



Stationary reflection principles and two cardinal tree properties

Sakai, Hiroshi

Velickovic, Boban

(Citation)

Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu, 14(1):69-85

(Issue Date)

2015-01

(Resource Type)

journal article

(Version)

Accepted Manuscript

(Rights)

©Cambridge University Press 2013

(URL)

<https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/90003537>



STATIONARY REFLECTION PRINCIPLES AND TWO CARDINAL TREE PROPERTIES

HIROSHI SAKAI AND BOBAN VELIČKOVIĆ

ABSTRACT. We study consequences of stationary and semi-stationary set reflection. We show that the semi-stationary reflection principle implies the Singular Cardinal Hypothesis, the failure of weak square principle, etc. We also consider two cardinal tree properties introduced recently by Weiss and prove that they follow from stationary and semi-stationary set reflection augmented with a weak form of Martin's Axiom. We also show that there are some differences between the two reflection principles which suggest that stationary set reflection is analogous to supercompactness whereas semi-stationary set reflection is analogous to strong compactness.

INTRODUCTION

Reflection principles are a way of transferring large cardinal properties to small cardinals. Over the years a large number of such principles have been considered and a rich theory has been developed with numerous applications not only to pure set theory but also to various other areas of mathematics. Some of the earliest and most important reflection principles concern reflection of various classes of stationary sets. In this paper we will consider stationary reflection principle SR, introduced by Foreman, Magidor and Shelah [1], which asserts that, for every $\lambda \geq \omega_2$, the following statement SR(λ) holds:

If S is a stationary subset of $[\lambda]^\omega$ then there is $I \subseteq \lambda$ of cardinality ω_1 such that $\omega_1 \subseteq I$ and $S \cap [I]^\omega$ is stationary in $[I]^\omega$.

SR and its variations have been studied extensively by a number of authors and it has been shown that it has important consequences in cardinal arithmetic, infinite combinatorics, topology, algebra, etc. One of the key observations of [1] is that SR implies the following principle (\dagger):

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03E04, 03E35, 03E50, 03E55; Secondary: 03E05, 03E65.

Key words and phrases. stationary sets, semi stationary sets, reflection, singular cardinal hypothesis, tree property, supercompact cardinals, strongly compact cardinals.

This work is supported by the Exchange Grant 2744 from the INFTY Research Networking Programme (E.S.F.) and by a binational grant PHC Sakura 27604XE. The first author was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) No. 23740076 of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (MEXT).

Every posets preserving stationary subsets of ω_1 is semiproper.

This allowed Foreman, Magidor and Shelah [1] to show that in the standard model for the Semi Proper Forcing Axiom (SPFA) a provably maximal forcing axiom, Martin's Maximum (MM), holds. Somewhat later Shelah [7] showed that MM follows outright from SPFA. The principle (\dagger) in itself has many important consequences, for instance, already in [1] it was shown that it implies that the nonstationary ideal NS_{ω_1} is precipitous, and that Chang's Conjecture holds. It is therefore interesting in its own right. In [9, Chapter XIII, 1.7] Shelah showed that (\dagger) is equivalent to a certain reflection principle. In order to explain this we will introduce some notation.

For countable sets x and y , we say that y is an ω_1 -extension of x if $x \subseteq y$ and $x \cap \omega_1 = y \cap \omega_1$. We will write $x \sqsubseteq y$ to say that y is an ω_1 -extension of x . Given $S \subseteq [\lambda]^\omega$, for some $\lambda \geq \omega_1$, we will say that S is *full* if S is closed under ω_1 -extensions. Shelah [9] showed that (\dagger) is equivalent to the statement SSR which says that, for every $\lambda \geq \omega_2$, the following statement $\text{SSR}(\lambda)$ holds:

If S is a full stationary subset of $[\lambda]^\omega$ then there is $I \subseteq \lambda$ of cardinality ω_1 such that $\omega_1 \subseteq I$ and $S \cap [I]^\omega$ is stationary in $[I]^\omega$.

One may be tempted to conjecture that the assumption that S is full in the above statement is innocuous and that SSR is equivalent to SR. However the first author [6] showed that this is not the case, indeed SSR is strictly weaker than SR. One of the goals of the present paper is to show that SSR nevertheless has many of the consequences as SR; it implies the Singular Cardinal Hypothesis, the failure of a weak version of the square principle, etc.

Another topic of this paper has to do with two cardinal properties recently introduced and studied by Weiss [13]. We first recall the relevant definitions. Suppose κ is a regular cardinal and $\lambda \geq \kappa$. By $\text{Fn}(\kappa, \lambda, 2)$ we denote the set of all partial functions of size $< \kappa$ from λ to $\{0, 1\}$. A (κ, λ) -tree is a family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \text{Fn}(\kappa, \lambda, 2)$ which is closed under restrictions and such that for every $u \in [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$ there is $f \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\text{dom}(f) = u$. We denote by $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ the u -level of \mathcal{F} , i.e. the set $\{f \in \mathcal{F} : \text{dom}(f) = u\}$. A *cofinal branch* through \mathcal{F} is a function $b : \lambda \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $f \restriction u \in \mathcal{F}$, for every $u \in [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$. A (κ, λ) -tree is called *thin* if $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ is of size $< \kappa$, for all $u \in [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$. A *level sequence* of \mathcal{F} is a sequence $\vec{f} = (f_u : u \in [\lambda]^{<\kappa})$ such that $f_u \in \text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ for all $u \in [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$. Given a (κ, λ) -tree and a level sequence \vec{f} of \mathcal{F} we will say that a branch b of \mathcal{F} is *ineffable* for \vec{f} if the set $\{u \in [\lambda]^{<\kappa} : b \restriction u = f_u\}$ is stationary in $[\lambda]^{<\kappa}$. Given a regular cardinal $\kappa \geq \omega_1$ and $\lambda \geq \kappa$ the two cardinal tree property $\text{TP}(\kappa, \lambda)$ states that every thin (κ, λ) -tree has a cofinal branch. We say that κ has the strong tree property if $\text{TP}(\kappa, \lambda)$ holds for every $\lambda \geq \kappa$. Given κ and λ as before we let $\text{ITP}(\kappa, \lambda)$ denote the statement that for every thin (κ, λ) -tree and a level sequence \vec{f} of \mathcal{F} there is

an ineffable branch for \vec{f} . We say that κ has the super tree property if $\text{ITP}(\kappa, \lambda)$ holds for every $\lambda \geq \kappa$. Note that if κ is inaccessible then every (κ, λ) -tree is thin. With this in mind we can now reinterpret classical results of Jech [2] and Magidor [5]. Namely, in our terminology, Jech [2] showed that an uncountable cardinal is strongly compact if and only if it is inaccessible and has the strong tree property. Similarly, Magidor [5] showed that an uncountable cardinal κ is supercompact if and only if it is inaccessible and has the super tree property. These results are analogous to the classical reformulation of weak compactness which states that an uncountable cardinal κ is weakly compact if and only if it is inaccessible and the usual tree property holds for κ , see for instance [3]. Since all known proofs of the consistency of strong forcing axioms require supercompact cardinals it was natural to expect that they would imply these two cardinal properties for $\kappa = \omega_2$. This was indeed confirmed by Weiss [13] who showed that the Proper Forcing Axiom (PFA) implies that ω_2 has the super tree property. Moreover, Viale and Weiss [14] showed that if the universe V is obtained by forcing over some inner model M by a forcing notion which has the κ -chain condition and the κ -approximation property, then if κ has the strong tree property in V , it also has the strong tree property in M . If, moreover, the forcing notion is proper then the same holds for the super tree property. Since all known methods for producing PFA start from an inaccessible cardinal κ in some universe M and produce a generic extension by a forcing notion which has the above property and in which κ becomes ω_2 , it follows that they require at least a strongly compact cardinal. We will show that the SR together with $\text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ implies the super tree property of ω_2 and that SSR together with $\text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ implies the strong tree property of ω_2 . This suggests that $\text{SR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ should have the consistency strength of a supercompact cardinal whereas $\text{SSR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ should have the strength of a strongly compact cardinal. We also show that $\text{SSR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ does not imply the super tree property of ω_2 .

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 1 we present notation and basic facts used in this paper. In Section 2 we prove that SSR implies the failure of weak square principles. In Section 3 we prove that $\text{SR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ and $\text{SSR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ imply the super and the strong tree properties, respectively. Finally in Section 4 we prove that SSR implies SCH.

1. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we present notation and basic facts used in this paper. For a set A of ordinals let $\lim(A)$ be the set of all limit points in A . Moreover let $\sup^+(A) = \sup\{\alpha + 1 : \alpha \in A\}$. We often use \sup^+ instead of \sup since it slightly simplifies our arguments. For an ordinal λ and a regular cardinal $\kappa < \lambda$ let $E_\kappa^\lambda = \{\alpha < \lambda : \text{cof}(\alpha) = \kappa\}$.

