THE TREE PROPERTY AT DOUBLE SUCCESSORS OF SINGULAR CARDINALS OF UNCOUNTABLE COFINALITY WITH INFINITE GAPS
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Abstract. Assuming the existence of a strong cardinal $\kappa$, a weakly compact cardinal $\lambda$ above it and $\gamma > \lambda$, we force a generic extension in which $\kappa$ is a singular strong limit cardinal of any given cofinality $\delta$, $2^\kappa \geq \gamma$ and such that the tree property holds at $\kappa^{++}$.

This extends the main result of [FHS18] for uncountable cofinalities.

1. Introduction

Infinite trees are one of the main combinatorial objects of Set Theory. In the present paper we are mainly concerned in the question of whether any infinite tree has a cofinal branch. Recall that for an infinite cardinal $\kappa$, a tree $T$ is said to be a $\kappa$-tree if it has height $\kappa$ and all of its levels are of size less than $\kappa$. A cofinal branch in a $\kappa$-tree $T$ is simply a chain in the corresponding order of order type $\kappa$. Formally speaking, we are interested in the following classical question: Given an infinite regular cardinal $\kappa$, does any $\kappa$-tree $T$ have a cofinal branch? If for a given infinite cardinal $\kappa$ the answer to the previous question is affirmative it is said that Tree Property holds at $\kappa$ and it is customary to denote this by TP($\kappa$). Classical and well-known results due to König and Aronszajn respectively shows that TP($\omega_0$) holds while TP($\omega_1$) fails. Regarding this results it is worth to say that both are ZFC results and no additional assumptions are needed. At the light of this it is thus natural to ask about the tree property configuration of bigger regular cardinals.
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The first answer given on this regard was due to Mitchel and Silver and emphasizes the role of large cardinals on what the tree property is concerned: TP($\aleph_2$) is equiconsistent with the existence of a weakly compact cardinal, modulo ZFC.

The first implication of the metatheorem is due to Silver who proved that if TP($\aleph_2$) holds then $\aleph_2^L$ is weakly compact in $L$. The converse follows from a forcing argument due to Mitchell [Mit72], who introduced a forcing (the so called Mitchell forcing) that starting with a weakly compact cardinal $\kappa$ yields a generic extension where $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2$ and TP($\aleph_2$) holds. Following up with this line of research Abraham [Abr83] later proved that starting with GCH, a supercompact cardinal $\kappa$ and a weakly compact cardinal $\lambda > \kappa$, one can force to get a generic extension where TP($\aleph_2$) and TP($\aleph_3$) hold simultaneously. This result was subsequently extended by Cummings and Foreman in [CF98], who proved that starting with the GCH and infinitely many supercompact cardinals it is possible to force a generic extension where TP($\aleph_n$) holds, for each $2 \leq n < \omega$. Later Neeman [Nee14] showed that under the same assumptions the consistency of TP($\aleph_n$) holds, for each $\alpha \in [2, \omega) \cup \{\omega + 1\}$. Extensions of Neeman’s result were subsequently obtained by Unger [Ung16] and Hayut [Hay16]. The maximality demand of getting a model of ZFC where the tree property holds at all regular cardinals $\kappa > \aleph_1$ is one of the major open problems of Set Theory and the most relevant question within the area.

On what this paper is concerned, we aim to discuss the possible tree property configurations at double successors of singular strong limit cardinals. The analogous study for successors of singular strong limit cardinals is of high interest in the field though, as it is widely known, the techniques and the large cardinal assumptions needed differs substantially from those of the current paper.

The first result on the tree property configurations at double successors of strong limit singular cardinals is due to Cummings and Foreman [CF98]. Starting with a model of the GCH, a supercompact cardinal $\kappa$ and a weakly compact cardinal $\lambda > \kappa$ the authors devised a Mitchell-like forcing that yields a generic extension with the following features: $\kappa$ is a strong limit cardinal with countable cofinality, $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++} = \lambda$, hence SCH fails, and TP($\kappa^{++}$) holds. One of the main novelties of Cummings-Foreman result is that it provides a general framework to combine the classical Mitchell forcing with the Prikry-type
forcing technology. It is worth to emphasize that, by virtue of Specker’s theorem \cite{Spec90},
the failure of the Singular Cardinal Hypothesis at \( \kappa \) is mandator. Subsequent results of
Friedman and Halilović \cite{FHL11} yield, from almost optimal hypotheses, the consistency of
Cummings-Foreman result for \( \kappa = \aleph_\omega \). Finally, Gitik \cite{Git14} gave the exact consistency
strength of the former theory.

A natural question arises from Cummings-Foreman theorem: For a strong limit singular
cardinal \( \kappa \), is \( \text{TP}(\kappa^{++}) \) consistent with arbitrary failures of \( \text{SCH}_\kappa \)? In other terms, is it
possible to get a bigger gap between \( \kappa \) and \( 2^\kappa \) in the model described so far? This question
was answered by Friedman-Honzík-Stejskalová in \cite{FHS18} where a method to get arbitrary
gaps in Cummings-Foreman model is described. In this paper we aim to proved that the
analogous situation is consistent for uncountable cofinalities:

**Theorem 1.1** (Main theorem). **Assume the GCH holds.** Let \( \kappa \) be a strong cardinal, \( \lambda > \kappa \)
weakly compact and \( \gamma \geq \lambda \) be a cardinal with \( \text{cof}(\gamma) > \kappa \). Let \( \delta < \kappa \) be some regular cardinal.
Then there is a generic extension of the universe where the following properties hold:

1. \( 2^\kappa \geq \gamma \).
2. \( \kappa \) is strong limit singular with \( \text{cof}(\kappa) = \delta \).
3. \( \text{TP}(\kappa^{++}) \).

For the proof of this result we will follow the ideas described in \cite{FHS18} replacing Prikry
forcing for Magidor forcing. To this aim, we will define a variation of the forcing \( R \) of
\cite{GM18} in the spirit of \cite{FHS18} and we will carry out a similar analysis of the quotients as
in \cite{Ung13}. Along the paper it will be shown that similar ideas to those developed in the
previous references apply in our context, though now the analysis of the quotients becomes
more involved.

The structure of the paper is as follows: In Section 1 we will give the definition of the
classical Magidor forcing that will be used later. In Section 2 we will discuss in detail the
construction to get a model as described in theorem 1.1 but with \( \gamma = \lambda^+ \). Finally, in
Section 3 we shall take advantage of the results of the Section 2 and sketch the main ideas
to obtain the model described by our main result. The notation used here is standard and
no preliminar knowledge of the matter is need aside of familiarity with Prikry type forcings and large cardinals.

2. Preliminaries

One of the main forcing notions of the present paper is the so called Magidor forcing. This forcing notion was introduced by Magidor in [Mag78] to change the cofinality of a measurable cardinal $\kappa$ to a given uncountable cardinal. Originally the definition of Magidor forcing was based on Mitchell order increasing sequences of measures $\mathcal{U} = \langle \mathcal{U}(\kappa, \alpha) : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ on $\kappa$, though later Mitchell proposed to use coherent sequences of measures that further allow to define Radin forcing. In this section we will give the definition of Magidor forcing simply for the sake of completeness and refer the reader to the excellent survey [Git10] for more information or any non defined notion.

**Definition 2.1 (Coherent sequence).** A coherent sequence of measures $\mathcal{U}$ is a function with domain $\{ (\alpha, \beta) : \alpha < \ell^\mathcal{U} \text{ and } \beta < d^\mathcal{U}(\alpha) \}$ such that for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{U})$ the following conditions are true:

1. $\mathcal{U}(\alpha, \beta)$ is a normal ultrafilter over $\alpha$,
2. If $j^\mathcal{U}_\beta : V \rightarrow \text{Ult}(V, \mathcal{U}(\alpha, \beta))$ is the canonical embedding, then

$$j^\mathcal{U}_\beta(\mathcal{U}) \upharpoonright \alpha + 1 = \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright (\alpha, \beta)$$

where

$$\mathcal{U} \upharpoonright \alpha = \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright \{ (\alpha', \beta') : \alpha' < \alpha \text{ and } \beta' < d^\mathcal{U}(\alpha') \}$$

and

$$\mathcal{U} \upharpoonright (\alpha, \beta) = \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright \{ (\alpha', \beta') : (\alpha' < \alpha \text{ and } \beta' < d^\mathcal{U}(\alpha')) \text{ or } (\alpha = \alpha' \text{ and } \beta' < \beta) \}$$

The ordinals $\ell^\mathcal{U}$ and $d^\mathcal{U}(\alpha)$ are called respectively the length of $\mathcal{U}$ and the Mitchell order at $\alpha$ of $\mathcal{U}$.

---

1To be more precise, a measurable cardinal $\kappa$ with $o(\kappa) \geq \aleph_1$. 

