

Cardinal characteristics on κ modulo non-stationary

Johannes Philipp Schürz *

Abstract

For κ regular and uncountable we define variants of the classical cardinal characteristics modulo the non-stationary ideal.

1 Introduction

Cardinal characteristics of $\mathfrak{P}(\kappa)$ for κ at least inaccessible have been studied extensively in the last few years: [BTFFM17], [FMSS19], [FS18], [RS17] and [RS19] are just a few examples. Similar to the classical case on ω , these ‘higher’ cardinal characteristics are usually defined modulo the bounded ideal, e.g. x is almost disjoint to y iff $|x \cap y| < \kappa$ for $x, y \subseteq \kappa$ and $\mathfrak{a}_\kappa := \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\kappa) \text{ is a maximal almost disjoint family} \wedge |\mathcal{A}| \geq \kappa\}$. The cardinal characteristics $\mathfrak{p}_\kappa, \mathfrak{t}_\kappa, \mathfrak{s}_\kappa, \mathfrak{b}_\kappa, \mathfrak{d}_\kappa, \mathfrak{r}_\kappa$ and \mathfrak{u}_κ are defined similarly.

Let κ be regular uncountable. In this paper we intend to define variants of these ‘higher’ cardinal characteristics modulo the non-stationary ideal. To this end we define the club filter $Cl := \{x \subseteq \kappa : \exists y \subseteq x \text{ } y \text{ is club}\}$, the non-stationary ideal $NS := \{x \subseteq \kappa : \exists y \in Cl \ x \cap y = \emptyset\}$ and the set of stationary sets $St := \mathfrak{P}(\kappa) \setminus NS$. Note that while the property $x \in Cl$ is upwards absolute for models with the same cofinalities, the properties $x \in NS$ and $x \in St$ are in general not.

We will now define several relations on $St \times St$ modulo the non-stationary ideal and use them to define cardinal characteristics of St :

Definition 1.1. Let $x, y \in St$. We define:

- y stationarily splits x iff $x \cap y \in St$ and $x \setminus y \in St$.
- $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} := \min\{|\mathcal{S}| : \mathcal{S} \subseteq St \wedge \forall x \in St \exists y \in \mathcal{S} \text{ } y \text{ stationarily splits } x\}$ the stationary splitting number and
- $\mathfrak{r}_\kappa^{cl} := \min\{|\mathcal{R}| : \mathcal{R} \subseteq St \wedge \forall x \in St \exists y \in \mathcal{R} \neg(x \text{ stationarily splits } y)\}$ the stationary reaping number

*supported by FWF project I3081

- $x \subseteq_{cl}^* y$ iff $x \setminus y \in NS$.
 $\mathcal{F} \subseteq St$ has the $<\kappa$ -stationary intersection property iff for every $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of size $<\kappa$ we have that $\bigcap_{x \in \mathcal{F}'} x \in St$.
 $\mathfrak{p}_\kappa^{cl} := \min\{|\mathcal{P}|: \mathcal{P} \subseteq St \wedge \mathcal{P} \text{ has the } <\kappa\text{-stationary intersection property} \wedge \neg(\exists x \in St \forall y \in \mathcal{P} x \subseteq_{cl}^* y)\}$ the stationary pseudo intersection number
 $\mathfrak{t}_\kappa^{cl} := \min\{|\mathcal{T}|: \mathcal{T} \subseteq St \wedge \mathcal{T} \text{ has the } <\kappa\text{-stationary intersection property} \wedge \mathcal{T} \text{ is well-ordered by } \subseteq_{cl}^* \wedge \neg(\exists x \in St \forall y \in \mathcal{T} x \subseteq_{cl}^* y)\}$ the stationary tower number ¹
- x is stationary almost disjoint to y iff $x \cap y \in NS$.
 $\mathfrak{a}_\kappa^{cl} := \min\{|\mathcal{A}|: \mathcal{A} \text{ is a maximal stationary almost disjoint family} \wedge |\mathcal{A}| \geq \kappa\}$ the stationary almost disjointness number
- $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{cl} := \min\{|\mathcal{B}|: \mathcal{B} \subseteq St \wedge \exists \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\kappa) \mathcal{U} \text{ is an ultrafilter} \wedge \mathcal{B} \text{ is a base for } \mathcal{U}\}$ ² the stationary ultrafilter number
 $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{cl*} := \min\{|\mathcal{B}|: \mathcal{B} \subseteq St \wedge \exists \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\kappa) \mathcal{U} \text{ is an ultrafilter} \wedge \mathcal{B} \cup Cl \text{ is a subbase for } \mathcal{U}\}$ ³ the stationary* ultrafilter number
 $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{me} := \min\{|\mathcal{B}|: \mathcal{B} \subseteq St \wedge \exists \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\kappa) \mathcal{U} \text{ is a measure} \wedge \mathcal{B} \text{ is a base for } \mathcal{U}\}$ ⁴ the measure ultrafilter number
 $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm} := \min\{|\mathcal{B}|: \mathcal{B} \subseteq St \wedge \exists \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\kappa) \mathcal{U} \text{ is a normal measure} \wedge \mathcal{B} \text{ is a base for } \mathcal{U}\}$ the normal measure ultrafilter number
 $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm*} := \min\{|\mathcal{B}|: \mathcal{B} \subseteq St \wedge \exists \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\kappa) \mathcal{U} \text{ is a normal measure} \wedge \mathcal{B} \cup Cl \text{ is a subbase for } \mathcal{U}\}$ the normal measure* ultrafilter number
- Let $f, g \in \kappa^\kappa$ and define $f \leq_{cl}^* g$ iff $\{\alpha < \kappa: g(\alpha) < f(\alpha)\} \in NS$.
 $\mathfrak{b}_\kappa^{cl} := \min\{|\mathcal{B}|: \mathcal{B} \subseteq \kappa^\kappa \wedge \forall g \in \kappa^\kappa \exists f \in \mathcal{B} f \not\leq_{cl}^* g\}$ the club unbounded number
 $\mathfrak{d}_\kappa^{cl} := \min\{|\mathcal{D}|: \mathcal{D} \subseteq \kappa^\kappa \wedge \forall f \in \kappa^\kappa \exists g \in \mathcal{D} f \leq_{cl}^* g\}$ the club dominating number