Let A be a set and F be a function from $[A]^{<\omega}$ to A . We say that $x \subseteq A$ is closed under F if $F(a) \in x$, for all $a \in [x]^{<\omega}$. For each $x \subseteq A$ let $\text{cl}_F(x)$ be the closure of x under F , i.e. the smallest subset y of A which contains x and is closed under F .

Let κ be a regular uncountable cardinal and A be a set including κ . Recall that a subset C of $[A]^{<\kappa}$ is said to be *club* if and only if it is \subseteq -cofinal in $[A]^{<\kappa}$, and closed under unions of \subseteq -increasing sequence of length $< \kappa$. $S \subseteq [A]^{<\kappa}$ is said to be *stationary* if it intersects all club subsets of $[A]^{<\kappa}$. We often use the well-known fact that S is stationary in $[A]^{<\kappa}$ if and only if for any function $F : [A]^{<\omega} \rightarrow A$ there exists $x \in S$ which is closed under F and such that $x \cap \kappa \in \kappa$. We say that $X \subseteq [A]^\kappa$ is stationary (or club) if X is stationary (or club) in $[A]^{<\kappa^+}$.

For a set A and a limit ordinal η we say that A is *internally approachable of length η* if there exists a \subseteq -increasing sequence $(x_\xi : \xi < \eta)$ such that $\bigcup_{\xi < \eta} x_\xi = A$ and such that $(x_\xi : \xi < \zeta) \in A$, for all $\zeta < \eta$.

Suppose that $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \trianglelefteq, \dots)$ is a structure in a countable first order language and \trianglelefteq is a well ordering of A . Then \mathfrak{A} has definable Skolem functions. For each $X \subseteq A$ let $\text{Hull}^\mathfrak{A}(X)$ be the Skolem hull of X in \mathfrak{A} , i.e. $\text{Hull}^\mathfrak{A}(X)$ is the smallest M elementary submodel of \mathfrak{A} such that $X \subseteq M$. We say that a structure $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \dots)$ is an *expansion* of a structure $\mathfrak{A}' = (A, \dots)$ if \mathfrak{A} is obtained by adding countable many constants, functions and predicates to \mathfrak{A}' . We use the following fact.

Fact 1.1 (folklore). *Let θ be a regular uncountable cardinal and \trianglelefteq a well ordering of H_θ . Let $\mathfrak{A} = (H_\theta, \in, \trianglelefteq, \dots)$ be a structure in a countable language and suppose M is an elementary submodel of \mathfrak{A} and λ is a regular uncountable cardinal with $\lambda \in M$. Let $\delta = \sup(M \cap \lambda)$. Then $\text{Hull}^\mathfrak{A}(M \cup \delta) \cap \lambda = \delta$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that $\text{Hull}^\mathfrak{A}(M \cup \delta) \cap \lambda \subseteq \delta$. Take an arbitrary $\alpha \in \text{Hull}^\mathfrak{A}(M \cup \delta) \cap \lambda$. Then there are a formula $\varphi(v_0, v_1, v_2)$, $b \in [\delta]^{<\omega}$ and $p \in M$ such that α is the unique element with $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi[\alpha, b, p]$. Take $\gamma \in M \cap \lambda$ with $b \in [\gamma]^{<\omega}$, and for each $a \in [\gamma]^{<\omega}$ let $h(a)$ be the least $\xi < \lambda$ with $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi[\xi, a, p]$ if such ξ exists. Then h is a partial function from $[\gamma]^{<\omega}$ to λ , and $h \in M$ by the definability of h and the elementarity of M . Then

$$\alpha = h(b) < \sup(\text{ran}(h)) \in M \cap \lambda.$$

Hence $\alpha \in \delta$. □

Next we give our notation and facts relevant to the singular cardinal combinatorics. Recall that SCH is the statement that $\lambda^{\text{cof}(\lambda)} = \lambda^+$ for all singular cardinals λ with $2^{\text{cof}(\lambda)} < \lambda$. We say that SCH fails at a singular cardinal λ if $2^{\text{cof}(\lambda)} < \lambda$, and $\lambda^{\text{cof}(\lambda)} > \lambda^+$. We use the following well-known theorem:

Fact 1.2 (Silver [10]). *Suppose λ is the least singular cardinal at which SCH fails. Then $\text{cof}(\lambda) = \omega$.*

We also use Shelah's PCF theory. Since we will only be working with singular cardinals of cofinality ω we make the relevant definitions only in this case. Let $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_n : n \in \omega)$ be a strictly increasing sequence of regular cardinals, and let $\lambda = \sup_{n \in \omega} \lambda_n$. We let $\prod \vec{\lambda}$ denote $\prod_{n \in \omega} \lambda_n$. For a set x of ordinals with $|x| < \lambda_0$ let $\chi_x^{\vec{\lambda}} \in \prod \vec{\lambda}$ be the characteristic function of x , i.e. $\chi_x^{\vec{\lambda}}(n) = \sup^+(x \cap \lambda_n)$ for each $n \in \omega$. We will omit the superscript $\vec{\lambda}$ in $\chi_x^{\vec{\lambda}}$ if it is clear from the context.

For functions $f, g : \omega \rightarrow \text{On}$ we use the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} f < g &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \forall n \ f(n) < g(n) \\ f <^* g &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \exists m \ \forall n \geq m \ f(n) < g(n) \\ f =^* g &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \exists m \ \forall n \geq m \ f(n) = g(n) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover for $m < \omega$ we use the following:

$$\begin{aligned} f <_m g &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \forall n \geq m \ f(n) < g(n) \\ f =_m g &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \forall n \geq m \ f(n) = g(n) \end{aligned}$$

$f \leq g$, $f \leq^* g$ and $f \leq_m g$ are defined in the same way as $f < g$, $f <^* g$ and $f <_m g$.

A $<^*$ -increasing cofinal sequence in $\prod \vec{\lambda}$ of length λ^+ is called a *scale* on $\vec{\lambda}$. A scale $(f_\beta : \beta < \lambda^+)$ is called a *better scale* if for any $\alpha < \lambda^+$ of uncountable cofinality there exists a club $C \subseteq \alpha$ and $\sigma : C \rightarrow \omega$ such that for any $\beta, \gamma \in C$ with $\beta < \gamma$ we have $f_\beta <_{\max\{\sigma(\beta), \sigma(\gamma)\}} f_\gamma$. We use the following fact.

Fact 1.3 (Shelah [8]). *Suppose that λ is a singular cardinal of cofinality ω such that $\mu^\omega < \lambda$ for all $\mu < \lambda$ and such that $\lambda^\omega > \lambda^+$. Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence of regular cardinals of length ω which converges to λ and on which a better scale exists.*

2. FAILURE OF WEAK SQUARE

It is known, due to Veličković [12], that SR implies the failure of $\square(\lambda)$ for all regular $\lambda \geq \omega_2$. Recall that $\square(\lambda)$ says that there is a sequence $(C_\alpha : \alpha \in \lim(\lambda))$ such that

- (i) C_α is a club subset of α , for all α ,
- (ii) if $\alpha \in \lim(C_\beta)$, then $C_\alpha = C_\beta \cap \alpha$,
- (iii) there are no club $C \subseteq \lambda$ with $C \cap \alpha = C_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \lim(C)$.

In this section we prove that SSR also denies $\square(\lambda)$ for all regular $\lambda \geq \omega_2$:

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that λ is a regular cardinal $\geq \omega_2$ and that $\text{SSR}(\lambda)$ holds. Then $\square(\lambda)$ fails.*

Our proof is based on that in [12]. To prove Theorem 2.1 we need several preliminaries.

First we give a modification of SSR, which is also used in Section 4. For countable sets x and y we write $x \sqsubseteq^* y$ if

- (i) $x \sqsubseteq y$,
- (ii) $\sup^+(x) = \sup^+(y)$,
- (iii) $\sup^+(x \cap \gamma) = \sup^+(y \cap \gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in E_{\omega_1}^\lambda \cap x$.

Given $X \subseteq [\lambda]^\omega$, for some $\lambda \geq \omega_1$, we say that X is *weakly full* if X is upward closed under \sqsubseteq^* .

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that $\lambda \geq \omega_2$ and that $\text{SSR}(\lambda)$ holds. Then for any weakly full stationary $X \subseteq [\lambda]^\omega$ there exists $I \in [\lambda]^{\omega_1}$ including ω_1 such that $X \cap [J]^\omega$ is stationary for all $J \subseteq \lambda$ such that $I \subseteq J$ and $\sup^+(J) = \sup^+(I)$.*

Proof. Let X be a weakly full stationary subset of $[\lambda]^\omega$. Take a sufficiently large regular cardinal θ and a well-ordering \trianglelefteq of H_θ , and let $\mathfrak{A} = (H_\theta, \in, \trianglelefteq, \lambda)$. Let Y be the set of all $y \in X$ with $\text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(y) \cap \lambda = y$, and let \bar{Y} be the upward closure of Y under \sqsubseteq . By $\text{SSR}(\lambda)$ there is $I' \in [\lambda]^{\omega_1}$ such that $\omega_1 \subseteq I'$ and $\bar{Y} \cap [I']^\omega$ is stationary. Let I be one of such I' with the least \sup^+ . We show that I witnesses the lemma for X . To this end, we make a preliminary definition. Let

$$Z_0 = \{z \in [I]^\omega : \exists y \in Y, y \sqsubseteq z \wedge \sup^+(y) = \sup^+(z)\}.$$

Claim. Z_0 is stationary in $[I]^\omega$.

