The tree property at the double successor of a singular cardinal with a larger gap

SY-DAVID FRIEDMAN, RADEK HONZIK, ŠÁRKA STEJSKALOVÁ

Sy-D. Friedman: Kurt Gödel Research Center for Mathematical Logic,
Währinger Strasse 25, 1090 Vienna Austria
sdf@logic.univie.ac.at

R. Honzik, Š. Stejskalová: Charles University, Department of Logic,
Celetná 20, Praha 1, 116 42, Czech Republic
radek.honzik@ff.cuni.cz
sarka.stejskalova@ff.cuni.cz

All three authors were supported by FWF/GAČR grant I 1921-N25.

Abstract. Starting from a Laver-indestructible supercompact κ and a weakly compact λ above κ, we show there is a forcing extension where κ is a strong limit singular cardinal with cofinality ω, $2^\kappa = \kappa^{+3} = \lambda^+$, and the tree property holds at $\kappa^{++} = \lambda$. Next we generalize this result to an arbitrary cardinal μ such that $\kappa < \mathrm{cf}(\mu)$ and $\lambda^+ \leq \mu$. This result provides more information about possible relationships between the tree property and the continuum function.

Keywords: The tree property, singular cardinals.

AMS subject code classification: 03E35,03E55.

1 Introduction

In [2], Cummings and Foreman showed that starting from a Laver-indestructible supercompact cardinal κ and a weakly compact $\lambda > \kappa$, one can construct a generic extension where $2^\kappa = \lambda = \kappa^{++}$, κ is a singular strong limit cardinal with cofinality ω, and the tree property holds at κ^{++}. It is natural to try to generalize this result in at least two directions.

First, one can ask whether – in addition to the properties identified in the previous paragraph – κ can equal $\aleph_\omega$. Cummings and Foreman suggested in [2] that this is possible, but did not provide any details. A model with the tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+2}$, with $\aleph_\omega$ strong limit, was first constructed by Friedman and Halilović in [3], moreover from a significantly lower large cardinal assumption of hypermeasurability.[1] Shortly afterwards, Gitik, answering a question posed in [3], showed in [6] that the same result can be proved from a weaker and optimal assumption.

Second, one can ask whether it is possible to have 2^κ greater than κ^{++} with the tree property at κ^{++}. Using a variant of the Mitchell forcing, Friedman and Halilović [4] proved that starting from a sufficiently hypermeasurable κ, one can keep the measurability of κ together with $2^\kappa > \kappa^{++}$ and the tree property at κ^{++}.

[1] The technique of proof in [3] used the Sacks forcing to obtain the tree property, unlike the proof in [2] which is based on a Mitchell-style analysis.

In this paper, we generalize [2] in the second direction. In Theorem 3.1, we prove that starting from a Laver-indestructible supercompact κ and a weakly compact λ above, one can find a forcing extension where κ is a strong limit singular cardinal with cofinality ω, $2^\kappa = \kappa^{+3} = \lambda^+$, and the tree property holds at κ^{++}. In Theorem 4.1 we give an outline of a generalization in which the gap $(\kappa, 2^\kappa)$ can be arbitrarily large: $2^\kappa = \mu$ for any cardinal $\mu > \lambda$ with cofinality greater than κ. The method of the proof is in general based on the argument of Cummings and Foreman [2], with the final part of the argument following Unger's presentation in [10].[2]

The basic idea of our proof is as follows: Recall that the basic Mitchell forcing for obtaining $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++} = \lambda$ with the tree property at λ, as presented for instance in Abraham [1], can be viewed as being composed of two components: of the Cohen forcing for adding λ-many subsets of κ (we denote this forcing by $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \lambda)$), and of the collapsing component which ensures $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++} = \lambda$ in the final extension. It is important that the collapsing component at stage $\alpha < \lambda$ depends on the first α-many subsets of κ added by the Cohen forcing, i.e. on $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \alpha)$. Cummings and Foreman generalized this idea by making the first component of the Mitchell forcing more complex: they made the collapsing part at stage $\alpha < \lambda$ depend not only on $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \alpha)$, but on $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \alpha)$ followed by the Prikry forcing on κ defined with respect to a certain normal measure U_α existing in the generic extension by $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \alpha)$. To make this definition coherent, these U_α's are obtained uniformly from a single measure U which exists in the extension of V by $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \lambda)$. Importantly, they still retain the same length of the first component (now a Cohen forcing followed by a Prikry forcing) and the collapsing component (they both have length λ).

In our case, we would like to add μ-many subsets of κ, with the final measure U living in the extension by $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mu)$, where μ is typically much larger than λ. This introduces a mismatch between the length of the first and second component of the Mitchell forcing (our collapsing component needs to have the same length as before, i.e. λ). We solve this problem by reflecting U more carefully and in several stages. To simplify the exposition, we first provide the argument for the special case of $\mu = \lambda^+$ (Theorem 3.1), and articulate the modifications for the general case only later (Theorem 4.1).

The argument in Theorem 3.1 (and implicitly also the argument in Theorem 4.1) is divided into two stages. In the first stage, Section 3.1, we fix some β_0, $\lambda < \beta_0 < \lambda^+$ (Theorem 3.1), or in general some $y_0 \in [\mu]^\lambda$, $\lambda + 1 \subseteq y_0$ (Theorem 4.1), which reflects the measure U on a set of size λ, and we also fix the associated bijection π between β_0 (or y_0) and the even ordinals below λ.[3] These fixed objects are used to define the main forcing $\mathbb{R}$ while ensuring that the measure U – or more precisely its π-image – becomes a normal measure in the extension of V by the Cohen forcing defined on cofinally many even coordinates below λ.[4] The definition of the collapsing component of $\mathbb{R}$ uses only the even ordinals below λ for the reason of reserving some free space for conditions in the forcing $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mu)$ which do not have a role in the collapsing component of $\mathbb{R}$, but need to be mapped onto the odd ordinals

[2] There seems to be a problem with Lemma 7.1 in [2] which states that a certain forcing is κ^+-Knaster, but without a convincing proof. Unger in [10] proved a version of Lemma 7.1, weakening κ^+-Knasterness to "κ^+-square-cc", which is still sufficient to conclude the whole proof. See Lemmas 3.22 and 3.28 in the present paper which follow Unger's presentation.

[3] β_0 is fixed in (3.11) and y_0 in item (2) of the proof of Theorem 4.1.

[4] Definition 3.9 for Theorem 3.1 and item (4) for Theorem 4.1.

below λ by the following argument: Assuming for contradiction that $\mathbb{R}$ adds a λ-Aronszajn tree $\dot{T}$, we choose some β^* (which again reflects U), $\beta_0 < \beta^* < \lambda^+$, or in general $y^* \in [\mu]^\lambda$, $y_0 \subsetneq y^*$, which is large enough to contain all coordinates in $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mu)$ which appear in $\dot{T}$.[5] We argue that $\mathbb{R}$ naturally restricts to β^*, or y^*, and moreover is isomorphic to a forcing with domain λ, which we denote $\mathbb{R}^*$, so that the original argument of [2] can be invoked with this $\mathbb{R}^*$.[6]

The argument concludes in the second stage (Section 3.2) – which is identical both for the Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.1 – by showing that $\mathbb{R}^*$ cannot add a λ-Aronszajn tree, which yields the final contradiction. The argument is very similar to [2], with the key ingredient in this part being Lemma 3.28 which shows that a certain forcing cannot add a branch to a λ-tree on account of its being "κ^+-square-cc". At this point we follow the presentation of Unger, stated in [10], diverging from [2] which claims that the relevant forcing is κ^+-Knaster (see Footnote 2 for more details).

2 Preliminaries

We review some useful results regarding projections of partial orders and their Boolean completions. Let us recall that a projection π between a partial order $(\mathbb{P}, \leq_{\mathbb{P}})$ and $(\mathbb{Q}, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}})$ is an order-preserving function from $\mathbb{P}$ into $\mathbb{Q}$ such that $\pi(1_{\mathbb{P}}) = 1_{\mathbb{Q}}$, and for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and all $q \leq_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi(p)$ there is $\bar{p} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ such that $\pi(\bar{p}) \leq_{\mathbb{Q}} q$. Note that the condition $\pi(1_{\mathbb{P}}) = 1_{\mathbb{Q}}$ ensures that the range of π is dense in $\mathbb{Q}$, and is sometimes omitted from the definition of a projection. It is a standard fact (see for instance [9]) that if $\pi : \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{Q}$ is a projection, then $\mathbb{P}$ is forcing equivalent to an iteration $\mathbb{Q} * \mathbb{P}/\mathbb{Q}$ for a quotient forcing which we denote $\mathbb{P}/\mathbb{Q}$.