We will aim to establish some relations between these cardinal characteristics and also show some consistency results.

2 Results / Questions

The notions of club unbounded and dominating number have already been investigated by Cummings and Shelah (see [CS95]). In particular they showed the following theorem:

Theorem 2.1. Let κ be regular uncountable. Then $\mathfrak{b}_\kappa = \mathfrak{b}_\kappa^{cl}$. If $\kappa \geq \beth_\omega$ then $\mathfrak{d}_\kappa = \mathfrak{d}_\kappa^{cl}$.

The stationary almost disjointness number \mathfrak{a}_κ^{cl} is trivial:

Lemma 2.2. Let κ be regular uncountable. Then $\mathfrak{a}_\kappa^{cl} = \kappa$.

¹Note that the notions of \mathfrak{p}_κ^{cl} and \mathfrak{t}_κ^{cl} introduced here are different to the ones defined in [FMSS19].

²Hence $Cl \subseteq \mathcal{U}$.

³i.e. $\{y \in St: \exists x \in \mathcal{B} \exists cl \in Cl y = x \cap cl\}$ is a base for \mathcal{U} , since w.l.o.g. \mathcal{B} is closed under intersections.

⁴i.e. \mathcal{U} is a $<\kappa$ -complete ultrafilter.

Proof. Partition κ into κ many stationary sets $(x_i)_{i < \kappa}$. Define $y_i := \kappa \setminus \bigcup_{j \leq i} x_j$ and set $x_\kappa := \bigtriangleup_{i < \kappa} y_i$. Note that $x_i \cap x_\kappa \in NS$ for every $i < \kappa$. Now we have to distinguish two cases:

- If $x_\kappa \in St$, then we claim that the family $(x_i)_{i \leq \kappa}$ is maximal stationary almost disjoint. Towards a contradiction assume that $x^* \in St$ is stationary almost disjoint to x_i for every $i \leq \kappa$. We define a function $f: x^* \rightarrow \kappa$ such that $f(k)$ is the unique $i < \kappa$ such that $k \in x_i$. Equivalently $f(k) := \min\{i < \kappa: k \notin y_i\}$. If the set $\{k \in x^*: f(k) < k\}$ is stationary, then by Fodor's lemma (see [Jec03]) the set $\{k \in x^*: f(k) = \delta\}$ is stationary for some $\delta < \kappa$. But this implies that $x^* \cap x_\delta \in St$. Hence the set $\{k \in x^*: f(k) \geq k\}$ is stationary, and therefore $x^* \cap x_\kappa \in St$. But this also leads to a contradiction, hence $(x_i)_{i \leq \kappa}$ is a maximal stationary almost disjoint family.
- If $x_\kappa \in NS$, then we proceed similarly and claim that $(x_i)_{i < \kappa}$ is maximal stationary almost disjoint. We define $f: x^* \rightarrow \kappa$ as above, and note that $\{k \in x^*: f(k) \geq k\}$ cannot be stationary. Hence there exists $\delta < \kappa$ such that $x^* \cap x_\delta \in St$.

□

Let us say a few words about the spectrum of stationary almost disjointness:

Definition 2.3. We define $\text{Spec}_{\text{sad}} := \{\gamma \geq \kappa: \exists \mathcal{A} \text{ } \mathcal{A} \text{ is a maximal stationary almost disjoint family } \wedge |\mathcal{A}| = \gamma\}$.

Definition 2.4. Let $x \in St$. We say that $NS \upharpoonright x$ is γ -saturated iff for every stationary almost disjoint family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(x)$ we have $|\mathcal{A}| < \gamma$.

Obviously, this definition agrees with the usual definition of saturation (see [Jec03]).

The next lemma will summarize some properties of Spec_{sad} :

Lemma 2.5. The following holds true for κ regular uncountable:

1. By Lemma 2.2 we have $\kappa \in \text{Spec}_{\text{sad}}$.
2. By [GS97] we have NS is not κ^+ -saturated for $\kappa \geq \omega_2$, hence $\{\kappa\} \subsetneq \text{Spec}_{\text{sad}}$.
3. If $\diamond_\kappa(\kappa)$ holds (see Definition 2.9), then $2^\kappa \in \text{Spec}_{\text{sad}}$.
4. By [Git86] it is consistent that κ is inaccessible and there exists $x \in St$ such that $x \cap \{i < \kappa: \text{cf}(i) = j\} \in St$ for all cardinals $j < \kappa$ and $NS \upharpoonright x$ is κ^+ -saturated. By [JW85] it is consistent that κ is Mahlo and $NS \upharpoonright \text{Reg}$ is κ^+ -saturated.

