Very Large Cardinals and Combinatorics

Vincenzo Dimonte
TU Wien

15 April 2014

ZFC leaves a lot of freedom for our understanding of the universe

ZFC leaves a lot of freedom for our understanding of the universe.

- Is there a set of reals of cardinality strictly between the set of natural numbers and the set of real numbers? (CH)

ZFC leaves a lot of freedom for our understanding of the universe.

- Is there a set of reals of cardinality strictly between the set of natural numbers and the set of real numbers? (CH)
- Is every set definable from some ordinal? (V=HOD)

ZFC leaves a lot of freedom for our understanding of the universe.

- Is there a set of reals of cardinality strictly between the set of natural numbers and the set of real numbers? (CH)
- Is every set definable from some ordinal? (V=HOD)
- Is the Reflection Principle (with class parameters) reflected?

ZFC leaves a lot of freedom for our understanding of the universe.

- Is there a set of reals of cardinality strictly between the set of natural numbers and the set of real numbers? (CH)
- Is every set definable from some ordinal? (V=HOD)
- Is the Reflection Principle (with class parameters) reflected?
- Is every Borelian measure on $\mathcal{B}([0,1])$ extendible to $\mathcal{P}([0,1])$?

ZFC leaves a lot of freedom for our understanding of the universe.

- Is there a set of reals of cardinality strictly between the set of natural numbers and the set of real numbers? (CH)
- Is every set definable from some ordinal? (V=HOD)
- Is the Reflection Principle (with class parameters) reflected?
- Is every Borelian measure on $\mathcal{B}([0,1])$ extendible to $\mathcal{P}([0,1])$?

These are all question non-answerable in ZFC.

A-philosophical Remark:
In this talk I won't go into philosophical questions, like whether ZFC is the "right" axiom system, and so on.

A-philosophical Remark:

In this talk I won't go into philosophical questions, like whether ZFC is the "right" axiom system, and so on.

The right point of view for this seminar is "set theory as a mathematical branch" and not "set theory as foundation of mathematics".

A-philosophical Remark:
In this talk I won't go into philosophical questions, like whether ZFC is the "right" axiom system, and so on.
The right point of view for this seminar is "set theory as a mathematical branch" and not "set theory as foundation of mathematics".
A good mental image is the multiverse, a collection of universes that satisfy ZFC. We want to know what can happen in those universes, and what cannot.

Guidelines:

Guidelines:

- Forcing constructions permit to pass from one universe to another;

Guidelines:

- Forcing constructions permit to pass from one universe to another;
- Large cardinals hypotheses enlarge our multiverse (more universes!)

Guidelines:

- Forcing constructions permit to pass from one universe to another;
- Large cardinals hypotheses enlarge our multiverse (more universes!)
- $V = L$ has very nice structural properties;

Guidelines:

- Forcing constructions permit to pass from one universe to another;
- Large cardinals hypotheses enlarge our multiverse (more universes!)
- $V = L$ has very nice structural properties;
- it is also interesting to go the other way, and investigating properties opposed to thoes in $V = L$;

Guidelines:

- Forcing constructions permit to pass from one universe to another;
- Large cardinals hypotheses enlarge our multiverse (more universes!)
- $V = L$ has very nice structural properties;
- it is also interesting to go the other way, and investigating properties opposed to thoes in $V = L$;
- combinatorial properties can be local (regarding one cardinal) or global (regarding all cardinals, or at least a class).

Loosely speaking, combinatorics is the study of the structural properties of sets.

Loosely speaking, combinatorics is the study of the structural properties of sets. Some examples:

Definition

The *power function* is $\kappa \mapsto 2^\kappa$. The exponentiation function is $(\kappa, \lambda) \mapsto \kappa^\lambda$.

Loosely speaking, combinatorics is the study of the structural properties of sets. Some examples:

Definition

The *power function* is $\kappa \mapsto 2^\kappa$. The exponentiation function is $(\kappa, \lambda) \mapsto \kappa^\lambda$.