Recall that if $\mathbb{P}$ is a separative partial order, we can identify $\mathbb{P}$ with a dense suborder of the canonical Boolean completion of $\mathbb{P}$ without least element, denoted by $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P})$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ be two separative partial orders. Assume that for every $\mathbb{P}$-generic filter G over V, there is in $V[G]$ a $\mathbb{Q}$-generic filter F over V. Let $\dot{F}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name such that $\mathbb{P} \Vdash$ ($\dot{F}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-generic filter). Then the following hold:*

(i) Define $\pi : \mathbb{P} \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$ by

$$\pi(p) = \bigwedge \{b \in \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q}) \mid p \Vdash b \in \dot{F}\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Set $b_{\mathbb{P}} = \pi(1) = \bigwedge\{b \in \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q}) \mid 1 \Vdash b \in \dot{F}\}$. Let $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})|b_{\mathbb{P}}$ denote the partial order $\{b \in \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q}) \mid b \leq b_{\mathbb{P}}\}$. Then

$$\pi : \mathbb{P} \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})|b_{\mathbb{P}} \text{ is a projection} \tag{2.2}$$

and the range of π is dense in $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})|b_{\mathbb{P}}$.

[5] β^* introduced below Lemma 3.13, and y^* is fixed in item (5).

[6] This is the import of Lemma 3.17 for Theorem 3.1, and of item (5) for Theorem 4.1. See Definition 3.16 for the definition of $\mathbb{R}^*$ in Theorem 3.1 and item (5) for Theorem 4.1. The isomorphism is induced by a bijection π^* between β^* (or y^*) extending the original bijection π fixed at the beginning which sends the ordinals in $\beta^* \setminus \beta_0$ (or $y^* \setminus y_0$) onto the odd ordinals below λ.

(ii) *Suppose π is as in (i), $\pi(1) = 1$ and all q_1, q_2 in $\mathbb{Q}$ have their supremum in $\mathbb{Q}$ (i.e. the supremum of q_1 and q_2 in $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$ is an element of $\mathbb{Q}$). Then π can be defined just using $-\mathbb{Q} = \{-q \,|\, q \in \mathbb{Q}\}$, where $-q$ is the Boolean complement of q in $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$:*

$$\pi(p) = \bigwedge\{-q \,|\, q \in \mathbb{Q} \;\&\; p \Vdash -q \in \dot{F}\} = \bigwedge\{-q \,|\, q \in \mathbb{Q} \;\&\; p \Vdash q \notin \dot{F}\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. (i). We first show (2.2). The preservation of the ordering is easy. We check the density condition, i.e. for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and every $c \leq \pi(p)$, there is $p' \leq p$ such that $\pi(p') \leq c$. Let p and c be given. If $c = \pi(p)$, we are trivially done. So suppose $c < \pi(p)$. If for every $p' \leq p$, $p' \nVdash c \in \dot{F}$, then $p \Vdash \pi(p) - c \in \dot{F}$, which contradicts the fact that $\pi(p)$ is the infimum of $\{b \in \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q}) \,|\, p \Vdash b \in \dot{F}\}$. It follows that there is some $p' \leq p$, $p' \Vdash c \in \dot{F}$. Then $\pi(p') \leq c$ as required.

We now show that the range of π is dense. Suppose for contradiction there is $b \leq b_{\mathbb{P}}$ such that the range of π is disjoint from $\{b' \in \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})|b_{\mathbb{P}} \,|\, b' \leq b\}$. Then $b_{\mathbb{P}} - b$ is forced by 1 to be in $\dot{F}$, a contradiction because $b_{\mathbb{P}} - b < b_{\mathbb{P}}$.

(ii). Let p be fixed and let a_p denote $\bigwedge\{-q \,|\, q \in \mathbb{Q} \;\&\; p \Vdash -q \in \dot{F}\}$. We wish to show that $\pi(p)$ as in (2.1) is equal to a_p. Clearly $\pi(p) \leq a_p$. Suppose for contradiction $\pi(p) < a_p$ and set $b = a_p - \pi(p)$. By density, there is $q_b \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $q_b \leq b$; in particular

$$a_p - q_b < a_p. \tag{2.4}$$

Since $a_p - q_b \geq \pi(p)$ and $p \Vdash \pi(p) \in \dot{F}$, we have

$$p \Vdash a_p - q_b \in \dot{F}. \tag{2.5}$$

Now,

$$a_p - q_b = a_p \wedge -q_b = \bigwedge\{-q \wedge -q_b \,|\, q \in \mathbb{Q} \;\&\; p \Vdash -q \in \dot{F}\}. \tag{2.6}$$

By (2.5), $p \Vdash -q \wedge -q_b = -(q \vee q_b) \in \dot{F}$, and hence $-(q \vee q_b)$ is an element of $\{-q \,|\, q \in \mathbb{Q} \;\&\; p \Vdash -q \in \dot{F}\}$ whenever p forces $-q \in \dot{F}$. It follows $a_p - q_b = a_p$, contradicting (2.4), and so $\pi(p) = a_p$ as desired.

Note that if the supremum of q_1, q_2 is not in general in $\mathbb{Q}$, then the proof still provides a simplification of the definition of $\pi(p)$:

$$\pi(p) = \bigwedge\{-b \,|\, (\exists n \in \omega)(\exists q_1, \ldots, q_n \in \mathbb{Q})(b = q_1 \vee \ldots \vee q_n \;\&\; p \Vdash -b \in \dot{F})\}. \tag{2.7}$$

□

It would be tempting to try and prove that $\pi(p)$ is equivalent to

$$\bigwedge\{q \in \mathbb{Q} \,|\, p \Vdash q \in \dot{F}\}, \tag{2.8}$$

and not the rather unintuitive (2.3) or (2.7).[7] However, (2.8) does not work in general.

[7] Perhaps some intuition is salvaged by considering that if $p \Vdash q \in \dot{F}$, $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, and $q' \in \mathbb{Q}$ is incompatible with q, then $p \Vdash -q' \in \dot{F}$ by the upwards closure of $\dot{F}$. Thus using density, q is captured as the infimum of all complements of q' which are incompatible with q: $q = \bigwedge\{-q' \,|\, q' \in \mathbb{Q} \;\&\; q' \perp q\}$.

The following folklore results will be used tacitly later on when we deal with projections on Boolean completions:

Lemma 2.2 *Assume $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ are separative partial orders and $\pi : \mathbb{P} \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$ is a projection.*

(i) If $\mathbb{P}'$ is dense in $\mathbb{P}$, then $\pi|\mathbb{P}' : \mathbb{P}' \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$ is a projection.
(ii) (a) If $\mathbb{P}$ is dense in $\mathbb{P}'$, then there is $\pi' \supseteq \pi$ such that $\pi' : \mathbb{P}' \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$ is a projection.
(b) Assume $\mathbb{P}'$ is forcing equivalent with $\mathbb{P}$. Then there is a projection $\pi' : \mathbb{P}' \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$.
(iii) Let $\mathbb{R}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name for a forcing notion. Then π naturally extends to a projection $\pi' : \mathbb{P} * \mathbb{R} \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$.

Proof. (i). Obvious.

(ii)(a). For $p' \in \mathbb{P}'$ define

$$\pi'(p') = \bigvee \{\pi(p) \,|\, p \leq p'\}.$$

By density of $\mathbb{P}$ in $\mathbb{P}'$, $\{\pi(p) \,|\, p \leq p'\}$ is non-empty for every p' and therefore $\pi'(p')$ is in $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$. If $p' \leq q'$ in $\mathbb{P}'$, then clearly $\pi'(p') \leq \pi'(q')$. Suppose $p' \in \mathbb{P}'$ is arbitrary and $b \leq \pi'(p')$. By the definition of $\pi'(p')$, there is $b' \leq b$ such that for some $p \leq p'$, $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $b' \leq \pi(p)$. It follows there is some $q \leq p \leq p'$, $q \in \mathbb{P}$, such that $\pi(q) = \pi'(q) \leq b' \leq b$ as desired.

(ii)(b). As $\mathbb{P}$ is dense in $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P})$, by the previous item there is a projection π^* from $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P})$ to $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$. Since $\mathbb{P}'$ is forcing equivalent with $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{P}'$ is dense in $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P})$, and $\pi' = \pi^*|\mathbb{P}'$ is a projection from $\mathbb{P}'$ to $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{Q})$ by (i).

(iii). Define

$$\pi'(p, r) = \pi(p), \tag{2.9}$$

for every (p, r) in $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{R}$. If $(p_1, r_1) \leq (p_2, r_2)$, then in particular $p_1 \leq p_2$, and so $\pi'(p_1, r_1) \leq \pi'(p_2, r_2)$ because π is order-preserving. If (p, r) is arbitrary and $b \leq \pi'(p, r) = \pi(p)$, then since π is a projection, there is $p' \leq p$ such that $\pi(p') \leq b$. Since $(p', r) \leq (p, r)$, $\pi'(p', r) \leq b$ is as required. □

3 Gap three

Let μ be a regular cardinal. We write $\mathrm{TP}(\mu)$ to say that μ satisfies the tree property. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing notion, we write $V[\mathbb{P}]$ to denote an arbitrary generic extension by the forcing $\mathbb{P}$. We say that a supercompact cardinal κ is *Laver-indestructible* if it remains supercompact in any forcing extension by a forcing which is κ-directed closed (where $\mathbb{P}$ is κ-directed closed if for every $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ of size less than κ, if for all p_1, p_2 in D there is $e \in D$ such that $e \leq p_1$ and $e \leq p_2$, then there is $p \in \mathbb{P}$, with $p \leq d$ for all $d \in D$).