Proof of Claim. Assume not. Then

$$Z = \{z \in [I]^\omega : \exists y \in Y, y \sqsubseteq z \wedge \sup^+(y) < \sup^+(z)\}$$

is stationary in $[I]^\omega$. For each $z \in Z$, choose $y_z \in Y$ such that $y_z \sqsubseteq z$ and $\sup^+(y_z) < \sup^+(z)$, and let $\beta_z = \min(z \setminus \sup^+(y_z))$. Note that $\beta_z \geq \omega_1$. By Fodor's lemma we can find β such that $Z' = \{z \in Z : \beta_z = \beta\}$ is stationary in $[I]^\omega$. Let $I' = I \cap \beta$. Then $\{z \cap \beta : z \in Z'\}$ is stationary in $[I']^\omega$. Moreover $z \cap \beta \in \bar{Y}$ for each $z \in Z'$ because $z \cap \beta \supseteq y_z$. So $\bar{Y} \cap [I']^\omega$ is stationary. Note also that $\omega_1 \subseteq I'$ and $|I'| = \omega_1$. But $\sup^+(I') < \sup^+(I)$. This contradicts the choice of I . \square_{Claim}

Now we prove that I witnesses the lemma for X . Take an arbitrary $J \subseteq \lambda$ with $I \subseteq J$ and $\sup^+(J) = \sup^+(I)$. Let

$$Z_1 = \{z \in [J]^\omega : z \cap I \in Z_0 \wedge \sup^+(z \cap I) = \sup^+(z) \wedge \text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(z) \cap \omega_1 = z \cap \omega_1\}.$$

Then Z_1 is stationary in $[J]^\omega$ because Z_0 is stationary, $\sup^+(J) = \sup^+(I)$, and $\omega_1 \subseteq J$. We show that $Z_1 \subseteq X$. In order to see this, take an arbitrary $z \in Z_1$. We prove that $z \in X$. First we can take $y \in Y$ with $y \sqsubseteq z$ and $\sup^+(y) = \sup^+(z)$. Recall that $Y \subseteq X$ and that X is closed under \sqsubseteq^* . So it suffices to prove that $y \sqsubseteq^* z$. For this all we have to show is that $\sup^+(y \cap \gamma) \geq \sup^+(z \cap \gamma)$

for every $\gamma \in E_{\omega_1}^\lambda \cap y$. Suppose that $\gamma \in E_{\omega_1}^\lambda \cap y$. Let $M = \text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(y)$ and $N = \text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(z)$. Note that $M \cap \omega_1 = y \cap \omega_1 = z \cap \omega_1 = N \cap \omega_1$. Then, since $\gamma \in M \subseteq N$ and $\text{cof}(\gamma) = \omega_1$, we have that $\sup^+(M \cap \gamma) = \sup^+(N \cap \gamma)$. Moreover $\sup^+(z \cap \gamma) \leq \sup^+(N \cap \gamma)$, and $\sup^+(y \cap \gamma) = \sup^+(M \cap \gamma)$ by the definition of Y . Hence $\sup^+(y \cap \gamma) \geq \sup^+(z \cap \gamma)$. \square

Next we present a game which will be used to construct a weakly full stationary set. Let λ be a regular cardinal $\geq \omega_2$. For a function $F : [\lambda]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \lambda$ let $G_1(\lambda, F)$ be the following game of length ω :

I	α_0	γ_0	α_1	γ_1	\cdots	α_n	γ_n	\cdots
II		β_0		β_1	\cdots		β_n	\cdots

I and II in turn choose ordinals $< \lambda$. In the n -th stage, first I chooses α_n , then II chooses β_n , and then I again chooses $\gamma_n > \alpha_n, \beta_n$ of cofinality ω_1 . I wins if

$$\text{cl}_F(\{\gamma_n : n \in \omega\}) \cap [\alpha_m, \gamma_m) = \emptyset$$

for every $m \in \omega$. Otherwise, II wins.

Lemma 2.3. *Let λ be a regular cardinal $\geq \omega_2$ and F be a function from $[\lambda]^{<\omega}$ to λ . Then I has a winning strategy for the game $G_1(\lambda, F)$.*

Proof. Since $G_1(\lambda, F)$ is an open game for player I, by the Gale-Stewart theorem, one of the players has a winning strategy. Assume towards contradiction that II has a winning strategy, say τ . We will find a play $(\alpha_n, \beta_n, \gamma_n : n \in \omega)$ in which II follows τ , but which is won by I.

Let θ be a sufficiently large regular cardinal. First, build an \in -chain $\{M_n : n < \omega\}$ of elementary submodels of H_θ containing F and τ as elements and such that $\gamma_n = M_n \cap \lambda$ is an ordinal $< \lambda$ of cofinality ω_1 . Let $x = \text{cl}_F(\{\gamma_n : n \in \omega\})$ and $\alpha_n = \sup(x \cap \gamma_n)$, for each n . Note that $\alpha_n < \gamma_n$, since x is countable and $\text{cof}(\gamma_n) = \omega_1$. Finally let $(\beta_n : n \in \omega)$ be a sequence of II's moves according to τ against $(\alpha_n, \gamma_n : n \in \omega)$. Note that $\beta_n < \gamma_n$ since $\alpha_0, \gamma_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, \gamma_{n-1}, \alpha_n \in M_n$ and M_n is an elementary submodel of H_θ containing τ . Now $(\alpha_n, \beta_n, \gamma_n : n \in \omega)$ is a legal play of $G_1(\lambda, F)$ in which II has followed τ . However, $x \cap [\alpha_n, \gamma_n) = \emptyset$, for each n , by the definition of the α_n . Therefore I wins this play, a contradiction. It follows that I has a winning strategy in $G_1(\lambda, F)$ as required. \square

Now we prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Assuming that $\square(\lambda)$ holds, we prove that $\text{SSR}(\lambda)$ fails. Let $\vec{C} = (C_\alpha : \alpha \in \lim(\lambda))$ be a $\square(\lambda)$ -sequence. Let X be the set of all $x \in [\lambda]^\omega$ which have limit order type and there is $\xi < \sup^+(x)$ such that:

- (1) $\sup(x \cap C_{\sup^+(x)}) \leq \xi$,
- (2) $\text{cof}(\min(x \setminus \beta)) = \omega_1$, for all $\beta \in C_{\sup^+(x)} \setminus \xi$.

Here note that X is weakly full. So it suffices to prove the following claims.

Claim 1. X is stationary in $[\lambda]^\omega$.

Proof. Take an arbitrary function $F : [\lambda]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \lambda$. We find $x \in X$ closed under F . By Lemma 2.3 fix a winning strategy τ of I for $G_1(\lambda, F)$. Moreover let C be the set of all limit ordinals $\beta < \lambda$ closed under τ and F . Note that C is club in λ . Then, since \vec{C} is a $\square(\lambda)$ -sequence, there exists $\delta \in \lim(C) \cap E_\omega^\lambda$ such that $C \cap \delta \setminus C_\delta$ is unbounded in δ . Take a strictly increasing sequence $(\delta_n : n \in \omega)$ in $C \cap \delta \setminus C_\delta$ which is cofinal in δ . For each $n \in \omega$ we can take $\beta_n < \delta_n$ such that $[\beta_n, \delta_n) \cap C_\delta = \emptyset$ because δ_n is a limit ordinal which is not in C_δ . Then let $(\alpha_n, \gamma_n : n \in \omega)$ be a sequence of I's moves according to τ against $(\beta_n : n \in \omega)$. Moreover let $x = \text{cl}_F(\{\gamma_n : n \in \omega\})$. It suffices to prove that $x \in X$.

To see this, first note that $\sup^+(x) = \delta$ because δ is closed under F . Next note that $\alpha_{n+1} < \delta_n$ for each $n \in \omega$ because δ_n is closed under τ . Moreover $C_\delta \cap \delta_{n+1} \subseteq \beta_{n+1} \subseteq \gamma_{n+1}$ by the choice of β_{n+1} . Hence $C_\delta \cap [\delta_n, \delta_{n+1}) \subseteq [\alpha_{n+1}, \gamma_{n+1})$ for every $n \in \omega$. Note that $x \cap [\alpha_{n+1}, \gamma_{n+1}) = \emptyset$ for each $n \in \omega$ because I wins with the play $(\alpha_n, \beta_n, \gamma_n : n \in \omega)$. Thus $x \cap C_\delta \subseteq \delta_0$. Moreover $\min(x \setminus \beta) = \gamma_{n+1}$ for all $\beta \in C_\delta \cap [\delta_n, \delta_{n+1})$, and $\text{cof}(\gamma_{n+1}) = \omega_1$ by the rule of $G_1(\lambda, F)$. Therefore $\xi = \delta_0$ witnesses that $x \in X$. \square

Claim 2. The conclusion of Lemma 2.2 fails for X .