---
Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathcal{U}(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha < \kappa + 1, \beta < \delta^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha)\}$ be a coherent sequence of measures with length $\kappa + 1$ and $\delta^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha) = \delta$. Define the function $F : \kappa + 1 \rightarrow V$ by:

$$F(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \bigcap_{\beta < \delta^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha)} \mathcal{U}(\alpha, \beta) & \delta^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha) > 0 \\ \emptyset & \delta^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha) = 0 \end{cases}$$

Note that if $\delta^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha) > 0$, then $F(\alpha)$ is a normal $\alpha$-complete filter over $\alpha$. We are now ready to define the Magidor forcing.

Definition 2.3. Assume $\mathcal{U}$ is a coherent sequence of measures of length $\kappa + 1$ and $\delta^{\mathcal{U}}(\kappa) = \delta$ is a limit ordinal.

(a) The Magidor forcing relative to $\mathcal{U}$, denoted $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{U}}$, consists of finite sequences of the form $p = \langle \langle \alpha_0, A_0 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \alpha_n, A_n \rangle \rangle$ where:

(a) $\delta < \alpha_0 < \cdots < \alpha_n = \kappa$,

(b) $A_i \in F(\alpha_i)$,

(c) $A_i \cap \alpha_{i-1} = \emptyset$ (where $\alpha_{-1} = \delta + 1$).

(b) Let $p = \langle \langle \alpha_0, A_0 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \alpha_n, A_n \rangle \rangle$ and $q = \langle \langle \beta_0, B_0 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \beta_m, B_m \rangle \rangle$ be two conditions in $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Then $q$ is stronger than $p$ ($q \leq p$) if

(a) $m \geq n$,

(b) $\forall i \leq n \exists j \leq m \, \alpha_i = \beta_j$ and $B_j \subseteq A_i$,

(c) $\forall j$ such that $\beta_j \notin \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$, $B_j \subseteq A_k \cap \beta_j$ and $\beta_j \in A_k$ where $k$ is the least index such that $\beta_j < \alpha_k$.

(c) $q$ is the direct extension or the Prikry extension of $p$ ($q \leq^{*} p$) if

(a) $q \leq p$

(b) $m = n$

The main feature of the generic extension given by Magidor forcing is described in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.4 (Magidor [Mag78]). Let $\kappa$ be a measurable cardinal with $\alpha(\kappa) = \delta$ for some ordinal $\aleph_0 \leq \delta < \kappa$. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a coherent sequences of measures of length $\kappa + 1$ and $\delta^{\mathcal{U}}(\kappa) = \delta$. Then, $\Vdash_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{U}}}$ “$\kappa$ is strong limit with $\text{cof}(\kappa) = \text{cof}^V(\delta)$”.
3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

The present section we will devoted for the proof of the main theorem 1.1 in the case where \( \gamma = \lambda^+ \). We will present with full details the forcing construction necessary to get this concrete model, which will be enough to convince the reader in the next section that the same arguments apply in the general setting. Our arguments will follow the ideas described in [FHS18] and the analysis of the quotient carried out in [Ung13].

3.1. Some preparation results. Let \( \kappa \) be a strong cardinal, \( \lambda > \kappa \) a weakly compact cardinal and fix \( \delta < \kappa \) a regular cardinal. Let \( \mathbb{P} = \text{Add}(\kappa, \lambda^+) \) and let \( G \) be a \( \mathbb{P} \)-generic filter over \( V \). Given an ordinal \( \xi \leq \lambda^+ \) it is customary to denote by \( \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \xi \) the standard projection of \( \mathbb{P} \) onto its first \( \xi \)-coordinates, i.e. \( \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \xi = \text{Add}(\kappa, \xi) \). Analogously we will denote by \( G \upharpoonright \xi \) the \( \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \xi \)-generic filter over \( V \) induced by \( G \) and the aforementioned projection. We need the following indestructibility theorem for strongness due to Woodin.

**Theorem 3.1** (Woodin, see [GS89]). Assume that \( \kappa \) is a strong cardinal. Then there is a forcing notion of size \( \kappa \), such that in the generic extension by it, \( \kappa \) remains strong and its strongness is indestructible under adding any new Cohen subsets of \( \kappa \).

Assume that \( \kappa \) has been made indestructible under Cohen forcing and thus that it remains strong in \( V[G] \). Notice that in particular \( \kappa \) is a measurable with \( o(\kappa) = \delta \) in \( V[G] \). Now fix in this generic extension a coherent sequence of measures \( \mathcal{U} = \{ U(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < o^U(\alpha) \} \) with \( o^U(\kappa) = \delta \) and let \( \hat{\mathcal{U}} = \{ \hat{U}(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < o^U(\alpha) \} \) be a \( \mathbb{P} \)-name for \( \mathcal{U} \).

**Notation 3.2.**

1. \( D := \{ X \subseteq \lambda : \sup(X) = \lambda \text{ and } X \text{ is } (> \kappa) \text{-closed} \} \)
2. \( D^+ := \{ X \subseteq \lambda^+ : \sup(X) = \lambda^+ \text{ and } X \text{ is } (> \kappa) \text{-closed} \} \).

The following is a key lemma for the definition of the main forcing:

**Lemma 3.3.** There exists a set \( A \in D^+ \) such that for every \( \xi \in A \) and every \( \mathbb{P} \)-generic filter \( G \), \( U_\xi := \{ \hat{U}(\alpha, \beta)_G \cap V[G \upharpoonright \xi] : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < o^U(\alpha) \} \) is a coherent sequence of measures in \( V[G \upharpoonright \xi] \).

2Recall that a set \( X \) of ordinals is \((> \kappa)\)-closed if it contains its limit points of cofinality \( > \kappa \).
Proof. Since \( \mathcal{U} \) is a coherent sequence of measures in \( V[G] \) it follows that \( \mathcal{U}_\xi \) witnesses requirement (2) from \( 2.1 \) so that it remains to show that (1) is also fulfilled and that \( \mathcal{U}_\xi \in V[G \upharpoonright \xi] \). Following the same closure argument as in Lemma 3.3 from \( [FHS18] \) for each pair \( (\alpha, \beta) \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{U}) \) we obtain a set \( \mathcal{A}_{(\alpha, \beta)} \in D^+ \) such that \( \dot{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha, \beta)_G \cap V[G \upharpoonright \xi] \in V[G \upharpoonright \xi] \) is a normal measure over \( \alpha \) in \( V[G \upharpoonright \xi] \), for each \( \xi \in \mathcal{A}_{(\alpha, \beta)} \). On the other hand, it is routine to prove that \( D^+ \) is closed by intersection of \( \lambda \)-many sets hence, since \( |\text{dom}(\mathcal{U})| = \delta < \lambda \), it follows that \( \mathcal{A} := \bigcap_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{U})} \mathcal{A}_{(\alpha, \beta)} \in D^+ \). Finally notice that \( \mathcal{A} \) is as sought.

\[ \square \]

Notation 3.4.

(1) \( Q \) denotes the Magidor forcing as defined in \( V[G] \) with respect to the coherent sequence \( \mathcal{U} \).

(2) For each \( \xi \in \mathcal{A} \), \( Q_\xi \) denotes the Magidor forcing as defined in \( V[G \upharpoonright \xi] \) with respect to the coherent sequence \( \mathcal{U}_\xi \).

Fix some \( \xi_0 \in \mathcal{A} \) with \( \lambda < \xi_0 < \lambda^+ \) and set \( \tilde{\mathcal{A}} = (A \cap [\xi_0, \lambda^+)) \cup \{ \lambda^+ \} \). Let \( \pi : \xi_0 \leftrightarrow \text{Even}(\lambda) \) be a bijection between \( \xi_0 \) and the even ordinals. Any such bijection induces an isomorphism between the forcings \( P \upharpoonright \xi_0 \) and \( P \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\lambda) \) and thus also between the corresponding names. In particular, if \( G \upharpoonright \xi_0 \) is a \( V \)-generic filter for \( P \upharpoonright \xi_0 \) then \( \pi(G \upharpoonright \xi_0) \) is also \( V \)-generic filter for \( P \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\lambda) \). Further, \( 1_{P|\text{Even}(\lambda)} \models \text{"}\pi(\dot{U}_{\xi_0}) \text{ is a coherent sequence of measures"} \) and \( \mathcal{U}_{\xi_0} = (\dot{U}_{\xi_0})^{P|\xi_0} = (\pi(\dot{U}_{\xi_0}))^{P|\text{Even}(\lambda)} \).

Arguing as in \( 3.3 \) we can get a similar result for the projected measures.

Lemma 3.5. There exists a set \( B \in D \) such that for every \( \gamma \in B \) and every \( P \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\lambda) \)-generic filter \( H \), \( \mathcal{U}_\gamma^* = \langle \dot{U}(\alpha, \beta)^H \cap V[H \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\gamma)] : \alpha \leq \kappa, \, \beta < o^V(\alpha) \rangle \) is a coherent sequence of measures in \( V[H \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\gamma)] \).