Question 2.6. Is it consistent that NS is 2^κ -saturated for κ inaccessible? Is it even consistent that NS is κ^{++} -saturated and 2^κ is very large?

In [GS97] the authors ask whether the following is consistent for κ inaccessible: $\forall x \in St \exists y \in St: y \subseteq x \wedge NS \upharpoonright y$ is κ^+ -saturated.

Also the stationary pseudo intersection number \mathfrak{p}_κ^{cl} and the stationary tower number \mathfrak{t}_κ^{cl} are trivial:

Lemma 2.7. Let κ be regular uncountable. Then $\mathfrak{p}_\kappa^{cl} = \mathfrak{t}_\kappa^{cl} = \kappa$.

Proof. It will suffice to show that there exists a decreasing sequence $(x_i)_{i < \kappa}$ of stationary sets such that $\Delta_{i < \kappa} x_i = \{0\}$: Assume that x^* is a stationary pseudo intersection of $(x_i)_{i < \kappa}$. Again define $f: x^* \rightarrow \kappa$ such that $f(j) := \min\{i < \kappa: j \notin x_i\}$ and again we note that $\{j \in x^*: f(j) < j\} \in NS$. Hence, $x^* \subseteq_{cl}^* \Delta_{i < \kappa} x_i$ must hold, which leads to a contradiction.

Therefore, let us show that there exists such a sequence $(x_i)_{i < \kappa}$. Let $E_\omega^\kappa := \{i < \kappa: cf(i) = \omega\}$ and for every $k \in E_\omega^\kappa$ let $(j_n^k)_{n < \omega}$ be a cofinal sequence in k . We claim that there exists $n^* < \omega$ such that for every $i < \kappa$ the set $x_i := \{k < \kappa: j_{n^*}^k \geq i\}$ is stationary. Assume towards a contradiction that for every $n < \omega$ there exist $i_n < \kappa$ such that $x_{i_n} \in NS$ and let cl_n be a club disjoint to x_{i_n} . We define $i^* := \sup_{n < \omega} i_n$ and $cl^* := \bigcap_{n < \omega} cl_n$. Let $k^* \in E_\omega^\kappa \cap cl^*$ with $k^* > i^*$. Then it follows that $j_{n^*}^{k^*} < i^*$ for every $n < \omega$. But this contradicts the assumption that $(j_n^{k^*})_{n < \omega}$ is cofinal in k^* .

Hence let n^* and $(x_i)_{i < \kappa}$ be as defined above. It remains to be shown that $\Delta_{i < \kappa} x_i = \{0\}$. Assume towards a contradiction that there exists $k > 0$ such that $k \in \Delta_{i < \kappa} x_i$. This means that $j_{n^*}^k \geq i$ for every $i < k$. But this is a contradiction. \square

Next, we investigate the stationary reaping number \mathfrak{r}_κ^{cl} :

Theorem 2.8. $\mathfrak{r}_\kappa^{cl} \geq \kappa$ for κ inaccessible.

Proof. Let $(x_i)_{i < \lambda}$ with $\lambda < \kappa$ be a family of stationary sets and w.l.o.g. assume that $\kappa \subseteq_{cl}^* \bigcup_{i < \lambda} x_i$. Assume that $(x_{i,j})_{j < \lambda}$ is a partition of x_i into λ many stationary sets and define $x_{i,\lambda} := \kappa \setminus x_i$ for every $i < \lambda$. We will find a common refinement of the partitions $(x_{i,j})_{j \leq \lambda}$.

For every $s \in (\lambda + 1)^\lambda$ define $y_s := \bigcap_{i < \lambda} x_{i,s(i)}$. Clearly, if $s_1, s_2 \in (\lambda + 1)^\lambda$ with $s_1 \neq s_2$ then $y_{s_1} \cap y_{s_2} = \emptyset$. Now set $S := \{s \in (\lambda + 1)^\lambda: y_s \in St\}$ and note that since $(\lambda + 1)^\lambda < \kappa$ and every $x_{i,j} = \bigcup_{s \in (\lambda + 1)^\lambda, s(i)=j} y_s$, we clearly have that $\kappa \subseteq_{cl}^* \bigcup_{s \in S} y_s$ and $(y_s)_{s \in S}$ refines every partition $(x_{i,j})_{j \leq \lambda}$.

Since the y_s are pairwise disjoint, one can now easily construct a set $y^* \in St$ which stationarily splits y_s for every $s \in S$, and hence stationarily splits x_i for every $i < \lambda$. \square

We will later see that $\mathfrak{r}_\kappa^{cl} > \kappa$ can be forced.

Definition 2.9. Let $x \subseteq \kappa$ be stationary. We say that $\diamond_\kappa(x)$ holds iff there exists a sequence $(s_i)_{i \in x}$ with $s_i \subseteq i$ and for every $y \subseteq \kappa$ the set $\{i \in x: y \upharpoonright i = s_i\}$ is stationary (see [Jec03]).