Proof. It suffices to prove that $X \cap [\delta]^\omega$ is non stationary for every ordinal $\delta \in \lambda \setminus \omega_1$. If δ is a successor ordinal, then $X \cap [\delta]^\omega$ is clearly non stationary. Next suppose that $\text{cof}(\delta) = \omega$. Let Z_0 be the set of all $z \in [\delta]^\omega$ such that $\sup^+(z) = \delta$ and such that $z \cap C_\delta$ is unbounded in δ . Then Z_0 is club in $[\delta]^\omega$, and $X \cap Z_0 = \emptyset$. Thus $X \cap [\delta]^\omega$ is non stationary.

Finally suppose that $\text{cof}(\delta) > \omega$. Let Z_1 be the set of all $z \in [\delta]^\omega$ such that $\sup^+(z) \in \lim(C_\delta)$ and such that $z \cap C_\delta$ is unbounded in $\sup^+(z)$. Then Z_1 is club in $[\delta]^\omega$. Here note that $z \cap C_{\sup^+(z)}$ is unbounded in $\sup^+(z)$ for each $z \in Z_1$ because $C_\delta \cap \sup^+(z) = C_{\sup^+(z)}$. So $X \cap Z_1 = \emptyset$. \square

This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.1. \square

3. ITP AND TP

In this section we prove that $\text{SR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ implies the super tree property at ω_2 and that $\text{SSR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ implies the strong tree property at ω_2 . Here note that the tree property at ω_2 implies the failure of CH and that SR and SSR are consistent with CH. So SR or SSR alone does not imply the super or strong tree property at ω_2 , respectively. We also prove that $\text{SSR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ does not imply the super tree property at ω_2 .

Theorem 3.1.

- (a) *If SR and MA_{ω_1} (Cohen) hold, then ω_2 has the super tree property.*
- (b) *If SSR and MA_{ω_1} (Cohen) hold, then ω_2 has the strong tree property.*

Before we proof Theorem 3.1, we introduce some notation. For an ordinal $\lambda \geq \omega_2$ and a set M let

$$u_M^\lambda = \bigcup ([\lambda]^{\omega_1} \cap M) .$$

We will omit the superscript λ in u_M^λ if it is clear from the context. The following is a key lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume MA_{ω_1} (Cohen). Let λ be an ordinal $\geq \omega_2$ and \mathcal{F} be a thin (ω_2, λ) -tree. Let θ be a sufficiently large regular cardinal. Then there are stationary many $M \in [H_\theta]^\omega$ such that for all $f \in \text{lev}_{u_M}(\mathcal{F})$ exactly one of the following holds:*

- (1) *There exists $b \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap M$ with $b \restriction u_M = f$.*
- (2) *There exists $u \in [\lambda]^{\omega_1} \cap M$ with $f \restriction u \notin M$.*

To prove this lemma we further need two lemmas. First, let θ be a regular cardinal $\geq \omega_2$. For a function $F : [H_\theta]^{<\omega} \rightarrow H_\theta$ and $\xi < \omega_1$, let $G_2(\theta, F, \xi)$ be the following game of length ω :

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c} \text{I} & J_0 & J_1 & \cdots & J_n & \cdots \\ \hline \text{II} & K_0 & K_1 & \cdots & K_n & \cdots \end{array}$$

In the n -th stage first I chooses $J_n \in [H_\theta]^{\omega_1}$ and then II chooses $K_n \in [H_\theta]^{\omega_1}$ with $K_n \supseteq J_n$. II wins if and only if

$$\text{cl}_F(\xi \cup \{K_n : n \in \omega\}) \cap \omega_1 = \xi .$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let θ be a regular cardinal $\geq \omega_2$. Then for any function $F : [H_\theta]^{<\omega} \rightarrow H_\theta$ there exists $\xi < \omega_1$ such that II has a winning strategy for $G_2(\theta, F, \xi)$.*

Proof. Take an arbitrary function $F : [H_\theta]^{<\omega} \rightarrow H_\theta$. Towards contradiction assume that II does not have a winning strategy for $G_2(\theta, F, \xi)$, for any $\xi < \omega_1$. Since each $G_2(\theta, F, \xi)$ is an open-closed game, I has a winning strategy, say τ_ξ , in $G_2(\theta, F, \xi)$, for each ξ . Let $\vec{\tau} = (\tau_\xi : \xi < \omega_1)$. Take a sufficiently large regular cardinal μ and a countable elementary submodel M of H_μ containing θ, F and $\vec{\tau}$. Let $\zeta = M \cap \omega_1$. By induction on n let

$$\begin{aligned} J_n &= \tau_\zeta((K_m : m < n)) , \\ K_n &= \bigcup_{\xi < \omega_1} \tau_\xi((K_m : m < n)) . \end{aligned}$$

Then $(J_n, K_n : n \in \omega)$ is a legal play of $G_2(\theta, F, \zeta)$ in which I has moved according to τ_ζ . Here note that $K_n \in M$, for each n , by the elementarity of M . Moreover $\zeta = M \cap \omega_1$ and M is closed under F . Hence $\text{cl}_F(\zeta \cup \{K_n : n \in \omega\}) \subseteq M$, and

thus $\text{cl}_F(\zeta \cup \{K_n : n \in \omega\}) \cap \omega_1 = \zeta$. Therefore II wins the play $(J_n, K_n : n \in \omega)$ in $G_2(\theta, F, \zeta)$, which contradicts the fact that τ_ζ is a winning strategy of I. \square

The second one is a lemma on very thin (ω_2, λ) -trees.

Lemma 3.4. *Let λ be an ordinal $\geq \omega_2$ and \mathcal{F} be an (ω_2, λ) -tree such that $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ is countable for every $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}$. Then there is a countable subset \mathcal{B} of ${}^\lambda 2$ and a club C in $[\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}$ such that for any $u \in C$ and $f \in \text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ there is a unique $b \in \mathcal{B}$ with $b \restriction u = f$.*

Proof. Let θ be a sufficiently large regular cardinal and W_0 be the set of all elementary submodels K of H_θ which have cardinality \aleph_1 and are internally approachable of length ω_1 . Note that W_0 is stationary in $[H_\theta]^{\leq \omega_1}$. For each $K \in W_0$ we can take $x_K \in [K \cap \lambda]^{\leq \omega_1} \cap K$ such that $f_0 \restriction x_K \neq f_1 \restriction x_K$ for any distinct $f_0, f_1 \in \text{lev}_{K \cap \lambda}(\mathcal{F})$. This is because $\text{lev}_{K \cap \lambda}(\mathcal{F})$ is countable. By the Pressing Down Lemma, there is $x \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}$ such that $W_1 = \{K \in W_0 : x_K = x\}$ is stationary. Let $U = \{K \cap \lambda : K \in W_1\}$. Note that U is stationary in $[\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}$. Let A be the set of all $h \in \text{lev}_x(\mathcal{F})$ such that for every $u \in U$ there is $f \in \text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ with $f \restriction x = h$. For each $h \in A$ and $u \in U$ let f_u^h be the unique element of $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ with $f_u^h \restriction x = h$. Here note that if $h \in A$, and $u, v \in U$, then $f_u^h \restriction (u \cap v) = f_v^h \restriction (u \cap v)$. For each $h \in A$ let $b_h = \bigcup \{f_u^h : u \in U\} \in {}^\lambda 2$, and let $\mathcal{B} = \{b_h : h \in A\}$. Clearly \mathcal{B} is a countable subset of ${}^\lambda 2$. Note that $b_h \restriction u \in \text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ for all $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}$ since U is \subseteq -cofinal in $[\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}$. Let D be the collection of all elementary submodels K of H_θ which have size \aleph_1 and contain all the relevant objects. Then D is a club in $[H_\theta]^{\omega_1}$ and $C = \{K \cap \lambda : K \in D\}$ is a club in $[\lambda]^{\omega_1}$. We claim that \mathcal{B} and C are as desired. In order to see this, fix $K \in D$ and $f \in \text{lev}_{K \cap \lambda}(\mathcal{F})$. Let $h = f \restriction x$. Then $h \in \text{lev}_x(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq K$, and $f \restriction u$ witnesses that there is $g \in \text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ with $g \restriction x = h$, for every $u \in U \cap K$. So it follows from the elementarity of K that $h \in A$. Moreover $f \restriction u = f_u^h$ for all $u \in U \cap K$, and $\bigcup (U \cap K) = K \cap \lambda$ by the elementarity of K . Therefore $f = \bigcup_{u \in U \cap K} f_u^h = b_h \restriction (K \cap \lambda)$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Take an arbitrary function $F : [H_\theta]^{<\omega} \rightarrow H_\theta$. We find a countable elementary submodel M of $[H_\theta]$ closed under F such that for any $f \in \text{lev}_{u_M}(\mathcal{F})$ either (1) or (2) in Lemma 3.2 holds. Let \trianglelefteq be a well-ordering of H_θ . By changing F if necessary, we may assume that if a subset M of H_θ is closed under F , then M is an elementary submodel of $(H_\theta, \in, \trianglelefteq)$ and contains λ and \mathcal{F} . By Lemma 3.3 let $\xi < \omega_1$ be such that II has a winning strategy, say τ , for $G_2(\theta, F, \xi)$. Moreover take a sufficiently large regular cardinal μ and a countable elementary submodel N of H_μ containing all the relevant objects. The desired M will be a subset of N and will be obtained by applying MA_{ω_1} (Cohen) to an appropriate poset.