Theorem 3.1 *Assume GCH and let κ be a Laver-indestructible supercompact cardinal and $\kappa < \lambda$, λ weakly compact. Then there is a forcing notion $\mathbb{R}$ such that the following hold:*

(i) $\mathbb{R}$ *preserves cardinals* $\leq \kappa^+$ *and* $\geq \lambda$.
(ii) $V[\mathbb{R}] \models (\kappa^{++} = \lambda \ \& \ 2^\kappa = \lambda^+ \ \& \ \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) = \omega \ \& \ \ \kappa$ *is strong limit*$)$.
(iii) $V[\mathbb{R}] \models \mathrm{TP}(\lambda)$.

The proof will be given in a sequence of lemmas, and is divided into two stages. Stage 1 defines $\mathbb{R}$, verifies some basic properties for (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.1 and shows that if $\mathbb{R}$ adds an Aronszajn tree on λ, then already a regular subforcing, which we denote $\mathbb{R}^*$, adds an Aronszajn tree on λ. The forcing $\mathbb{R}^*$ is designed to be very similar to the forcing used in [2]. In stage 2, we show that indeed $\mathbb{R}^*$ allows a very similar analysis to [2] (with correction according to [10]), and therefore cannot add an Aronszajn tree on λ, which finishes the proof.

3.1 Stage 1

Definition 3.2 *Let* $\mathbb{P}$ *denote the Cohen forcing* $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \lambda^+)$ *and for* $\alpha < \lambda^+$, *let* $\mathbb{P}|\alpha$ *denote* $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \alpha)$. *For concreteness, we identify conditions in* $\mathbb{P}$ *with partial functions from* $\lambda^+ \times \kappa$ *to* 2 *with domain of size* $< \kappa$.

We will abuse notation slightly and say that $\alpha < \lambda^+$ is in the support of $p \in \mathbb{P}$ if (α, ξ) is in the domain of p for some $\xi < \kappa$.

The following lemma will be useful.

Lemma 3.3 *Let* $\dot{U}$ *be a* $\mathbb{P}$*-name such that*

$$1_{\mathbb{P}} \Vdash \dot{U} \text{ is a normal measure on } \kappa.$$

Then there is a set $\mathcal{A}$ *of unboundedly many* $\alpha < \lambda^+$ *containing its limit points of cofinality* $> \kappa$ *such that for every* $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ *and every* $\mathbb{P}$*-generic filter* G,

$$\dot{U}^G \cap V[G|\alpha] \in V[G|\alpha].$$

Proof. Let $\alpha_0 < \lambda^+$ be given, we show how to find $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ which satisfies the requirements of the lemma. Let $\langle \dot{x}_i \,|\, i < \nu \rangle$ be an enumeration of all nice $\mathbb{P}|\alpha_0$-names for subsets of κ where $\nu < \lambda^+$. Note that there are at most λ-many such names so we can indeed choose $\nu < \lambda^+$. For every $i < \nu$, let X_i be a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{P}$ of conditions deciding the statement $\dot{x}_i \in \dot{U}$; by the κ^+-cc of $\mathbb{P}$, the size of X_i is at most κ. Let $\beta_0 \geq \alpha_0$ be such that the supports of all conditions in $\bigcup_{i<\nu} X_i$ are contained in β_0. Repeat this procedure κ^+-many times, building an increasing chain of ordinals and let $\alpha = \sup\{\beta_k \,|\, k < \kappa^+\}$, $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \kappa^+$. Now, if $\dot{x}$ is a $\mathbb{P}|\alpha$-name for a subset of κ, then there is some $\alpha' < \alpha$ such that all coordinates mentioned by $\dot{x}$ are below α'; it follows that $\dot{x}$ was considered in the construction, together with a maximal antichain X in $\mathbb{P}$ of conditions deciding the statement $\dot{x} \in \dot{U}$. Using these $\dot{x}$'s and X's, one can build a $\mathbb{P}|\alpha$-name $\dot{U}_\alpha$ such that for every nice $\mathbb{P}|\alpha$-name $\dot{x}$ for a subset of κ:

$$\dot{x}^{G|\alpha} = \dot{x}^G \in \dot{U}^G \Leftrightarrow \dot{x}^{G|\alpha} \in \dot{U}_\alpha^{G|\alpha}.$$

□

Remark 3.4 It is clear that if α with cofinality $> \kappa$ is a limit point of elements in $\mathcal{A}$, then α satisfies the defining property of $\mathcal{A}$, and we can therefore assume that α is in $\mathcal{A}$.[8]

Fix temporarily a $\mathbb{P}$-generic filter G. Denote $\dot{U}^G = U$. For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\lambda < \alpha < \lambda^+$ there is by Lemma 3.3 a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name, which we denote by $\dot{U}_\alpha$, such that

$$(\dot{U}_\alpha)^{G|\alpha} = U \cap V[G|\alpha]. \tag{3.10}$$

Let us write U_α for $U \cap V[G|\alpha]$. Let us fix for the remainder of the proof some

$$\beta_0 \in \mathcal{A}, \lambda < \beta_0. \tag{3.11}$$

Recall the review of the proof in Section 1 where we mentioned that we need to reserve some space below λ, and we will therefore use even and odd ordinals for different purposes. Making good on this promise, let $\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)$ denote the set of even ordinals below α, where $\alpha \leq \lambda$ (limit ordinals count as even). For $\alpha \leq \lambda$, let us write $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)$ to denote the Cohen forcing $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mathrm{Even}(\alpha))$ which only mentions coordinates indexed by even ordinals. Let π be a bijection between β_0 fixed in (3.11) and $\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$; π naturally generates an isomorphism between $\mathbb{P}|\beta_0$ and $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$ which we also denote π. Let us further extend the domain of π to all $\mathbb{P}|\beta_0$-names, and also to $\mathbb{P}|\beta_0$-generic filters, in the obvious way.

Since $1_{\mathbb{P}|\beta_0} \Vdash \dot{U}_{\beta_0}$ is a measure, we have $1_{\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)} \Vdash \pi(\dot{U}_{\beta_0})$ is a measure.

Remark 3.5 Note that π generates a $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$-generic filter $\pi(G|\beta_0)$ such that $V[G|\beta_0] = V[\pi(G|\beta_0)]$, and

$$U_{\beta_0} = (\dot{U}_{\beta_0})^{G|\beta_0} = \pi(\dot{U}_{\beta_0})^{\pi(G|\beta_0)}. \tag{3.12}$$

However, it is not true that $\pi(\dot{U}_{\beta_0})^{G|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)} = U_{\beta_0}$, where $G|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$ is the $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$-generic filter composed of the Cohen generics on the even coordinates of G below λ. The reason is that $V[G|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)]$ is a proper submodel of $V[\pi(G|\beta_0)] = V[G|\beta_0]$.

The proof of the following lemma is the same as for Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 3.6 *There is a set $\mathcal{B}$ of unboundedly many $\alpha < \lambda$ containing its limit points of cofinality $> \kappa$ such that for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$ and every $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$-generic filter H,*

$$\pi(\dot{U}_{\beta_0})^H \cap V[H|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)] \in V[H|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)], \tag{3.13}$$

where $H|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)$ is the restriction of H to $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)$, and β_0 is the one fixed in (3.11).

Let us write $\dot{U}^\pi_\alpha$ for the natural (i.e. obtained from the construction in the proof of Lemma 3.6) $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)$-name for the measure $\pi(\dot{U}_{\beta_0})^H \cap V[H|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)]$.

For concreteness, let us review the definition of Prikry forcing.

[8] We mention the closure of $\mathcal{A}$ because the current proof is directly applicable to Lemma 3.6 with a set $\mathcal{B}$, where the closure is relevant to ensure $\mathcal{B}^* \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ for a certain set $\mathcal{B}^*$ defined in Section 3.2, 2nd paragraph. The closure will not be used for $\mathcal{A}$, though.

Definition 3.7 *Assume κ is measurable and U is a normal measure at κ. Prikry forcing at κ with the measure U, which we will denote $\mathbb{Q}$, is a collection of pairs (s, A) where s is a finite subset of κ, A is in U, and $A \cap \max(s)+1 = \emptyset$. (s, A) is stronger than (t, B) if s extends t, $A \subseteq B$ and $s \setminus t \subseteq B$.*

We fix the following notation: Denote $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = (\mathcal{A} \cap [\beta_0, \lambda^+)) \cup \{\lambda^+\}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ was specified in Lemma 3.3. For every $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$, let $\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma$ denote the Cohen forcing $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \gamma)$ followed by the Prikry forcing $\mathbb{Q}_\gamma$ defined with respect to the measure $\dot{U}_\gamma$ (where we identify $\dot{U}_{\lambda^+}$ with $\dot{U}$ and $\mathbb{P}|\lambda^+ * \mathbb{Q}_{\lambda^+}$ with $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}$). For $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is as in Lemma 3.6, let $\mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha$ be a $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)$-name for the Prikry forcing defined with the $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)$-name $\dot{U}^\pi_\alpha$. Let us also define $\mathbb{Q}^\pi_\lambda$ as the Prikry forcing with the measure $\pi(\dot{U}_{\beta_0})$ in $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$.