Local: how large is 2^κ?

Loosely speaking, combinatorics is the study of the structural properties of sets. Some examples:

Definition

The *power function* is $\kappa \mapsto 2^\kappa$. The exponentiation function is $(\kappa, \lambda) \mapsto \kappa^\lambda$.

Local: how large is 2^κ?
Global: given a function $f : Ord \to Ord$, is it possible $2^\kappa = f(\kappa)$? On regular cardinals? Or on singulars?

Loosely speaking, combinatorics is the study of the structural properties of sets. Some examples:

Definition

The *power function* is $\kappa \mapsto 2^\kappa$. The exponentiation function is $(\kappa, \lambda) \mapsto \kappa^\lambda$.

Local: how large is 2^κ?
Global: given a function $f : Ord \to Ord$, is it possible $2^\kappa = f(\kappa)$? On regular cardinals? Or on singulars?
Weakening: for every λ singular, 2^λ is at least as possible (SCH)

Loosely speaking, combinatorics is the study of the structural properties of sets. Some examples:

Definition

The *power function* is $\kappa \mapsto 2^\kappa$. The exponentiation function is $(\kappa, \lambda) \mapsto \kappa^\lambda$.

Local: how large is 2^κ?
Global: given a function $f : Ord \to Ord$, is it possible $2^\kappa = f(\kappa)$? On regular cardinals? Or on singulars?
Weakening: for every λ singular, 2^λ is at least as possible (SCH).
$V = L \to$ for all κ, $2^\kappa = \kappa = +$ (GCH).

Loosely speaking, combinatorics is the study of the structural properties of sets. Some examples:

Definition

The *power function* is $\kappa \mapsto 2^\kappa$. The exponentiation function is $(\kappa, \lambda) \mapsto \kappa^\lambda$.

Local: how large is 2^κ?
Global: given a function $f : Ord \to Ord$, is it possible $2^\kappa = f(\kappa)$? On regular cardinals? Or on singulars?
Weakening: for every λ singular, 2^λ is at least as possible (SCH).
$V = L \to$ for all κ, $2^\kappa = \kappa = +$ (GCH).

Definition (Gödel, 1965)

Global: $V =$ HOD iff every set is definable from some ordinal.

Loosely speaking, combinatorics is the study of the structural properties of sets. Some examples:

Definition

The *power function* is $\kappa \mapsto 2^\kappa$. The exponentiation function is $(\kappa, \lambda) \mapsto \kappa^\lambda$.

Local: how large is 2^κ?
Global: given a function $f : Ord \to Ord$, is it possible $2^\kappa = f(\kappa)$? On regular cardinals? Or on singulars?
Weakening: for every λ singular, 2^λ is at least as possible (SCH).
$V = L \to$ for all κ, $2^\kappa = \kappa = +$ (GCH).

Definition (Gödel, 1965)

Global: $V = \text{HOD}$ iff every set is definable from some ordinal.

$V = L \to V = \text{HOD}$.

Other properties that will appear in the talk:

Other properties that will appear in the talk:

- $\diamondsuit_\kappa$ is about stationary subsets of κ (globally true in L) (Jensen, 1972);

Other properties that will appear in the talk:

- $\diamondsuit_\kappa$ is about stationary subsets of κ (globally true in L) (Jensen, 1972);
- $\square_\kappa$ is about the existence of a coherent collection of clubs (globally true in L);

Other properties that will appear in the talk:

- $\diamondsuit_\kappa$ is about stationary subsets of κ (globally true in L) (Jensen, 1972);
- $\square_\kappa$ is about the existence of a coherent collection of clubs (globally true in L);
- AP_κ (Approachability Property) is a weakening of $\square_\kappa$;

Other properties that will appear in the talk:

- $\Diamond_\kappa$ is about stationary subsets of κ (globally true in L) (Jensen, 1972);
- $\Box_\kappa$ is about the existence of a coherent collection of clubs (globally true in L);
- AP_κ (Approachability Property) is a weakening of $\Box_\kappa$;
- $\Box$ is the global version of $\Box_\kappa$ (it is morally $\Box_\infty$);

Other properties that will appear in the talk:

- $\diamondsuit_\kappa$ is about stationary subsets of κ (globally true in L) (Jensen, 1972);
- $\Box_\kappa$ is about the existence of a coherent collection of clubs (globally true in L);
- AP_κ (Approachability Property) is a weakening of $\Box_\kappa$;
- $\Box$ is the global version of $\Box_\kappa$ (it is morally $\Box_\infty$);
- $\Box$ at small cofinalities is a weaker version of $\Box$ (ad hoc to avoid inconsistencies with large cardinals);

Other properties that will appear in the talk:

- $\diamondsuit_\kappa$ is about stationary subsets of κ (globally true in L) (Jensen, 1972);
- $\square_\kappa$ is about the existence of a coherent collection of clubs (globally true in L);
- AP_κ (Approachability Property) is a weakening of $\square_\kappa$;
- $\square$ is the global version of $\square_\kappa$ (it is morally $\square_\infty$);
- $\square$ at small cofinalities is a weaker version of $\square$ (ad hoc to avoid inconsistencies with large cardinals);
- TP_κ (Tree Property) is König's Lemma for κ. $TP_{\kappa^{++}}$ is both a stronger failure of the local GCH and a failure of $\square$.

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$ $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$ $\quad$ $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$ $\quad$ $(\forall \gamma < \kappa \ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$ $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$ $(\forall\gamma < \kappa\ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$

$\Diamond_\kappa$

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$ $\qquad$ $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$ $\qquad$ $(\forall \gamma < \kappa \; 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$

$\diamondsuit_\kappa$ $\qquad$ $\neg\diamondsuit_\kappa$

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$	$2^\kappa > \kappa^+$	$(\forall \gamma < \kappa \ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$
$\diamondsuit_\kappa$	$\neg\diamondsuit_\kappa$	
$\square_\kappa$		

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$ $\quad$ $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$ $\quad$ $(\forall \gamma < \kappa \ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$

$\diamondsuit_\kappa$ $\quad$ $\neg\diamondsuit_\kappa$

$\square_\kappa$ $\quad$ $\neg\square_\kappa + AP_\kappa$

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$	$2^\kappa > \kappa^+$	$(\forall\gamma < \kappa\ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$
$\diamondsuit_\kappa$	$\neg\diamondsuit_\kappa$	
$\square_\kappa$	$\neg\square_\kappa + AP_\kappa$	$\neg AP_\kappa$

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$ $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$ $(\forall\gamma < \kappa\ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$

$\Diamond_\kappa$ $\neg\Diamond_\kappa$

$\square_\kappa$ $\neg\square_\kappa + AP_\kappa$ $\neg AP_\kappa$

GCH

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$	$2^\kappa > \kappa^+$	$(\forall \gamma < \kappa\ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$
$\diamondsuit_\kappa$	$\neg\diamondsuit_\kappa$	
$\square_\kappa$	$\neg\square_\kappa + AP_\kappa$	$\neg AP_\kappa$
GCH	$\neg$GCH+SCH	

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$	$2^\kappa > \kappa^+$	$(\forall \gamma < \kappa\ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$
$\Diamond_\kappa$	$\neg\Diamond_\kappa$	
$\Box_\kappa$	$\neg\Box_\kappa + AP_\kappa$	$\neg AP_\kappa$
GCH	$\neg$GCH+SCH	$\neg$SCH

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$	$2^\kappa > \kappa^+$	$(\forall \gamma < \kappa\ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$
$\diamondsuit_\kappa$	$\neg\diamondsuit_\kappa$	
$\square_\kappa$	$\neg\square_\kappa + AP_\kappa$	$\neg AP_\kappa$
GCH	$\neg$GCH+SCH	$\neg$SCH
$V = \mathrm{HOD}$		