Let \mathcal{P} be the set of partial plays of the form $p = \langle J_0^p, K_0^p, \dots, J_{n_p-1}^p, K_{n_p-1}^p \rangle$ in the game $G_2(\theta, F, \xi)$ in which II follows his winning strategy τ . We call the

integer n_p the *length* of p . Moreover, let $u_i^p = K_i^p \cap \lambda$, for all $i < n_p$. We order \mathcal{P} by reverse end extension. We will apply $\text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ to the poset $\mathcal{P}_N = \mathcal{P} \cap N$. Note that, since N is countable, so is \mathcal{P}_N .

Given $K \in [H_\theta]^{\omega_1} \cap N$, let

$$D_K = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_N : K \subseteq K_i^p, \text{ for some } i < n_p\}.$$

Then D_K is dense in \mathcal{P}_N , for all such K . Next, for $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}$ let $(f_\zeta^u : \zeta < \omega_1)$ be the \trianglelefteq -least enumeration of $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$, and let $A(u) = \{f_\zeta^u : \zeta < \xi\}$. Note that $(A(u) : u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}) \in N$. Then for each $f \in \text{lev}_{u_N}(\mathcal{F})$ let

$$E_f = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_N : f \restriction u_i^p \notin A(u_i^p), \text{ for some } i < n_p\}.$$

Claim. *Suppose $f \in \text{lev}_{u_N}(\mathcal{F})$ and E_f is not dense in \mathcal{P}_N . Then there is $b \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap N$ such that $b \restriction u_N = f$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \text{lev}_{u_N}(\mathcal{F})$ be such that E_f is not dense in \mathcal{P}_N . We find $b \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap N$ such that $b \restriction u_N = f$. Fix $p \in \mathcal{P}_N$ which has no extensions in E_f . Let

$$W = \{K \in [H_\theta]^{\omega_1} : p \hat{\smallfrown} \langle J, K \rangle \in \mathcal{P}, \text{ for some } J\},$$

and let $U = \{K \cap \lambda : K \in W\}$. Note that $W, U \in N$ and that W and U are \subseteq -cofinal in $[H_\theta]^{\omega_1}$ and $[\lambda]^{\omega_1}$, respectively. Note also that, by the choice of p , $f \restriction u \in A(u)$, for all $u \in U \cap N$. Let \mathcal{G} be the set of all $g \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

- (i) $g \restriction u \in A(u)$, for all $u \in U$ with $u \subseteq \text{dom}(g)$,
- (ii) for any $u \in U$ with $\text{dom}(g) \subseteq u$ there exists $h \in A(u)$ with $g \subseteq h$.

Since all the parameters in the definition of \mathcal{G} are in N and N is elementary in H_μ , it follows that $\mathcal{G} \in N$. Note also that $f \restriction v \in \mathcal{G}$ for all $v \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1} \cap N$ by the fact that $f \restriction u \in A_u$ for all $u \in U \cap N$ and the elementarity of N . It follows that $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{G})$ is nonempty, for all $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}$, again by the elementarity of N . Clearly \mathcal{G} is closed under restrictions. So \mathcal{G} is an (ω_2, λ) -tree. Moreover, all the levels of $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{G})$ are countable. Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq {}^\lambda 2$ and $C \subseteq [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}$ be those obtained by applying Lemma 3.4 for \mathcal{G} . We may assume that $\mathcal{B}, C \in N$ by the elementarity of N . Take an \subseteq -increasing sequence $(u_n)_n$ of elements of $C \cap N$ such that $\bigcup \{u_n : n < \omega\} = u_N$. Moreover, for each n , let b_n be the unique element of \mathcal{B} with $b_n \restriction u_n = f \restriction u_n$. Note that $b_m = b_n$ for each m, n by the uniqueness. Therefore $b_0 \restriction u_N = f$. Moreover $b_0 \in N$, since $\mathcal{B} \in N$ and \mathcal{B} is countable. Therefore b_0 is as desired. \square

Now, let \mathcal{D} be the set of the D_K , for $K \in [H_\theta]^{\omega_1} \cap N$, and \mathcal{E} the set of the E_f , for $f \in \text{lev}_{u_N}(\mathcal{F})$ such that there is no $b \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap N$ with $b \restriction u_N = f$. Then \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} are dense subsets of \mathcal{P}_N . Moreover, \mathcal{D} is countable and \mathcal{E} has cardinality at most \aleph_1 , since the cardinality of $\text{lev}_{u_N}(\mathcal{F})$ is at most \aleph_1 . By $\text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ we can find a filter G in \mathcal{P}_N which meets all the sets of $\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{E}$. Let $r_G = \bigcup G$. Then

r_G is an infinite run of the game $G_2(\theta, F, \xi)$ in which II follows τ and therefore wins. Let us say $r_G = \langle J_0, K_0, J_1, K_1, \dots \rangle$ and let $u_n = K_n \cap \lambda$, for all n . Let

$$M = \text{cl}_F(\xi \cup \{K_n : n \in \omega\}).$$

We show that this M is as desired. Prior to this, note that M is an elementary submodel of $(H_\theta, \in, \sqsubseteq)$ and contains λ and \mathcal{F} . Moreover, $M \cap \omega_1 = \xi$, since II wins the play r_G . Moreover, $u_M = u_N$ since G meets all the dense sets in \mathcal{D} .

Now, $f \in \text{lev}_{u_M}(\mathcal{F})$ and suppose first that (1) fails for f , i.e. there is no $b \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap M$ such that $b \restriction u_M = f$. Then $G \cap E_f \neq \emptyset$. Let n be such that $f \restriction u_n \notin A(u_n)$. Note that $A(u_n) = \text{lev}_{u_n}(\mathcal{F}) \cap M$, since $u_n = K_n \cap \lambda \in M$ and $M \cap \omega_1 = \xi$. So $f \restriction u_n \notin M$. Thus u_n witnesses (2) for f . Next suppose that there exists $b \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap N$ such that $b \restriction u_M = f$. Then we can find an integer n such that $b \in K_n$, by the \mathcal{D} -genericity of G . Since $K_n \in M \cap [H_\theta]^{\omega_1}$, we can find $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1} \cap M$ such that $c \restriction u \neq d \restriction u$ for any distinct $c, d \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap K_n$. Then $c \mapsto c \restriction u$ is an injection from ${}^\lambda 2 \cap K_n$ to ${}^u 2$, and this injection belongs to M . Hence $c \in M$ if and only if $c \restriction u \in M$, for any $c \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap K_n$. Here note that $b \notin M$ by our assumption that (1) fails for f . Therefore $f \restriction u = b \restriction u \notin M$. \square

Using Lemma 3.2 we prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. (a) Assume SR and $\text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$. Let λ be an ordinal $\geq \omega_2$, \mathcal{F} be a thin (ω_2, λ) -tree and $\vec{f} = (f_u : u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1})$ be a level sequence of \mathcal{F} . We will find an ineffable branch for \vec{f} . Let θ be a sufficiently large regular cardinal, let \sqsubseteq be a well-ordering of H_θ , and let $\mathfrak{A} = (H_\theta, \in, \sqsubseteq)$. Moreover let Z be the set of all countable elementary submodels M of \mathfrak{A} containing λ and \mathcal{F} and such that either (1) or (2) of Lemma 3.2 holds, for any $f \in \text{lev}_{u_M}(\mathcal{F})$. Then Z is stationary in $[H_\theta]^\omega$ by Lemma 3.2. Let W be the set of all $K \in [H_\theta]^{\omega_1}$ such that $\omega_1 \subseteq K$ and $Z \cap [K]^\omega$ is stationary in $[K]^\omega$. By SR it follows that W is stationary in $[H_\theta]^{\leq \omega_1}$.

