)_j < y_j$. In other words, $f(y) < y$ and $f$ is regressive.

Now we follow the proof of Theorem 3.5 closely. We point out only differences. There is a pruned stationary subset $Y'$ of $Y$ so that $f$ restricted to $Y'$ is a stem function. Find an attuned $C$ to satisfy (1) and (2). Let $x$ be an arbitrary element of $E_\theta(C)$. Define $y_j$ to be the least element of $\pi_j^{(y_0, \ldots, y_{j-1})} [Y']$ greater than $\mu^+_\theta(x)_j$. Verify that $f(y)_j < \mu^+_\theta(x)_j \leq \mu^-_\theta(x)_j < y_j$ for each $j < m_\theta$, which yields $b(\tilde{y}) < x_i < \tilde{y}_i$ for all $i < n$. We have verified that $x \in (b(\tilde{y}), \tilde{y}) \subset U$, as required. □

And this implies, as before (see Theorem 3.7).

**Lemma 4.5.** Let $\theta \in \Theta$ satisfy $\mu^-_\theta [X_\theta]$ is $\kappa^\theta$-stationary, and let $\psi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Then $\psi$ is constant on $E_\theta(C)$ for some attuned $m_\theta$-tuple $C$ of cub sets.

Now we return to the proof of Theorem 4.2. For a carefully chosen $C$, $\varphi$ will be constant on $E_\theta(C)$. However, we cannot ensure that $X_\theta \setminus E_\theta(C)$ is small. So we introduce a slightly larger set.
Definition 4.6. Let $\overline{E}_\theta(C)$ be the set of $x \in X$ such that there is $c \in \prod C$ satisfying

$$c_0 < \mu^-_\theta(x)_0 \leq \mu^+_\theta(x)_0 \leq c_1 < \cdots < c_{m_0-1} < \mu^-_\theta(x)_{m_0-1}.$$ 

We say that $x$ is weakly $\theta$-entwined with $c$.

Observe that $\overline{E}_\theta(D) \subseteq \overline{E}_\theta(C)$ if $D_j \subseteq C_j$ for all $j < m_\theta$. Note that the set of $x \in X$ which are $\theta$-entwined with a specific $c \in \prod C$ is an open subset of $X$; hence $\overline{E}_\theta(C)$ is open in $X$.

Let $\kappa$ be the coarsest element of $\Theta$; in other words, $\kappa^\ell$ lists the coordinates of $\kappa$ in strictly increasing order. For example, when all the $\kappa_i$’s are equal, then $\kappa$ is constant 0 function and $\kappa^\ell$ is a 1-tuple. At the other extreme, if the $\kappa_i$’s are distinct, then $\kappa$ is the unique element of $\Theta$.

For $\ell < m_\kappa$, let $S_\ell$ be the collection of $s \subseteq \kappa^{-\left[\left[\ell\right]\right]}$ such that $\bigcap_{i \in s} \mu_i[A_i]$ is not stationary in $\kappa^\ell$. Let $S = \bigcup_{\ell} S_\ell$. We now classify the elements of the partition.

Definition 4.7. We say that $\theta$ is Type 1 if $\theta^{-\left[\left[\ell\right]\right]} \in S$ for some $\ell < m_\theta$. We say that $\theta$ is Type 2 otherwise.

Since $\theta$ corresponds to subspace $X_\theta$ in a unique way, we can say $X_\theta$ is Type 1 or 2 when $\theta$ is Type 1 or 2, respectively.

Note that by Corollary 2.5, $\mu_{\theta}(X_\theta)$ is $\kappa^\theta$-stationary iff $\theta$ is Type 2. If $\theta'$ is coarser than $\theta$ and $\theta$ is Type 1, then $\theta'$ is Type 1.

The next lemma is where we use that $X$ has the form $\prod_{i < \alpha} A_i$.

Lemma 4.8. Let $D = \langle D_0, \ldots, D_{m_\theta-1} \rangle$ be a $\kappa^\theta$-attuned tuple of cub sets which additionally satisfies: for all $i < n$, $D_\theta(i) \subseteq M_i^{-\left[\left[\lim A_i\right]\right]}$. Then

$$\overline{E}_\theta(D) \subseteq \text{Cl}_X \left(\overline{E}_\theta(D)\right).$$

Proof. Take $y \in \overline{E}_\theta(D)$ arbitrarily and suppose that $y$ is weakly $\theta$-entwined with $c$. Let $H = \left\{ i < n : \theta(i) < m_\theta - 1 \text{ and } \mu_i(y_i) = c_{\theta(i)+1} \right\}$.