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$	$2^\kappa > \kappa^+$	$(\forall\gamma < \kappa\ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$
$\diamondsuit_\kappa$	$\neg\diamondsuit_\kappa$	
$\square_\kappa$	$\neg\square_\kappa + AP_\kappa$	$\neg AP_\kappa$
GCH	¬GCH+SCH	¬SCH
$V = \mathrm{HOD}$	$V \neq \mathrm{HOD}$	

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$	$2^\kappa > \kappa^+$	$(\forall \gamma < \kappa \ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \land 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$
$\Diamond_\kappa$	$\neg\Diamond_\kappa$	
$\square_\kappa$	$\neg\square_\kappa + AP_\kappa$	$\neg AP_\kappa$
GCH	¬GCH+SCH	¬SCH
$V = \mathrm{HOD}$	$V \neq \mathrm{HOD}$	
$\square$		

$2^\kappa = \kappa^+$	$2^\kappa > \kappa^+$	$(\forall\gamma < \kappa\ 2^\gamma = \gamma^+) \wedge 2^\kappa > \kappa^+$
$\diamondsuit_\kappa$	$\neg\diamondsuit_\kappa$	
$\square_\kappa$	$\neg\square_\kappa + AP_\kappa$	$\neg AP_\kappa$
GCH	$\neg$GCH+SCH	$\neg$SCH
$V = \mathrm{HOD}$	$V \neq \mathrm{HOD}$	
$\square$	$\square$ s.m.	

Definition (1930)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then

- κ is *strong limit* iff $\forall\gamma, \eta < \kappa\ \gamma^{\eta} < \kappa$.

Definition (1930)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then

- κ is *strong limit* iff $\forall \gamma, \eta < \kappa \ \gamma^\eta < \kappa$.
- κ is *(strongly) inaccessible* iff uncountable, regular and strong limit.

Definition (1930)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then

- κ is *strong limit* iff $\forall \gamma, \eta < \kappa \ \gamma^\eta < \kappa$.
- κ is *(strongly) inaccessible* iff uncountable, regular and strong limit.

Definition

Let M, N be sets or classes

Definition (1930)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then

- κ is *strong limit* iff $\forall \gamma, \eta < \kappa \ \gamma^\eta < \kappa$.
- κ is *(strongly) inaccessible* iff uncountable, regular and strong limit.

Definition

Let M, N be sets or classes. Then $j : M \to N$ is an *elementary embedding* iff for any formula $\varphi(v_0, \ldots, v_n)$ and for any $x_0, \ldots, x_n \in M$,

$$M \vDash \varphi(x_0, \ldots, x_n) \text{ iff } N \vDash \varphi(j(x_0), \ldots, j(x_n)).$$

Definition (1930)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then

- κ is *strong limit* iff $\forall \gamma, \eta < \kappa \ \gamma^\eta < \kappa$.
- κ is *(strongly) inaccessible* iff uncountable, regular and strong limit.

Definition

Let M, N be sets or classes. Then $j : M \to N$ is an *elementary embedding* iff for any formula $\varphi(v_0, \ldots, v_n)$ and for any $x_0, \ldots, x_n \in M$,

$$M \models \varphi(x_0, \ldots, x_n) \text{ iff } N \models \varphi(j(x_0), \ldots, j(x_n)).$$

Theorem (Keisler, 1962)

κ is measurable iff there exists $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$

Definition (1930)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then

- κ is *strong limit* iff $\forall \gamma, \eta < \kappa \ \gamma^\eta < \kappa$.
- κ is *(strongly) inaccessible* iff uncountable, regular and strong limit.