The following lemma defines certain projections which will be used later on.

Lemma 3.8 *(i) For every $\gamma, \delta \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$ with $\gamma < \delta$, there is a projection*

$$\sigma^\delta_\gamma : \mathbb{P}|\delta * \mathbb{Q}_\delta \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma). \tag{3.14}$$

(ii) For every γ in $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ and every $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$, there is a projection

$$\sigma^\gamma_\alpha : \mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha). \tag{3.15}$$

(iii) For $\gamma \in \mathcal{A} \cap (\beta_0, \lambda^+)$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$, let $\hat{\sigma}^\gamma_\alpha$ be the extension of σ^γ_α to the Boolean completion of $\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma$ obtained according to Lemma 2.2(ii)(b):

$$\hat{\sigma}^\gamma_\alpha : \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma) \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha). \tag{3.16}$$

Then the projections commute:

$$\sigma^{\lambda^+}_\alpha = \hat{\sigma}^\gamma_\alpha \circ \sigma^{\lambda^+}_\gamma, \tag{3.17}$$

where $\sigma^{\lambda^+}_\alpha$ is as in item (ii) of the present lemma.

Proof. (i). Let $G * x$ be a $\mathbb{P}|\delta * \mathbb{Q}_\delta$-generic filter,[9] where x is an ω-sequence cofinal in κ. By the geometric condition for Prikry genericity,[10] and the fact that $\dot{U}_\gamma$ is the restriction of $\dot{U}_\delta$, it is clear that $G|\gamma * x$ is $\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma$-generic. The result follows by Lemma 2.1.

(ii). Let $G * x$ be a $\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma$-generic filter, where x is an ω-sequence cofinal in κ. By (3.12) and the geometric condition for the generic filters for Prikry forcings,

$$\pi(G|\beta_0) * x \text{ is } \mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\lambda\text{-generic.}$$

Substituting $H = \pi(G|\beta_0)$ in Lemma 3.6, for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha$ is a forcing in $V[H|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)]$ defined with respect to the restriction of the measure U; it follows that $H|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * x$ is a

[9] We abuse notation here and identify $G * x$ with the generic filter which it determines.

[10] The geometric condition characterises the genericity for Prikry forcing: a cofinal ω-sequence in κ determines a generic filter if and only if it is eventually contained in every element of the measure used to define the forcing.

generic filter for $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha$ existing in $V[G * x]$. The result again follows by Lemma 2.1.

(iii). σ^γ_α is correctly defined by Lemma 2.2(ii)(a). Let us fix $(p,(s,\dot{A}))$ in $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}$ and let us denote

$$b_\alpha = \bigwedge\{b \in \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha) \mid (p,(s,\dot{A})) \Vdash b \in \dot{G}_\alpha\},$$

$$b_\gamma = \bigwedge\{b \in \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma) \mid (p,(s,\dot{A})) \Vdash b \in \dot{G}_\gamma\},$$

and

$$b^\gamma_\alpha = \bigwedge\{b \in \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha) \mid b_\gamma \Vdash b \in \dot{G}_\alpha\},$$

where $\dot{G}_\gamma$ and $\dot{G}_\alpha$ are the canonical names for the generic filters. The intuition is that the Boolean value b_α (and similarly b_γ and b^γ_α) corresponds to a condition $(\pi(p|\beta_0)|\alpha,(s,\dot{C}))$ for some $\dot{C}$ which is the intersection of all elements in $\dot{U}_\alpha$ in $V^{\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)*\mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha}$ which contain $\dot{A}$; the problem is that this condition in general may not exist in $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha$, and it is necessary to use the more abstract Boolean names.

We show that $b_\alpha = b^\gamma_\alpha$.

To argue for $b^\gamma_\alpha \le b_\alpha$, notice that we can identify every element of $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha)$ with an element b of $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma)$ by virtue of the projection $\hat{\sigma}^\gamma_\alpha$; now if $(p,(s,\dot{A}))$ forces b into $\dot{G}_\alpha$, then clearly $(p,(s,\dot{A}))$ forces b into $\dot{G}_\gamma$. In particular b_γ forces b into $\dot{G}_\alpha$, and so $b^\gamma_\alpha \le b_\alpha$.

Conversely, b_γ can be identified with an element of $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}*\mathbb{Q})$, and under this identification $(p,(s,\dot{A})) \le b_\gamma$. It follows that if b_γ forces $b \in \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha)$ into $\dot{G}_\alpha$, so does $(p,(s,\dot{A}))$, and hence $b_\alpha \le b^\gamma_\alpha$. □

We are now ready to define the main forcing $\mathbb{R}$.

Definition 3.9 *Conditions in $\mathbb{R}$ are triples (p,q,r) which satisfy the following (where $\mathcal{B}$ is as in Lemma 3.6):*

- *(i) (p,q) is a condition in $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}$.*
- *(ii) r is a function with $\mathrm{dom}(r) \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $|\mathrm{dom}(r)| \le \kappa$ such that for every $\alpha \in \mathrm{dom}(r)$, $r(\alpha)$ is a nice $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha$-name and:*

$$\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha \Vdash r(\alpha) \in \dot{\mathrm{Add}}(\kappa^+,1).$$

The ordering is defined as follows: $(p',q',r') \le (p,q,r)$ if the following hold:

- *(i) $(p',q') \le (p,q)$ in $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}$.*
- *(ii) $\mathrm{dom}(r) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(r')$ and for every $\alpha \in \mathrm{dom}(r)$,*

$$\sigma^{\lambda^+}_\alpha(p',q') \Vdash_{\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)*\mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha)} r'(\alpha) \le r(\alpha).$$

The following lemmas identify the basic properties of $\mathbb{R}$.

Define $\mathbb{U}$ to consist of all elements of $\mathbb{R}$ of the form $(1,1,r)$, with the induced partial ordering. Let $\nu : (\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}) \times \mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by $\nu((p,q),(1,1,r)) = (p,q,r)$.

Assume μ is a regular uncountable cardinal. We say that a partial order has the *μ-Knaster property* if every family of conditions of size μ contains μ-many pairwise compatible conditions.

Lemma 3.10 *The following hold:*

(i) $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}$ *has a dense subset which has the* κ^+*-Knaster property.*
(ii) $\mathbb{U}$ *is* κ^+*-closed, i.e. every decreasing sequence of conditions in* $\mathbb{U}$ *of length less than* κ^+ *has a lower bound.*
(iii) ν *is a projection which commutes with the natural projections from* $\mathbb{R}$ *and* $(\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}) \times \mathbb{U}$ *to* $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}$ *(so that in a natural way* $V[\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}] \subseteq V[\mathbb{R}] \subseteq V[(\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}) \times \mathbb{U}]$*).*
(iv) $V[\mathbb{R}]$ *and* $V[\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}]$ *have the same* κ*-sequences.*

Proof. (i). Let Z contain all conditions of the form $(p, (\check{s}, \dot{A}))$; then Z is dense in $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}$ because the first coordinate can always be extended to determine $\check{s}$. By GCH and the fact that conditions in the Prikry forcing with the same stem s are compatible, this dense set has the κ^+-Knaster property. (ii)–(iii) are obvious. Regarding (iv), by (i), (ii) and the Easton lemma, $\mathbb{U}$ is κ^+-distributive over $V[\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}]$; then (iv) follows by (iii). □

Lemma 3.11 *The following hold:*

(i) $\mathbb{R}$ *has the* λ*-Knaster property.*
(ii) $\mathbb{R}$ *collapses cardinals in the interval* (κ^+, λ) *(and no other cardinals), making* κ^{++} *in* $V[\mathbb{R}]$ *equal to* λ*. In* $V[\mathbb{R}]$*,* $2^\kappa = \lambda^+ = \kappa^{+3}$*.*

Proof. (i). Let us work in V, and let $Y = \{(p_\alpha, q_\alpha, r_\alpha) \,|\, \alpha < \lambda\}$ be a set of conditions in $\mathbb{R}$ of size λ. We wish to find a subset Y' of size λ which consists of pairwise compatible conditions. By a Δ-system argument there is a cofinal $a \subseteq \lambda$ such that $\{(p_\alpha, q_\alpha) \,|\, \alpha \in a\}$ is a family of pairwise compatible conditions in $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}$. By another Δ-system argument, there is a cofinal $a' \subseteq a$, and a root $r \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ of size $\le \kappa$, such that for all $\alpha, \beta \in a'$, $\alpha \ne \beta$, $\mathrm{dom}(r_\alpha) \cap \mathrm{dom}(r_\beta) = r$. By the inaccessibility of λ, the number of nice $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\gamma) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\gamma$-names, $\gamma \in r$, for conditions in $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa^+, 1)$ is less than λ. Hence there is a cofinal $a'' \subseteq a'$ such that if α, β are in a'', then for all $\gamma \in r$, $r_\alpha(\gamma) = r_\beta(\gamma)$. It follows $Y' = \{(p_\alpha, q_\alpha, r_\alpha) \,|\, \alpha \in a''\}$ is as required.