We claim that if $i \in H$, then $\kappa^\theta_{\theta(i)} = \kappa^\theta_{\theta(i)+1}$. Indeed, if $i \in H$ and $\kappa^\theta_{\theta(i)} < \kappa^\theta_{\theta(i)+1}$, then $c_{\theta(i)+1} \in D_{\theta(i)+1} \subset (\kappa^\theta_{\theta(i)}, \kappa^\theta_{\theta(i)+1})$ and $c_{\theta(i)+1} = \mu_i(y_i) < \kappa^\theta_{\theta(i)}$, which is a contradiction.

Thus we have $\kappa^\theta_{\theta(i)} = \kappa^\theta_{\theta(i)+1}$. Since $\mu_i(y_i) = c_{\theta(i)+1} \in D_{\theta(i)+1} = D_{\theta(i)} \subseteq M_i^{-\left[\left[\lim A_i\right]\right]}$, we have $y_i = M_i(\mu_i(y_i)) \in \text{Lim} A_i$. Let $(z, y)$ be an arbitrary neighborhood of $y$. We seek $x \in (z, y) \cap \overline{E}_\theta(D)$. If $i \notin H$, let $x_i = y_i$. If $i \in H$, choose $x_i \in A_i$ so that $\max\{x_i, M_i(c_{\theta(i)})\} < x_i < y_i$. It is possible because $M_i(c_{\theta(i)}) < M_i(\mu_i(y_i)) = y_i$. Now it is clear that $x \in (z, y) \cap X$, and routine to verify that $x \in \overline{E}_\theta(D)$. □

By Lemmas 4.5 and 4.8, we have

Lemma 4.9. Let $\theta$ be Type 2, and $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Then $\varphi$ is constant on $\overline{E}_\theta(C)$ for some $C$. 
For each $\theta$ of Type 2, let us fix $C^0$ so that $\phi$ is constant on $E_\theta(C^0)$. Let $E = \bigcup \{E_\theta(C^0): \theta$ is Type 2 $\}$. Then $\phi \upharpoonright E$ has finite range. We must show that $X \setminus E$ is contained in a small clopen set.

Fix a $\kappa^\ell$-attuned tuple $\langle G_0, \ldots, G_m, -1 \rangle$ of cub sets satisfying

1. if $\theta$ is Type 2 and $\kappa^\theta = \kappa^\ell$, then $G_\ell \subset C^0$,
2. if $s \in S_\ell$, then $G_\ell \cap \bigcap_{i \in S_\ell} \mu_i[A_i] = \emptyset$.

Let $V^\downarrow = \{ x \in X: (\exists i < n)(\mu(x)_i \leq \min G_{\xi(i)}) \}$. Then $V^\downarrow$ is a small clopen set and $V^* \subset V^\downarrow$.

For each $s \in S$, we will define a small clopen set $V_s$. Let $s \in S$. For $\gamma \in G_\ell$, let $\gamma^+$ be the least element of $G_\ell$ greater than $\gamma$. If $\xi \notin G_\ell$, then either $\xi < \min G_\ell$, or there is $\gamma \in G_\ell$ such that $\gamma < \xi < \gamma^+$. Let

$$V_\gamma = \{ x \in X: y < \mu(x)i < \gamma^+ \text{ for all } i \in s \},$$

$$V_s = \bigcup \{ V_\gamma: \gamma \in G_\ell \}.$$

**Lemma 4.10.** For each $s \in S$, $V_s$ is a small clopen set.

**Proof.** Fix $s \in S$. Observe that each $V_\gamma$ is clopen. We must show that $\{ V_\gamma: \gamma \in G_\ell \}$ is discrete. Towards that end, let $x \in X$ be arbitrary. First consider the case that $\mu(x)_i \notin G_\ell$ for some $i \in s$. If $\mu(x)_i < \min G_\ell$, then the clopen set $V^\downarrow$ misses $V_s$. Otherwise, for some $\gamma \in G_\ell$, the clopen set $\{ y \in X: y < \mu(x)_i \leq \gamma^+ \}$ $\ni \exists x$ meets only $V_\gamma$.

Next consider the case that $\mu(x)_i \in G_\ell$ for all $i \in s$. If $\mu(x)_i < \min G_\ell$, then $\mu(x)_i \in G_\ell \cap \bigcap_{i \in S_\ell} \mu_i[A_i] = \emptyset$. So let $\mu(x)_i < \mu(x)_i$ for some $i, i' \in s$. Then the clopen set $\{ y \in X: \mu(x)_i < \mu(x)_i \text{ and } \mu(y)_i \leq \mu(x)_i \}$ contains $x$ and misses $V_s$. \hfill \Box

Set $V = V^\downarrow \cup \bigcup_{s \in S} V_s$. We claim that $V$ satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 4.2. So we fix an arbitrary $x \in X$ and prove that $x \notin V \cup E$. We assume that $x \notin V^*$. Define $\eta \in \Theta$ so that (informally) $\eta(i) < \eta(i')$ iff $G$ separates $\mu(x)_i$ and $\mu(x)_{i'}$. Formally, $\eta(i) < \eta(i')$ iff $\mu(x)_{i'} < \gamma < \mu(x)_{i'}$ for some $\gamma \in G_{\xi(i)}$. If $x \notin X_\theta$, then $\eta$ is coarser than (possibly, but not necessarily, equal to) $\theta$.