Notation 3.6. For each \( \gamma \in B \), \( Q_\gamma^* \) denotes the Magidor forcing as defined in the generic extension \( V[\pi(G \upharpoonright \xi_0) \upharpoonright \gamma] \) with respect to the coherent sequence \( \mathcal{U}_\gamma^* \).

---

\(^3\)Limit ordinals are also considered even ordinals.
Lemma 3.7 (Projections).

1. For every \( \xi, \xi' \in \hat{\mathcal{A}} \) with \( \xi < \xi' \), there is a projection

\[
\sigma^{\xi'}_{\xi} : P \upharpoonright \xi' * Q_{\xi'} \to RO^+(P \upharpoonright \xi * Q_{\xi}).
\]

2. For every \( \xi \in \hat{\mathcal{A}} \) and \( \gamma \in B \), there is a projection

\[
\sigma^{\xi}_{\gamma} : P \upharpoonright \xi * Q_{\xi} \to RO^+(P \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\gamma) * Q_{\gamma}^\pi).
\]

3. For every \( \xi \in A \cap (\xi_0, \lambda^+) \) and \( \gamma \in B \), let \( \hat{\sigma}^{\xi}_{\gamma} \) be the extension of \( \sigma^{\xi}_{\gamma} \) to the Boolean completion of \( P \upharpoonright \xi * Q_{\xi} \):

\[
\hat{\sigma}^{\xi}_{\gamma} : RO^+(P \upharpoonright \xi * Q_{\xi}) \to RO^+(P \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\gamma) * Q_{\gamma}^\pi).
\]

Moreover, the projections commute with \( \sigma^{\lambda^+}_{\xi} \):

\[
\sigma^{\lambda^+}_{\xi} = \hat{\sigma}^{\xi}_{\gamma} \circ \sigma^{\lambda^+}_{\xi}.
\]

Proof. The proof of (1) and (2) follows from the geometric characterization of Magidor sequences (see e.g. (Theorem 2.8 from [GM18])) and the proof of (3) is the same as in [FHS18].

3.2. The main forcing and its basic properties. We will devote the following section to introduce the main forcing and to present its basic properties. Our forcing is a hybrid of the forcing introduced in [GM18] and in [FHS18]. Some of the results in this section are similar or even the same as those proved in [FHS18] so in that cases we will refer the reader to this source.

Definition 3.8 (Main Forcing).

(a) Conditions in \( R \) are triples \((p, \dot{q}, r)\) such that:

1. \((p, \dot{q}) \in P * \hat{Q}.

2. \( r \) is a partial function with \( \text{dom}(r) \subseteq B \) and \( |\text{dom}(r)| \leq \kappa \).

3. For every \( \xi \in \text{dom}(r) \), \( r(\xi) \) is a nice \( P \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\xi) * \hat{Q}_{\xi}^\pi \)-name for a condition in \( \text{Add}(\kappa^+, 1) \).

(b) For conditions \((p_0, \dot{q}_0, r_0)\) and \((p_1, \dot{q}_1, r_1)\) in \( R \), we say \((p_1, \dot{q}_1, r_1) \leq (p_0, \dot{q}_0, r_0)\) iff

4. \((p_1, \dot{q}_1) \leq (p_0, \dot{q}_0)\) in \( P * \hat{Q} \).
(5) \( \text{dom}(r_0) \subseteq \text{dom}(r_1) \) and for all \( \xi \in \text{dom}(r_0) \): \( \sigma^+_{\xi}(p_1, \dot{q}_1)[\text{Even}(\xi) \cdot \dot{Q}^\xi] \models \text{"} r_1(\xi) \leq r_0(\xi) \text{"}. \)

Define \( U := \{(p, \dot{q}, r) \in \mathbb{R} : p = 1 \land \|p\dot{q} = 1\} \) and endowed it with the restricted order of \( \mathbb{R} \). Let \( \rho : (\mathbb{P} \cdot \dot{Q}) \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be defined as \( \langle (p, \dot{q}), (1, 1, r) \rangle \mapsto (p, \dot{q}, r) \). The proof of the next lemma is standard and can be found in Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 4.2 of [GM18].

Lemma 3.9.

(1) \( \mathbb{P} \cdot \dot{Q} \) is \( \kappa^+ \)-Knaster.

(2) \( U \) is \( \kappa^+ \)-closed.

(3) \( \rho \) is a projection and thus \( V_{\mathbb{P} \cdot \dot{Q}} \subseteq V_\mathbb{R} \subseteq V_{(\mathbb{P} \cdot \dot{Q}) \times \mathbb{U}} \).

Lemma 3.10. \( \mathbb{R} \) has the following properties:

(1) \( \mathbb{R} \) is \( \lambda \)-Knaster, hence it preserves cardinals \( \geq \lambda \).

(2) \( \mathbb{R} \) preserves \( \kappa^+ \) collapses the cardinals in \( (\kappa^+, \lambda) \) to it. In particular, \( V_\mathbb{R} \models \kappa^{++} = \lambda \).

(3) \( \mathbb{R} \) preserves all the cardinals outside \( (\kappa^+, \lambda) \).

(4) \( V_\mathbb{R} \models 2^\kappa = \lambda^+ = \kappa^{+3} \).

(5) \( \mathbb{R} \) forces that \( \kappa \) is a strong limit cardinal of cofinality \( \delta \).

Proof.

(1) Let \( \{(p_\alpha, \dot{q}_\alpha, r_\alpha) : \alpha \in \lambda\} \) be a collection of conditions in \( \mathbb{R} \). By the usual \( \Delta \)-system argument we can find \( \mathcal{I} \in |\lambda|^\lambda \) such that \( \{p_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{I}\} \) yields a family of pairwise compatible conditions. For each \( \alpha \in \mathcal{I} \), we can assume without loss of generality that \( \dot{q}_\alpha = \langle (\dot{\beta}_0^\alpha, \dot{A}_0^\alpha), \ldots, (\dot{\beta}_{m_\alpha-1}^\alpha, \dot{A}_{m_\alpha-1}^\alpha), (\kappa, \dot{A}_{m_\alpha}^\alpha) \rangle \). Since \( |\mathcal{Q}| < \lambda \), possibly passing to a set \( \mathcal{I}^* \in [\mathcal{I}]^\lambda \), we may assume that the \( m_\alpha \)'s and the \( \dot{\beta}^\alpha \)'s are constant. Again we can find \( \mathcal{T}^{**} \in [\mathcal{T}^*]^\lambda \) such that \( \{\text{dom}(r_\alpha) : \alpha \in \mathcal{T}^{**}\} \) is a \( \Delta \)-system with root \( \Delta \) such that \( r_\alpha \upharpoonright \Delta = r^* \), for each \( \alpha \in \mathcal{T}^{**} \). This is possible because \( \lambda \) is inaccessible and thus the number of \( \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\gamma) \cdot \dot{Q}^\gamma \)-nice names \( (\gamma \in r) \) for conditions in \( \text{Add}(\kappa^+, 1) \) is less than \( \lambda \). Altogether \( \{(p_\alpha, \dot{q}_\alpha, r_\alpha) : \alpha \in \mathcal{T}^{**}\} \) is a family of pairwise compatible conditions in \( \mathbb{R} \).

(2) Since \( \mathbb{P} \cdot \dot{Q} \) and \( U \) are respectively \( \kappa^+ \)-Knaster and \( \kappa^+ \)-closed in \( V \) then, by Easton lemma, \( \mathbb{P} \cdot \dot{Q} \) forces that \( U \) is \( \kappa^+ \)-distributive. In particular \( (\mathbb{P} \cdot \dot{Q}) \times U \) preserves
\( \kappa^+ \) and thus \( \mathbb{R} \) too. Now let \( \mu \in (\kappa^+, \lambda) \) be a cardinal and define \((p, q, r) \mapsto (p \restriction (\kappa \times \mu), r(\mu))\). Standard arguments prove that this map entails a projection between \( \mathbb{R} \) and \( \text{Add}(\kappa, \mu) \ast \text{Add}(\kappa^+, 1) \) and that in the extension given by this latter forcing \( \mu \) is collapsed to \( \kappa^+ \). Altogether we have shown that \( \mathbb{R} \) collapses all cardinals \( \mu \in (\kappa^+, \lambda) \) to \( \kappa^+ \).

(3) Follows immediately from (1) and (2) and the fact that \((\mathbb{P} \ast \mathbb{Q}) \times \mathbb{U}\) preserves all cardinals \( \leq \kappa \).

(4) Follows from (2) and the fact that \( \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{R} = \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{V}^\mathbb{P} \mathbb{Q} \).