Question 2.10. Is $\mathfrak{r}_\kappa^{cl} = \kappa$ consistent? Does $\forall x \in St: \diamond_\kappa(x)$ imply $\mathfrak{r}_\kappa^{cl} > \kappa$? How does \mathfrak{r}_κ^{cl} relate to \mathfrak{r}_κ ?

Concerning the various definitions of ultrafilter numbers:

Lemma 2.11. For κ measurable we have:

1. $\kappa^+ \leq \mathfrak{r}_\kappa \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{cl} \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm}$
2. $\kappa \leq \mathfrak{r}_\kappa^{cl} \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{cl*} \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm*}$, $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{cl*} \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{cl}$ and $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm*} \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm}$
3. $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{me} = \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm}$ and $\kappa^+ \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm*}$

Proof. 1.) and 2.) should be obvious (using Theorem 2.8). Hence let us prove 3.): We clearly have $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{me} \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm}$. On the other hand let \mathcal{U} be a measure such that there exists a base \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{U} with $|\mathcal{B}| = \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{me}$. Let V^κ/\mathcal{U} denote the ultrapower of V modulo \mathcal{U} , let $M := \text{mos}(V^\kappa/\mathcal{U})$ be the transitive collapse and $j: V \rightarrow M$ the elementary embedding. Pick $f: \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ such that $\kappa = \text{mos}([f]_{\mathcal{U}})$. Then $\mathcal{V} := \{x \subseteq \kappa: \kappa \in j(x)\}$ is a normal measure and it easily follows that $\mathcal{V} = \{x \subseteq \kappa: \exists y \in \mathcal{U} f[y] \subseteq x\}$. Hence $f[\mathcal{B}]$ is a base of \mathcal{V} and $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm} \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{me}$ follows.

To show that $\kappa^+ \leq \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm*}$ we assume towards a contradiction that \mathcal{U} is a normal ultrafilter and there exists $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ with $|\mathcal{B}| = \kappa$ such that $\{y \in St: \exists x \in \mathcal{B} \exists cl \in Cl y = x \cap cl\}$ is a base of \mathcal{U} . If we enumerate \mathcal{B} as $(x_i)_{i < \kappa}$ then we see that $\Delta_{i < \kappa} x_i \in \mathcal{U}$. But for all $x \in \mathcal{B}$ we have $x \not\subseteq_{cl}^* \Delta_{i < \kappa} x_i$ which leads to a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.12. By [BTFFM17] the following is consistent: $\kappa^+ < \mathfrak{r}_\kappa = \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm} < 2^\kappa$.

Question 2.13. Are there any other provable relations between the various ultrafilter numbers? Are $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{cl*} < \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{cl}$ or $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm*} < \mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{nm}$ consistent? Is even $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa^{cl*} = \kappa$ consistent?

Let us now investigate the stationary splitting number \mathfrak{s}_κ^{cl} :

Theorem 2.14. For κ regular uncountable we have $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} \geq \kappa$ iff κ is inaccessible.

Proof. We follow the proof of [Suz93]. First assume that κ is not inaccessible, hence there exists a minimal $\lambda < \kappa$ such that $2^\lambda \geq \kappa$. Let $f: \kappa \rightarrow 2^\lambda$ be injective and for every $s \in 2^{<\lambda}$ define $x_s := \{i < \kappa: s \triangleleft f(i)\}$. We set $X := \{x_s: s \in 2^{<\lambda} \wedge x_s \in St\}$ which is of size $2^{<\lambda} < \kappa$, and claim that X is a stationary splitting family. Towards a contradiction assume that $y \in St$ is not stationarily split by X . It follows that the set $S := \{s \in 2^{<\lambda}: y \subseteq_{cl}^* x_s\}$ is linearly ordered by \triangleleft , because for incompatible $s_1, s_2 \in 2^{<\lambda}$ we have that x_{s_1} and x_{s_2} are disjoint. Let us define $t := \bigcup_{s \in S} s \in 2^\lambda$. Now we can deduce that $y \subseteq f^{-1}(\{t\}) \cup \bigcup_{s \in 2^{<\lambda} \setminus S} x_s$. However, this leads to a contradiction, because y would be covered by a union of $< \kappa$ many non-stationary sets.

On the other hand assume that κ is inaccessible and let $X \subseteq St$ be of size $\lambda < \kappa$. Let θ be large enough and choose an elementary submodel $M \prec H(\theta)$ with $\kappa, X \in M$, $X, 2^\lambda \subseteq M$ and $|M| < \kappa$. Now pick $i^* > \sup(M \cap \kappa)$ such that $i^* \in \bigcap_{cl \in Cl \cap M} cl$. The ordinal i^* induces a partition Y_0, Y_1 of X : set $Y_0 := \{x \in X: i^* \notin x\}$ and $Y_1 := \{x \in X: i^* \in x\}$. Since $2^\lambda \subseteq M$ we can deduce that also $Y_0, Y_1 \in M$, and hence $y := \bigcap Y_1 \setminus \bigcup Y_0 \in M$. If we can show that $y \in St$, this will imply that X is not a stationary splitting family. To this end let $cl \in Cl \cap M$ be arbitrary, and we obviously have $H(\theta) \models i^* \in y \cap cl$. By elementarity it follows that $M \models y \cap cl \neq \emptyset$, and since cl was arbitrary, we can deduce that $M \models y \in St$. Again by elementarity we have $y \in St$. \square

The following definition already appeared in [HS18]:

Definition 2.15. Let $F \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\kappa)$ be a uniform filter ⁵, i.e. for every $x \in F$ we have

⁵In particular we can assume that F contains the co-bounded filter.