Definition

Let M, N be sets or classes. Then $j : M \to N$ is an *elementary embedding* iff for any formula $\varphi(v_0, \ldots, v_n)$ and for any $x_0, \ldots, x_n \in M$,

$$M \models \varphi(x_0, \ldots, x_n) \text{ iff } N \models \varphi(j(x_0), \ldots, j(x_n)).$$

Theorem (Keisler, 1962)

κ is measurable iff there exists $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. This implies ${}^{<\kappa}M \subseteq M$.

Definition (late 60's)

Let κ and γ be cardinals

Definition (late 60's)

Let κ and γ be cardinals. Then κ is γ-*supercompact* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, $\gamma < j(\kappa)$ and ${}^{\gamma}M \subseteq M$

Definition (late 60's)

Let κ and γ be cardinals. Then κ is γ-*supercompact* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, $\gamma < j(\kappa)$ and ${}^{\gamma}M \subseteq M$. If κ is γ-supercompact for any γ, then κ is supercompact.

Definition (Kunen, 1972)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *huge* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, ${}^{j(\kappa)}M \subseteq M$.

Definition (late 60's)

Let κ and γ be cardinals. Then κ is *γ-supercompact* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, $\gamma < j(\kappa)$ and ${}^{\gamma}M \subseteq M$. If κ is γ-supercompact for any γ, then κ is supercompact.

Definition (Kunen, 1972)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *huge* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, ${}^{j(\kappa)}M \subseteq M$.

Definition

Let $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. We define the critical sequence $\langle \kappa_0, \kappa_1, \ldots \rangle$ as $\kappa_0 = \kappa$ and $j(\kappa_n) = \kappa_{n+1}$.

Definition (late 60's)

Let κ and γ be cardinals. Then κ is *γ-supercompact* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, $\gamma < j(\kappa)$ and ${}^{\gamma}M \subseteq M$. If κ is γ-supercompact for any γ, then κ is supercompact.

Definition (Kunen, 1972)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *huge* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, ${}^{j(\kappa)}M \subseteq M$.

Definition

Let $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. We define the critical sequence $\langle \kappa_0, \kappa_1, \dots \rangle$ as $\kappa_0 = \kappa$ and $j(\kappa_n) = \kappa_{n+1}$.

Definition (Reinhardt, 1970)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *Reinhardt* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa_0$, ${}^{\lambda}M \subseteq M$, with $\lambda = \sup_{n \in \omega} \kappa_n$.

Definition (late 60's)

Let κ and γ be cardinals. Then κ is *γ-supercompact* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, $\gamma < j(\kappa)$ and ${}^{\gamma}M \subseteq M$. If κ is γ-supercompact for any γ, then κ is supercompact.

Definition (Kunen, 1972)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *huge* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, ${}^{j(\kappa)}M \subseteq M$.

Definition

Let $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. We define the critical sequence $\langle \kappa_0, \kappa_1, \dots \rangle$ as $\kappa_0 = \kappa$ and $j(\kappa_n) = \kappa_{n+1}$.

Definition (Reinhardt, 1970)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *Reinhardt* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa_0$, ${}^{\lambda}M \subseteq M$, with $\lambda = \sup_{n\in\omega} \kappa_n$.Equivalently, if there is a $j : V \prec V$, with $\kappa = \mathrm{crt}(j)$.

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

This leaves space for the following definitions:

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

This leaves space for the following definitions:

Definition

I3 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_\lambda \prec V_\lambda$;

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

This leaves space for the following definitions:

Definition

- I3 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_\lambda \prec V_\lambda$;
- I2 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec_1 V_{\lambda+1}$;

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

This leaves space for the following definitions:

Definition

- I3 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_\lambda \prec V_\lambda$;
- I2 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec_1 V_{\lambda+1}$;
- I1 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$;

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

This leaves space for the following definitions:

Definition

- I3 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_\lambda \prec V_\lambda$;
- I2 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec_1 V_{\lambda+1}$;
- I1 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$;
- I0 For some λ there exists a $j : L(V_{\lambda+1}) \prec L(V_{\lambda+1})$, with $\text{crt}(j) < \lambda$

All the large cardinals defined, other than the inaccessible, are incompatible with $V = L$.