(5) Let \( \lambda < \kappa \). As before \( \mathcal{P}(\lambda) \cap \mathbb{R} = \mathcal{P}(\lambda) \cap \mathbb{V}^\mathbb{P} \mathbb{Q} \), so that \((2^\lambda)^\mathbb{R} = (2^\lambda)^\mathbb{V}^\mathbb{P} \mathbb{Q} \). Let us now work inside \( \mathbb{V}^\mathbb{P} \). Recall that one of the properties of Magidor forcing is that new subsets of \( \kappa \) are created along with the generic sequence. More formally, if \( C = \langle \kappa_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle \) is a Magidor club for \( \mathbb{Q} \) then

\[
\mathcal{P}(\lambda) \cap \mathbb{V}[C] = \mathcal{P}(\lambda) \cap \mathbb{V}[\mathbb{C}[\beta + 1]],
\]

where \( \beta \) is the least ordinal such that \( \kappa_\beta \leq \lambda < \kappa_{\beta + 1} \). In particular, \((2^\lambda)^{\mathbb{V}[C][\beta + 1]} = (2^\lambda)^{\mathbb{V}[C]} \). Since \( |\mathbb{Q}|_{\kappa_{\beta + 1}} < \kappa \), \( \kappa \) remains strong limit in \( \mathbb{V}[\mathbb{C}[\beta + 1]] \) and thus \((2^\lambda)^{\mathbb{V}[C]} < \kappa \). For the last fact about the cofinality notice that \( \mathbb{P} \ast \mathbb{Q} \) forces “cof(\( \kappa \)) = \delta” and that, again appealing to Easton lemma, \( \mathbb{U} \) preserves this fact. Since there is a projection between \((\mathbb{P} \ast \mathbb{Q}) \times \mathbb{U} \) and \( \mathbb{R} \) the desired result follows.

\[ \square \]

### 3.3. Tree property in \( \mathbb{V}^\mathbb{R} \)

The present section will be devoted to complete the proof of theorem 1.1 by showing that \( \mathbb{R} \) forces the tree property at \( \lambda \). The proof will be carried out by contradiction taking as an initial assumption that some \( \lambda \)-Aronszajn tree exists in the generic extension by \( \mathbb{R} \). Aiming for the desired contradiction we will firstly argue that in case that \( \mathbb{R} \) forces the existence of a \( \lambda \)-Aronszajn tree then this fact must already be forced by some subforcing of \( \mathbb{R} \). This subforcings of \( \mathbb{R} \) responds exactly to the notion of truncations of \( \mathbb{R} \) that is presented in definition 3.11. Nonetheless, this truncated forcings are not still suitable to being able to proceed with the standard analysis of the quotients that eventually would yield the proof of TP(\( \lambda \)). The reason, as described in the introduction of [FHS18], is that the mismatch between the Cohen part (i.e. \( \text{Add}(\kappa, \lambda^+) \)) and the collapsing part of
\( \mathbb{R} \) persists in this truncated forcing. To fix this in definition 3.10, we introduce a forcing \( \mathbb{R}^∗ \) which is isomorphic to the aforementioned truncation and for which there is no mismatch issue anymore. The section finishes carrying out an analysis of the truncations of \( \mathbb{R}^∗ \) and its quotients in the line of [Ung13, Section 5] that will finally yield the desired contradiction.

**Definition 3.11** (Truncations of \( \mathbb{R} \)). Let an ordinal \( \xi_0 < \xi \in A \). The \( \xi \)-truncation of \( \mathbb{R} \), \( \mathbb{R} | \xi \), is the forcing described by the following items:

(a) Conditions in \( \mathbb{R} | \xi \) are triples \((p, \dot{q}, r)\) such that:

1. \((p, \dot{q}) \in P | \xi * \dot{Q}_\xi \),
2. \(r\) is a partial function with \( \text{dom}(r) \subseteq B \) and \(|\text{dom}(r)| \leq \kappa\),
3. For every \( \alpha \in \text{dom}(r) \), \( r(\alpha) \) is a \( P | \text{Even}(\alpha) * \dot{Q}_{\pi \alpha} \)-nice name for a condition in \( \text{Add}(\kappa^+, 1) \).

(b) For conditions \((p_0, \dot{q}_0, r_0)\) and \((p_1, \dot{q}_1, r_1)\) in \( \mathbb{R} | \xi \) we say that \((p_1, \dot{q}_1) \leq (p_0, \dot{q}_0, r_0)\) iff

1. \((p_1, \dot{q}_1) \leq (p_0, \dot{q}_0)\) in \( P | \xi * \dot{Q}_\xi \),
2. \( \text{dom}(r_0) \subseteq \text{dom}(r_1) \) and for all \( \alpha \in \text{dom}(r_0) \),
\[ \sigma^\xi_\alpha (p_1, \dot{q}_1) \vDash P | \text{Even}(\alpha) * \dot{Q}_{\pi \alpha} \text{ “} r_1(\alpha) \leq r_0(\alpha) \text{”}. \]

**Lemma 3.12.** Let \( \xi_0 < \xi \in A \). There is a projection from \( \mathbb{R} \) to \( RO^+(\mathbb{R} | \xi) \).

**Proof.** Let us denote by \( \hat{\mathbb{R}} | \xi \) the forcing \( \mathbb{R} | \xi \) but with Cohen part consisting of \( RO^+(P | \xi * \dot{Q}_\xi) \)-names instead of \( P | \xi * \dot{Q}_\xi \)-names. Both posets \( \hat{\mathbb{R}} | \xi \) and \( \mathbb{R} | \xi \) are isomorphic, so that it will be enough to argue that there is a projection between \( \hat{\mathbb{R}} \) and \( \hat{\mathbb{R}} | \xi \). Nevertheless, using the geometric characterization of Magidor generics and equation (3.4) of [5.7] one can easily define a generic for \( \hat{\mathbb{R}} | \xi \) in \( V^\mathbb{R} \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.13.** Suppose \( \vDash \mathbb{R} \text{ “There exists a } \lambda \text{-Aronszajn tree”} \). Then there exists \( \xi^* \in A \), \( \xi_0 < \xi \), such that \( \vDash_{\mathbb{R} | \xi} \text{ “There exists a } \lambda \text{-Aronszajn tree”} \).

**Proof.** Let \( \dot{T} \) be an \( \mathbb{R} \)-nice name for a subset of \( \lambda \) whose interpretation yields a \( \lambda \)-Aronszajn tree. Say \( \dot{T} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda} \{\alpha\} \times A_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda \), where \( A_\alpha \) are maximal antichains in \( \mathbb{R} \). Set \( A := \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} A_\alpha \). Since \( \mathbb{R} \) is \( \lambda \)-Knaster (see lemma 3.10) and \( \lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda, |A| \leq \lambda \). We claim
that all the conditions deciding $\hat{T}$ are members of certain $\xi$-truncation of $\mathbb{R}$. Notice that condition in $A$ is a triple $(p, \dot{q}, r)$ with $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{q} = (\langle \dot{\alpha}_0^p, \dot{A}_0^p \rangle, \ldots, \langle \dot{\alpha}_{\kappa(n-1)}^p, \dot{A}_{\kappa(n-1)}^p \rangle, (\dot{\kappa}, \dot{A}_n^p)),$$

with $\dot{A}_i^p$'s being $\mathbb{P}$-names for elements of $\dot{\mathcal{F}}(\dot{\alpha}_i)$. By definition of $\mathbb{P}$ there are less than $\kappa$-many ordinals appearing in $\text{dom}(p)$ or in the domain of any condition occurring in the $\mathbb{P}$-names $\hat{A}_i$'s. Since $|A| \leq \lambda$ there are no more than $\lambda$-many ordinals occurring in either the $\mathbb{P}$-names or in the $\mathbb{P}$-names $\hat{A}_i$'s. Since $A \in D^+$, we can pick $\xi^* \in A$, $\xi_0 < \xi^*$ such that all the conditions in $A$ can be regarded as conditions in $\mathbb{R} \upharpoonright \xi^*$. Finally, since there is a projection between $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R} \upharpoonright \xi^*$, there is a $\mathbb{R} \upharpoonright \xi^*$-name $\hat{T}^*$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{R} \upharpoonright \xi^*} \text{“}\hat{T}^* \text{ is a } \lambda\text{-Aronszajn tree”}$. □

Let us fix $\xi^* \in A$ as in the above lemma and let $\pi^* : \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \xi^* \simeq \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda$ be an isomorphism extending $\pi$. Again, notice that the interpretation of the $\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \xi^*$-name $\pi^*(\dot{\mathcal{U}}_{\xi^*})$ is the same as the interpretation of the $\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \xi_0$-name $\pi(\dot{\mathcal{U}}_{\xi_0})$. Moreover, each measure in the interpretation of $\pi^*(\dot{\mathcal{U}}_{\xi^*})$ is forced to extend some measure in the interpretation of $\pi(\dot{\mathcal{U}}_{\xi_0})$.

**Notation 3.14.** Let $\mathcal{Q}_\lambda^{\xi^*}$ denote the Magidor forcing in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda$ defined using $\pi^*(\dot{\mathcal{U}}_{\xi^*})$.

**Lemma 3.15.**

1. $\pi^*$ extends to an isomorphism from $(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \xi^* \ast \dot{\mathcal{Q}}_{\xi^*})$ to $(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \dot{\mathcal{Q}}_\lambda^{\xi^*})$.

