

A note on some versions of ♣

Mirna Džamonja
Mathematics Department
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI 53706, USA

`dzamonja@math.wisc.edu`

Saharon Shelah
Mathematics Department
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
91904 Givat Ram, Israel

`shelah@sunset.huji.ac.il`

September 12, 1997

Abstract

This note gives two results on guessing unbounded subsets of λ^+ . The first is a positive result and applies to the situation of λ regular, while the second is a negative consistency result which applies to the situation of λ singular. Both results are connected to an earlier result of Džamonja-Shelah (see Fact 0.2 of this paper) in which they showed that a certain version of ♣ holds at a successor of singular just in *ZFC*. The first result here shows that the result of Fact 0.2 can to a certain extent be extended to the successor of regular. The negative result here gives limitations to the extent to which one can hope to extend Fact 0.2. ¹

¹This note is numbered F227(10/97) in Saharon Shelah's list of publications. It is presently available only as an electronic publication.

0 Introduction and background

We consider possible improvements of a result from [DjSh 545] about the *ZFC* existence of a certain version of \clubsuit . The result in question is quoted as Fact 0.2 below, and can be summarized as having shown that at the successor of singular a certain version of \clubsuit always hold. One direction that can be suggested, is to consider the successor of regular. A positive result in this direction is given in §1 here.

Another direction is to consider *ZFC* improvements to Fact 0.2 at the successor of singular. In §2 we show that there are some non-obvious limitations, by giving a consistency result regarding successor of singular strong limit in which a negation of guessing is obtained.

We now recall the relevant result from [DjSh 545].

Definition 0.1. Suppose that λ is a cardinal. $\clubsuit_{-\lambda}^*(\lambda^+)$ is the statement saying that there is a sequence $\langle \mathcal{P}_\delta : \delta \text{ limit} < \lambda^+ \rangle$ such that

- (i) \mathcal{P}_δ is a family of $\leq |\delta|$ unbounded subsets of δ ,
- (ii) For $a \in \mathcal{P}_\delta$ we have $\text{otp}(a) < \lambda$,
- (iii) For all $X \in [\lambda^+]^{\lambda^+}$, there is a club C of λ^+ such that for all $\delta \in C$ limit, there is $a \in \mathcal{P}_\delta$ such that

$$\sup(a \cap X) = \delta.$$

Fact 0.2 (Džamonja-Shelah). [DjSh 545] If $\aleph_0 < \kappa = \text{cf}(\lambda) < \lambda$, then $\clubsuit_{-\lambda}^*(\lambda^+)$.

In §1 we show that Fact 0.2 can be to a certain extent extended to the successor of regular, by proving the following (see below for the relevant notation):

Theorem 0.3. 1.1

- (1) Suppose that

- (a) $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \theta_1^+ > \theta_1 \geq \theta = \text{cf}(\theta) > \aleph_1$ and $\lambda \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$,
- (b) $S^* \subseteq S_\theta^{\lambda^+}$ is stationary, moreover

$$S_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\delta < \lambda^+ : \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta_1^+ \text{ \& } S^* \cap \delta \text{ is stationary}\}$$

is stationary.

Then there is a stationary $S' \subseteq S^*$ and $\langle E_\delta : \delta \in S' \rangle$ such that

- (i) E_δ is a club of δ with $\text{otp}(E_\delta) \leq \lambda^\omega \times \theta_1^+$,
- (ii) for every unbounded $A \subseteq S_\lambda^{\lambda^+}$, for stationarily many $\delta \in S'$, we have

$$\delta = \sup(A \cap \text{nacc}(E_\delta)).$$

- (2) We can omit the assumption of $\lambda \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ if $S^* = S_\theta^{\lambda^+}$.

Note that this result is in some sense complementary to the “club guessing” results of Shelah, because here we are guessing unbounded subsets of λ^+ which are not necessarily clubs, but on the other hand, there are limitations on the cofinalities.

In §2, modulo the existence of a supercompact (Theorem 2.1), it is shown here that it is consistent that there is λ a strong limit singular of cofinality ω , such that $2^\lambda > \lambda^+$ and the following negation of guessing holds:

There is a function $f : \lambda^+ \rightarrow \omega$ such that for every $\mathcal{P} \subseteq [\lambda^+]^\omega$ of cardinality $< 2^\lambda$, for some $X \in [\lambda^+]^{\lambda^+}$ we have

- (i) $(\forall i < \omega)[|X \cap f^{-1}(\{i\})| = \lambda^+]$,
- (ii) If $a \in \mathcal{P}$, then $\sup(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright (a \cap X))) < \omega$.

We finish this introduction by recalling some notation and facts which will be used in the following sections.