All the large cardinals defined, other than the inaccessible, are incompatible with $V = L$.
It makes sense to ask the relationship between large cardinals and combinatorics:

All the large cardinals defined, other than the inaccessible, are incompatible with $V = L$.
It makes sense to ask the relationship between large cardinals and combinatorics:

- Are there consistency equivalences? (It needs another talk)

All the large cardinals defined, other than the inaccessible, are incompatible with $V = L$.
It makes sense to ask the relationship between large cardinals and combinatorics:

- Are there consistency equivalences? (It needs another talk)
- Which combinatorial properties (local or global) are possible in models with large cardinals?

All the large cardinals defined, other than the inaccessible, are incompatible with $V = L$.
It makes sense to ask the relationship between large cardinals and combinatorics:

- Are there consistency equivalences? (It needs another talk)
- Which combinatorial properties (local or global) are possible in models with large cardinals?
- Special case: local case exactly at the large cardinal.

Theorem (Easton, 1970)

We say that E is an Easton function if

- if $\kappa < \lambda$ then $E(\kappa) \leq E(\lambda)$;
- $\mathrm{cof}(E(\kappa)) > \kappa$.

Theorem (Easton, 1970)

We say that E is an Easton function if

- if $\kappa < \lambda$ then $E(\kappa) \leq E(\lambda)$;
- $\mathrm{cof}(E(\kappa)) > \kappa$.

Then $\mathrm{Con}(ZFC) \rightarrow \mathrm{Con}(ZFC + \forall\kappa \text{ regular } 2^{\kappa} = E(\kappa))$.

Theorem (Easton, 1970)

We say that E is an Easton function if

- if $\kappa < \lambda$ then $E(\kappa) \leq E(\lambda)$;
- $\mathrm{cof}(E(\kappa)) > \kappa$.

Then $\mathrm{Con}(ZFC) \to \mathrm{Con}(ZFC + \forall\kappa \text{ regular } 2^\kappa = E(\kappa))$.

Theorem (Silver, 1974)

Let λ be a singular cardinal of uncountable cofinality

Theorem (Easton, 1970)

We say that E is an Easton function if

- if $\kappa < \lambda$ then $E(\kappa) \leq E(\lambda)$;
- $\mathrm{cof}(E(\kappa)) > \kappa$.

Then $\mathrm{Con}(ZFC) \to \mathrm{Con}(ZFC + \forall\kappa \text{ regular } 2^\kappa = E(\kappa))$.

Theorem (Silver, 1974)

Let λ be a singular cardinal of uncountable cofinality. If for all $\kappa < \lambda$ $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$, then $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.

Theorem (Easton, 1970)

We say that E is an Easton function if

- if $\kappa < \lambda$ then $E(\kappa) \leq E(\lambda)$;
- $\mathrm{cof}(E(\kappa)) > \kappa$.

Then $\mathrm{Con}(ZFC) \rightarrow \mathrm{Con}(ZFC + \forall\kappa \text{ regular } 2^\kappa = E(\kappa))$.

Theorem (Silver, 1974)

Let λ be a singular cardinal of uncountable cofinality. If for all $\kappa < \lambda$ $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$, then $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.

Same thing for measurable (Scott, 1961).

Theorem (Solovay, 1974)

Let κ be supercompact.

Theorem (Easton, 1970)

We say that E is an Easton function if

- if $\kappa < \lambda$ then $E(\kappa) \leq E(\lambda)$;
- $\mathrm{cof}(E(\kappa)) > \kappa$.

Then $\mathrm{Con}(ZFC) \to \mathrm{Con}(ZFC + \forall\kappa \text{ regular } 2^\kappa = E(\kappa))$.