**Lemma 4.11.** If $\eta$ is Type 1, then $x \in V$. If $\eta$ is Type 2 and $x \notin V^\uparrow$, then $x \in E$.

**Proof.** Assume that $\eta$ is Type 1. By Definition 4.7, there are $j, l$, and $\ell$ so that $\eta^{-1}[\{ j \}] = s \in S_l$. From the definition of $\eta$, there is $\gamma' \in G_\ell$ so that $\min \{ \gamma \in G_\ell: \mu(x)_i \leq \gamma \}$ is equal to $\gamma'$ for all $i \in s$. The assumption that $\gamma'$ is $\lim G_\ell$ together with (2) of the definition of $G_\ell$ leads to a contradiction, so $\gamma' = \gamma^+$ for some $\gamma \in G_\ell$. Then $x \in V_{\gamma} \subset V \subset V^\downarrow$.

Assume that $\eta$ is Type 2 and $x \notin V^\uparrow$. We will show that $x \in E_\eta(C^0)$. We define $c \in \prod \{ C^0 \}$ by cases. If $j = 0$ or if $\kappa^\eta_{j-1} = \kappa^\eta_j$, then set $c_j = \min C^0$. In this case, $c_j < \mu^\eta(x)_j$ because $x \notin V^\downarrow$. If $\kappa^\eta_{j-1} = \kappa^\eta_j$, let $c_j$ be the least element of $C^0_j$ greater than or equal to $\mu^\eta(x)_{j-1}$. In this case, $c_j < \mu^\eta(x)_j$, because by definition of $\eta$, there is $\gamma \in G_\ell$ such that
\[ \mu_\eta^+(x)_j-1 \leq \gamma < \mu_\eta^-(x)_j, \] and \( G_\ell \subseteq C^n_\eta \). In both cases, \( \mu_\eta^+(x)_j-1 \leq c_j \) is obvious. So \( x \) is weakly \( \eta \)-entwined with \( c \), and \( x \in E_\eta(C^n_\eta) \subseteq E \). \( \square \)

Thus ends our proof of Theorem 4.2.

To end this section, we calculate the upper bound of \( |\varphi \restriction (X \setminus V)| \) in Theorem 4.2. For that we need to find a standard form of \( E_\eta(C^n_\eta) \) on which \( \varphi \restriction (X \setminus V) \) is constant.

Take any \( \theta \in \Theta \). Since \( \xi \) is coarser than \( \theta \), there is, for each \( j < m_\eta \), a unique \( \ell < m_\xi \) such that \( \kappa_\theta^j = \kappa_\xi^\ell \) and hence, we can define a \( \kappa^\theta \)-attuned tuple \( D^\theta \) by \( D^\theta_j = G_\ell \).

**Lemma 4.12.** If \( \eta \) is coarser than \( \theta \), then \( \overline{E_\theta(D^\theta)} \subseteq \overline{E_\eta(C^n_\eta)} \).

**Proof.** For each \( k < m_\eta \), let \( j(k) = \min(\eta^{-1}([k])) \). Note that \( \kappa^\theta_{j(k)} = \kappa^\eta_k \).

Let \( x \) be weakly \( \theta \)-entwined with \( c \in \prod D^\theta \) and define \( c_k = d_{j(k)}(k \leq k < m_\eta) \) for \( k < m_\eta \). Since \( \xi \) is coarser than \( \eta \), there is a unique \( \ell < m_\xi \) so that \( \kappa^\xi_\ell = \kappa^\eta_k \). This implies

\[ c = (c_0, \ldots, c_{m_\eta-1}) \in \prod C^n_\eta. \]

