

# DIAMOND ON SUCCESSOR CARDINALS

ASSAF RINOT

ABSTRACT. We include a proof to the main result of Shelah's paper 922, e.g., that for uncountable  $\lambda$ ,  $(2^\lambda = \lambda^+ \text{ iff } \diamond_{\lambda^+})$ . The presentation follows a lecture given by Péter Komjáth at the HUJI seminar on 28/Dec/2007.

**Theorem** (Shelah). *Suppose  $\lambda$  is a cardinal satisfying  $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$ .*

*Then  $\diamond_S$  holds for any stationary  $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda^+ \mid \text{cf}(\delta) \neq \text{cf}(\lambda)\}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix a stationary set  $S$  as above. In particular,  $\lambda$  is uncountable. To avoid trivialities, we may also assume that  $S \cap \lambda = \emptyset$  and that  $S$  contains no successor ordinals. Set  $\kappa := \text{cf}(\lambda)$ . For each  $\delta \in S$ , let  $\{A_i^\delta \mid i < \kappa\}$  be an increasing chain of elements of  $[\delta]^{<\lambda}$  satisfying  $\delta = \bigcup_{i < \kappa} A_i^\delta$ .

For all  $\delta \in S$ , since  $\text{cf}(\delta) < \lambda$ , we may also assume that  $\sup(A_0^\delta) = \delta$ .

*Notation.* For  $X \subseteq I \times Y$  and  $i \in I$ , write  $(X)_i = \{y \mid (i, y) \in X\}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose  $\{X_\beta \mid \beta < \lambda^+\}$  is an enumeration of  $[\kappa \times (\lambda \times \lambda^+)]^{\leq \lambda}$ .*

*Then there exists some  $i < \kappa$  such that for all  $Z \subseteq \lambda \times \lambda^+$ , the following is stationary:*

$$S_{i,Z} := \{\delta \in S \mid \sup\{\alpha \in A_i^\delta \mid \exists \beta \in A_i^\delta (Z \cap (\lambda \times \alpha) = (X_\beta)_i)\} = \delta\}.$$

*Proof.* Suppose not. Then for all  $i < \kappa$ , we may find some  $Z_i \subseteq \lambda \times \lambda^+$  and a club  $D_i \subseteq \lambda^+$  that avoids  $S_{i,Z_i}$ . Define  $f : \lambda^+ \rightarrow \lambda^+$  by:

$$f(\alpha) := \min\{\beta < \lambda^+ \mid X_\beta = \bigcup_{j < \kappa} \{j\} \times (Z_j \cap (\lambda \times \alpha))\}.$$

Let  $D \subseteq \bigcap_{i < \kappa} D_i$  be a club such that  $f(\alpha) < \delta$  for all  $\alpha < \delta \in D$ .

Clearly, for  $\delta \in D$ :

$$A_0^\delta = \{\alpha \in A_0^\delta \mid \exists \beta < \delta \forall j < \kappa (Z_j \cap (\lambda \times \alpha) = (X_\beta)_j)\}.$$

Fix  $\delta \in D \cap S$ . For  $i < \kappa$ , write:

$$B_i^\delta := \{\alpha \in A_0^\delta \mid \exists \beta \in A_i^\delta \forall j < \kappa (Z_j \cap (\lambda \times \alpha) = (X_\beta)_j)\}.$$

By  $A_0^\delta = \bigcup_{i < \kappa} B_i^\delta$ ,  $\sup A_0^\delta = \delta$  and  $\text{cf}(\delta) \neq \kappa$ , there must exist some  $i < \kappa$  with  $\sup(B_i^\delta) = \delta$ . In particular:

$$\sup\{\alpha \in A_i^\delta \mid \exists \beta \in A_i^\delta (Z_i \cap (\lambda \times \alpha) = (X_\beta)_i)\} = \delta,$$

i.e.,  $\delta \in S_{i,Z_i}$ . A contradiction to  $\delta \in D_i$ . □

---

*Date:* January 1, 2008.

**Corollary 2.** *There exists a sequence  $\langle A^\delta \in [\delta]^{<\lambda} \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ , and an enumeration  $\{X_\beta \mid \beta < \lambda^+\} = [\lambda \times \lambda^+]^{\leq \lambda}$  such that for all  $Z \subseteq \lambda \times \lambda^+$ , the following set is stationary:*

$$S_Z := \{\delta \in S \mid \sup\{\alpha \in A^\delta \mid \exists \beta \in A^\delta (Z \cap (\lambda \times \alpha) = X_\beta)\} = \delta\}.$$

*Proof.* Take  $i$  as above, and consider  $\langle A_i^\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$  and  $\{(X_\beta)_i \mid \beta < \lambda^+\}$ .  $\square$

Let us fix such sequence  $\langle A^\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$  and enumeration  $\{X_\beta \mid \beta < \lambda^+\}$ .

We shall now recursively define a sequence of subsets of  $\lambda^+$ ,  $\langle Y_\tau \mid \tau < \lambda \rangle$ , and a  $\subseteq$ -decreasing sequence of clubs of  $\lambda^+$ ,  $\langle E_\tau \mid \tau < \lambda \rangle$ .