Claim. *For any $K \in W$ there is $b_K \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap K$ such that $b_K \restriction (K \cap \lambda) = f_{K \cap \lambda}$.*

Proof. Fix $K \in W$, and let $f = f_{K \cap \lambda}$. Note that K is an elementary submodel of \mathfrak{A} since $Z \cap [K]^\omega$ is stationary. Then $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ is a subset of K , for all $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1} \cap K$, since $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ is an element of K of size \aleph_1 and $\omega_1 \subseteq K$. Since $Z \cap [K]^\omega$ is stationary in $[K]^\omega$, we can find $M \in Z \cap [K]^\omega$, such that, letting $N = \text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(M \cup \{f\})$, we have that $N \cap K = M$. Note that $f \restriction u \in M$, for all $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1} \cap M$, since, $f \restriction u \in K \cap N$, for every such u . So (2) of Lemma 3.2 fails for $f \restriction u_M$ and M . Hence (1) holds for $f \restriction u_M$ and M , that is, there is $b \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap M$ with $b \restriction u_M = f \restriction u_M$. Note that $b \in K$. Hence it suffices to show that $b \restriction (K \cap \lambda) = f$. Note that both $b \restriction (K \cap \lambda)$ and f are functions on $K \cap \lambda$ which are in N . Moreover $b \restriction (K \cap \lambda)$ and f coincides on $N \cap (K \cap \lambda)$ since $N \cap (K \cap \lambda) = M \cap \lambda$, and $b \restriction u_M = f \restriction u_M$. Hence $b \restriction (K \cap \lambda) = f$, by the elementarity of N . \square

By the Pressing Down Lemma we can find $b \in {}^\lambda 2$ such that $b_K = b$, for stationary many $K \in W$. It follows that b is an ineffable branch for \vec{f} .

(b) Assume SSR and MA_{ω_1} (Cohen). Let λ be an ordinal $\geq \omega_2$ and \mathcal{F} be a thin (ω_2, λ) -tree. We will find a cofinal branch for \mathcal{F} . Let $\theta, \trianglelefteq, \mathfrak{A}$ and Z be as in the proof of (a). Moreover let Z^* be the upward closure of Z under \sqsubseteq . By SSR there is $K \in [H_\theta]^{\omega_1}$ such that $\omega_1 \subseteq K$ and $Z^* \cap [K]^\omega$ is stationary in $[K]^\omega$. Here note that $Z^* \cap [K^*]^\omega$ is stationary, for any $K^* \supseteq K$. Hence, by replacing K with $\text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(K)$ if necessary, we may assume that K is an elementary submodel of \mathfrak{A} and contains λ and \mathcal{F} as elements. Pick any $f \in \text{lev}_{K \cap \lambda}(\mathcal{F})$. Then $f \restriction u \in K$, for all $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1} \cap K$. So we can take $M^* \in Z^* \cap [K]^\omega$ which is an elementary submodel of \mathfrak{A} , contains λ and \mathcal{F} as elements, and such that $f \restriction u \in M^*$, for all $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1} \cap M^*$. Let $M \in Z$ be such that $M \sqsubseteq M^*$. Here note that $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F}) \cap M = \text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F}) \cap M^*$, for any $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1} \cap M$, since both M and M^* are elementary submodels of \mathfrak{A} , $\text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$ is of size \aleph_1 , and $M \cap \omega_1 = M^* \cap \omega_1$. Hence $f \restriction u \in M$, for all $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1} \cap M$, and so (2) of Lemma 3.2 fails for $f \restriction u_M$ and M . Thus there is $b \in {}^\lambda 2 \cap M$ with $b \restriction u_M = f \restriction u_M$. Then $b \restriction u \in \text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$, for all $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1} \cap M$. So $b \restriction u \in \text{lev}_u(\mathcal{F})$, for all $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \omega_1}$, by the elementarity of M . So, b is a cofinal branch of \mathcal{F} , as required. \square

We now show that SSR and MA_{ω_1} (Cohen) is not sufficient to imply the super tree property for ω_2 .

Theorem 3.5. *Assume that there exists a strongly compact cardinal. Then there exists a forcing extension in which SSR and MA_{ω_1} (Cohen) hold but ω_2 does not have the super tree property.*

Theorem 3.5 follows easily from the following facts.

Fact 3.6 (Magidor). *Assume that κ is a supercompact cardinal. Then there is a forcing extension in which κ is strongly compact but not supercompact.*

Fact 3.7 (Shelah [9, Chapter XIII, 1.6 and 1.10]). *Assume that κ is a strongly compact cardinal. Let $(\mathcal{P}_\alpha, \dot{\mathcal{Q}}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa)$ be a revised countable support iteration of semi-proper posets of size $< \kappa$ such that $\kappa = \omega_2$ in $V^{\mathcal{P}_\kappa}$. Then SSR holds in $V^{\mathcal{P}_\kappa}$.*

Fact 3.8 (Viale-Weiss [14]). *Assume that κ is an inaccessible cardinal. Assume also that there exists a countable support iteration $(\mathcal{P}_\alpha, \dot{\mathcal{Q}}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa)$ of proper posets of size $< \kappa$ such that κ has the super tree property in $V^{\mathcal{P}_\kappa}$. Then κ is supercompact in V .*

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Assume that κ is strongly compact in V . By Fact 3.6 we may assume that κ is not supercompact. Let $(\mathcal{P}_\alpha, \dot{\mathcal{Q}}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa)$ be the countable support iteration of Cohen forcing. Here recall that a revised countable

support iteration coincides with a countable support iteration for proper posets. Note also that $\kappa = \omega_2$ in $V^{\mathbb{P}_\kappa}$. Hence SSR holds $V^{\mathcal{P}_\kappa}$ by Fact 3.7. Moreover $\text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ holds in $V^{\mathcal{P}_\kappa}$. By Fact 3.8, ω_2 does not have the super tree property in $V^{\mathcal{P}_\kappa}$. \square

We end this section with some remarks. In Theorem 3.5 we have proved that $\text{SSR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ does not imply the super tree property at ω_2 . In fact we can prove that it does not imply $\text{ITP}(\omega_2, \omega_3)$. We outline the proof. For a regular uncountable cardinal κ let

$$U_\kappa = \{u \in [\kappa^+]^{<\kappa} : u \cap \kappa \in \kappa \wedge \text{otp}(u) = (u \cap \kappa)^+\}.$$

It is easy to see that if κ is κ^+ -supercompact, then U_κ is stationary in $[\kappa^+]^{<\kappa}$. On the other hand Krueger [4] proved that this does not follow from the strong compactness of κ .

Fact 3.9 (Krueger [4]). *Assume that κ is a supercompact cardinal. Then there is a forcing extension in which κ is strongly compact, and U_κ is non-stationary.*

Moreover we can prove the following.

Fact 3.10. *Assume that κ is an inaccessible cardinal. Assume also that there is a countable support iteration $(\mathcal{P}_\alpha, \dot{\mathcal{Q}}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa)$ of proper posets of size $< \kappa$ such that $\text{ITP}(\kappa, \kappa^+)$ holds in $V^{\mathcal{P}_\kappa}$. Then U_κ is stationary in $[\kappa^+]^{<\kappa}$ in V .*

Using Facts 3.9 and 3.10 instead of Facts 3.6 and 3.8, by the same argument as Theorem 3.5, we can prove that $\text{SSR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ does not imply $\text{ITP}(\omega_2, \omega_3)$.

On the other hand, we can also prove that $\text{SSR} + \text{MA}_{\omega_1}(\text{Cohen})$ implies $\text{ITP}(\omega_2, \omega_2)$: Assume SSR, and suppose that \mathcal{F} is a thin (ω_2, ω_2) -tree and that $\vec{f} = (f_u : u \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega_1})$ is a level sequence of \mathcal{F} . Let $\theta, \trianglelefteq, \mathfrak{A}$ and Z be as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Here recall the fact, due to Foreman, Magidor and Shelah [1], that SSR (equivalently (\dagger)) implies Strong Chang's Conjecture. In fact it implies the following.

There are club many $M \in [H_\theta]^\omega$ such that $\text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(M \cup \{\delta\}) \cap \delta = M \cap \omega_2$, for stationary many $\delta \in \omega_2$.

Take such $M \in Z$, and let E be the set of all $\delta \in \omega_2$ with $\text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(M \cup \{\delta\}) \cap \delta = M \cap \omega_2$. Then, by the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (a), for any $\delta \in E$ there is $b_\delta \in {}^{\omega_2}2 \cap M$ such that $b_\delta \restriction \delta = f_\delta$. Take $b \in {}^{\omega_2}2$ such that $\{\delta \in E : b_\delta = b\}$ is stationary. Then b is an ineffable branch for \vec{f} .