(ii). The preservation of κ^+, and the collapsing of the cardinals in the open interval (κ^+, λ), follows as in the classical case (see [1]) using the results from Lemma 3.10 (in particular the existence of the projections in (iii)). λ and larger cardinals are preserved by the λ-Knasterness of $\mathbb{R}$, and $2^\kappa = \lambda^+$ follows by the inclusion of $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \lambda^+)$ in $\mathbb{R}$. □

We will need to consider truncations of $\mathbb{R}$, which we define next.

Definition 3.12 *Let* $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ *be such that* $\lambda < \beta_0 < \gamma$*, where* $\mathcal{A}$ *is as in Lemma 3.3 and* β_0 *as in (3.11). Conditions in* $\mathbb{R}|\gamma$ *are triples* (p, q, r) *which satisfy the following (where* $\mathcal{B}$ *is as in Lemma 3.6):*

(i) (p, q) *is a condition in* $\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma$*, where* $\mathbb{Q}_\gamma$ *is the Prikry forcing defined with respect to the measure* $\dot{U}_\gamma$*.*

(ii) r *is a function with* $\mathrm{dom}(r) \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ *and* $|\mathrm{dom}(r)| \leq \kappa$ *such that for every* $\alpha \in \mathrm{dom}(r)$, $r(\alpha)$ *is a nice* $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi}_{\alpha}$*-name and:*

$$\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi}_{\alpha} \Vdash r(\alpha) \in \mathrm{Add}(\kappa^+, 1).$$

The ordering is defined as for $\mathbb{R}$*, but using the projections* σ^{γ}_{α}*,* $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$*.*

Lemma 3.13 *Let* $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ *be such that* $\beta_0 < \gamma < \lambda^+$*. There is a projection from* $\mathbb{R}$ *to* $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{R}|\gamma)$*.*

Proof. First notice that $\mathbb{R}|\gamma$ is densely embeddable in $\hat{\mathbb{R}}|\gamma$, which is defined as $\mathbb{R}|\gamma$ but with elements of $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma)$ instead of $\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma$, and with the projection $\hat{\sigma}^{\gamma}_{\alpha}$. Because of the commutativity $\sigma^{\lambda^+}_{\alpha} = \hat{\sigma}^{\gamma}_{\alpha} \circ \sigma^{\lambda^+}_{\gamma}$, see Lemma 3.8(iii), it is easy to check that in $V^{\mathbb{R}}$, we can find a generic for $\hat{\mathbb{R}}|\gamma$. □

We now show that if $\mathbb{R}$ adds an Aronszajn tree on λ, then a truncation $\mathbb{R}|\beta^*$ for a certain β^* must add an Aronszajn tree on λ.

Before we give the lemma, let us define some terminology. Let (p, q) be a condition in $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}$; without loss of generality, q is of the form $(s, \dot{A})$ for some finite subset s of κ and some nice $\mathbb{P}$-name $\dot{A}$ for a subset of κ. We say that α is in the support of (p, q) if it is in the support of p or some p' which occurs in the nice name $\dot{A}$ (see the convention following Definition 3.2).

Lemma 3.14 *Suppose* $\mathbb{R}$ *forces that there is an Aronszajn tree on* λ*. Then for some* β^* *in* $\mathcal{A}$*,* $\beta_0 < \beta^*$*,* $\mathbb{R}|\beta^*$ *forces there is an Aronszajn tree on* λ*.*

Proof. Let $\dot{T}$ be a nice name for a subset of λ which in some natural way corresponds to an Aronszajn tree on λ, which we assume exists in $V^{\mathbb{R}}$. $\dot{T}$ is of the form $\bigcup\{\{\alpha\} \times K_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < \lambda\}$, where K_α for $\alpha < \lambda$ is an antichain in $\mathbb{R}$. By the λ-Knaster property, $|K_\alpha| < \lambda$ for every $\alpha < \lambda$. It follows there are at most λ many coordinates $\alpha < \lambda^+$ which are in the support of (p, q) such that for some r, $(p, q, r) \in \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} K_\alpha$ (we say that α is *in the support of* $\dot{T}$). Hence we can choose β^* in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\beta_0 < \beta^*$, and $\mathbb{R}|\beta^*$ forces that $\dot{T}'$ is an Aronszajn tree on λ, for some name $\dot{T}'$ which is naturally obtained from $\dot{T}$. □

Suppose now that $\mathbb{R}$ does force that there is an Aronszajn tree on λ and let us fix β^* as above (we will later show that the assumption that $\mathbb{R}$ adds an Aronszajn tree on λ leads to a contradiction).

Let π^* be an isomorphism between $\mathbb{P}|\beta^*$ and $\mathbb{P}|\lambda$; choose π^* so that it extends π (the fixed isomorphism between $\mathbb{P}|\beta_0$ and $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$). This implies $\pi(\dot{U}_{\beta_0}) = \pi^*(\dot{U}_{\beta_0})$, and therefore the measure $\pi^*(\dot{U}_{\beta^*})$ is forced to extend the measure $\pi(\dot{U}_{\beta_0})$. More precisely, if $G|\beta^*$ is $\mathbb{P}|\beta^*$-generic, then the following hold:

(i) $\bar{G} = \pi^*(G|\beta^*)$ is $\mathbb{P}|\lambda$-generic and its restriction to its even coordinates, to be denoted as $\bar{G}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$, is equal to $\pi(G|\beta_0)$ (and $\bar{G}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$ is $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$-generic).

(ii) The measure $\pi(\dot{U}_{\beta_0})^{\bar{G}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)}$ in $V[\bar{G}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)]$ is extended by the measure $\pi^*(\dot{U}_{\beta^*})^{\bar{G}}$ in $V[\bar{G}]$.

Define $\mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda$ as the Prikry forcing in $\mathbb{P}|\lambda$ with the measure $\pi^*(\dot{U}_{\beta^*})$.

Lemma 3.15 *(i) π^* extends to an isomorphism from $\mathbb{P}|\beta^* * \mathbb{Q}_{\beta^*}$ onto $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda$.*
(ii) For every $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$, $\sigma^\lambda_\alpha = \sigma^{\beta^*}_\alpha \circ (\pi^*)^{-1}$ is a projection

$$\sigma^\lambda_\alpha : \mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha). \tag{3.18}$$

Proof. (i). Let us view $\mathbb{P}|\beta^* * \mathbb{Q}_{\beta^*}$ as a collection of conditions $(p,(s,\dot{A}))$, where $\dot{A}$ is a nice $\mathbb{P}|\beta^*$-name. It is clear that we can naturally extend π^* so that $\pi^*(\dot{A})$ is a nice name in $\mathbb{P}|\lambda$. Moreover, since π^* is an isomorphism, $\mathbb{P}|\beta^*$ forces that $\dot{A}$ is in $\dot{U}_{\beta^*}$ if and only if $\pi(\dot{A})$ is in $\pi^*(\dot{U}_{\beta^*})$.

(ii). This is clear because $(\pi^*)^{-1}$ is an isomorphism. □

Let us define the following variant of $\mathbb{R}$, and call it $\mathbb{R}^*$:

Definition 3.16 *Conditions in $\mathbb{R}^*$ are triples (p,q,r) which satisfy the following (where $\mathcal{B}$ is as in Lemma 3.6):*

(i) (p,q) is a condition in $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda$.
(ii) r is a function with $\mathrm{dom}(r) \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $|\mathrm{dom}(r)| \leq \kappa$ such that for every $\alpha \in \mathrm{dom}(r)$, $r(\alpha)$ is a nice $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha$-name and:

$$\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha \Vdash r(\alpha) \in \mathrm{Add}(\kappa^+, 1).$$

The ordering is defined by means of the projections σ^λ_α, $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$.

Lemma 3.17 *$\mathbb{R}|\beta^*$ and $\mathbb{R}^*$ are isomorphic.*

Proof. Define $f : \mathbb{R}|\beta^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$ by assigning to $(p,(s,\dot{A}),r)$ the condition $(\pi^*(p),(s,\pi^*(\dot{A})),r)$, where $(s,\dot{A})$ is a condition in $\mathbb{Q}_{\beta^*}$. Since σ^λ_α is determined by π^* and $\sigma^{\beta^*}_\alpha$ (3.18), it is easy to check that f is an isomorphism. □

By Lemma 3.14, it follows that if $\mathbb{R}$ adds an Aronszajn tree on λ, $\mathbb{R}^*$ adds an Aronszajn tree on λ. In Stage 2, we show that this cannot happen.

3.2 Stage 2

We verify that the method of [2], and the ideas from [10], can be applied in our case to verify that $\mathbb{R}^*$ does not add an Aronszajn tree at λ (see the review of the proof in Section 1).