Theorem (Silver, 1974)

Let λ be a singular cardinal of uncountable cofinality. If for all $\kappa < \lambda$ $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$, then $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.

Same thing for measurable (Scott, 1961).

Theorem (Solovay, 1974)

Let κ be supercompact.For all $\lambda > \kappa$ strong limit singular, $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.

Theorem

Con(inaccessible)$\rightarrow$Con(inaccessible$+$GCH).

Theorem

Con(inaccessible)$\rightarrow$Con(inaccessible+GCH).
Con(supercompact)$\rightarrow$Con(supercompact+GCH).

Theorem

Con(inaccessible)$\rightarrow$Con(inaccessible+GCH).
Con(supercompact)$\rightarrow$Con(supercompact+GCH).

Theorem

If κ is λ^+-supercompact, then $\square_\lambda$ fails

Theorem

Con(inaccessible)$\to$Con(inaccessible+GCH).
Con(supercompact)$\to$Con(supercompact+GCH).

Theorem

If κ is λ^+-supercompact, then $\square_\lambda$ fails. If there exists a subcompact, then $\square$ fails.

Theorem (D., Friedman, 2013)

Suppose I* is I3, I2, I1 or I0. Then I* is consistent with each of the following

Theorem (D., Friedman, 2013)

Suppose I* is I3, I2, I1 or I0. Then I* is consistent with each of the following:

- GCH

Theorem (D., Friedman, 2013)

Suppose I* is I3, I2, I1 or I0. Then I* is consistent with each of the following:

- GCH
- failure of GCH at regular cardinals

Theorem (D., Friedman, 2013)

Suppose I* is I3, I2, I1 or I0. Then I* is consistent with each of the following:

- GCH
- failure of GCH at regular cardinals
- V=HOD

Theorem (D., Friedman, 2013)

Suppose I* is I3, I2, I1 or I0. Then I* is consistent with each of the following:

- GCH
- failure of GCH at regular cardinals
- V=HOD
- $\Diamond$

Theorem (D., Friedman, 2013)

Suppose I* is I3, I2, I1 or I0. Then I* is consistent with each of the following:

- GCH
- failure of GCH at regular cardinals
- V=HOD
- $\Diamond$
- $\Box$ at small cofinalities

Theorem (D., Friedman, 2013)

Suppose I* is I3, I2, I1 or I0. Then I* is consistent with each of the following:

- GCH
- failure of GCH at regular cardinals
- V=HOD
- $\Diamond$
- $\Box$ at small cofinalities
- etc...

Theorem (D., Wu, 2014)

Suppose I0. Then I1, i.e., $j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$, is consistent with each of the following

Theorem (D., Wu, 2014)

Suppose I0. Then I1, i.e., $j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$, is consistent with each of the following:

- the failure of SCH at λ

Theorem (D., Wu, 2014)

Suppose I0. Then I1, i.e., $j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$, is consistent with each of the following:

- the failure of SCH at λ
- the *first* failure of SCH at λ

Theorem (D., Wu, 2014)

Suppose I0. Then I1, i.e., $j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$, is consistent with each of the following:

- the failure of SCH at λ
- the *first* failure of SCH at λ
- $TP(\lambda^{++})$

Theorem (D., Wu, 2014)

Suppose I0. Then I1, i.e., $j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$, is consistent with each of the following:

- the failure of SCH at λ
- the *first* failure of SCH at λ
- $TP(\lambda^{++})$
- $\neg SCH + \neg AP_\lambda$

Theorem (D., Wu, 2014)

Suppose I0. Then I1, i.e., $j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$, is consistent with each of the following:

- the failure of SCH at λ
- the *first* failure of SCH at λ
- $TP(\lambda^{++})$
- $\neg SCH + \neg AP_\lambda$
- etc...

Can we lower the hypotheses of the last Theorem to I1? Can we improve the Theorem to I0?

Is there a combinatorial property that is non-trivially inconsistent with I*?

Or some that is equiconsistent?