2. For every $\gamma \in \mathcal{B}$, $\sigma_\lambda^\gamma = \sigma_\gamma^{\xi^*} \circ (\pi^*)^{-1}$ defines a projection, where

$$\sigma_\lambda^\gamma : \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \mathcal{Q}_\lambda^{\xi^*} \to \text{RO}^+(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\alpha) \ast \dot{\mathcal{Q}}_\gamma^{\xi^*}).$$

**Proof.**

1. Since $\pi^* : \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \xi^* \to \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda$ is an isomorphism, it naturally induces an isomorphism between $V^\mathbb{P}[\xi^*]$ and $V^\mathbb{P}[\lambda]$. By ease of notation, let us denote this later isomorphism by $\pi^*$. Say $(p, \dot{q}) \in \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \xi^* \ast \dot{\mathcal{Q}}_{\xi^*}$ with $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{q} = (\langle \dot{\alpha}_0, \dot{A}_0 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \dot{\alpha}_{\kappa(n-1)}, \dot{A}_{\kappa(n-1)} \rangle, (\dot{\kappa}, \dot{A}_n))$. Abusing a bit more of the notation, define $\pi^*(p, \dot{q}) = (\pi^*(p), \pi^*(\dot{q}))$ where

$$\pi^*(p) \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \pi^*(\dot{q}) = (\langle \dot{\alpha}_0, \pi^*(\dot{A}_0) \rangle, \ldots, \langle \dot{\alpha}_{\kappa(n-1)}, \pi^*(\dot{A}_{\kappa(n-1)}) \rangle, (\dot{\kappa}, \pi^*(\dot{A}_n))).$$

It is routine to check that $\pi^*$ defines the desired isomorphism.
(2) Follows from the fact that $\pi^*$ is an isomorphism.

In the next definition we describe the non-mismatches version of $\mathbb{R} \upharpoonright \xi^*$ described at the beginning of the section.

**Definition 3.16 (The non-mismatch forcing $\mathbb{R}^*$).** We define the non-mismatch forcing $\mathbb{R}^*$ as the set of conditions satisfying the following properties:

(a) Conditions in $\mathbb{R}^*$ are triples $(p, \dot{q}, r)$ such that:

1. $(p, \dot{q}) \in \mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \lambda^* \dot{Q}^\pi_{\lambda^*}$.
2. $r$ is a partial function with $\text{dom}(r) \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $|\text{dom}(r)| \leq \kappa$.
3. For every $\xi \in \text{dom}(r)$, $r(\xi)$ is a $\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\xi)^* \dot{Q}_{\xi}^\pi$-nice name for a condition in $\text{Add}(\kappa^+, 1)$.

(b) For conditions $(p_0, \dot{q}_0, r_0)$ and $(p_1, \dot{q}_1, r_1)$ in $\mathbb{R}^*$ we say that $(p_1, \dot{q}_1, r_1) \leq (p_0, \dot{q}_0, r_0)$ iff

4. $(p_1, \dot{q}_1) \leq (p_0, \dot{q}_0)$ in $\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda^* \dot{Q}^\pi_{\lambda^*}$,
5. $\text{dom}(r_0) \subseteq \text{dom}(r_1)$ and for all $\alpha \in \text{dom}(r_0)$:

$$\sigma^\lambda_\alpha(p_1, \dot{q}_1) \models_{\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\alpha)^* \dot{Q}_{\alpha}^\pi} "r_1(\alpha) \leq r_0(\alpha)".$$ 

**Lemma 3.17.** There is an isomorphism between $\mathbb{R}^*$ and $\mathbb{R} \upharpoonright \xi^*$.

*Proof. Let $\pi^*$ as defined in the proof of Lemma 3.15 and define $\rho : \mathbb{R} \upharpoonright \xi^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^*$ as $\rho(p, \dot{q}, r) = (\pi^*(p, \dot{q}), r)$. It is routine to check that item (2) of lemma 3.15 implies that $\rho$ defines an isomorphism between these forcings. □

In particular $\mathbb{R}^*$ forces that TP($\lambda$) fails. In the next lines we will define the aforementioned truncations of $\mathbb{R}^*$ and analyse the combinatorial properties of its quotients. The next lemma is the corresponding analogous of lemmas 3.3 and 3.5 for the coherent sequence $(\pi^*(\dot{U}^\tau))_{\pi^*(G)^*}$. We omit to reproduce its proof as it is the same to that of lemma 3.3.

**Lemma 3.18.** There exists a set $\mathcal{B}^* \in D$, $\mathcal{B}^* \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, such that for every $\gamma \in \mathcal{B}^*$ and every $\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda$-generic filter $H$, $\dot{U}^\tau_{\xi^*} := \langle \pi^*(\dot{U}(\alpha, \beta))^H \cap V[H \upharpoonright \gamma] : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \sigma^*(\dot{U}(\gamma)) \rangle$ is a coherent sequence of measures in $V[H \upharpoonright \gamma]$. 

Let $H$ be the $\mathbb{P} \restriction \lambda$-generic filter over $V$ generated by $\pi^*$ and the generic filter $G \restriction \xi^*$.

**Notation 3.19.** For each ordinal $\gamma \in B^*$ we denote by $Q^\gamma_{\pi^*}$ the Magidor forcing as defined in $V[H \restriction \gamma]$ using the coherent sequence of measures $U^\gamma_{\pi^*}$.

The next lemma is the analogous of lemma 3.7 for $\hat{B}^* := B^* \cup \{\lambda\}$ and the proof is the same that of Lemma 3.18 in [FHS18].

**Lemma 3.20.**

1. For every $\gamma, \gamma' \in \hat{B}^*$ with $\gamma < \gamma'$, there is a projection

\[ \hat{\rho}^\pi_{\gamma'} : \mathbb{P} \restriction \gamma' \ast \hat{Q}^\pi_{\gamma'} \to RO^+(\mathbb{P} \restriction \text{Even}(\gamma) \ast \hat{Q}^\pi_{\xi^*}). \]

2. For every $\gamma, \gamma' \in \hat{B}^*$ with $\gamma < \gamma'$, let $\hat{\rho}^\pi_{\gamma'}$ be the extension of $\hat{\rho}^\pi_{\gamma}$ to the Boolean completion of $\mathbb{P} \restriction \gamma' \ast Q^\gamma_{\pi^*}$:

\[ \hat{\rho}^\pi_{\gamma'} : RO^+(\mathbb{P} \restriction \gamma' \ast Q^\gamma_{\pi^*}) \to RO^+(\mathbb{P} \restriction \text{Even}(\gamma) \ast Q^\gamma_{\pi^*}). \]

Further, this projections commute with $\rho^\lambda_{\gamma}$:

\[ \rho^\lambda_{\gamma} = \hat{\rho}^\pi_{\gamma} \circ \rho^\lambda_{\gamma'}. \]

3. For each ordinal $\gamma \in B^*$, $\sigma^\lambda_\gamma = \rho^\lambda_{\gamma}$.

**Definition 3.21** (Truncations of $R^*$). Let an ordinal $\gamma \in B^*$. The $\gamma$-truncation of $R^*$, $R^* \restriction \gamma$, is the forcing defined as follows:

(a) Conditions in $R^* \restriction \gamma$ are triples $(p, \dot{q}, r)$ such that:

1. $(p, \dot{q}) \in \mathbb{P} \restriction \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^\pi_{\gamma'}$,

2. $r$ is a partial function with $\text{dom}(r) \subseteq B \cap \gamma$ and $|\text{dom}(r)| \leq \kappa$,

3. For every $\alpha \in \text{dom}(r)$, $r(\alpha)$ is a $\mathbb{P} \restriction \text{Even}(\alpha) \ast \hat{Q}^\pi_{\gamma}$-nice name for a condition in $\text{Add}(\kappa^+, 1)$.

(b) For conditions $(p_0, \dot{q}_0, r_0)$ and $(p_1, \dot{q}_1, r_1)$ in $R^* \restriction \gamma$ we say that $(p_1, \dot{q}_1, r_1) \leq (p_0, \dot{q}_0, r_0)$ iff:

4. $(p_1, \dot{q}_1) \leq (p_0, \dot{q}_0)$ in $\mathbb{P} \restriction \lambda \ast \hat{Q}^\pi_{\xi^*}$,

5. $\text{dom}(r_0) \subseteq \text{dom}(r_1)$ and for all $\alpha \in \text{dom}(r_0)$,

\[ \hat{q}_{\alpha}^\pi(p_1, \dot{q}_1) \forces_{\mathbb{P} \restriction \text{Even}(\alpha) \ast \hat{Q}^\pi_{\xi^*}} " r_1(\alpha) \leq r_0(\alpha)". \]
Lemma 3.22. For each ordinal $\gamma \in B^*$ there is a projection from $R^*$ to $RO^+(R^* \rest \gamma)$.