4. SINGULAR CARDINAL HYPOTHESIS

In this section we prove that SSR implies SCH. In fact we prove the following:

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that λ is a singular cardinal of cofinality ω and that $\text{SSR}(\lambda^+)$ holds. Then for any strictly increasing sequence $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_n : n < \omega)$ of regular cardinals converging to λ there are no better scales on $\vec{\lambda}$.*

Here recall the fact, due to Foreman, Magidor and Shelah [1], that SSR implies the Strong Chang's Conjecture and the fact, due to Todorćević [11], that the Strong Chang's Conjecture implies $2^\omega \leq \omega_2$. So SSR implies $2^\omega \leq \omega_2$. Then, using the theorem above and Fact 1.3, it is easy to see that if SSR holds, then $\lambda^\omega = \lambda^+$ for all singular cardinals of cofinality ω . Then it follows from Fact 1.2 that if SSR holds, then so does SCH.

Corollary 4.2. *SSR implies SCH.* □

To prove the theorem we make preliminaries. First we present a game which is a variant of the game used in Section 2:

Let $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_n : n \in \omega)$ be a strictly increasing sequence of regular cardinals $\geq \omega_2$, let $\lambda = \sup_{n \in \omega} \lambda_n$, and let $\vec{E} = (E_{n,i} : n \in \omega, i \in 2)$ be a sequence such that each $E_{n,i}$ is a stationary subset of $E_{\omega_1}^{\lambda_n}$. Moreover let $\vec{b} = (b_\xi : \xi < \omega_1)$ be a sequence of functions from ω to 2. For a function $F : [\lambda^+]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \lambda^+$ and $\xi < \omega_1$ let $G_3(\vec{E}, \vec{b}, F, \xi)$ be the following game of length ω :

I	α_0	δ_0, ϵ_0	α_1	δ_1, ϵ_1	\cdots	α_n	δ_n, ϵ_n	\cdots
II		β_0, γ_0		β_1, γ_1	\cdots		β_n, γ_n	\cdots

In the n -th stage, first I chooses $\alpha_n < \lambda_n$, then II chooses $\beta_n < \lambda_n$ and $\gamma_n < \lambda^+$. Then I again chooses $\delta_n > \alpha_n, \beta_n$ with $\delta_n \in E_{n,b_\xi(n)}$ and $\epsilon_n < \lambda^+$ with $\epsilon_n > \gamma_n$. I wins if, letting $x = \text{cl}_F(\xi \cup \{\delta_n, \epsilon_n : n \in \omega\})$, we have:

- (i) $x \cap \omega_1 = \xi$,
- (ii) $x \cap [\alpha_m, \delta_m) = \emptyset$, for every m .

Otherwise, II wins.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\vec{\lambda}$, λ , \vec{E} , \vec{b} and F be as above. Then there exists $\xi < \omega_1$ such that I has a winning strategy for $G_3(\vec{E}, \vec{b}, F, \xi)$.*

Proof. Towards a contradiction assume that I does not have a winning strategy in $G_3(\vec{E}, \vec{b}, F, \xi)$, for every $\xi < \omega_1$. Since each $G_3(\vec{E}, \vec{b}, F, \xi)$ is an open-closed game, by the Gale-Stewart theorem, II has a winning strategy, say τ_ξ , for all ξ . We will find $\zeta < \omega_1$ and a play $(\alpha_n, \beta_n, \gamma_n, \delta_n, \epsilon_n : n \in \omega)$ of $G_3(\vec{E}, \vec{b}, F, \zeta)$ in which II follows his strategy τ_ζ , yet I wins the game.

Let $\vec{\tau} = (\tau_\xi : \xi < \omega_1)$. Take a sufficiently large regular cardinal θ . Then we can find a system $(K_{n,i} : n \in \omega, i \in 2)$ of elementary submodels of (H_θ, \in) containing $\vec{\lambda}$ and $\vec{\tau}$, such that $\delta_{n,i} = K_{n,i} \cap \lambda_n \in E_{n,i}$, for each n and i , and such that $K_{n,i} \in K_{n',i'}$ if $n < n'$ and $i, i' \in 2$. Let $\epsilon_{n,i} = \sup^+(K_{n,i} \cap \lambda^+)$, for each n and i . Then we can take $\zeta < \omega_1$ such that

$$\text{cl}_F(\zeta \cup \{\delta_{n,i}, \epsilon_{n,i} : n \in \omega, i \in 2\}) \cap \omega_1 = \zeta.$$

For each n , let K_n , δ_n and ϵ_n be $K_{n,b_\zeta(n)}$, $\delta_{n,b_\zeta(n)}$ and $\epsilon_{n,b_\zeta(n)}$, respectively. Moreover, let

$$x = \text{cl}_F(\zeta \cup \{\delta_n, \epsilon_n : n \in \omega\}),$$

and let $\alpha_n = \sup^+(x \cap \delta_n)$ for each n . Note that $\alpha_n < \delta_n$, since x is countable and $\text{cof}(\delta_n) = \omega_1$. Finally let $(\beta_n, \gamma_n : n \in \omega)$ be a sequence of II's moves according to τ_ζ against $(\alpha_n, \delta_n, \epsilon_n : n \in \omega)$. Note that $\zeta, \alpha_0, \delta_0, \epsilon_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, \delta_{n-1}, \epsilon_{n-1}, \alpha_n \in K_n$, and K_n is an elementary submodel of H_θ , for all n . Hence $\beta_n \in K_n \cap \lambda_n = \delta_n$. Moreover $\gamma_n \in K_n \cap \lambda^+$, and so $\gamma_n < \epsilon_n$. Thus $(\alpha_n, \beta_n, \gamma_n, \delta_n, \epsilon_n : n \in \omega)$ is a legal play of $G_3(\vec{E}, \vec{b}, F, \zeta)$ in which II moves according to his winning strategy τ_ζ . On the other hand $x \cap [\alpha_m, \delta_m] = \emptyset$, for every m , by the choice of α_m and δ_m . Moreover $x \cap \omega_1 = \zeta$ by the choice of ζ and x . Therefore I wins this play of the game. This is a contradiction. \square

Next we give a standard lemma on better scales.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_n : n < \omega)$ be a strictly increasing sequence of regular cardinals, and let $\lambda = \sup_{n \in \omega} \lambda_n$. Suppose that $\vec{f} = (f_\beta : \beta < \lambda^+)$ is a better scale on $\vec{\lambda}$. Then for any regular $\theta > \lambda^+$ there are stationary many $N \in [H_\theta]^\omega$ with $\chi_N \leq^* f_{\sup^+(N \cap \lambda^+)}$, where χ_N is the characteristic function of N (see §1).*

Proof. Suppose that θ is a regular cardinal bigger than λ^+ . It is sufficient to show that for every expansion \mathfrak{A} of (H_θ, \in) there is a countable elementary submodel N of \mathfrak{A} , such that $\chi_N \leq^* f_\rho$, where $\rho = \sup(N \cap \lambda^+)$. In order to find such an N , first take a continuous \in -chain $(N_\xi : \xi < \omega_1)$ of countable elementary submodels of \mathfrak{A} containing all the relevant parameters. Let $\rho_\xi = \sup(N_\xi \cap \lambda^+)$. Then, since \vec{f} is a better scale, we can find $m < \omega$ and a stationary $S \subseteq \omega_1$ such that $(f_{\rho_\xi} : \xi \in S)$ is $<_m$ -increasing. Here note that if $\xi < \eta$, then $\chi_{N_\xi} <^* f_{\rho_\eta}$, since $N_\xi \in N_\eta$ and N_η is an elementary submodel of \mathfrak{A} . So, by shrinking S and increasing m if necessary, we may assume that $\chi_{N_\xi} <_m f_{\rho_\eta}$ for any $\xi, \eta \in S$ with $\xi < \eta$. Take $\eta \in \lim(S)$. Then $\chi_{N_\xi} <_m f_{\rho_\eta}$, for all $\xi \in S \cap \eta$. Moreover $\chi_{N_\eta}(n) = \sup_{\xi \in S \cap \eta} \chi_{N_\xi}(n)$, for all n , since $N_\eta = \bigcup_{\xi \in S \cap \eta} N_\xi$. So $\chi_{N_\eta} \leq_m f_{\rho_\eta}$. Therefore $N = N_\eta$ is as desired. \square

Now we prove Theorem 4.1. In the proof we will use Lemma 2.2 as well as Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Towards a contradiction assume that $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_n : n < \omega)$ is a strictly increasing sequence of regular cardinals converging to λ and there is a better scale $\vec{f} = (f_\beta : \beta < \lambda^+)$ on $\vec{\lambda}$. We may also assume that $\lambda_0 \geq \omega_2$. Fix a sequence $\vec{E} = (E_{n,i} : n \in \omega, i \in 2)$ such that $E_{n,0}$ and $E_{n,1}$ are disjoint stationary subsets of $E_{\omega_1}^{\lambda_n}$, for all n , and fix a sequence $\vec{b} = (b_\xi : \xi < \omega_1)$ of functions from ω to 2 such that if $\xi \neq \eta$, then $b_\xi \neq^* b_\eta$. Moreover for each $x \subseteq \lambda^+$ let e_x be the function on ω defined by $e_x(n) = \min(x \setminus f_{\sup^+(x)}(n))$. (If

$x \setminus f_{\sup^+(x)}(n) = \emptyset$, then let $e_x(n) = 0$.) Then let X be the set of all $x \in [\lambda^+]^\omega$ such that, letting $\xi = x \cap \omega_1 \in \omega_1$, we have

- (i) $f_{\sup^+(x)} < \chi_x$,
- (ii) $e_x(n) \in E_{n, b_\xi(n)}$, for all but finitely many n .