In order to carry out the analysis of $\mathbb{R}^*$, we need to be able to define truncations $\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha$ for a large set $\mathcal{B}^* \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ below λ, where $\mathcal{B}$ is as in Lemma 3.6. In order to obtain such $\mathcal{B}^*$, first apply the construction in Lemma 3.6 to the measure $\pi^*(\dot{U}_{\beta^*})$ in the generic extension of V by $\mathbb{P}|\lambda$, and obtain an unbounded set $\mathcal{B}^*$ below λ where the measure $\pi^*(\dot{U}_{\beta^*})$ reflects in the sense that if H is $\mathbb{P}|\lambda$-generic and $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$, then

$$\pi^*(\dot{U}_{\beta^*})^H \cap V[H|\alpha] \in V[H|\alpha]. \tag{3.19}$$

Using the closure at points of cofinality $> \kappa$, one can in fact refine to ensure

$$\mathcal{B}^* \subseteq \mathcal{B}. \tag{3.20}$$

For $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$, define $\mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$ as the Prikry forcing defined with respect to the restriction of the measure $\pi^*(\dot{U}_{\beta^*})$ in (3.19); let us denote this measure $\dot{U}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$. Denote $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^* = \mathcal{B}^* \cup \{\lambda\}$. We now proceed as in Lemma 3.8, and in particular using Lemma 2.1, to obtain for every $\alpha < \gamma$ in $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*$ projections:

$$\varrho^\gamma_\alpha : \mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\gamma \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha) \tag{3.21}$$

and

$$\hat{\varrho}^\gamma_\alpha : \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\gamma) \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha), \tag{3.22}$$

which moreover satisfy:

$$\varrho^\lambda_\alpha = \hat{\varrho}^\gamma_\alpha \circ \varrho^\lambda_\gamma. \tag{3.23}$$

Recall we used projections σ^λ_α, $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}$, to define the forcing $\mathbb{R}^*$. We show that σ^λ_α is the same projection as ϱ^λ_α for $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$, and therefore we can view $\mathbb{R}^*$ as being defined with the projections ϱ^λ_α, $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$.

Lemma 3.18 *For $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$, $\sigma^\lambda_\alpha = \varrho^\lambda_\alpha$.*

Proof. Let us fix $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$ and a condition (p,q) in $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda$, and let us temporarily denote $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha)$ by $P^{\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)}$. Let F be a $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda$-generic filter, F^* a $\mathbb{P}|\beta^* * \mathbb{Q}_{\beta^*}$-generic filter, and let $\dot{F}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)$ and $\dot{F}^*|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)$ be the canonical names for the $P^{\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)}$-generic filters existing in $V[F]$ and $V[F^*]$, respectively. Since π^* extends π, it is clear that for every $b \in P^{\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)}$,

$$(p,q) \Vdash b \in \dot{F}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (\pi^*)^{-1}(p,q) \Vdash b \in \dot{F}^*|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha),$$

and therefore

$$\varrho^\lambda_\alpha(p,q) = \bigwedge\{b \in P^{\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)} \mid (p,q) \Vdash b \in \dot{F}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)\} = \bigwedge\{b \in P^{\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)} \mid (\pi^*)^{-1}(p,q) \Vdash b \in \dot{F}^*|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)\} = \sigma^\lambda_\alpha(p,q),$$

as desired. □

Now we can define truncations $\mathbb{R}|\gamma$ for $\gamma \in \mathcal{B}^*$:

Definition 3.19 *For $\gamma \in \mathcal{B}^*$, define $\mathbb{R}^*|\gamma$ as follows. Conditions in $\mathbb{R}^*|\gamma$ are triples (p,q,r), where $\mathcal{B}^*$ is from (3.20):*

- *(i) (p,q) is a condition in $\mathbb{P}|\gamma * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\gamma$.*
- *(ii) r is a function with $\mathrm{dom}(r) \subseteq \mathcal{B}^* \cap \gamma$ and $|\mathrm{dom}(r)| \leq \kappa$ such that for every $\alpha \in \mathrm{dom}(r)$, $r(\alpha)$ is a nice $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha$-name and:*

$$\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha \Vdash r(\alpha) \in \mathrm{Add}(\kappa^+, 1).$$

The ordering is defined as follows: $(p', q', r') \leq (p, q, r)$ *if the following hold:*

(i) $(p', q') \leq (p, q)$ *in* $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}$.
(ii) $\mathrm{dom}(r) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(r')$ *and for every* $\alpha \in \mathrm{dom}(r)$,

$$\varrho^{\gamma}_{\alpha}(p', q') \Vdash_{\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)*\mathbb{Q}^{\pi}_{\alpha})} r'(\alpha) \leq r(\alpha).$$

Lemma 3.20 *For every* $\gamma \in \mathcal{B}^*$ *there exists a projection from* $\mathbb{R}^*$ *to* $\mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{R}^*|\gamma)$.

PROOF. It follows as in Lemma 3.13, using the fact that $\sigma^{\lambda}_{\alpha} = \varrho^{\lambda}_{\alpha}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$ (see Lemma 3.18). □

The analysis in Lemma 3.10 can be applied to $\mathbb{R}^*$ straightforwardly. Let $\mathbb{U}^*$ denote the κ^+-closed forcing such that there is a projection from $(\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_{\lambda}) \times \mathbb{U}^*$ to $\mathbb{R}^*$. By arguments similar to Lemma 3.10 and 3.11, for an inaccessible $\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}^*$, $\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha$ preserves all cardinals except in the interval (κ^+, α) and forces $2^{\kappa} = \alpha$. Moreover, $V[\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha]$ is a submodel of $V[\mathbb{R}^*]$ and every bounded subset of λ in $V[\mathbb{R}^*]$ appears in $V[\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha]$, for some $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$.

The existence of $\mathbb{U}^*$ generalizes to the truncations $\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$.

Lemma 3.21 *Let* α *be in* $\mathcal{B}^*$. *Then* $\mathbb{R}^*/(\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha)$ *is in* $V[\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha]$ *a projection of* $(\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_{\lambda}/\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_{\alpha}) \times \mathbb{U}^*_{\alpha}$ *for some* κ^+*-closed forcing* $\mathbb{U}^*_{\alpha}$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha$.

PROOF. The proof follows the analysis of the classical Mitchell forcing in [1], using the facts given in Lemma 3.10. □

Following [2, Lemma 6.5], and the correction in [10], the proof is finished by showing that for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$, the product $(\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_{\lambda}/\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_{\alpha}) \times (\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_{\lambda}/\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_{\alpha})$ ("the square of $(\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_{\lambda}/\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_{\alpha})$") is κ^+-cc in $V[\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha]$ (this result is stated as Lemma 3.28). Please see the paragraph after the proof of Lemma 3.28 for a brief explanation why Lemma 3.28 suffices to finish the proof.

The importance of the square of the forcing being κ^+-cc follows from the following Lemma due to Unger [10] which we give with a proof for the convenience of the reader (our proof is a bit simpler).

Lemma 3.22 *Suppose* γ *is regular and a forcing* P *adds a subset* x *of* γ *such that* x *is not in* V *but* $x \cap \alpha$ *is in* V *for all* $\alpha < \gamma$. *Then* $P \times P$ *is not* γ*-cc.*

PROOF. It suffices to show that if G is P-generic then P is not γ-cc in $V[G]$. In $V[G]$ let $x = (\dot{x})^G$ be a subset of γ as in the hypothesis and choose a sequence $\langle p_i \,|\, i < \gamma \rangle$ of conditions in G and an increasing sequence of ordinals $\langle \alpha_i \,|\, i < \gamma \rangle$ less than γ such that p_i fixes $\dot{x} \cap \alpha_i$ (i.e. forces it to equal a specific element of V) but does not fix $\dot{x} \cap \alpha_{i+1}$. This is possible as $x \cap \alpha$ is fixed by some condition in G for each $\alpha < \gamma$ but x itself is fixed by no condition in G. Now choose q_{i+1} extending p_i to disagree with p_{i+1} about $\dot{x} \cap \alpha_{i+1}$. This is possible as p_i does not fix $\dot{x} \cap \alpha_{i+1}$. But then the q_{i+1}'s form an antichain as any condition extending q_{i+1} disagrees with p_{i+1} (and therefore with p_j for all $j > i$) about $\dot{x}$ and therefore cannot extend q_{j+1} for $j > i$, as q_{j+1} extends p_j. □

Since the argument in [10] is stated for a different forcing, we provide a self-contained proof of Lemma 3.28. For the proof of Lemma 3.28, we need to prove some preliminary facts (Lemma 3.23 – Lemma 3.27).

Lemma 3.23 *Let α be in $\mathcal{B}^*$. Assume $(p,(s,\dot{A})) \in \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}_\alpha^{\pi^*}$ and $(q,(t,\dot{B})) \in \mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}_\lambda^{\pi^*}$ are arbitrary conditions. Then $(p,(s,\dot{A}))$ forces that $(q,(t,\dot{B}))$ is not a condition in $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}_\lambda^{\pi^*}/\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}_\alpha^{\pi^*}$ if and only if one of the following conditions holds:*

(i) $q|\alpha$ is incompatible with p,

(ii) $q|\alpha$ is compatible with p, s does not extend t and t does not extend s,

(iii) $q|\alpha$ is compatible with p, s extends t and $q \cup p \Vdash s \setminus t \nsubseteq \dot{B}$,

(iv) $q|\alpha$ is compatible with p, t extends s and $(q|\alpha) \cup p \Vdash t \setminus s \nsubseteq \dot{A}$.