Notation 0.4. (1) Suppose that $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) < \delta$. We let

$$S_\kappa^\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\alpha < \delta : \text{cf}(\alpha) = \kappa\}.$$

(2) Suppose that $C \subseteq \alpha$. We let

$$\text{acc}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\beta \in C : \beta = \sup(C \cap \beta)\},$$

$$\text{and } \text{nacc}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C \setminus \text{acc}(C).$$

Definition 0.5. Suppose that $\lambda \geq \aleph_1$ and γ is an ordinal, while $A \subseteq \lambda^+$. For $S \subseteq \lambda^+$, we say that S *has a square of type $\leq \gamma$ nonaccumulating in A* iff there is a sequence $\langle e_\alpha : \alpha \in S \rangle$ such that

- (i) $\beta \in e_\alpha \implies \beta \in S$ & $e_\beta = e_\alpha \cap \beta$,
- (ii) e_α is a closed set,
- (iii) If $\alpha \in S \setminus A$, then $\alpha = \sup(e_\alpha)$,
- (iv) $\text{otp}(e_\alpha) \leq \gamma$.

Fact 0.6 (Shelah). [[Sh 351]§4, [Sh -g]III§2] Suppose that

$$\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_1, \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa).$$

Further suppose that $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$ is stationary. Then there is $S_1 \subseteq \lambda$ on which there is a square of type $\leq \kappa$, nonaccumulating on A =the successor ordinals, and $S_1 \cap S$ is stationary.

Remark 0.7. In the proof of Fact 0.6 we can replace A =the successor ordinals with $A = S_\sigma^\lambda$ for any $\sigma = \text{cf}(\sigma) < \kappa$.

Definition 0.8 (Shelah). [Sh -g] Suppose that $\delta < \lambda$ and $e \subseteq \delta$, while $E \subseteq \lambda$. We define

$$\text{gl}(e, E) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\sup(\alpha \cap E) : \alpha \in e \text{ \& } \alpha > \min(E)\}.$$

Observation 0.9. Suppose that e and E are as in Definition 0.8, and both e and $E \cap \delta$ are clubs of δ . Then, observe that $\text{gl}(e, E)$ is a club of δ with $\text{otp}(\text{gl}(e, E)) \leq \text{otp}(e)$.

If e is just closed in δ , and $E \cap \delta$ is a club of δ then $\text{gl}(e, E)$ is closed and $\text{otp}(\text{gl}(e, E)) \leq \text{otp}(e)$.

Fact 0.10 (Shelah). [Sh 355] Suppose that $\text{cf}(\kappa) = \kappa < \kappa^+ < \text{cf}(\lambda) = \lambda$. Further suppose that $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$ is stationary and $\langle e_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is a sequence such that each e_δ is a club of δ . Then there is a club E^* of λ such that the sequence

$$\bar{c} = \langle c_\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{gl}(e_\delta, E^*) : \delta \in S \cap E^* \rangle$$

has the property that for every club E of λ , there are stationarily many δ such that $c_\delta \subseteq E$.

Observation 0.11. Suppose that $\text{cf}(\kappa) = \kappa < \kappa^+ < \text{cf}(\lambda) = \lambda$ and that $S_1 \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$ is stationary, while $A = S_\sigma^\lambda$ for some $\sigma = \text{cf}(\sigma) < \kappa$, possibly $\sigma = 1$. Then there is stationary $S_2 \subseteq \lambda$ and a square $\langle e_\delta : \delta \in S_2 \rangle$ of type $\leq \kappa$ nonaccumulating in A , such that $S_1 \cap S_2$ is stationary and

$$E \text{ a club of } \lambda \implies \{\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2 : e_\delta \subseteq E\} \text{ is stationary.}$$

[Why? By Fact 0.6, there is $S_3 \subseteq S_1$ with a square $\langle e_\alpha : \alpha \in S_3 \rangle$ of type $\leq \kappa$ nonaccumulating in A , and that $S_1 \cap S_3$ is stationary. By Fact 0.10, there is club E^* of λ as in the conclusion of Fact 0.10, with $S_3 \cap S_1$ in place of S . Now, letting

$$S_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\sup(\alpha \cap E^*) : \alpha \in \bigcup_{\delta \in S_3} e_\delta \cup \{\delta\} \text{ \& } \alpha > \min(E^*)\},$$

and for $\delta \in S_2$, letting $c_\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{gl}(e_\delta, E^*)$, we observe that $S_2 \cap S_1$ is stationary (as $S_2 \cap S_1 \supseteq S_1 \cap S_3 \cap \text{acc}(E^*)$), and $\langle c_\delta : \delta \in S_2 \rangle$ is a square of type $\leq \kappa$ nonaccumulating in A , while

$$E \text{ a club of } \lambda \implies \{\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2 : c_\delta \subseteq E\} \text{ is stationary.}]$$

1 A ZFC version of ♣

Theorem 1.1. (1) Suppose that

$$(a) \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \theta_1^+ > \theta_1 \geq \theta = \text{cf}(\theta) > \aleph_1 \text{ and } \lambda \geq 2^{\aleph_0},$$

(b) $S^* \subseteq S_\theta^{\lambda^+}$ is stationary, moreover

$$S_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\delta < \lambda^+ : \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta_1^+ \text{ \& } S^* \cap \delta \text{ is stationary}\}$$

is stationary.