Let us see that \( x \) is weakly \( \eta \)-entwined with \( c \). Let \( k < m_\eta \), \( \eta(i) = k \) and \( \theta(i) = j \). Then \( j \in \theta(\eta^{-1}([k])) \) implies \( j \geq j(k) \), which further implies \( c_k = d_{j(k)} \leq d_j < \mu_{\eta}^+(x)_j \leq \mu(x)_j \). and hence \( c_k < \mu_{\eta}^-(x)_k \). When \( k < m_\eta - 1 \), observe that \( j + 1 \leq j(k + 1) \) because \( \eta \) is coarser than \( \theta \). Then \( \mu(x)_j \leq \mu_{\eta}^+(x)_j \leq d_{j+1} \leq d_{j(k+1)} = c_{k+1} \), and hence \( \mu_{\eta}^+(x)_k \leq c_{k+1} \). This shows \( x \in E_\eta(C^n_\eta) \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.13.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.2, there is a small clopen set \( V \) of \( X \) such that

\[ |\varphi \restriction (X \setminus V)| \leq \prod_{\ell < m_\xi} |(\xi^{-1}([\ell]))!| \leq n!. \]

**Proof.** By the proof of Lemma 4.11, the values of \( \varphi \restriction (X \setminus V) \) are given by constant values \( \varphi[E_\eta(C^n_\eta)] \), where \( \eta \) is determined by \( x \notin V \). Let \( \theta(\eta) \in \Theta \) be a permutation finer than such \( \eta \). Then, by Lemma 4.12,

\[ \varphi[E_\eta(C^n_\eta)] = \varphi[E_{\theta(\eta)}(D^{\theta(\eta)})]. \]

Since there are at most \( \prod_{\ell < m_\xi} |(\xi^{-1}([\ell]))!| \)-many permutations in \( \Theta \), we have \( |\varphi \restriction (X \setminus V)| \leq \prod_{\ell < m_\xi} |(\xi^{-1}([\ell]))!| \leq n! \). \( \square \)

Let \( \{A_i : i < n\} \) be a pairwise disjoint collection of stationary sets in \( \omega_1 \). Then \( X = \prod_{i < n} A_i \) is the free union of \( X_\theta \)'s, where \( \theta \) is a permutation on \( n \). So we can define a continuous map \( \varphi \) on \( X \) such that \( |\varphi \restriction (X \setminus V)| = n! \) for each small clopen set \( V \).
5. Main theorem

In this section, we state and prove

**Theorem 5.1** (Main). The product of finitely many subspaces of ordinals is strongly zero-dimensional. In other words, if \( A_i \subset \alpha_i \) for all \( i < n \), then \( X = \prod_{i<n} A_i \) is strongly zero-dimensional.

**Proof.** Here is our induction hypothesis. For a tuple \( \alpha = (\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}) \) of ordinals, let \( \text{SZD}(\alpha) \) abbreviate “if \( A_i \subset \alpha_i \) for all \( i < n \), then \( X = \prod_{i<n} A_i \) is strongly zero-dimensional”.

We will prove \( \text{SZD}(\alpha) \) for all finite-tuples of ordinals by induction on the order \( \prec \).

Assuming \( \text{SZD}(\beta) \) for all \( \beta \prec \alpha \), we will show \( \text{SZD}(\alpha) \). Let \( Z_0 \) and \( Z_1 \) be disjoint zero-sets of \( X \). By [5, 1.15], we may assume that \( Z_0 = h^{-1}[0] \) and \( Z_1 = h^{-1}[1] \) for some continuous function \( h : X \to [0, 1] \).

**Case 1.** For some \( i < n \), \( \alpha_i \) has the form \( \beta + 2 \), or \( \text{cf} \alpha_i = \omega \), or \( \text{cf} \alpha_i > \omega \) and \( A_i \) is not stationary in \( \alpha_i \).

We shall show that \( X \) is the free sum of spaces known to be strongly zero-dimensional by induction hypothesis, and hence is itself strongly zero-dimensional.

Indeed, for notational convenience, we may assume \( i = 0 \). Let \( Y = \prod_{1 \leq i < n} A_i \).

The first case \( (\alpha_0 = \beta + 2) \): We have \( X = (A_0 \cap (\beta + 1)) \times Y \bigoplus (A_0 \cap \beta + 1) \times Y \) and \((A_0 \cap (\beta + 1)) \times Y \) is homeomorphic to \( [0] \times Y \) if \( \beta + 1 \in A_0 \).

The second case \( (\text{cf} \alpha_0 = \omega) \): Fix a normal function \( M : \omega \to \alpha_0 \). Then we have \( X = \bigoplus_{\alpha_0} (A_0 \cap (A_0 \cap (\omega - M(\gamma))) \times Y, \text{ where } M(-1) \text{ is considered as } -1 \).

The third case \( (\text{cf} \alpha_0 > \omega \text{ and } A \text{ is not stationary in } \alpha_0) \): Since \( A_0 \) is not stationary in \( \alpha_0 \) and \( \text{cf} \alpha_0 > \omega \), one can fix a normal function \( M : \text{cf} \alpha_0 \to \alpha_0 \) such that \( \text{ran } M \cap \alpha_0 = \theta \). Then \( X = \bigoplus_{\gamma < \text{cf} \alpha_0} (A_0 \cap (\omega - M(\gamma))) \times Y \).