Proof. $(p,(s,\dot{A})) \Vdash (q,(t,\dot{B})) \notin \mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}_\lambda^{\pi^*}/\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}_\alpha^{\pi^*}$ if and only if there is no generic filter $G * x$ such that $(q,(t,\dot{B})) \in G * x$ and $(p,(s,\dot{A})) \in G|\alpha * x$.

First, it is easy to see that each of the conditions above rules out the existence of such a generic filter $G * x$.

Second, assume that all conditions above fail. Then p is compatible with q and it has to hold that either s extends t or t extends s. If s extends t, then $q \cup p \nVdash s \setminus t \nsubseteq \dot{B}$. This means that there is r below $q \cup p$ such that $r \Vdash s \setminus t \subseteq \dot{B}$. Consider the condition $(r,(s,\dot{A} \cap \dot{B}))$ and let $G * x$ be generic filter such that $(r,(s,\dot{A} \cap \dot{B})) \in G * x$. It is easy to verify that $(q,(t,\dot{B})) \in G * x$ and $(p,(s,\dot{A})) \in G|\alpha * x$. The second case, if t extends s, is similar. □

We have just characterised the case when a condition in $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}_\lambda^{\pi^*}$ is forced out of the quotient. Now, we focus on the case when a condition is forced into the quotient. First we prove an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 3.24 *Let α be in $\mathcal{B}^*$. Assume $(p,(s,\dot{A})) \in \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}_\alpha^{\pi^*}$ and $(q,(t,\dot{B})) \in \mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}_\lambda^{\pi^*}$ are arbitrary conditions such that $p \leq q|\alpha$. Then there is a $\mathbb{P}|\alpha$-name $\dot{C}$ such that p forces that $\dot{C}$ is in $\dot{U}_\alpha^{\pi^*}$ and for each finite set x in $\dot{C}$ such that $s \cup x$ is a stem,[11] $q \nVdash^{V[\mathbb{P}|\alpha]}_{\mathbb{P}|\lambda/\mathbb{P}|\alpha} x \nsubseteq \dot{B}$.*

Proof. Assume that G is a $\mathbb{P}|\alpha$-generic filter such that $p \in G$. We define a colouring of $[\kappa]^{<\omega}$ as follows:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s \cup x \text{ is a stem and } q \nVdash^{V[G]}_{\mathbb{P}|\lambda/\mathbb{P}|\alpha} x \nsubseteq \dot{B}; \\ 1 & \text{if } s \cup x \text{ is a stem and } q \Vdash^{V[G]}_{\mathbb{P}|\lambda/\mathbb{P}|\alpha} x \nsubseteq \dot{B}; \\ 2 & \text{if } s \cup x \text{ is not a stem.} \end{cases}$$

By Rowbottom's theorem, there is a set C in $U_\alpha^{\pi^*}$ homogeneous for f. Let $\dot{C}$ be a $\mathbb{P}|\alpha$-name for C.

[11] $s \cup x$ is a stem if $s \cup x$ extends s.

Assume for contradiction that $\dot{C}$ is not as required. Then there is some $r \leq p$ and a finite set x in $\dot{C}$ such that r forces that $q \Vdash^{V[\mathbb{P}|\alpha]}_{\mathbb{P}|\lambda/\mathbb{P}|\alpha} x \nsubseteq \dot{B}$. Let n be the size of x. Since $\dot{C}$ is a homogeneous set for f, we know that for each set y of size n, $f(y) = 1$. As we assume $p \leq q|\alpha$, $r \cup q$ is a condition in $\mathbb{P}|\lambda$. Let H be a $\mathbb{P}|\lambda$-generic filter which contains $r \cup q$. Then $\dot{B}^{V[H]} \cap \dot{C}^{V[H]} = \emptyset$ in $V[H]$. This is a contradiction since $\dot{B}^{V[H]}$ and $\dot{C}^{V[H]}$ are sets in $(\dot{U}^{\pi^*}_\lambda)^{V[H]}$. □

Now we provide a sufficient condition for a condition in $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi*}_\lambda$ to be forced into the quotient.

Lemma 3.25 *Let α be in $\mathcal{B}^*$. Assume $(p,(s,\dot{A})) \in \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$ and $(q,(t,\dot{B})) \in \mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda$ are arbitrary conditions. If they satisfy the following conditions*

(i) s extends t,

(ii) $p \leq q|\alpha$ and

(iii) $q \cup p \Vdash s \setminus t \subseteq \dot{B}$,

then for the set $\dot{C}$ from Lemma 3.24, it holds that $(p,(s,\dot{A} \cap \dot{C}))$ forces $(q,(t,\dot{B}))$ into the quotient $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda / \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$.

Proof. For contradiction assume that there is $(p',(s',\dot{A}')) \leq (p,(s,\dot{A} \cap \dot{C}))$ such that $(p',(s',\dot{A}')) \Vdash (q,(t,\dot{B})) \notin \mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda / \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$. It means that one of the conditions in Lemma 3.23 is true. It is easy to see that conditions (i), (ii) and (iv) are false, hence the condition (iii) has to be true. Thus $p' \cup q \Vdash s' \setminus t \nsubseteq \dot{B}$. By the assumptions (i) and (iii) of the present lemma, s extends t and $p \cup q \Vdash s \setminus t \subseteq \dot{B}$. Therefore $p' \cup q \Vdash s' \setminus s \nsubseteq \dot{B}$.

Since $(p',(s',\dot{A}')) \leq (p,(s,\dot{A} \cap \dot{C}))$, $p' \Vdash s' \setminus s \subseteq \dot{A} \cap \dot{C}$. Hence $p' \Vdash s' \setminus s \subseteq \dot{C}$. By Lemma 3.24, we know that p' forces $q \nVdash^{V[\mathbb{P}|\alpha]}_{\mathbb{P}|\lambda/\mathbb{P}|\alpha} s' \setminus s \nsubseteq \dot{B}$. Therefore $p' \cup q \nVdash s' \setminus s \nsubseteq \dot{B}$. This is in contradiction with the result of the previous paragraph. □

Lemma 3.26 *Let α be in $\mathcal{B}^*$. Assume $(p,(s,\dot{A}))$ is a condition in $\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$, and $\dot{r}_i$ for $i < 2$, are conditions forced by the weakest condition of $\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$ into the quotient $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda / \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$. Then there are $(p',(s',\dot{A}')) \leq (p,(s,\dot{A}))$, $(q_i,(t_i,\dot{B}_i))$ and $\bar{q}_i \leq q_i$, $i < 2$, such that for $i < 2$:*

(i) $(p',(s',\dot{A}'))$ decides $\dot{r}_i$ to be $(q_i,(t_i,\dot{B}_i))$,

(ii) $(p',(s',\dot{A}'))$ and $(\bar{q}_i,(t_i,\dot{B}_i))$ satisfy the assumptions (i)–(iii) of Lemma 3.25.

Proof. Let $(p',(s',\dot{A}')) \leq (p,(s,\dot{A}))$ be such that it decides the value of $\dot{r}_i$ to be $(q_i,(t_i,\dot{B}_i))$ for $i < 2$. We may assume that s' extends t_i and $p' \leq q_i|\alpha$ for $i < 2$. Since $(p',(s',\dot{A}'))$ forces that $\dot{r}_0$ is in $\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$, the condition (iii) in Lemma 3.23 has to fail, hence there is $\bar{q}_0 \leq p' \cup q_0$ such that $\bar{q}_0$ forces $s' \setminus t_0 \subseteq \dot{B}_0$. Now, if it is necessary we can extend p' to ensure $p' \leq \bar{q}_0|\alpha$.

Now, we need to deal with $\dot{r}_1 = (q_1, (t_1, \dot{B}_1))$. Since $(p', (s', \dot{A}'))$ forces that $\dot{r}_1$ is in $\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$, the condition (iii) in Lemma 3.23 has to fail. Therefore there is $\bar{q}_1 \leq p' \cup q_1$ such that $\bar{q}_1$ forces $s' \setminus t_1 \subseteq \dot{B}_1$. Again, if it is necessary we can extend p' to ensure $p' \leq \bar{q}_1|\alpha$. □

Lemma 3.27 *Let α be in $\mathcal{B}^*$. $(\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda)^2 \times (\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha)$ is κ^+-cc.*

Proof. The Cohen forcing at κ is κ^+-Knaster by GCH and the Prikry forcing at κ is κ^+-Knaster because its conditions are compatible whenever the stems are the same. The result follows by the productivity of the Knaster property. □

Finally we can prove the desired lemma which finishes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 3.28 *Let α be in $\mathcal{B}^*$. Then the square of $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda / \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$ is κ^+-cc in $V[\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha]$.*

Proof. For contradiction assume that $\{(\dot{r}^0_\beta, \dot{r}^1_\beta) \mid \beta < \kappa^+\}$ is a $\mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$-name for an antichain in $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda / \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha$. By Lemma 3.26, we can find for each $\beta < \kappa^+$ and $i < 2$ conditions $(p_\beta, (s_\beta, \dot{A}_\beta))$, $(q^i_\beta(t^i_\beta, \dot{B}^i_\beta))$ and extensions $\bar{q}^i_\beta \leq q^i_\beta$ which satisfy items (i) and (ii) in Lemma 3.26.