Then there is a stationary $S' \subseteq S^*$ and $\langle E_\delta : \delta \in S' \rangle$ such that

- (i) E_δ is a club of δ with $\text{otp}(E_\delta) \leq \lambda^\omega \times \theta_1^+$,
- (ii) for every unbounded $A \subseteq S_\lambda^{\lambda^+}$, for stationarily many $\delta \in S'$, we have

$$\delta = \sup(A \cap \text{nacc}(E_\delta)).$$

(2) We can omit the assumption of $\lambda \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ if $S^* = S_\theta^{\lambda^+}$.

Proof. (1) Let $S_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S_\theta^{\lambda^+}$ and let $A^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S_{\aleph_1}^{\lambda^+}$.

By Observation 0.11, there is a $S_2 \subseteq S_{\leq \theta_1^+}^{\lambda^+}$ such that there is a square $\langle e_\delta : \delta \in S_2 \rangle$ of type $\leq \theta_1^+$ nonaccumulating in A^* , the set $S_1 \cap S_2$ is stationary, and, moreover, for every E a club of λ^+ , the set $\{\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2 : e_\delta \subseteq E\}$ is stationary. [Why can we assume that $S_2 \subseteq S_{\leq \theta_1^+}^{\lambda^+}$? Just throw away the elements of higher cofinality.]

Let $S' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S^* \cap S_2$, so stationary.

Claim 1.2. There is a function $g : S' \rightarrow \omega$ such that for every club E of λ^+ , there are stationarily many $\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2$ such that $e_\delta \subseteq E$ and

$$(\forall n < \omega)[E \cap \delta \cap g^{-1}(\{n\}) \text{ is stationary in } \delta].$$

Proof of the Claim. For $\delta \in S^*$, we choose a sequence $\langle \xi_{\delta,i} : i < \theta \rangle$ increasing with limit δ , and such that $\xi_{\delta,i} \in e_\delta$ and $\text{otp}(e_{\xi_{\delta,i}})$ depends only on i and $\text{otp}(e_\delta)$, but not on δ . For each $i < \theta$, we define a function $h_i : S' \rightarrow \theta_1^+$ by letting

$$h_i(\alpha) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{otp}(e_{\xi_{\alpha,i}}).$$

For $\beta < \theta_1^+$, let $h_i^\beta : S' \rightarrow \beta + 1$ be given by $h_i^\beta(\alpha) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{h_i(\alpha), \beta\}$.

Subclaim 1.3. For some $\beta = \beta^*, i = i^*$, letting $h = h_i^\beta$ we have that for every club E of λ^+ , there are stationarily many $\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2$ such that $e_\delta \subseteq E$ and

$$|\{\zeta \leq \beta : E \cap \delta \cap h^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \text{ is stationary in } \delta\}| \geq \theta_1.$$

Proof of the Subclaim. Suppose the subclaim is not true, so for every $\beta < \theta_1^+$, and $i < \theta$ we can find clubs $E_{\beta,i}^0$ and $E_{\beta,i}^1$ of λ^+ such that $[\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2 \cap E_{\beta,i}^1 \ \& \ e_\delta \subseteq E_{\beta,i}^0] \implies$

$$|\{\zeta \leq \beta : E_{\beta,i}^0 \cap \delta \cap (h_i^\beta)^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \text{ is stationary in } \delta\}| < \theta_1.$$

Let $E^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{acc}(\bigcap_{\beta,i} E_{\beta,i}^0 \cap \bigcap_{\beta,i} E_{\beta,i}^1)$, so a club of λ^+ . Let $\delta \in E^* \cap S_1 \cap S_2$ be such that $e_\delta \subseteq E^*$ and $\delta > \theta_1^+ + 1$. Hence, for all $\beta < \theta_1^+$ and $i < \theta$,

$$|\{\zeta \leq \beta : E^* \cap \delta \cap (h_i^\beta)^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \text{ is stationary in } \delta\}| < \theta_1.$$

Fix $i < \theta$. Note:

$$\zeta < \beta_1 \leq \beta_2 \implies (h_i^{\beta_1})^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) = (h_i^{\beta_2})^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) = h_i^{-1}(\{\zeta\}).$$

By induction on $\varepsilon < \theta_1$ we try to choose $\beta_\varepsilon, \zeta_\varepsilon$ such that

- (i) $\beta_{\varepsilon+1} > \zeta_\varepsilon > \beta_\varepsilon$,
- (ii) $(h_i^{\beta_{\varepsilon+1}})^{-1}(\{\zeta_\varepsilon\}) \cap S' \cap E^*$ is stationary in δ .