**Case 2.** For some \( i < n \), \( \alpha_i \) has the form \( \lambda + 1 \), where \( \lambda \) is a limit ordinal.

For notational convenience, we may assume that \( i = 0 \). Moreover by induction hypothesis, we may assume that \( \lambda \in A_0 \). Set \( Y = \prod_{1 \leq i < n} A_i \) and \( X_1 = \{ \lambda \} \times Y \). Set \( h_1 = h \mid X_1 \).

By the induction hypothesis, there is a clopen set \( W \) of \( Y \) so that \( h_1^{-1}[[0, 1/3]] \subseteq \{ \lambda \} \times W \) and \( h_1^{-1}[[2/3, 1]] \subseteq \{ \lambda \} \times (Y \setminus W) \).

Let \( X_2 = (A_0 \setminus \{ \lambda \}) \times W \) and \( h_2 = h \mid X_2 \). By induction hypothesis, there is a clopen subset \( V_2 \) of \( X_2 \) such that \( h_2^{-1}[[0, 5/6]] \subseteq V_2 \) and \( h_2^{-1}[[1]] \subseteq X_2 \setminus V_2 \). Analogously, by letting \( X_3 = (A_0 \setminus \{ \lambda \}) \times (Y \setminus W) \) and \( h_3 = h \mid X_3 \), one can find a clopen set \( V_3 \) of \( X_3 \) such that \( h_3^{-1}[[0]] \subseteq V_3 \) and \( h_3^{-1}[[1]] \subseteq X_3 \setminus V_3 \). Then \( V = (\{ \lambda \} \times W) \cup V_2 \cup V_3 \) obviously contains \( Z_0 \) and is disjoint from \( Z_1 \).

To show that \( V \) is open, let \( x \in V \). Since \( V_2 \) and \( V_3 \) are open in \( X \), it suffices to consider the case that \( x = (\lambda, y) \in \{ \lambda \} \times W \). It follows from \( h(x) < 2/3 < 5/6 \) that there are \( \alpha < \lambda \) and a neighborhood \( U \) of \( y \) such that \( U \subset W \) and \((\alpha, \lambda] \cap A_0) \times U \subset h^{-1}[[0, 2/3]] \). Then
it is straightforward to show that \(((\alpha, \lambda] \cap A_0) \times U \subset V\), thus \(V\) is open in \(X\). Similarly we can show that \(X \setminus V\) is open in \(X\), and hence \(V\) is clopen.

**Case 3.** For all \(i < n\), cf \(\alpha_i > \omega\) and \(A_i\) is stationary in \(\alpha_i\).

We apply Theorem 4.2 to the function \(h\) and obtain a small clopen set \(V\) so that \(h \upharpoonright (X \setminus V)\) has finite range. Note that \(W^* = Z_0 \cap (X \setminus V)\) is clopen.

By the definition of small, \(V = \bigcup\{V_\lambda: \lambda \in \Lambda\}\), where the induction hypothesis applies to each \(V_\lambda\). That is, for each \(\lambda\), there is \(W_0^\lambda\), clopen in \(V_\lambda\) (hence clopen in \(X\)) such that \(Z_0 \cap V_\lambda \subset W_0^\lambda \subset V_\lambda \setminus Z_1\). Because \(\{V_\lambda: \lambda \in \Lambda\}\) is locally finite in \(X\), \(W_0^* = \bigcup\{W_0^\lambda: \lambda \in \Lambda\}\) is clopen in \(X\). Then \(W_0^* \cup W_0\) is the desired clopen set separating \(Z_0\) and \(Z_1\).

6. Subspaces of the product space \((\omega + 1) \times \mathfrak{c}\) which are not strongly zero-dimensional

We begin by considering a MAD family \(\mathcal{R}\) of subsets of \(\omega\). Here \(\mathcal{R}\) is called MAD (= maximal almost disjoint) if it is almost-disjoint (\(|s \cap s'| < \omega\) for distinct \(s, s' \in \mathcal{R}\)), and not contained properly in any other almost-disjoint family. For such \(\mathcal{R}\), let \(\Psi(\mathcal{R})\) denote the space which is defined on the set \(\omega \cup \mathcal{R}\) and has the so-called \(\Psi\)-space topology, [5, 5.I], [3, 3.6.I]. That is, a subset \(U\) of \(\Psi(\mathcal{R})\) is open iff \(\forall s \in \mathcal{R} (s \in U \iff |s \setminus U| < \omega)\).