$|x| = \kappa$. We define:

- F is $<\kappa$ -complete* iff for every $\lambda < \kappa$ and every $(x_i)_{i<\lambda}$ with $x_i \in F$ we have $|\bigcap_{i<\lambda} x_i| = \kappa$.⁶
- F is normal* iff for every $(x_i)_{i<\kappa}$ with $x_i \in F$ we have that $\Delta_{i<\kappa} x_i$ is stationary.
- F measures a set $X \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\kappa)$ iff for every $x \in X$ either $x \in F$ or $\kappa \setminus x \in F$ holds true.

Note that we explicitly do not require that the (diagonal) intersection is again an element of F . Clearly, if F is normal*, then it is also $<\kappa$ -complete*.

Definition 2.16. We say that κ has the normal* filter property iff for every $X \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\kappa)$ of size $\leq \kappa$ there exists a normal* filter F measuring X .

The following notion clearly strengthens weak compactness and is downwards absolute to L (see [JK69]):

Definition 2.17. Recall that κ is ineffable iff for every partition $f: [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ there exists a stationary homogeneous set $x \subseteq \kappa$.

The following theorem was proven in [DPZ80]:

Theorem 2.18. Let κ be regular uncountable. Then κ has the normal* filter property iff κ is ineffable.

Theorem 2.19. For κ regular uncountable we have $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} > \kappa$ iff κ is ineffable.

Proof. We will show that $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} > \kappa$ iff κ has the normal* filter property. Then this theorem follows by Theorem 2.18.

Let us first assume that $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} > \kappa$ and let $X \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\kappa)$ be of size $\leq \kappa$. We will show that there exists a normal* filter F measuring X . W.l.o.g. X is closed under compliments. Since $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} > \kappa$ there exists $y^* \in St$ such that X does not stationarily split y^* . Now we define $F := \{x \in X : y^* \subseteq_{cl}^* x\}$ and note that F is obviously an ultrafilter on X . We claim that F is normal*. Let $(x_i)_{i<\kappa}$ with $x_i \in F$ be arbitrary and $cl_i \in Cl$ with $y^* \cap cl_i \subseteq x_i$. Then $\Delta_{i<\kappa} x_i \supseteq \Delta_{i<\kappa} y^* \cap cl_i = y^* \cap \Delta_{i<\kappa} cl_i$ which is clearly stationary.

On the other hand assume that κ has the normal* filter property and let $X \subseteq St$ be of size κ . Then there exists a normal* filter F measuring X , and enumerate X as $(x_i)_{i<\kappa}$. Define $y_i := x_i$ if $x_i \in F$ and $y_i := \kappa \setminus x_i$ else. Since F is normal*, we can deduce that $y^* := \Delta_{i<\kappa} y_i \in St$. But no $x_i \in X$ can stationarily split y^* , hence $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} > \kappa$. \square

Before we can state the next theorem, we need the following definition:

Definition 2.20. Let α be a measurable cardinal and let $\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1$ and \mathcal{U} be normal measures on α . We recall (see [Jec03]):

⁶Note that any $<\kappa$ -complete* filter F can be extended to a $<\kappa$ -complete filter \tilde{F} .

- the Mitchell order: $\mathcal{U}_0 \triangleleft \mathcal{U}_1$ iff $\mathcal{U}_0 \in V^\kappa/\mathcal{U}_1$, i.e. \mathcal{U}_0 is contained in the ultrapower of V modulo \mathcal{U}_1
- $o(\mathcal{U}) := \sup\{o(\mathcal{U}') + 1 : \mathcal{U}' \triangleleft \mathcal{U}\}$ the order of \mathcal{U}
- $o(\alpha) := \sup\{o(\mathcal{U}') : \mathcal{U}' \text{ is normal measure on } \alpha\}$ the order of α

It was proven by Zapletal (see [Zap97]) that $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa > \kappa^+$ has large consistency strength, and indeed the same proof shows:

Theorem 2.21. Let $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} > \kappa^{++}$. Then there exists an inner model with a measurable cardinal α of order α^{++} .⁷

Let us now show some consistency results regarding \mathfrak{s}_κ^{cl} , \mathfrak{b}_κ , \mathfrak{d}_κ and \mathfrak{r}_κ^{cl} . First we state a helpful tool:

Lemma 2.22. Let $V \models x \in St$ and let \mathcal{P} be a $<\kappa$ -closed forcing. Then $V^{\mathcal{P}} \models x \in St$.

Proof. Since being stationary is a Π_1^1 statement, the lemma follows by Π_1^1 -absoluteness for $<\kappa$ -closed forcing extensions. \square

Definition 2.23. Let \mathcal{U} be a $<\kappa$ -complete, normal ultrafilter on κ . We define $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$, the generalized Mathias forcing with respect to \mathcal{U} , as follows:

- A condition p is of the form (s^p, A^p) where $s^p \in [\kappa]^{<\kappa}$, $A^p \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\sup s^p \leq \min A^p$.
- Let $p = (s^p, A^p)$ and $q = (t^q, B^q)$ be in $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$. We define $q \leq_{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}} p$, in words q is stronger than p , if $s^p \subseteq t^q$, $B^q \subseteq A^p$ and $t^q \setminus s^p \subseteq A^p$.