*Notation.* Whenever  $\langle Y_\tau \mid \tau < \gamma \rangle$  is defined, we shall denote for  $\delta \in S$ :

$$V_\gamma^\delta = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in A^\delta \times A^\delta \mid \forall \tau < \gamma (Y_\tau \cap \alpha = (X_\beta)_\tau)\}.$$

We start the recursion by letting  $E_0 = Y_0 = \lambda^+$ . Suppose now  $\langle (Y_\tau, E_\tau) \mid \tau < \gamma \rangle$  has been defined for some  $\gamma < \lambda$ . Clearly, for any set  $Y_\gamma$ , and any  $\delta \in S$ , we would have  $V_\gamma^\delta \supseteq V_{\gamma+1}^\delta$ . If there exists a set  $Y_\gamma \subseteq \lambda^+$  and a club  $E_\gamma \subseteq \bigcap_{\tau < \gamma} E_\tau$  such that for all  $\delta \in E_\gamma \cap S$ :

$$\sup\{\alpha < \delta \mid \exists \beta < \delta ((\alpha, \beta) \in V_\gamma^\delta)\} = \delta \text{ implies } V_\gamma^\delta \neq V_{\gamma+1}^\delta,$$

then continue the recursion with such  $Y_\gamma$  and  $E_\gamma$ . Otherwise, terminate the recursion.

**Claim 3.** *The recursion must terminate at some  $\gamma^* < \lambda$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not, and let  $\langle Y_\tau \mid \tau < \lambda \rangle$ ,  $\langle E_\tau \mid \tau < \lambda \rangle$  be the output sequences. Put  $E = \bigcap_{\tau < \lambda} E_\tau$  and  $Z = \bigcup_{\tau < \lambda} \{\tau\} \times Y_\tau$ .

Fix  $\delta \in E \cap S_Z$ . Then by definition of  $S_Z$ :

$$\sup\{\alpha \in A^\delta \mid \exists \beta \in A^\delta (Z \cap (\lambda \times \alpha) = X_\beta)\} = \delta,$$

In other words:

$$\sup\{\alpha \in A^\delta \mid \exists \beta \in A^\delta \forall \tau < \lambda (Y_\tau \cap \alpha = (X_\beta)_\tau)\} = \delta.$$

It follows that  $\sup\{\alpha < \delta \mid \exists \beta < \delta ((\alpha, \beta) \in V_\gamma^\delta)\} = \delta$  for all  $\gamma < \lambda$ . Since  $S_Z \subseteq S$ , the recursive construction gives that  $\langle V_\gamma^\delta \mid \gamma < \lambda \rangle$  is a strictly  $\subseteq$ -decreasing sequence of subsets  $A^\delta \times A^\delta$ , contradicting the fact that  $|A^\delta| < \lambda$ .  $\square$

Thus, let  $\gamma^*$  be the point at which the recursion terminates, and let  $\langle Y_\tau \mid \tau < \gamma^* \rangle, \langle E_\tau \mid \tau < \gamma^* \rangle$  be the resulted sequences. Set  $E = \bigcap_{\tau < \gamma^*} E_\tau$ .

For every  $\delta \in S \cap E$ , put:

$$S_\delta := \bigcup \{(X_\beta)_{\gamma^*} \mid (\alpha, \beta) \in V_{\gamma^*}^\delta\}.$$

**Claim 4.**  $\{S_\delta \mid \delta \in E \cap S\}$  exemplify  $\diamond_S$ .

*Proof.* Assume towards a contradiction that there exists a set  $Y \subseteq \lambda^+$  and a club  $C \subseteq E$  such that  $S_\delta \neq Y \cap \delta$  for all  $\delta \in C \cap S$ .

Following the notation of the recursion, write  $Y_{\gamma^*} := Y$ .

Let  $Z = \bigcup_{\tau \leq \gamma^*} \{\tau\} \times Y_\tau$ . Then, for  $\delta \in C \cap S_Z$ , we have:

$$\sup\{\alpha \in A^\delta \mid \exists \beta \in A^\delta \forall \tau \leq \gamma^* (Y_\tau \cap \alpha = (X_\beta)_\tau)\} = \delta.$$

So,  $\sup\{\alpha < \delta \mid \exists \beta < \delta ((\alpha, \beta) \in V_{\gamma^*}^\delta)\} = \delta$ , and also:

$$Y \cap \delta = \bigcup\{(X_\beta)_{\gamma^*} \mid (\alpha, \beta) \in V_{\gamma^*+1}^\delta\}.$$

It follows that if  $V_{\gamma^*+1}^\delta = V_{\gamma^*}^\delta$ , then  $Y \cap \delta = S_\delta$ . However, by the choice of  $Y$  and  $\delta \in C$ , this is not the case, i.e.,  $V_{\gamma^*+1}^\delta \neq V_{\gamma^*}^\delta$ .

But if  $\sup\{\alpha < \delta \mid \exists \beta < \delta ((\alpha, \beta) \in V_{\gamma^*}^\delta)\} = \delta$  and  $V_{\gamma^*+1}^\delta \neq V_{\gamma^*}^\delta$  for all  $\delta \in S \cap C$ , this means that the recursion could have been continued using  $Y$  and  $C$ , while it was terminated at  $\gamma^*$ . A contradiction.  $\square$

$\square$

*Remark.* To see that the above theorem is optimal, we mention the following two results concerning successors of regular and singular cardinals.

**Theorem** (Shelah).  $2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_2$  is consistent with the failure of  $\diamond_S$  for  $S = \{\alpha < \omega_2 \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \aleph_1\}$ .

**Theorem** (Magidor). Assume GCH and that  $\kappa$  is a measurable cardinal.

In the generic extension of prikry forcing, GCH holds,  $\kappa^+$  is a successor of a singular cardinal of countable cofinality, and  $\diamond_S$  fails for some stationary  $S \subseteq \{\alpha < \kappa^+ \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \aleph_0\}$ .

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY, TA 69978, ISRAEL  
URL: <http://www.tau.ac.il/~rinot>