Let \(L = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{c}: \lambda\) is a limit\}, and let \(S = \mathfrak{c} \setminus L\). Note that \(|L| = |S| = \mathfrak{c}\). Since \(|\mathcal{R}| \times \mathfrak{c} \approx \mathfrak{c}\), the unindexed family can be indexed \(\mathcal{R} = \{s_\alpha: \alpha \in S\}\) in such a way that, for each \(s \in \mathcal{R}\), \(|\{\alpha \in S: s = s_\alpha\}| = \mathfrak{c}\). With \(\mathcal{R}\) thus indexed, we consider the subspace

\[K(\mathcal{R}) = \omega \times L \cup \bigcup_{\alpha \in S} \left( (s_\alpha \times \{\alpha\}) \cup \{\langle \omega, \alpha \rangle\} \right)\]

of the product space \((\omega + 1) \times \mathfrak{c}\).

**Theorem 6.1.** For every MAD family \(\mathcal{R}\), \(\beta\Psi(\mathcal{R})\) is embedded in \(K(\mathcal{R})^* = \beta K(\mathcal{R}) \setminus K(\mathcal{R})\).

As noted in [10, Concluding remarks], where the symbol \(N \cup \mathcal{R}\) denotes our space \(\Psi(\mathcal{R})\), every first-countable separable compact space as well as the space \(\omega_1 + 1\) is homeomorphic to \(\Psi(\mathcal{R})^*\) for some \(\mathcal{R}\).

(Let us take this opportunity to point out that extensions of this result, which were subsequently obtained by a few authors, remain mostly unpublished, and that some of their zero-dimensional versions are found in [1]. However, [1] is written in Boolean algebra terms, and, by Stone’s duality, concerned with Banaschewski compactification (i.e., maximal zero-dimensional compactification) of \(\Psi(\mathcal{R})\) instead of [10]’s Stone–Čech one. Hence results of [1] and [10] overlap only in the case that \(\Psi(\mathcal{R})\) is strongly zero-dimensional, or, equivalently, \(\Psi(\mathcal{R})^*\) is zero-dimensional, see [10, Lemma 1.1]. Or, more clearly, [10] contains a higher-dimensional version of some results of [1]. See also the interesting paper [2].)
Therefore

**Corollary 6.2.** Every first-countable, separable, compact space is embedded in $K(\mathcal{R})^*$ for some $\mathcal{R}$.

**Corollary 6.3.** The space $\omega_1 + 1$ is embedded in $K(\mathcal{R})^*$ for some $\mathcal{R}$.

Throughout the rest of this section we will fix $\mathcal{R}$ a MAD family indexed by $S$ in the special way described above. We will often write $K$ or $\Psi$ in place of $K(\mathcal{R})$ or $\Psi(\mathcal{R})$, respectively, for simplicity’s sake.

For the proof of Theorem 6.1, we define in the space $K = K(\mathcal{R})$

$$H_\alpha = (\omega + 1) \times (\alpha, c) \cap K, \quad \alpha < c,$$

and in the space $\beta K$

$$Y = \bigcap_{\alpha < c} \text{Cl}_K H_\alpha, \quad Y' = Y \cap \text{Cl}_K [\{\omega\} \times S].$$

Obviously each $H_\alpha$ is a clopen subset of $K$. Being the intersection of compact sets, $Y$ and $Y'$ are compact subspaces of $K^*$.

The following well-known lemma, which is a consequence of the Pressing Down Lemma, and its corollaries are central to our argument.

**Lemma 6.4.** Let $L \subset A \subset c$. Then every continuous map $f \in C(A)$ is constant on $A \cap (\lambda, c)$ for some $\lambda < c$.

**Corollary 6.5.** For every continuous function $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$, there is a $\lambda < c$ such that $f$ is constant on the sets $\{n\} \times (\lambda, c) \cap K$ and $\{\langle \omega, \alpha \rangle : \alpha > \lambda$ and $s = s_\alpha \} \cap K$ for all $n < \omega$ and $s \in \mathcal{R}$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 6.4, for each $n$, there is an ordinal $\lambda_n < c$ in which $f \restriction (\{n\} \times (\lambda_n, c) \cap K)$ is constant. Let $\lambda = \sup \{\lambda_n : n\}$. Then we have that $f \restriction (\{n\} \times (\lambda, c) \cap K)$ is constant for each $n < \omega$. Further let $s \in \mathcal{R}$, $s = s_\alpha = s_\beta$ and $\alpha, \beta > \lambda$. Then it follows that $f(\langle k, \alpha \rangle) = f(\langle k, \beta \rangle)$ for each $k \in s$. Since $\{\langle k, \alpha \rangle : k \in s\}$ and $\{\langle k, \beta \rangle : k \in s\}$ converge to $\langle \omega, \alpha \rangle$ and $\langle \omega, \beta \rangle$ respectively, we have $f(\langle \omega, \alpha \rangle) = f(\langle \omega, \beta \rangle)$. \qed

**Corollary 6.6.** For every zero set $Z$ of $K$, there is a $\lambda$ such that

$$L \cap H_\lambda \cap Z \neq \emptyset \iff L \cap H_\lambda \subset Z$$

where $L = \{n\} \times c$ or $L = \{\langle \omega, \alpha \rangle : s = s_\alpha \}$ for $n < \omega$ or $s \in \mathcal{R}$, respectively.