If G is a $(V, \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}})$ -generic filter, we define $m_G := \bigcup_{p \in G} s^p$.

The next lemma follows immediately.

Lemma 2.24. Let \mathcal{U} be a $<\kappa$ -complete, normal ultrafilter. Then the forcing $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$ has the following properties:

- $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is κ -centered $_{<\kappa}$. In particular it is κ^+ -c.c.
- $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is $<\kappa$ -directed closed.

Lemma 2.25. Let \mathcal{U} be a $<\kappa$ -complete, normal ultrafilter on κ and let $V \models x \in St$. Then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}} \dot{m}_G \in St \wedge (\dot{m}_G \subseteq_{cl}^* x \vee \dot{m}_G \cap x \in NS)$.

Proof. If $x \in \mathcal{U}$ then clearly $\Vdash_{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}} \dot{m}_G \subseteq^* x$. On the other hand, if $x \notin \mathcal{U}$ then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}} \dot{m}_G \cap x$ is bounded. Hence, it remains to be shown that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}} \dot{m}_G \in St$. To this end let $p \in \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\dot{c}l$ be a $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$ -name for a club. Let $(p_i)_{i < \kappa}$ be a decreasing sequence of conditions below p interpreting $\dot{c}l$ as $cl^* \in V$, and w.l.o.g assume that $p_\lambda = \inf_{i < \lambda} p_i$ for every limit $\lambda < \kappa$. Let $A^* := \bigcap_{i < \kappa} A^{p_i}$ denote the diagonal intersection of the A^{p_i} , and since \mathcal{U} is a normal measure, we have that $A^* \in \mathcal{U}$. Hence, $A^* \cap \text{Lim}(cl^*) \neq \emptyset$ where $\text{Lim}(cl^*)$ is the club consisting only of the limit points of cl^* , and pick $i^* \in A^* \cap cl^*$. It follows that $i^* \in A^{p_{i^*}}$ and $p_{i^*} \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}} i^* \in \dot{c}l$. If we define a condition $q := (s^{p_{i^*}} \cup \{i^*\}, A^{p_{i^*}} \setminus \{i^*\})$ then trivially $q \leq_{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}} p_{i^*}$ and $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}} i^* \in \dot{m}_G \cap \dot{c}l$. Hence, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}} \dot{m}_G \in St$. \square

⁷This is equivalent to $\exists \mathcal{F} : L[\mathcal{F}] \models \exists \alpha : \alpha \text{ is measurable with order } \alpha^{++}$ (see [Mit83]).

Theorem 2.26. Let κ be supercompact and indestructible by $<\kappa$ -directed closed forcing posets (see [Lav78]). Define a $<\kappa$ -support iteration $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa^{++}, \beta < \kappa^{++})$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha} \dot{Q}_\alpha = \dot{M}_{\dot{U}_\alpha}$ where \dot{U}_α is a \mathbb{P}_α -name for a $<\kappa$ -complete, normal ultrafilter. Furthermore, assume that $V \models 2^\kappa = \kappa^+$. Then $V^\mathbb{P} \models \mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} = \mathfrak{b}_\kappa = \mathfrak{d}_\kappa = \mathfrak{r}_\kappa^{cl} = 2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.

Proof. Since \mathbb{P} satisfies the κ^+ -c.c. and for every $\alpha < \kappa^{++}$ the forcing \mathbb{P}_α has a dense subset of size κ^+ , we can deduce that $V^\mathbb{P} \models 2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$. It is easy to see that $V^\mathbb{P} \models \mathfrak{b}_\kappa = \mathfrak{d}_\kappa = \kappa^{++}$. Since \mathbb{P} has $<\kappa$ -support, it follows that \mathbb{P} adds κ -Cohen reals, hence $V^\mathbb{P} \models \mathfrak{r}_\kappa^{cl} = \kappa^{++}$ (see Lemma 2.27). Now if $V^\mathbb{P} \models X \subseteq St$ is a set of size $\leq \kappa^+$ in $V^\mathbb{P}$, then by the κ^+ -c.c. there exists $\alpha < \kappa^{++}$ such that $X \in V^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$ and by downward absoluteness $V^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha} \models X \subseteq St$. By Lemma 2.25 X is not a stationary splitting family in $V^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$, hence by Lemma 2.22 X cannot be a stationary splitting family in $V^\mathbb{P}$. \square

Lemma 2.27. Let \mathbb{C}_κ denote the κ -Cohen forcing and let G be a (V, \mathbb{C}_κ) -generic filter. Let $c_G \subseteq \kappa$ denote the κ -Cohen real added by G , and let $V \models x \in St$. Then $V^{\mathbb{C}_\kappa} \models c_G$ stationarily splits x .

Furthermore, if $\mathbb{P} = \prod_{\alpha < \kappa^+} \mathbb{C}_\kappa$ denotes the $<\kappa$ -support product of κ -Cohen forcing, then $V^\mathbb{P} \models (c_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa^+}$ is a stationary splitting family.