The induction must stop somewhere, as otherwise, taking

$$\beta^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{\beta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta_1\},$$

we get $\beta^* < \theta_1^+$, yet

$$\{\zeta \leq \beta^* : (h_i^{\beta^*})^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E^* \text{ is stationary in } \delta\} \supseteq \{\zeta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta_1\},$$

a contradiction. Hence, there is β^i such that for no $\theta_1^+ > \beta > \zeta > \beta^i$ do we have

$$(h_i^\beta)^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E^* \text{ is stationary in } \delta.$$

Let $\beta^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{\beta^i : i < \theta\}$, so $\beta^* < \theta_1^+$ and for no $\theta_1^+ > \beta > \zeta > \beta^*$ and $i < \theta$ do we have that $(h_i^\beta)^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E^*$ is stationary in δ . Note that for every such ζ, β we have $(h_i^\beta)^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) = h_i^{-1}(\{\zeta\})$, for every $i < \theta$. Hence, for every $i < \theta$ there is ζ_i such that

$$\zeta \geq \zeta_i \implies h_i^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E^* \text{ is nonstationary in } \delta.$$

In particular, for $\zeta \geq \zeta_i$, the set $h_i^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap e_\delta$ is nonstationary in δ .

Now let $\zeta^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{\zeta_i : i < \theta\}$, hence $\zeta^* < \theta_1^+$ and

$$\zeta \geq \zeta^* \implies (\forall i < \theta)[h_i^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap e_\delta \text{ is nonstationary in } \delta].$$

As $\text{cf}(\delta) = \theta_1^+$, there is $\alpha^* < \delta$ such that

$$\alpha \in e_\delta \setminus \alpha^* \implies \text{otp}(e_\alpha) > \zeta^*.$$

Without loss of generality $\alpha^* > \theta_1^+$. For such $\alpha \in S'$, let

$$i(\alpha) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{i < \theta : \text{otp}(e_{\xi_{\alpha,i}}) > \zeta^*\},$$

so $i(\alpha) < \alpha$. Now note that, as $\delta \in S_1$, we have that S^* is stationary in δ , so $e_\delta \cap S^*$ is stationary in δ . On the other hand, $e_\delta \subseteq S_2$, hence $S' = S^* \cap S_2$ is stationary in δ . Hence there is $T \subseteq S' \cap e_\delta$ stationary in δ and $i^* < \theta$ such that $\alpha \in T \implies i(\alpha) = i^*$. As $\min(T) > \alpha^* > \theta_1^+$, the function h_{i^*} is regressive on T , hence there is $T' \subseteq T$ stationary in δ and $\zeta^{**} > \zeta^*$ such that

$$\alpha \in T' \implies h_{i^*}(\alpha) = \zeta^{**}.$$

Contradiction. $\star_{1.3}$

Now let i^* and β^* be as guaranteed by Subclaim 1.3. Let $h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h_{i^*}^{\beta^*}$.

Subclaim 1.4. For some $\gamma = \gamma^* \leq \beta^*$ with $\text{cf}(\gamma) = \aleph_0$, for every club E of λ^+ , there are stationary many $\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2$ such that $e_\delta \subseteq E$ and

$$\gamma = \sup\{\zeta < \gamma : h^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E \text{ is stationary in } \delta\}.$$

Proof of the Subclaim. Suppose not. Then for every $\gamma \leq \beta^*$ with $\text{cf}(\gamma) = \aleph_0$, there are clubs E_γ^0 and E_γ^1 of λ^+ such that

$$[\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2 \cap E_\gamma^1 \ \& \ e_\delta \subseteq E_\gamma^0] \implies \\ \gamma > \sup\{\zeta < \gamma : h^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E_\gamma^0 \text{ is stationary in } \delta\}.$$

Let $E^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{acc}(\bigcap_{\gamma \in S_{\aleph_0}^{\beta^*+1}} E_\gamma^0 \cap \bigcap_{\gamma \in S_{\aleph_0}^{\beta^*+1}} E_\gamma^1)$, so a club of λ^+ . By the choice of β^* , there is $\delta \in E^* \cap S_1 \cap S_2$ such that $e_\delta \subseteq E^*$ and

$$|\{\zeta \leq \beta^* : h^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E^* \text{ is stationary in } \delta\}| \geq \theta_1.$$

Hence we can choose $\{\gamma_n : n < \omega\}$ increasing, with $\gamma_n < \beta^*$ and such that $h^{-1}(\{\gamma_n\}) \cap S' \cap E^*$ is stationary in δ , for all $n < \omega$. Let $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{\gamma_n : n < \omega\}$, hence $\text{cf}(\gamma) = \aleph_0$ and $\gamma \leq \beta^*$. This contradicts the choice of E^* . $\star_{1.4}$

Now choose γ^* as in Subclaim 1.4, and let $\langle \gamma_n^* : n < \omega \rangle$ be increasing to γ^* .