Proof. Using the geometric characterization of Magidor sequences one can argue that there is a projection $\pi^\lambda_\gamma$ between $(P \rest \lambda^* \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^*_\lambda)$ and $(P \rest \gamma^* \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^*_\gamma)$. Define $(p, \dot{q}, r) \mapsto (\pi^\lambda_\gamma(p, \dot{q}), r \rest \gamma)$. Clearly this defines a projection between $R^*$ and its truncation $R^* \rest \gamma$. Now composing with the canonical isomorphism between $R^* \rest \gamma$ and its Boolean completion we obtain the desired projection.

Broadly speaking, $R^*$ is a forcing whose Cohen part is isomorphic to the Cohen part of $R$ restricted to the first $\lambda$ components. Using the same arguments of lemma 3.10 one can show the following:

Lemma 3.23. Let $\gamma \in \hat{B}^*$ be an inaccessible cardinal. Then $R^* \rest \gamma$ has the following properties:

1. There is a $\kappa^+$-closed forcing $U_\gamma^*$ such that $(P \rest \gamma^* \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^*_\gamma) \times U_\gamma^*$ projects onto $R^* \rest \gamma$.
2. $R^* \rest \gamma$ is $\lambda$-Knaster, hence it preserves cardinals $\geq \lambda$.
3. $R^* \rest \gamma$ preserves $\kappa^+$ and collapses the cardinals in $(\kappa^+, \gamma)$ to it. In particular $V^{|R^*|\gamma} \models \kappa^{++} = \gamma$.
4. $R^* \rest \gamma$ preserves all the cardinals outside $(\kappa^+, \gamma)$.
5. $V^{R^* \rest \gamma} \models 2^\kappa = \kappa^{++} = \gamma$.
6. $R^* \rest \gamma$ forces that $\kappa$ is a strong limit cardinal with $\text{cof}(\kappa) = \delta$.

The next result begins with the analysis of the quotients announced at the beginning of the section.

Lemma 3.24. Let $\gamma \in B^*$. Then in the generic extension $V^{|R^*|\gamma}$ there is a projection from the quotient $(P \rest \lambda^* \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^*_\lambda)/(P \rest \gamma^* \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^*_\gamma) \times U_\gamma^*$ onto $R^*/R^* \rest \gamma$.

Proof. Set $U_\gamma^* := \{(p, \dot{q}, r) \in R^* \rest \gamma : p = 1 \land \vdash \dot{q} = 1\}$, endowed with the ordering inherit from $R^* \rest \gamma$. Let $\varphi_\gamma : (P \rest \gamma^* \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^*_\gamma) \times U_\gamma^* \to R^* \rest \gamma$ and $\pi^\lambda_\gamma : (P \rest \lambda^* \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^*_\lambda) \to (P \rest \gamma^* \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^*_\gamma)$ be the projections considered in lemmas 3.9 and 3.22 respectively. Let $H \times K \subseteq (P \rest \gamma^* \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^*_\gamma) \times U_\gamma^*$ generic over $V$ and $T$ be the $R^* \rest \gamma$-generic filter over $V$ induced by $\varphi_\gamma$ and $H \times K$. Working
We claim that $E$ is a dense subset of $P$ and thus in Lemma 3.25. Let

$$
E := \{(p', q', r') \in R^* / R^* \mid \exists (p, q, r) \in R^* / R^* \mid \gamma, (p, q, r) \leq (p', q', r') \land \pi_\gamma(p, q) \in H, (1, \hat{1}, r \mid \gamma) \in K\}.
$$

We claim that $E$ is a $R^* / R^* \mid \gamma$-generic over $V[T]$. Indeed, let $D$ be a dense subset of $R^* / R^* \mid \gamma$ and notice that

$$
D^* := \{((p', q'), (1, \hat{1}, r')) \in (P \mid \gamma * \hat{Q}_\gamma^* \gamma)/(P \mid \gamma * \hat{Q}_\gamma^* \gamma) \times U_\gamma^* : \\
\exists (p, q, r) \in D (\pi_\gamma(p, q) = (p', q') \land (1, \hat{1}, r \mid \gamma) = (1, \hat{1}, r'))\}
$$

is a dense subset of $((\pi_\gamma) \gamma^{-1} H \times K) \neq \emptyset$, and thus $E$ meets $D$.

\[\Box\]

The following lemma will be crucial in further arguments and characterizes when a condition is being forced outside the quotient forcing $(P \mid \gamma * Q_\gamma^* \gamma)/(P \mid \gamma * Q_\gamma^* \gamma)$.

**Lemma 3.25.** Let $\gamma \in B^*$, $p^* = (p, (\langle \alpha_1, \hat{A}_1 \rangle, \ldots, (\alpha_{n-1}, \hat{A}_{n-1}, (\kappa, \hat{A}))) \in P \mid \gamma * Q_\gamma^* \gamma$ and $q^* = (q, (\langle \beta_1, \hat{B}_1 \rangle, \ldots, (\beta_{n-1}, \hat{B}_{n-1}, (\kappa, \hat{B}))) \in P \mid \gamma * Q_\gamma^* \gamma$. Then

$$p^* \perp_{P \mid \gamma * Q_\gamma^* \gamma} q^* \notin (P \mid \gamma * Q_\gamma^* \gamma)/(P \mid \gamma * Q_\gamma^* \gamma)$$

if and only if one of the following conditions hold:

1. $p \perp q \mid \lambda$.
2. $p \parallel q \mid \lambda$ and there exists $j$ such that $\beta_j \notin \{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$, and $p \cup q \parallel_{P \mid \lambda} \beta_j \not\notin \hat{A}_k$, where $k$ is the least index such that $\beta_j < \alpha_k$.
3. $p \parallel q \mid \lambda$ and there exists $j$ such that $\beta_j \notin \{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$, and $p \cup q \parallel_{P \mid \lambda} \beta_j \not\notin \hat{A}_k \cap \beta_j$, where $k$ is the least index such that $\beta_j < \alpha_k$.
4. $p \parallel q \mid \lambda$ and there exists $i$ such that $\alpha_i \notin \{\beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m\}$, and $p \cup q \parallel_{P \mid \lambda} \alpha_i \not\notin \hat{B}_k$, where $k$ is the least index such that $\alpha_i < \beta_k$.
5. $p \parallel q \mid \lambda$ and there exists $i$ such that $\alpha_i \notin \{\beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m\}$, and $p \cup q \parallel_{P \mid \lambda} \hat{A}_i \not\notin \hat{B}_k \cap \alpha_i$, where $k$ is the least index such that $\alpha_i < \beta_k$. 
Notation 3.26.

**Proof.** It is easy to show that \("p^*\)\(\upharpoonright_{\mathbb{P}\upharpoonright\lambda} Q_\gamma^+ q^* \notin (\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast Q_\lambda^+)\) holds if and only if there is no \(G \ast \mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast Q_\lambda^+\) generic such that \(q^* \in G \ast \mathbb{C}\) and \(p^* \in (\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma) \ast \mathbb{C}\). If one of the above mentioned conditions hold then every generic filter \(G \ast \mathbb{C}\) with \(q^* \in G \ast \mathbb{C}\) satisfies the claim since \(p^*\) and \(\pi_1^\lambda(q^*)\) are incompatible. This proves the right to left implication.

Conversely, assume that all the previous conditions fail. In particular, \(p\) is compatible with \(q \upharpoonright \lambda\) and thus \(p \cup q \in \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda\). Set \(p^*(1) := \langle (\alpha_1, \hat{A}_1), \ldots, (\alpha_{n-1}, \hat{A}_{n-1}), (\alpha_n = \kappa, \hat{A}) \rangle\) and \(q^*(1) := \langle (\beta_1, \hat{B}_1), \ldots, (\beta_{m-1}, \hat{B}_{m-1}), (\beta_m = \kappa, \hat{B}) \rangle\) and let us show that \(p \cup q\) forces \(p^*(1)\) and \(q^*(1)\) are compatible”. Let \(\{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_t\}\) be an increasing enumeration of \(\{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \cup \{\beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m\}\). Let \(k \leq t\) and let us define a name \(\hat{C}_k\) in the following way:

1. If there are \(i\) and \(j\) such that \(\alpha_i = \gamma_k = \beta_j\), then define \(\hat{C}_k\) to be a name forced by \(p \cup q\) to be \(\hat{A}_i \cap \hat{B}_j\).
2. If there is \(i\) such that \(\gamma_k = \alpha_i\) and \(\alpha_i \notin \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m\}\), then let \(j\) be the least index such that \(\gamma_k < \beta_j\) and let \(\hat{C}_k\) be a name forced by \(p \cup q\) to be \(\hat{A}_i \cap (\hat{B}_j \cap \alpha_i)\).
3. If there is \(j\) such that \(\gamma_k = \beta_j\) and \(\beta_j \notin \{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\}\) then let \(i\) be the least index such that \(\gamma_k < \alpha_i\) and let \(\hat{C}_k\) be a name forced by \(p \cup q\) to be \((\hat{A}_i \cap \beta_j) \cap \hat{B}_j\).