Proof. We proceed similarly to the proof of 2.25: Let $p \in \mathbb{C}_\kappa$ and \dot{c} a \mathbb{C}_κ -name for a club. Let $(p_i)_{i < \kappa}$ be a decreasing sequence below p interpreting \dot{c} as $cl^* \in Cl \cap V$. Again, w.l.o.g. assume that $p_\lambda = \inf_{i < \lambda} p_i$ for every limit $\lambda < \kappa$. Since x is stationary in V , we can find $i^* \in x \cap \text{Lim}(cl^*)$ where $\text{Lim}(cl^*)$ is again the club consisting only of the limit points of cl^* . Hence, there are $q_0, q_1 \in \mathbb{C}_\kappa$ below p_{i^*} such that $q_0 \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\kappa} (x \setminus c_{\dot{G}}) \cap \dot{c} \neq \emptyset$ and $q_1 \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\kappa} x \cap c_{\dot{G}} \cap \dot{c} \neq \emptyset$.

Let \dot{x} be a \mathbb{P} -name for a stationary set in $V^\mathbb{P}$. By the κ^+ -c.c. of \mathbb{P} it follows that there exists $\alpha < \kappa^+$ such that \dot{x} is a \mathbb{P}_α -name, where $\mathbb{P}_\alpha := \prod_{\beta < \alpha} \mathbb{C}_\kappa$. By the above $V^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha} \models c_\alpha$ stationarily splits x . By Lemma 2.22 we have $V^\mathbb{P} \models c_\alpha$ stationarily splits x . \square

The following proof already appeared in a similar version in [She84]:

Theorem 2.28. Let κ be supercompact and indestructible by $<\kappa$ -directed closed forcing posets. Let $V \models 2^\kappa = \kappa^+$ and define $\mathbb{R} := \mathbb{P} \star \dot{Q}$ where $\mathbb{P} = \prod_{\alpha < \kappa^+} \mathbb{C}_\kappa$ and \dot{Q} is a \mathbb{P} -name for a κ^{++} iteration of κ -Hechler forcing \mathbb{H}_κ with $<\kappa$ -support. Then $V^\mathbb{R} \models \mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} = \kappa^+ \wedge \mathfrak{b}_\kappa = \mathfrak{d}_\kappa = \mathfrak{r}_\kappa^{cl} = 2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.

Proof. Obviously, $\mathfrak{b}_\kappa = \mathfrak{d}_\kappa = \kappa^{++}$. Since \mathbb{H}_κ adds κ -Cohen reals, we can deduce by 2.27 that $\mathfrak{r}_\kappa^{cl} = \kappa^{++}$. Since κ remains ineffable in $V^\mathbb{R}$ it follows that $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} \geq \kappa^+$. It remains to be shown that $\mathfrak{s}_\kappa^{cl} \leq \kappa^+$. To this end we will show that $(c_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa^+}$ remains a splitting family in $V^\mathbb{R}$ where the $(c_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa^+}$ are the generic κ -Cohen reals added by \mathbb{P} .

Towards a contradiction assume that \dot{x} is a \mathbb{R} -name and (p, \dot{q}) a condition in \mathbb{R} such that $(p, \dot{q}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{x} \in St \wedge (\forall \alpha < \kappa^+ : \dot{x} \subseteq_{cl}^* \dot{c}_\alpha \vee \dot{x} \cap \dot{c}_\alpha \in NS)$. Since \mathbb{R} satisfies the κ^+ -c.c. we can find $\alpha^* < \kappa^+$ such that the \mathbb{R} -name \dot{x} does not depend on \dot{c}_{α^*} . Since \mathbb{P} is $<\kappa$ -closed and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{Q}$ has $<\kappa$ -support and is $<\kappa$ -closed, we obviously have

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \{q \in \dot{Q} : \text{dom}(q) \in \check{V} \wedge \exists \bar{\rho} \in (\kappa^{<\kappa})^{\text{dom}(q)} \cap \check{V}$$

$\forall \alpha \in \text{dom}(q) \exists \dot{f} \Vdash_{\dot{\mathbb{Q}}} \dot{q}(\alpha) = (\bar{\rho}(\alpha), \dot{f})$ is dense in $\dot{\mathbb{Q}}$

Hence, we can pick a condition $(p', \dot{q}') \leq_{\mathbb{R}} (p, \dot{q})$ such that all trunks of (p', \dot{q}') are ground model objects, and (p', \dot{q}') decides whether $\dot{x} \subseteq_{cl}^* c_{\alpha^*}$ or $\dot{x} \cap c_{\alpha^*} \in NS$, w.l.o.g. assume that $(p', \dot{q}') \Vdash_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{x} \subseteq_{cl}^* c_{\alpha^*}$. Now we define an automorphism π of \mathbb{P} which fixes $\prod_{\alpha \in \kappa \setminus \{\alpha^*\}} \mathbb{C}_{\kappa}$ and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{c}_{\alpha^*} \cap \pi(\dot{c}_{\alpha^*}) \subseteq \text{dom}(p'(\alpha^*))$, in particular $p' = \pi(p')$. Now π induces an automorphism $\tilde{\pi}$ of \mathbb{R} , and since all trunks of (p', \dot{q}') are ground model objects, we can deduce that $p' \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{q}'$ and $\tilde{\pi}(\dot{q}')$ are compatible in $\dot{\mathbb{Q}}$. Hence there exists a condition $(p', \dot{r}) \leq_{\mathbb{R}} (p', \dot{q}'), (p', \tilde{\pi}(\dot{q}'))$, and since $\Vdash_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{x} = \tilde{\pi}(\dot{x})$ we can deduce that $(p', \dot{r}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{x} \subseteq_{cl}^* c_{\alpha^*} \wedge \dot{x} \subseteq_{cl}^* \tilde{\pi}(c_{\alpha^*})$. But this immediately leads to a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.29. Let κ be supercompact and indestructible by $<\kappa$ -directed closed forcing posets. Let $V \models 2^{\kappa} = \kappa^+$ and define $\mathbb{P} = \prod_{\alpha < \kappa^{++}} \mathbb{C}_{\kappa}$. Then $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \mathfrak{s}_{\kappa}^{cl} = \mathfrak{b}_{\kappa} = \kappa^+ \wedge \mathfrak{d}_{\kappa} = \mathfrak{r}_{\kappa}^{cl} = 2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$.