Subclaim 1.5. For some $a = a^* \in [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$, for every club E of λ^+ , there are stationarily many $\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2$ such that $e_\delta \subseteq E$ and

$$n \in a \implies (\exists \zeta \in [\gamma_n^*, \gamma_{n+1}^*]) [h^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E^* \text{ stationary in } \delta].$$

Proof of the Subclaim. Suppose not. Then for every $a \in [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$, there are clubs E_a^0 and E_a^1 of λ^+ , such that

$$[\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2 \cap E_a^1 \ \& \ e_\delta \subseteq E_a^0] \implies \\ (\exists n_a \in a)(\forall \zeta \in [\gamma_{n_a}^*, \gamma_{n_a+1}^*]) [h^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E_a^0 \text{ is non-stationary in } \delta].$$

Let $E^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{acc}(\bigcap_{a \in [\omega]^{\aleph_0}} E_a^0 \cap E_a^1)$, a club of λ^+ , as $\lambda \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$. Hence for every $\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2 \cap E^*$ such that $e_\delta \subseteq E^*$ we have that for all $a \in [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$

$$(\exists n_a \in a)(\forall \zeta \in [\gamma_{n_a}^*, \gamma_{n_a+1}^*]) [h^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E^* \text{ is nonstationary in } \delta],$$

in other words

$$\{n : (\exists \zeta \in [\gamma_n^*, \gamma_{n+1}^*]) [h^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E^* \text{ is stationary in } \delta]\}$$

is bounded in ω . Choosing a $\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2 \cap E^*$ such that $e_\delta \subseteq E^*$ and $\gamma^* = \sup\{\zeta < \gamma^* : h^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) \cap S' \cap E^*$ is stationary in $\delta\}$, we obtain a contradiction. $\star_{1.5}$

Let a^* be as in Subclaim 1.5, and let us enumerate $a^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{k_n : n < \omega\}$ increasingly. Let

$$g^{-1}(\{n\}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup \{h^{-1}(\{\zeta\}) : \zeta \in [\gamma_{k_n}^*, \gamma_{k_{n+1}}^*)\}.$$

$\star_{1.2}$

We shall now define $\bar{c} = \langle c_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, so that

(α) For every α , we have that c_α is a club of α with $\text{otp}(c_\alpha) \leq \lambda$,

(β) If $\delta \in S_2$, then $c_\delta \supseteq e_\delta$,

(γ) If $\delta \in S_2$ and $\sup(e_\delta) = \delta$, then $c_\delta = e_\delta$,

Now for any limit $\delta < \lambda^+$ we choose by induction on $n < \omega$ a club C_δ^n of δ of order type $\leq \lambda^{n+1}$, using the following algorithm:

Let $C_\delta^0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c_\delta$. Let

$$C_\delta^{n+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_\delta^n \cup \{\alpha : (\exists \beta \in \text{nacc}(C_\delta^n)) [\sup(\beta \cap C_\delta^n) < \alpha < \beta \ \& \ \alpha \in c_\beta]\}.$$

Note 1.6. (1) The above algorithm really gives C_δ^n which is a club of δ with

$$\text{otp}(C_\delta^n) \leq \lambda^{n+1}.$$

If $\delta \in S_2$, then $\text{otp}(C_\delta^n) \leq \lambda^n \times \theta_1^+$.

[Why? We prove this by induction on n . It is clearly true for $n = 0$. Assume its truth for n . Clearly C_δ^{n+1} is unbounded in δ , let us show that it is closed. Suppose $\alpha = \sup(C_\delta^{n+1} \cap \alpha) < \delta$. If $\alpha = \sup(C_\delta^n \cap \alpha)$, then $\alpha \in C_\delta^n \subseteq C_\delta^{n+1}$ by the induction hypothesis. So, assume

$$\alpha^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup(C_\delta^n \cap \alpha) < \alpha$$

and $\alpha \notin C_\delta^n$. Let $\langle \alpha_i : i < \text{cf}(\alpha) \rangle$ be an increasing to α sequence in $(\alpha^*, \alpha) \cap C_\delta^{n+1}$. Hence for every i there is $\beta_i \in \text{nacc}(C_\delta^n)$ such that

$\alpha_i \in c_{\beta_i}$ and $\sup(C_\delta^n \cap \beta_i) < \alpha_i$. As $\sup(C_\delta^n \cap \alpha) = \alpha^* < \alpha_i$ and $\alpha \notin C_\delta^n$, we have $\beta_i > \alpha$, for every i . Suppose that $i \neq j$ and $\beta_i < \beta_j$. Hence $\sup(C_\delta^n \cap \beta_j) \geq \beta_i > \alpha_j$, a contradiction. So, there is β such that $\beta_i = \beta$ for all i , hence $\{\alpha_i : i < \text{cf}(\alpha)\} \subseteq c_\beta$. As c_β is closed, we have $\alpha \in c_\beta$, and by the definition of C_δ^{n+1} we have $\alpha \in C_\delta^{n+1}$.