Set \(r^* := \langle p \cup q, (\gamma_1, \hat{C}_1), \ldots, (\gamma_t = \kappa, \hat{C}_t) \rangle\). Since by assumption none of the clauses (1)-(5) hold it is routine to check that \(r^* \in (\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda) \ast Q_\lambda^+\) and that \(r^* \leq p^*, q^*\). Now let \(G \ast \mathbb{C} \subseteq (\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda) \ast Q_\lambda^+\) a generic filter containing \(r^*\), hence in particular containing \(q^*\). Then, \(p^*\)\(\upharpoonright_{\mathbb{P}\upharpoonright\lambda} Q_\gamma^+ q^* \notin (\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast Q_\lambda^+)\) holds and thus

\[p^*\upharpoonright_{\mathbb{P}\upharpoonright\lambda} Q_\gamma^+ q^* \notin (\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast Q_\lambda^+)/(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast Q_\gamma^+)\].

\[\square\]

**Notation 3.26.**

(a) Suppose \(\mathcal{U}\) is a Coherent sequence of measures, \(Q_\mathcal{U}\) is the corresponding Magidor forcing and \(q = \langle (\alpha_0, A_0), \ldots, (\alpha_n, A_n) \rangle \in Q_\mathcal{U}\). Suppose \(j \leq n\) and \(x = \langle \beta_0, \ldots, \beta_k \rangle\) is a finite increasing sequence in \(A_j \setminus (\alpha_{j-1} + 1)\) with \(\beta_k < \alpha_j\). Then \(add(q, x)\) denotes the least condition extending \(q\) and containing the sequence \(x\) in the stem:

\[\langle (\alpha_0, A_0), \ldots, (\alpha_{j-1}, A_{j-1}), (\beta_0, A_j \cap \beta_0), \ldots, (\beta_k, A_j \cap \beta_k), (\alpha_j, A_j \setminus \beta_k + 1), \ldots, (\alpha_n, A_n) \rangle.\]
Lemma 3.27 (Röwbottom Theorem). Let $\lambda < \kappa$, $\langle U_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be a collection of normal measures over $\kappa$ and $f : [\kappa]^{<\omega} \to 2$ be a function. There is a collection of measure one sets $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ such that for every $\vec{s} \in [\lambda]^{<\omega}$, the function $f \restriction \prod_{n \in \text{dom}(\vec{s})} A_{\vec{s}(n)}$ is constant.

Proof. Let $\vec{s} \in [\lambda]^{<\omega}$ be an arbitrary sequence. Let us prove by induction over $n = \text{len}(\vec{s})$ and functions $g : [\kappa]^n \to 2$ that there is a collection $\mathcal{A}^g = \langle A^g_{\vec{s}(n)} : n \in \text{dom}(\vec{s}) \rangle$ of measure one sets, $A^g_{\vec{s}(n)} \in U_{\vec{s}(n)}$, such that $g \restriction \prod_{n \in \text{dom}(\vec{s})} A^g_{\vec{s}(n)}$ is constant. If $\text{len}(\vec{s}) = 0$ there is nothing to prove while if $\text{len}(\vec{s}) = 1$ the result follows from the classical Röwbottom theorem applied to the measure $U_{\vec{s}(0)}$. Suppose $\text{len}(\vec{s}) = n + 1$. For each $\vec{t} \in [\kappa]^n$ let $G_{\vec{t}} : \kappa \to 2$ be defined by $\mu \mapsto f(\vec{t} \cup \{\mu\})$. By Röwbottom’s theorem there is $B_{\vec{t}} \in U_{\vec{s}(n)}$ homogeneous for the function $G_{\vec{t}}$. Let $A^g_{\vec{s}(n)} := \Delta_{\vec{t} \cup \{\mu\}} B^g_{\vec{t}}$ and by normality $A^g_{\vec{s}(n)} \in U_{\vec{s}(n)}$. Let $H : [\kappa]^n \to 2$ be the function such that $H(\vec{t})$ is the constant value of $G_{\vec{t}} \restriction B_{\vec{t}}$. Set $\vec{i} = \vec{s} \setminus n$. By induction, there is $\mathcal{A}^i = \langle A^i_{\vec{r}(m)} : m \in \text{dom}(\vec{r}) \rangle$, $A^i_{\vec{r}(m)} \in U_{\vec{r}(m)}$, such that $H \restriction \prod_{1 \leq m \leq n - 1} A^i_{\vec{r}(m)}$ is constant. Set $\mathcal{A}^g = \mathcal{A}^i \cup \{A^g_{\vec{s}(n)}\}$.

Claim 3.28. $f \restriction \prod_{1 \leq m \leq n} A^g_{\vec{s}(m)}$ is constant.

Proof of claim. Let $\vec{\mu}, \vec{\mu}' \in \prod_{1 \leq m \leq n} A^g_{\vec{s}(m)}$. By definition, $f(\vec{\mu}) = G_{\vec{\mu} \setminus \langle \mu_n \rangle}(\mu_n)$ and since $\mu_n \in A^g_{\vec{s}(n)}$ this value is $H(\vec{\mu} \setminus \langle \mu_n \rangle)$. Since $\vec{\mu} \setminus \langle \mu_n \rangle, \vec{\mu}' \setminus \langle \mu'_n \rangle \in \prod_{1 \leq m \leq n} A^g_{\vec{s}(m)}$, by homogeneity $H(\vec{\mu} \setminus \langle \mu_n \rangle) = H(\vec{\mu}' \setminus \langle \mu'_n \rangle)$. Arguing as before, $H(\vec{\mu} \setminus \langle \mu_n \rangle) = G_{\vec{\mu} \setminus \langle \mu_n \rangle}(\mu'_n) = f(\vec{\mu}')$, and we are done. \hfill $\square$

The previous claim completes the induction. Now for each sequence $\vec{s} \in [\lambda]^{<\omega}$ let $\mathcal{A}^g = \langle A^g_{\vec{s}(n)} : n \in \text{dom}(\vec{s}) \rangle$ be the corresponding family of homogeneous sets. For each $\alpha < \lambda$, define $A_\alpha := \bigcap \{ A^g_{\vec{s}} : \vec{s} \in [\lambda]^{<\omega} \land \alpha \in \text{range}(\vec{s}) \}$ Finally it is straightforward to check that the $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witnesses is as sought. \hfill $\square$

Lemma 3.29. Let $\gamma \in B^+$ and assume

$$\langle p, ((\alpha_0, \hat{A}_0), \ldots, (\alpha_n, \hat{A}_n)) \rangle \in P \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \dot{Q}_\gamma$$
and
\[(q, ((\beta_0, \dot{B}_0), \ldots, (\beta_m, \dot{B}_m))) \in \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^\pi_{\lambda}\]
are such that \(p \leq q \upharpoonright \gamma\) and \(\{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \supseteq \{\beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m\}\). Then there are \(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma\)-names \(\dot{C}_0, \ldots, \dot{C}_n\) such that letting \(U^\pi_\gamma = [U(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \vartheta^2(\alpha)]\), we have

1. For all \(j \leq n, p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma} \text{"} \dot{C}_j \in \bigcap_{\beta < \vartheta(\alpha_j)} U(\alpha_j, \beta)\text{"}\).
2. Suppose \(j_1 < \cdots < j_m\) are such that for each \(k \leq m, \beta_k = \alpha_{j_k}\). Then for each finite set \(x\) such that \(x \cap (\alpha_{j-1}, \alpha_j) \subseteq \dot{C}_j\), add\(((\alpha_0, \dot{A}_0), \ldots, (\alpha_n, \dot{A}_n)), x\) is a condition and \(p\) forces that
\[q \Vdash_{p \upharpoonright \lambda} \exists k \leq m, x \cap (\beta_{k-1}, \beta_k) \not\subseteq \dot{B}_k.\]

**Proof.** Assume \(G\) is a \(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma\)-generic filter such that \(p \in G\). Let
\[\bar{p} = ((\alpha_0, \dot{A}_0^G), \ldots, (\alpha_n, \dot{A}_n^G)) \in Q^\pi_\gamma.\]
Define \(f : [\kappa]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}\) as follows. Suppose \(x \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}\).

0. If \(\text{add}(\bar{p}, x)\) is a condition and \(q \Vdash \text{"} \exists k \leq m, x \cap (\beta_{k-1}, \beta_k) \not\subseteq \dot{B}_k\text{"}\), then set \(f(x) = 0\).

1. If \(\text{add}(\bar{p}, x)\) is a condition and \(q \Vdash \text{"} \exists k \leq m, x \cap (\beta_{k-1}, \beta_k) \not\subseteq \dot{B}_k\text{"}\), then set \(f(x) = 1\).

2. If \(\text{add}(\bar{p}, x)\) is not a condition, then set \(f(x) = 2\).

Let \(\langle C_j : j \leq n\rangle\) be such that
- For all \(j \leq n, C_j \in \bigcap_{\beta < \vartheta(\alpha_j)} U(\alpha_j, \beta)\).
- \(f\) is constant on the set of finite increasing sequences \(x \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}\) such that for each \(j \leq n, x \cap (\alpha_{j-1}, \alpha_j) \subseteq C_j\) (see lemma 3.27).