Proof. The lemma immediately follows from the proof of Theorem 2.28. \square

Lemma 2.30. Let κ be supercompact and indestructible by $<\kappa$ directed-closed forcing posets. Let $V \models 2^{\kappa} = \kappa^+$ and define $\mathbb{P} = \prod_{\alpha < \kappa^{++}} \mathbb{S}_{\kappa}$, i.e. a κ^{++} product of κ -Sacks forcing with $\leq \kappa$ -support. Then $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \mathfrak{b}_{\kappa} = \mathfrak{d}_{\kappa} = \kappa^+ \wedge \mathfrak{r}_{\kappa}^{cl} = 2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$.

Proof. Since \mathbb{P} is κ^{κ} -bounding, we have $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \mathfrak{b}_{\kappa} = \mathfrak{d}_{\kappa} = \kappa^+$. It also follows that $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models Cl \cap V$ is cofinal in Cl , and therefore it is easy to see that $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \forall \alpha < \kappa^{++} : s_{\alpha}$ stationarily splits $St \cap V^{\mathbb{P}\alpha}$, where $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha} := \prod_{\beta < \alpha} \mathbb{S}_{\kappa}$. Hence, $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \mathfrak{r}_{\kappa}^{cl} = 2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$. \square

It seems very reasonable to conjecture that $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \mathfrak{s}_{\kappa}^{cl} = \kappa^+$.

Question 2.31. Is $\mathfrak{b}_{\kappa} < \mathfrak{s}_{\kappa}^{cl}$ consistent? Is even $\mathfrak{d}_{\kappa} < \mathfrak{s}_{\kappa}^{cl}$ consistent? How does $\mathfrak{s}_{\kappa}^{cl}$ relate to \mathfrak{s}_{κ} ?

References

- [BTFFM17] A. D. Brooke-Taylor, V. Fischer, S. D. Friedman, and D. C. Montoya. Cardinal characteristics at κ in a small $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ model. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 168(1):37–49, 2017.
- [CS95] James Cummings and Saharon Shelah. Cardinal invariants above the continuum. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 75(3):251–268, 1995.
- [DPZ80] Carlos A. Di Prisco and William S. Zwicker. Flipping properties and supercompact cardinals. *Fund. Math.*, 109(1):31–36, 1980.
- [FMSS19] Vera Fischer, Diana Carolina Montoya, Jonathan Schilhan, and Dániel T. Soukup. Towers and gaps at uncountable cardinals. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1906.00843, June 2019.
- [FS18] Vera Fischer and Daniel T. Soukup. More ZFC inequalities between cardinal invariants. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1802.02791, February 2018.
- [Git86] Moti Gitik. Changing cofinalities and the nonstationary ideal. *Israel J. Math.*, 56(3):280–314, 1986.
- [GS97] Moti Gitik and Saharon Shelah. Less saturated ideals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 125(5):1523–1530, 1997.
- [HS18] Peter Holy and Philipp Schlicht. A hierarchy of Ramsey-like cardinals. *Fund. Math.*, 242(1):49–74, 2018.
- [Jec03] Thomas Jech. *Set theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded.
- [JK69] Ronald Jensen and Kenneth Kunen. Some combinatorial properties of L and V . *Unpublished manuscript*, 1969.
- [JW85] Thomas J. Jech and W. Hugh Woodin. Saturation of the closed unbounded filter on the set of regular cardinals. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 292(1):345–356, 1985.
- [Lav78] Richard Laver. Making the supercompactness of κ indestructible under κ -directed closed forcing. *Israel J. Math.*, 29(4):385–388, 1978.
- [Mit83] William J. Mitchell. Sets constructed from sequences of measures: revisited. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 48(3):600–609, 1983.
- [RS17] Dilip Raghavan and Saharon Shelah. Two inequalities between cardinal invariants. *Fund. Math.*, 237(2):187–200, 2017.

- [RS19] Dilip Raghavan and Saharon Shelah. Two results on cardinal invariants at uncountable cardinals. In *Proceedings of the 14th and 15th Asian Logic Conferences*, pages 129–138. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2019.
- [She84] Saharon Shelah. On cardinal invariants of the continuum. In *Axiomatic set theory (Boulder, Colo., 1983)*, volume 31 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 183–207. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1984.
- [Suz93] Toshio Suzuki. On splitting numbers. Number 818, pages 118–120. 1993. *Mathematical logic and applications '92 (Japanese) (Kyoto, 1992)*.
- [Zap97] Jindřich Zapletal. Splitting number at uncountable cardinals. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 62(1):35–42, 1997.