As for every β we have $\text{otp}(c_\beta) \leq \lambda$, and by the induction hypothesis $\text{otp}(C_\delta^n) \leq \lambda^{n+1}$, we have $\text{otp}(C_\delta^{n+1}) \leq \lambda^{n+2}$.

Similarly, if $\delta \in S_2$ clearly $\text{otp}(C_\delta^n) \leq \lambda^n \times \theta_1^+$.]

(2) For every n , we have $\text{acc}(C_\delta^n) \subseteq S_{<\lambda}^{\lambda^+}$.

[Why? Again by induction on n . For $n = 0$ it follows as $\text{otp}(c_\delta) \leq \lambda$. Suppose this is true for C_δ^n . The analysis from the proof of (1) shows that for $\alpha \in \text{acc}(C_\delta^{n+1}) \setminus \text{acc}(C_\delta^n)$, there is β such that $\alpha \in c_\beta$, hence $\text{cf}(\alpha) < \lambda$.

(3) For every limit $\delta < \lambda^+$, we have $S_\lambda^\delta = \bigcup_{n < \omega} \text{nacc}(C_\delta^n) \cap S_\lambda^\delta$.

[Why? Fix such δ and let $\alpha \in S_\lambda^\delta$. By item (2), it suffices to show that $\alpha \in C_\delta^n$ for some n . Suppose not, so let $\gamma_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min(C_\delta^n \setminus \alpha)$ for $n < \omega$. Hence $\langle \gamma_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is a non-increasing sequence of ordinals $> \alpha$, and so there is n^* such that $n \geq n^* \implies \gamma_n = \gamma_{n^*}$. In particular we have that $\gamma_{n^*} \in \text{nacc}(C_\delta^{n^*})$. Let $\beta \in c_{\gamma_{n^*}} \setminus \alpha$. Hence $\sup(\beta \cap C_\delta^{n^*}) < \alpha \leq \beta < \gamma_{n^*}$. By the definition of $C_\delta^{n^*+1}$, we have $\beta \in C_\delta^{n^*+1}$, a contradiction.]

Now for each $\delta \in S_1 \cap S_2$ we define

$$E_\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e_\delta \cup \bigcup \{C_\alpha^{g(\alpha)} \setminus \sup(e_\delta \cap \alpha) : \alpha \in \text{nacc}(e_\delta) \cap S'\}.$$

Note first that E_δ is a club of δ , for $\delta \in S'$.

[Why? Clearly, E_δ is unbounded. Suppose $\gamma = \sup(E_\delta \cap \gamma) < \delta$. Without loss of generality we can assume $\gamma \notin e_\delta$. Let $\gamma^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup(e_\delta \cap \gamma) < \gamma$. For every $\beta \in E_\delta \cap (\gamma^*, \gamma)$, there is $\alpha_\beta \in \text{nacc}(e_\delta) \cap S'$ such that $\beta \in C_{\alpha_\beta}^{g(\alpha_\beta)} \setminus \sup(e_\delta \cap \alpha_\beta)$. By the choice of γ^* , every such $\alpha_\beta > \gamma$. Suppose that $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2 \in E_\delta \cap (\gamma^*, \gamma)$ and $\alpha_{\beta_1} < \alpha_{\beta_2}$. Hence $\sup(e_\delta \cap \alpha_{\beta_2}) \geq \alpha_{\beta_1}$, a contradiction. So all α_β are

fixed α . Hence $\gamma < \alpha$ is a limit point of $C_\alpha^{g(\alpha)}$, and we are done, as $C_\alpha^{g(\alpha)}$ is closed.]

Also note that $\text{otp}(E_\delta) < \lambda^\omega \times \theta_1^+$, and that the above argument shows that $\text{acc}(E_\delta) \subseteq S_\lambda^{\lambda^+}$.

Suppose that $A \subseteq S_\lambda^{\lambda^+}$ is unbounded and it exemplifies that $\langle E_\delta : \delta \in S' \rangle$ fails to satisfy the requirements. Hence there is a club E of λ^+ such that

$$\delta \in E \cap S' \implies \sup(A \cap \text{nacc}(E_\delta)) < \delta.$$

Let $E^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{acc}(E) \cap \{\delta : \delta = \sup(A \cap \delta)\}$, hence a club of λ^+ . Let $\delta^* \in S_1 \cap S_2 \cap E^*$ be such that $e_{\delta^*} \subseteq E^*$ and for all $n < \omega$, the set $E^* \cap \delta^* \cap g^{-1}(\{n\})$ is stationary in δ^* .