Note that X is weakly full. So, it suffices to prove the following two claims.

Claim 1. X is stationary in $[\lambda^+]^\omega$.

Proof. Take an arbitrary function $F : [\lambda^+]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \lambda^+$. We need to find $x \in X$ which closed under F . By Lemma 4.3, fix $\xi < \omega_1$ such that there is a winning strategy τ of I in $G_3(\vec{E}, \vec{b}, F, \xi)$. Moreover take a sufficiently large regular cardinal θ and a well-ordering \trianglelefteq of H_θ , and let $\mathfrak{A} = (H_\theta, \in, \trianglelefteq, F, \tau)$. Then by Lemma 4.4 we can find a countable elementary submodel N of \mathfrak{A} , containing F and τ , such that $\chi_N \leq^* f_\rho$, where $\rho = \sup(N \cap \lambda^+)$. Let $\beta_n = f_\rho(n)$, for each n , and take an increasing cofinal sequence $(\gamma_n : n \in \omega)$ in $N \cap \lambda^+$. Then let $(\alpha_n, \delta_n, \epsilon_n : n \in \omega)$ be a sequence of I's moves according to τ against $(\beta_n, \gamma_n : n \in \omega)$, and let $x = \text{cl}_F(\xi \cup \{\delta_n, \epsilon_n : n \in \omega\})$. It suffices to show that $x \in X$. In order to see this, first note that $x \cap \omega_1 = \xi$, since $(\alpha_n, \beta_n, \gamma_n, \delta_n, \epsilon_n : n \in \omega)$ is a play of $G_3(\vec{E}, \vec{b}, F, \xi)$ in which I moves according to his winning strategy τ . Note also that $\sup(x) = \rho$. This is because $\sup(x) \geq \sup_{n \in \omega} \epsilon_n \geq \sup_{n \in \omega} \gamma_n = \rho$. On the other hand note that $x \subseteq \text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(\rho) \cap \lambda^+$. Indeed, $\beta_n, \gamma_n < \rho$, for all n , and $\tau, F \in \text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(\rho)$. Moreover $\text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(\rho) \cap \lambda^+ = \rho$ by Fact 1.1. Therefore $\sup(x) \leq \rho$. It follows that $x \cap \omega_1 = \xi$. Also x satisfies (i), since $f_\rho(n) = \beta_n < \delta_n \in x \cap \lambda_n$, for every n . In order to check (ii), first note that $\alpha_n < \chi_N(n)$, for each n , since

$$\alpha_n \in \text{Hull}^{\mathfrak{A}}(N \cup \chi_N(n)) \cap \lambda_n = \chi_N(n).$$

Here the former \in -relation is because $\{\beta_m, \gamma_m : m < n\} \subseteq N \cup \chi_N(n)$, and the latter equality is by Fact 1.1. Then $\alpha_n < f_\rho(n)$, for all but finitely many n , since $\chi_N \leq^* f_\rho$. Note also that $\delta_n \in x$ and that $x \cap [\alpha_n, \delta_n) = \emptyset$, since I wins the play $(\alpha_n, \beta_n, \gamma_n, \delta_n, \epsilon_n : n \in \omega)$ in $G_3(\vec{E}, \vec{b}, F, \xi)$. Hence $e_x(n) = \delta_n$, for all but finitely many n . Moreover, $\delta_n \in E_{n, b_\xi(n)}$ by the rules of $G_3(\vec{E}, \vec{b}, F, \xi)$. Thus x satisfies (ii). \square

Claim 2. The conclusion of Lemma 2.2 fails for X .

Proof. Towards a contradiction assume that the conclusion of Lemma 2.2 holds for X . Then we can find $u \in [\lambda]^{\omega_1}$ such that $\omega_1 \subseteq u$ and $X \cap [u]^\omega$ is stationary. Clearly $\sup(u)$ is a limit ordinal. We consider two cases according to whether the cofinality of $\sup(u)$ is ω or ω_1 .

First suppose that $\text{cof}(\sup(u)) = \omega$. Then the set

$$Y = \{x \in [u]^\omega : \sup(x) = \sup(u) \text{ and } \text{range}(e_u) \subseteq x\}$$

is club in $[u]^\omega$. Note that $e_x = e_u$ for all $x \in Y$. Take $x_0, x_1 \in X \cap Y$ with $x_0 \cap \omega_1 \neq x_1 \cap \omega_1$, and let $\xi_i = x_i \cap \omega_1$ for $i = 0, 1$. Then $e_{x_0} = e_u = e_{x_1}$, since $x_0, x_1 \in Y$, and so $b_{\xi_0} =^* b_{\xi_1}$, since $x_0, x_1 \in X$. This contradicts the choice of \vec{b} and the fact that $\xi_0 \neq \xi_1$.

Next suppose that $\text{cof}(\sup(u)) = \omega_1$. Since \vec{f} is a better scale we can find a club C in $\sup(u)$ and $\sigma : C \rightarrow \omega$ such that $f_\beta <_{\max\{\sigma(\beta), \sigma(\gamma)\}} f_\gamma$ for any $\beta, \gamma \in C$ with $\beta < \gamma$. Let h and e be functions on ω defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} h(n) &= \sup\{f_\beta(n) : \beta \in C \wedge n \geq \sigma(\beta)\}, \\ e(n) &= \min(u \setminus h(n)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover let Z be the set of all $x \in [u]^\omega$ such that

- (iv) $\sup(x) \in C$,
- (v) $x \cap h(n) \subseteq f_{\sup(x)}(n)$, for every $n \geq \sigma(\sup(x))$,
- (vi) $\text{range}(e) \subseteq x$.

Then it is easy to see that Z contains a club subset of $[u]^\omega$. Here note that if $x \in Z$, then $e_x(n) = e(n)$ for all $n \geq \sigma(\sup^+(x))$. Then we can get a contradiction by the same argument as in the case when $\text{cof}(\sup(u)) = \omega$. \square

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Matthew Foreman, Magidor Magidor, and Shelah Shelah. Martin's maximum, saturated ideals, and nonregular ultrafilters. I. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 127(1):1–47, 1988.
- [2] Thomas J. Jech. Some combinatorial problems concerning uncountable cardinals. *Ann. Math. Logic*, 5:165–198, 1972/73.
- [3] Akihiro Kanamori. *The higher infinite*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2003. Large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings.
- [4] John Krueger. Strong compactness and stationary sets. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 70(3):767–777, 2005.
- [5] Menachem Magidor. Combinatorial characterization of supercompact cardinals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 42:279–285, 1974.
- [6] Hiroshi Sakai. Semistationary and stationary reflection. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 73(1):181–192, 2008.
- [7] Saharon Shelah. Semiproper forcing axiom implies Martin maximum but not PFA^+ . *J. Symbolic Logic*, 52(2):360–367, 1987.
- [8] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1994. Oxford Science Publications.
- [9] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1998.
- [10] Jack Silver. On the singular cardinals problem. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Vancouver, B. C., 1974)*, Vol. 1, pages 265–268. Canad. Math. Congress, Montreal, Que., 1975.
- [11] Stevo Todorćević. Conjectures of Rado and Chang and cardinal arithmetic. In *Finite and infinite combinatorics in sets and logic (Banff, AB, 1991)*, volume 411 of *NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci.*, pages 385–398. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1993.

- [12] Boban Veličković. Forcing axioms and stationary sets. *Adv. Math.*, 94(2):256–284, 1992.
- [13] Christoph Weiss. *Subtle and ineffable tree properties*. Phd thesis, Ludwig Maximilians Universität, München, 2010.
- [14] Christoph Weiss and Matteo Viale. On the consistency strength of the proper forcing axiom. Preprint, 2010.

E-mail address: `hsakai@people.kobe-u.ac.jp`

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SYSTEMS ENGINEERING KOBE UNIVERSITY,
1-1 ROKKODAI, NADA, KOBE 657-8501, JAPAN

URL: `http://kurt.scitec.kobe-u.ac.jp/~hsakai`

E-mail address: `boban@math.univ-paris-diderot.fr`

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU - PARIS RIVE GAUCHE, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS
DIDEROT, 75205 PARIS CEDEX 13, FRANCE

URL: `http://www.logique.jussieu.fr/~boban`