By Lemma 3.27, there are $\beta < \beta' < \kappa^+$ such that p_β is compatible with $p_{\beta'}$ and $\bar{q}^i_\beta$ is compatible with $\bar{q}^i_{\beta'}$ for $i < 2$. This means that $p_\beta \cup p_{\beta'}$ and $\bar{q}^i_\beta \cup \bar{q}^i_{\beta'}$ for $i < 2$ are conditions in $\mathbb{P}|\lambda$. Moreover we may assume that $t^i = t^i_\beta = t^i_{\beta'}$ and $s = s_\beta = s_{\beta'}$ for $i < 2$.

For $i < 2$, the conditions $(p_\beta \cup p_{\beta'}, (s, \dot{A}_\beta \cap \dot{A}_{\beta'}))$ and $(\bar{q}^i_\beta \cup \bar{q}^i_{\beta'}, (t^i, \dot{B}^i_\beta \cap \dot{B}^i_{\beta'}))$ satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 3.25. Therefore, there is an extension of $(p_\beta \cup p_{\beta'}, (s, \dot{A}_\beta \cap \dot{A}_{\beta'}))$ which forces the compatibility of $(\dot{r}^0_\beta, \dot{r}^1_\beta)$ and $(\dot{r}^0_{\beta'}, \dot{r}^1_{\beta'})$ in the quotient. This is a contradiction. □

This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.1: Exactly as in [2] we argue that if T is a λ-Aronszajn tree in $V[\mathbb{R}^*]$, there exist some $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^*$ such that T restricted to α is an α-Aronszajn tree in $V[\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha]$ which has a cofinal branch in $V[\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha][(\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda / \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha) \times \mathbb{U}^*_\alpha]$ (see Lemma 3.21). However the product forcing $(\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda / \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha) \times \mathbb{U}^*_\alpha$ cannot add such a branch over $V[\mathbb{R}^*|\alpha]$ as $\mathbb{U}^*_\alpha$ is κ^+-closed and the square of $(\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda / \mathbb{P}|\alpha * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\alpha)$ is κ^+-cc (this uses Lemma 3.22).

4 An arbitrary gap

Theorem 4.1 *Assume GCH and let κ be a Laver-indestructible supercompact cardinal, λ a weakly compact cardinal and μ a cardinal of cofinality greater than κ such that $\kappa < \lambda < \mu$. Then there is a forcing notion $\mathbb{R}$ such that the following hold:*

(i) $\mathbb{R}$ *preserves cardinals* $\leq \kappa^+$ *and* $\geq \lambda$.
(ii) $V[\mathbb{R}] \models (\kappa^{++} = \lambda \ \&\ 2^\kappa = \mu \ \&\ \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) = \omega \ \&\ \kappa$ *is strong limit*).
(iii) $V[\mathbb{R}] \models \mathrm{TP}(\lambda)$.

We will not give a detailed proof, but instead specify what modifications to the proof of Theorem 3.1 are needed to prove Theorem 4.1. Assume the notation is the same as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 unless said otherwise.

Modify the construction in Stage 1 in Section 3.1 as follows:

(1) In analogy with Lemma 3.3, find a set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\mu]^\lambda$ which is unbounded in $[\mu]^\lambda$ and closed under unions of increasing chains of cofinality larger than κ which satisfies:

- For every $x \in \mathcal{A}$, $\lambda + 1 \subseteq x$.
- For every $x \in \mathcal{A}$, there is a name $\dot{U}_x$ such that in $V[\mathbb{P}|x]$, $\dot{U}_x$ interprets as the restriction of the measure $\dot{U}$ on κ. Let us denote by $\mathbb{P}|x * \mathbb{Q}_x$ the Cohen forcing restricted to x followed by the Prikry forcing with the measure $\dot{U}_x$.

(2) Choose an arbitrary $y_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ and an isomorphism $\pi : \mathbb{P}|y_0 \to \mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$. Thus $\pi(\dot{U}_{y_0})$ is a measure in $\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\lambda)$.

(3) Denote $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \{y \in \mathcal{A} \,|\, y_0 \subseteq y\}$. As in Lemma 3.8, and with the notation naturally modified for the current situation, there is an unbounded set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \lambda$ closed under limits of cofinality larger than κ, and commutative projections

$$\sigma^\mu_y : \mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q} \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|y * \mathbb{Q}_y), \text{ for } y \in \hat{\mathcal{A}},$$

$$\hat{\sigma}^y_\alpha : \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|y * \mathbb{Q}_y) \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha), \text{ for } y \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha \in \mathcal{B},$$

and

$$\sigma^\mu_\alpha : \mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q} \to \mathrm{RO}^+(\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha) * \mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha), \text{ for } \alpha \in \mathcal{B}$$

with

$$\sigma^\mu_\alpha = \hat{\sigma}^y_\alpha \circ \sigma^\mu_y, \text{ for } y \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha \in \mathcal{B}.$$

Note that we denote by $\mathbb{Q}^\pi_\alpha$ the Prikry forcing defined with respect to the restriction of the measure $\pi(\dot{U}_{y_0})$ to $V[\mathbb{P}|\mathrm{Even}(\alpha)]$.

(4) Modify Definition 3.9 of $\mathbb{R}$ to use π and σ^μ_α, in the sense of the previous paragraph. As in Definition 3.12, define the truncations $\mathbb{R}|y$ for $y \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$.

(5) The key step is to show that if $\dot{T}$ is a λ-Aronszajn tree added by $\mathbb{R}$, then for some $y \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$, $\mathbb{R}|y$ adds an Aronszajn tree on λ and importantly, $\mathbb{R}|y$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^*$ (which is the same forcing as in Definition 3.16). We argue as follows:

By the λ-Knaster property of (a dense subset of) $\mathbb{R}$, there is $y^* \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$ such that the support of $\dot{T}$ (see the paragraph after Lemma 3.13) is included in y^* and $y_0 \subsetneq y^*$. Choose a bijection π^* extending π, $\pi^* : \mathbb{P}|y^* \to \mathbb{P}|\lambda$. Denote $\mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda$ the Prikry forcing in $V[\mathbb{P}|\lambda]$ defined with respect to the measure $\pi^*(\dot{U}_{y^*})$. As in Lemma 3.15, π^* extends to an isomorphism between $\mathbb{P}|y^* * \mathbb{Q}_{y^*}$ and $\mathbb{P}|\lambda * \mathbb{Q}^{\pi^*}_\lambda$. Finally, as in Lemma 3.17, $\mathbb{R}|y^*$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^*$.

Stage 2 of the argument is exactly the same as in the proof of Theorem 3.1

5 Open questions and comments

There are several generalizations of Theorem 4.1 which can be considered:

(1) Can κ have an uncountable cofinality? By the result of Golshani and Mohammadpour [8], this is consistent with $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$. By a more recent result of Golshani [7], a finite fixed gap is consistent with the tree property holding at every other cardinal (including the double successors of singular strong limit cardinals of uncountable cofinality). This leaves open the question of obtaining a singular strong limit cardinal κ of uncountable cofinality with an infinite gap $(\kappa, 2^\kappa)$ and the tree property at κ^{++}.

(2) More specifically, can κ be equal to $\aleph_\omega$ or $\aleph_{\omega_1}$? This has been answered in Friedman, Honzik, and Stejskalova [5] for the case of $\aleph_\omega$ and finite gap. Building on the technique in [5], Golshani extended this result to other strong limit singular cardinals in the above-mentioned [7]. This leaves open (again) the question of an infinite gap.

(3) By the construction in [5], the large-cardinal assumption for Theorem 4.1 can be weakened to a hypermeasurable cardinal of a suitable degree. What is the optimal large-cardinal assumption and can it be used to obtain the result in this paper?

References

[1] Uri Abraham. Aronszajn trees on $\aleph_2$ and $\aleph_3$. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 24(3):213–230, 1983.

[2] James Cummings and Matthew Foreman. The tree property. *Advances in Mathematics*, 133(1):1–32, 1998.

[3] Sy-David Friedman and Ajdin Halilović. The tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+2}$. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 76(2):477–490, 2011.

[4] Sy-David Friedman and Ajdin Halilović. The tree property at the double successor of a measurable cardinal with 2^κ large. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 223:55–64, 2013.

[5] Sy-David Friedman, Radek Honzik, and Šárka Stejskalová. The tree property at $\aleph_{\omega+2}$ with a finite gap. Submitted, 2017.

[6] Moti Gitik. Extender based forcings, fresh sets and Aronszajn trees. Unpublished preprint.

[7] Mohammad Golshani. Tree property at all regular even cardinals. Preprint, 2017.

[8] Mohammad Golshani and Rahman Mohammadpour. The tree property at double successors of singular cardinals of uncountable cofinality. To appear in *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*.

[9] Tomáš Jech. *Set Theory.* Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[10] Spencer Unger. Aronszajn trees and the successors of a singular cardinal. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 52(5–6):483–496, 2013.