For $\alpha \in \text{nacc}(e_{\delta^*})$ we have that $A \cap \alpha$ is unbounded in α , hence by Note 1.6(3) (as $A \subseteq S_\lambda^{\lambda^+}$ and $\text{nacc}(e_{\delta^*}) \subseteq S_{\aleph_1}^{\lambda^+}$), there is $n < \omega$ such that $A \cap \text{nacc}(C_\alpha^n)$ is unbounded in α . Let $n^*(\alpha)$ be the smallest such n . There is n^* such that

$$\sup\{\alpha \in \text{nacc}(e_{\delta^*}) : n^*(\alpha) = n^*\} = \delta^*,$$

as $\text{cf}(\delta^*) > \aleph_0$. Let

$$e \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\beta \in \text{acc}(e_{\delta^*}) : \beta = \sup\{\alpha \in \beta \cap \text{nacc}(e_{\delta^*}) : n^*(\alpha) = n^*\}\},$$

hence e is a club of δ^* . By our assumption, $\alpha^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup(A \cap \text{nacc}(E_{\delta^*})) + 1 < \delta^*$. By the choice of g , the set $g^{-1}(\{n^*\}) \cap \delta^*$ is stationary in δ^* . So, there is $\beta \in e \setminus \alpha^*$ such that $g(\beta) = n^*$. Let $\alpha \in (\alpha^*, \beta)$ be such that $\alpha \in \text{nacc}(e_{\delta^*})$ and $n^*(\alpha) = n^*$. Hence $A \cap \text{nacc}(C_\alpha^{n^*})$ is unbounded in α . However,

$$C_\alpha^{n^*} \setminus \sup(\alpha \cap e_{\delta^*}) \subseteq E_{\delta^*},$$

hence there is $\gamma \in A \cap \text{nacc}(C_\beta^{n^*})$ with $\gamma \in E_{\delta^*} \setminus \alpha^*$. As $\gamma \in A$, we have $\text{cf}(\gamma) = \lambda$, hence $\gamma \in \text{nacc}(E_{\delta^*})$, a contradiction with the choice of α^* .

(2) The assumption that $\lambda \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ was used only in the proof of Claim 1.2. If $S^* = S_\theta^{\lambda^+}$, or just if $\{\text{otp}(e_\alpha) : \alpha \in e_\delta \cap S^* \text{ \& } \alpha = \sup(e_\alpha)\}$ does not depend on δ of cofinality θ_1^+ (which is true if $S^* = S_\theta^{\lambda^+}$), then the conclusion of Claim 1.2 easily follows. Namely, if $\delta \in S_1$, then $\text{cf}(\delta) = \theta_1^+ > \aleph_0$, and $\text{otp}(e_\delta) = \theta_1^+$. Hence, the set $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\text{otp}(e_\alpha) : \alpha \in e_\delta \cap S^* \text{ \& } \alpha = \sup(e_\alpha)\}$ is a

club of θ_1^+ . Let $C = \bigcup_{n < \omega} T_n$, where each T_n is a stationary subset of θ_1^+ and T_n 's are pairwise disjoint. Define g on S' by letting $g(\alpha) = n$ if $\text{otp}(e_\alpha) \in T_n$, and if $\alpha \in S'$ and $\text{otp}(e_\alpha) \notin C$, just let $g(\alpha) = 0$. $\star_{1.1}$

2 A negation of guessing

Theorem 2.1. Assume that there is a supercompact cardinal. Then

- (1) It is consistent that there is λ a strong limit singular of cofinality ω , such that $2^\lambda > \lambda^+$ and
 - (*) There is a function $f : \lambda^+ \rightarrow \omega$ such that for every $\mathcal{P} \subseteq [\lambda^+]^\omega$ of cardinality $< 2^\lambda$, for some $X \in [\lambda^+]^{\lambda^+}$ we have
 - (i) $(\forall i < \omega)[|X \cap f^{-1}(\{i\})| = \lambda^+]$,
 - (ii) If $a \in \mathcal{P}$, then $\sup(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright (a \cap X))) < \omega$.
- (2) In (1) we can replace ω by any regular $\kappa < \lambda$, but in the conclusion we do not necessarily obtain that λ is a strong limit.

Remark 2.2. So the theorem basically states that no \mathcal{P} as above provides a guessing.

Proof. (1) We start with a universe in which λ is a supercompact cardinal and GCH holds. We extend the universe by Laver's forcing ([La]), which makes the supercompactness of λ indestructible by any extension by a $(< \lambda)$ -directed-closed forcing. This forcing will preserve the fact that $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$. Let us call the so obtained universe V .

Now choose μ such that $\mu = \mu^\lambda > \lambda^+$. By [Ba], there is a $(< \lambda)$ -closed λ^{++} -cc forcing notion P adding μ unbounded subsets A_α ($\alpha < \mu$) to λ^+ such that

$$(**) \alpha \neq \beta < \mu \implies |A_\alpha \cap A_\beta| < \lambda.$$

In particular in V^P we have $2^\lambda \leq \mu$ and λ is supercompact. In V^P , let Q be Prikry's forcing which does not collapse cardinals and makes λ singular with $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \omega$, [Pr]. As this forcing does not add bounded subsets to λ , in the extension λ is a strong limit singular and clearly satisfies $2^\lambda \leq \mu$. In V^{P*Q} we have (**). We now work in V^{P*Q} .