Now Theorem 6.1 follows from

**Proposition 6.7.** $Y$ and $\beta \Psi$ are homeomorphic.
Proof. In the sequel, we will identify points of $\beta K$ with $\mathfrak{z}$-ultrafilters on $K$. Thus, for a zero-set $Z$ of $K$ and $p \in \beta K$, $Z \ni p$ is equivalent to $p \in \text{Cl}_{\beta K} Z$, that is, \( \{ p \} = \bigcap_{z \in p} \text{Cl}_{\beta K} Z \) (cf. [5, 6.5(c)]). Note that $H_\alpha \ni p$ for every $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$ and $p \in Y$, and hence that $Z \cap H_\alpha \ni p$ for every $Z \ni p$, $p \in Y$ and $\alpha$.

It suffices to show that $Y$ contains a $C^\ast$-embedded dense copy of $\Psi$.

First note that $\text{Cl}_{\beta K} [(\kappa \times \mathfrak{c}) \cap Y]$ is a singleton for each $\kappa < \omega$, and determines a point $p_\kappa$. In fact, if the set contains two points $q_0$, $q_1$, then there are disjoint zero sets $Z_i \in q_i$ so that $Z_i \subset \kappa \times \mathfrak{c} \cap K$. Let $\lambda$ be as in Corollary 6.6 for $Z_0$ and $Z_1$. Then both $Z_i$ contain $\kappa \times (\lambda, \kappa) \subset K$, which is impossible.

Obviously $p_\kappa$ is isolated in $Y$.

Likewise, for each $s \in {}^\mathbb{R} \mathcal{R}$, $\text{Cl}_{\beta K} [(\omega, \alpha) : s = s_\alpha] \cap Y$ is a singleton and determines a point $p_s$ of $Y$. Note that $\{(\omega, \alpha) : s = s_\alpha\}$ is also a zero set of $K$.

We claim that the subspace $T = \{ p_\kappa : \kappa < \omega \} \cup \{ p_s : s \in {}^\mathbb{R} \mathcal{R} \}$ is homeomorphic to $\Psi$, and is $C^\ast$-embedded and dense in $Y$.

For $s \in {}^\mathbb{R} \mathcal{R}$, let $B = (s \times \mathfrak{c} \cap K) \cup \{(\omega, \alpha) : s_\alpha = s\}$. Then $B$ is clopen in $K$. If $q \in Y \cap \text{Cl}_{\beta K} B \setminus \{ p_s \}$, then there is a zero set $Z \ni q$ such that $Z \subset B \setminus \{(\omega, \alpha) : s_\alpha = s\}$. Let $\lambda$ be as in Corollary 6.6. Then, obviously, $Z \cap H_\lambda$ meets $\{ n \} \times \mathfrak{c}$ for only finitely many $n \in s$. Thus $q = p_\kappa$ for some $n$, and $Y \cap \text{Cl}_{\beta K} B = \{ p_s \} \cup \{ p_n : n \in s \}$. Hence $T$ is homeomorphic to $\Psi$.

To see that $T$ is $C^\ast$-embedded in $Y$, take any $f : T \to [0, 1]$. Then a continuous function $F$ on $K \upharpoonright T$ is defined by $F((\kappa, \alpha)) = f(p_\kappa)$ and $F((\omega, \alpha)) = f(p_s)$ where $s = s_\alpha$. Extend $F \upharpoonright K$ to $\tilde{F} : \beta K \to [0, 1]$. $\tilde{F} \upharpoonright Y$ is the extension of $f$.