Let $\lambda = \sum_{\zeta < \omega} \lambda_\zeta$ where each $\lambda_\zeta < \lambda$ is regular. Let χ be large enough regular and $M \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$ with $\|M\| = \lambda^+$ be such that $\lambda^+ \subseteq M$ and $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle \in M$. We list $\bigcup_{\zeta < \omega} ([\lambda^+]^{\lambda_\zeta} \cap M)$ as $\{b_i : i < \lambda^+\}$.

We define $f : \lambda^+ \rightarrow \omega$ by $f(i) = \zeta$ iff $|b_i| = \lambda_\zeta$. For $\alpha < \mu$, let $X_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i : b_i \subseteq A_\alpha\}$.

Now suppose that $\mathcal{P} \subseteq [\lambda^+]^\omega$ is of cardinality $< 2^\lambda \leq \mu$, we shall look for X as required in (*).

If $\alpha < \mu$ is such that X_α fails to serve as X , then one of the following two cases must hold:

Case 1. For some $\zeta < \omega$ we have $|\{i : b_i \subseteq A_\alpha \text{ \& } |b_i| = \lambda_\zeta\}| < \lambda^+$, or

Case 2. For some $a \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $\sup(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright (a \cap X_\alpha))) = \omega$.

Considering the second case, we shall show that for any $a \in \mathcal{P}$, there are $< \lambda$ ordinals α such that the second case holds for X_α, a . Fix an $a \in \mathcal{P}$. If $\alpha < \mu$ is such that Case 2 holds for $X_{\alpha,a}$, then

$$\sup(\{\zeta : (\exists i \in a)[b_i \subseteq A_\alpha \text{ \& } |b_i| = \lambda_\zeta]\}) = \omega.$$

For $\zeta < \omega$ and $\alpha < \mu$ let $B_\zeta^\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in a : b_i \subseteq A_\alpha \text{ \& } |b_i| = \lambda_\zeta\}$. Notice that if $\alpha \neq \beta < \mu$ we have that for some $\zeta_{\alpha,\beta}$ the intersection $A_\alpha \cap A_\beta$ has size $< \lambda_{\zeta_{\alpha,\beta}}$, hence for all $\zeta \geq \zeta_{\alpha,\beta}$ we have $B_\zeta^\alpha \cap B_\zeta^\beta = \emptyset$.

Let $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\alpha : \text{Case 2 holds for } a, \alpha\}$. For every $\alpha \in A$, let

$$S_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\zeta < \omega : B_\zeta^\alpha \neq \emptyset\},$$

hence $\alpha \neq \beta \implies S_\alpha \neq S_\beta$. Hence $|A| \leq 2^\omega < \lambda$.

Now note that if $\alpha \in M$, then $A_\alpha \in M$, so for every $\zeta < \omega$ we have

$$\{i : b_i \subseteq A_\alpha \text{ \& } |b_i| = \lambda_\zeta\} = [A_\alpha]^{\lambda_\zeta} \cap M.$$

As $M \models "[A_\alpha]^{\lambda_\zeta} > \lambda"$, we have $|\{i : b_i \subseteq A_\alpha \text{ \& } |b_i| = \lambda_\zeta\}| = \lambda^+$. Hence Case 1 does not happen for this α .

As we can find $\alpha \in M$ such that Case 2 does not happen, we finish.

(2) Use Magidor's forcing from [Ma] in place of Prikry's forcing. ★_{2.1}

References

- [Ba] J. E. Baumgartner, *Almost-disjoint sets, the dense set problem and the partition calculus*, Annals of Mathematical Logic 10 (1976) 401-439.
- [La] R. Laver, *Making the supercompactness of κ indestructible under κ -directed closed forcing*, Israel Journal of Math, vol. 29 (1978), pp. 385-388.
- [DjSh 545] Mirna Džamonja and S. Shelah, *Saturated filters at successors of singulars, weak reflection and yet another weak club principle*, Annals of Pure And Applied Logic 79 (1996) 289-316.
- [Ma] M. Magidor, *Changing cofinality of cardinals*, Fundamenta Mathematicae, XCIX (1978), 61-71.
- [Pr] K. Prikry, *Changing measurable into accesible cardinals*, Dissertationes Math. 68 (1970).
- [Sh -g] S. Shelah, *Cardinal Arithmetic*, Oxford University Press 1994.
- [Sh 351] S. Shelah, *Reflecting stationary sets and successors of singular cardinals*, Arch. Math. Logic (1991) 31:25-53.
- [Sh 355] S. Shelah, Chapter II in *Cardinal Arithmetic*, Oxford University Press 1994.
- [Sh 365] S. Shelah, Chapter III in *Cardinal Arithmetic*, Oxford University Press 1994.