Let $f : \beta K \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function which sends all $p_\kappa$ to 0, and choose $\lambda$ as in Corollary 6.5 for $f \upharpoonright K$. Then $f((\omega, \alpha)) = 0$ for each $\kappa < \omega$ and $\alpha > \lambda$. This implies that $f((\omega, \alpha)) = 0$ for each $\kappa > \lambda$, that is, $f[H_\lambda] = \{ 0 \}$. Thus we have that $f[Y] = \{ 0 \}$, that $\{ p_\kappa : \kappa < \omega \}$ is dense in $Y$, all our spaces being Tychonoff, and finally that $T$ is dense in $Y$. \( \square \)

The above proof also shows

**Corollary 6.8.** $Y'$ is homeomorphic to $\beta \Psi \setminus \omega$.

It appears that $Y'$ is the main part of the space $\beta K$. That is,

**Proposition 6.9.** Any compact subspace of $\beta K$ is strongly zero-dimensional if it is disjoint from $Y'$.

**Proof.** First let $\Gamma = (\omega + 1) \times (\mathfrak{c} + 1)$, and consider the extension $\theta : \beta K \to \Gamma$ of the embedding $K \to \Gamma$. Note that $\{ \theta(p) \} = \bigcap_{z \in p} \text{Cl}_{\Gamma} Z$ for each $p \in \beta K$.

Then we have $Y' = \theta^{-1}[(\omega, \mathfrak{c})]$.

For this, only the inclusion $Y' \supseteq \theta^{-1}[(\omega, \mathfrak{c})]$ needs to be verified. If $\theta(p) = (\omega, \mathfrak{c})$ and $p \notin \text{Cl}_{\beta K} [(\omega) \times S]$, then there is a $Z \ni p$ so that $Z \cap (\omega) \times S = \emptyset$. Let $\lambda$ be as in Corollary 6.6. Since $\text{Cl}_{\Gamma} Z \supseteq (\omega, \mathfrak{c})$, $Z$ meets, and hence contains $\{ n \} \times (\lambda, \mathfrak{c}) \cap K$ for infinitely many $n$. Let $A = \{ n : Z \supseteq \{ n \} \times (\lambda, \mathfrak{c}) \cap K \}$. Then, by the MAD-ness of $\mathcal{R}$, $A \cap s$ is infinite for
some \( s \in \mathcal{R} \). Further, by the special indexing of \( \mathcal{R} \), \( s = s_\alpha \) for some \( \alpha > \lambda \). This implies that \( \langle \omega, \alpha \rangle \in Z \cap \{\omega\} \times S \), which is a contradiction.

Now take any compact space \( E \subset \beta K \setminus Y' \). Since \( \theta[E] \not\subseteq \langle \omega, c \rangle \), there are \( N < \omega \) and \( \lambda < c \) so that \( \theta[E] \cap ((N, \omega] \times (\lambda, c]) = \emptyset \). Then \( E \) is contained in the \( \beta K \)-closure of the union of \( (\omega + 1) \times [0, \lambda] \) and \( \bigcup_{n \leq N} \{n\} \times [0, c) \). Let \( U = (\omega + 1) \times [0, \lambda] \cap K \) and \( G_n = \{n\} \times [0, c) \cap K \). These are clopen sets of \( K \) and \( C^* \)-embedded in it. Thus each of \( \text{Cl}_{\beta K} U \) and \( \text{Cl}_{\beta K} G_n \) is equivalent, as an extension, to the Stone–Čech compactification of \( U \) and \( G_n \), respectively.

Since \( U \) consists of less-than-\( c \) many points, it has no continuous map onto \([0, 1]\). This means that \( 0 = \dim U = \dim \beta U = \dim \text{Cl}_{\beta K} U \). And, on the other hand, it is well-known that each \( G_n \) is normal and strongly zero-dimensional, and hence that \( \dim \text{Cl}_{\beta K} G_n = 0 \). Therefore \( E \subset \text{Cl}_{\beta K} U \cup \bigcup_{n \leq N} \text{Cl}_{\beta K} G_n \) is strongly zero-dimensional. \( \square \)

We note the following Dowker–Morita’s Generalized Sum Theorem (see, e.g., [3, Problem 7.4.11]): “Let \( X \) be a normal space and \( M \) its closed subspace such that \( \dim M \leq n \). If every closed set \( F \subset X \) disjoint from \( M \) satisfies \( \dim F \leq n \), then \( \dim X \leq n \).” Then Corollary 6.8 and Proposition 6.9 assure us (note that \( \beta \Psi \setminus \omega \) consists of a compact set \( \Psi^* \) and a discrete set \( \mathcal{R} \))

**Proposition 6.10.** \( \dim Y' = \dim \beta K = \dim \Psi^* \).

Now here is what we have intended in this section.

**Theorem 6.11.** For every non-negative integer \( n \), we can choose \( \mathcal{R} \) so that \( \dim \beta K (\mathcal{R}) = n \).

As we have pointed out in the last part of the proof of Proposition 6.9, every space of cardinality \( \leq c \) is strongly zero-dimensional. Hence

**Theorem 6.12.** \( c \) is the minimum cardinal such that \( (\omega + 1) \times c \) is not hereditarily strongly zero-dimensional.

We are grateful to the referee for suggesting the improvement of the proofs of Propositions 6.7 and 6.9.
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