Let \(\dot{C}_j\) be a \(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma\)-name for \(C_j, j \leq n\). We show that \(\dot{C}_0, \ldots, \dot{C}_n\) are as required. Assume towards a contradiction that this is not true. Then there are \(r \leq p, a\) finite increasing sequence \(x \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}\) and \(k \leq m\) such that \(\text{add}(\langle (\alpha_0, \dot{A}_0), \ldots, (\alpha_n, \dot{A}_n) \rangle, x)\) is a condition and \(r\) forces that \(q \Vdash_{\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda} \text{"} x \cap (\beta_{k-1}, \beta_k) \not\subseteq \dot{B}_k\text{"}\). Consider \(r \cup q \in \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda\) and let \(H\) be a \(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda\)-generic filter which contains \(r \cup q\). Let \(j \leq n\) be such that \(\alpha_j = \beta_k\). Then \(\dot{B}_k^H \cap \dot{C}_j^H = \emptyset\), which is a contradiction as both of them belong to \(\bigcap_{\beta < \vartheta(\beta_k)} U(\beta_k, \beta)\) which is a filter. \(\square\)

**Lemma 3.30.** Let \(\gamma \in B^*\) and assume
\[(p, ((\alpha_0, \dot{A}_0), \ldots, (\alpha_n, \dot{A}_n))) \in \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \dot{\mathcal{Q}}^\pi_\gamma\]
and

\[(q, ((\beta_0, \hat{B}_0), \ldots, (\beta_m, \hat{B}_m))) \in \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{Q}^*_\lambda\]

are arbitrary conditions. Suppose that

1. \(p \leq q \upharpoonright \gamma\).
2. \(\{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \supseteq \{\beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m\}\).
3. \(p \cup q \vDash \forall j \leq m, \{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \cap (\beta_{j-1}, \beta_j) \subseteq \hat{B}_j\).

Let \(\hat{C}_0, \ldots, \hat{C}_n\) be as in Lemma 3.29. Then \((p, ((\alpha_0, \hat{A}_0 \cap \hat{C}_0), \ldots, (\alpha_n, \hat{A}_n \cap \hat{C}_n)))\) forces

\[(q, ((\beta_0, \hat{B}_0), \ldots, (\beta_m, \hat{B}_m)))\]

into the quotient forcing \(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{Q}^*_\lambda / \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^*_\gamma\).

**Proof.** Aiming for a contradiction, suppose that the claim is false. Let \((p', ((\alpha'_0, \hat{A}'_0), \ldots, (\alpha'_l, \hat{A}'_l)))\)

\(\leq (p, ((\alpha_0, \hat{A}_0 \cap \hat{C}_0), \ldots, (\alpha_n, \hat{A}_n \cap \hat{C}_n)))\) forcing that \((q, ((\beta_0, \hat{B}_0), \ldots, (\beta_m, \hat{B}_m)))\) is not in the quotient \(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{Q}^*_\lambda / \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^*_\gamma\). Notice that one can take this \(((\alpha'_0, \hat{A}'_0^{G(\gamma)}), \ldots, (\alpha'_l, \hat{A}'_l^{G(\gamma)}))\) to be some \(\text{add}((\alpha_0, (\hat{A}_0 \cap \hat{C}_0)^{G(\gamma)}), \ldots, (\alpha_n, (\hat{A}_n \cap \hat{C}_n)^{G(\gamma)}), x)\) for some \(x\) finite such that \(x \cap (\alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_i) \subseteq \hat{C}_i\). By Lemma 3.29, one of the conditions (1) – (5) must hold.

1. Condition (1) fails since \(p' \leq q \upharpoonright \gamma\).
2. Condition (2) fails since \(\{\alpha'_0, \ldots, \alpha'_l\} \supseteq \{\beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m\}\).
3. Condition (3) fails by the same reason as before.
4. Condition (4) fails since \(p \cup q \vDash \forall j \leq m, \{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \cap (\beta_{j-1}, \beta_j) \subseteq \hat{B}_j\) and \(p' \cup q \leq p \cup q\).

So the only possibility is that Condition (5) holds. Namely, there is some index \(j \leq l\) such that \(p' \cup q \vDash \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{A}'_j \nsubseteq \hat{B}_{k_0} \cap \alpha'_j\) where \(k_0 \leq m\) is the least index for which \(\alpha_j' < \beta_{k_0}\). By our choice, \(p' \vDash \hat{A}'_j \nsubseteq \hat{A}_i \cap \hat{C}_i\) where \(i < n\) is the least index for which \(\alpha_j' < \alpha_i\). By Lemma 3.29 and since \(p' \leq p\), \(p'\) forces that \(q \vDash \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{A}_j' \nsubseteq \hat{B}_k\). Therefore there is some \(r \leq q\) such that \(p' \cup r \vDash \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{A}_j' \nsubseteq \hat{B}_{k_0}\) which leads us to the desired contradiction. \(\square\)

**Lemma 3.31.** Let \(\gamma \in B^*\) and assume

\[(p, ((\alpha_0, \hat{A}_0), \ldots, (\alpha_n, \hat{A}_n))) \in \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^*_\gamma\].

Suppose that for \(i \in \{0, 1\}\), \(\hat{r}_i\) are conditions forced by the trivial condition \(1_{\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^*_\gamma}\) to be into the quotient \(\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{Q}^*_\lambda / \mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^*_\gamma\). Then there are \((p', ((\alpha'_0, \hat{A}'_0), \ldots, (\alpha'_n, \hat{A}'_n))) \leq\)
Since Knasterness is a productive property the product \((p, ((\alpha_0, \hat{A}_0), \ldots, (\alpha_n, \hat{A}_n)))\) together with \((q^i, ((\beta^i_0, \hat{B}^i_0), \ldots, (\beta^i_m, \hat{B}^i_m)))\) and \(q^i \leq q^i\), \(i \in \{0, 1\}\) such that:

(a) \((p^i, ((\alpha^{i}_0, \hat{A}^{i}_0), \ldots, (\alpha^{i}_n, \hat{A}^{i}_n)))\) forces “\(\dot{r}_i = (q^i, ((\beta^i_0, \hat{B}^i_0), \ldots, (\beta^i_m, \hat{B}^i_m)))\)”, for each \(i \in \{0, 1\}\).

(b) \((p^i, ((\alpha^{i}_0, \hat{A}^{i}_0), \ldots, (\alpha^{i}_n, \hat{A}^{i}_n)))\) and \((q^i, ((\beta^i_0, \hat{B}^i_0), \ldots, (\beta^i_m, \hat{B}^i_m)))\) satisfy the assumptions (1)-(3) of lemma 3.30, for each \(i \in \{0, 1\}\).

Proof. Let \((p^i, ((\alpha^{i}_0, \hat{A}^{i}_0), \ldots, (\alpha^{i}_n, \hat{A}^{i}_n)))\) deciding the values of \(\dot{r}_i\) to be \((q^i, ((\beta^i_0, \hat{B}^i_0), \ldots, (\beta^i_m, \hat{B}^i_m)))\), for \(i \in \{0, 1\}\). Extending if necessary, one can assume without loss of generality that for each \(i \in \{0, 1\}\), \(p^i \leq q^i \upharpoonright \gamma\) and \(\{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \supseteq \{\beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m\}\). Since \((p^i, ((\alpha^{i}_0, \hat{A}^{i}_0), \ldots, (\alpha^{i}_n, \hat{A}^{i}_n)))\) forces each \((q^i, ((\beta^i_0, \hat{B}^i_0), \ldots, (\beta^i_m, \hat{B}^i_m)))\) to be into the quotient, item (4) of lemma 3.30 has to fail. Let \(q^i \leq p \cup q^i\) be a condition such that \(q^i \forces_{\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \lambda} \forall j \leq m, \{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \cap (\beta^i_{j-1}, \beta^i_j) \subseteq \hat{B}^i_j\). We can refine \(p^i\) a bit more to get \(p^i \leq q^i \upharpoonright \gamma\). Now it is clear that the conditions we constructed witness (a) and (b).

Lemma 3.32. Let \(\gamma \in \mathcal{B}^*\). Then \((\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\lambda)^2 \times (\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\gamma)^2\) is \(\kappa^+\)-c.c.

Proof. As in lemma 3.10 it is routine to check that \(\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\lambda\) and \(\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\gamma\) are \(\kappa^+\)-Knaster. Since Knasterness is a productive property the product \((\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\lambda)^2 \times (\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\gamma)^2\) is \(\kappa^+\)-Knaster, hence \(\kappa^+\)-c.c.

Lemma 3.33. Let \(\gamma \in \mathcal{B}^*\). Then

\[
\text{forces}_{\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\gamma}: \quad \text{“}(\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\lambda)^2 / \mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\gamma)^2\text{ is } \kappa^+\text{-c.c.”}
\]

Proof. Let \(\{p_\beta, q_\beta\} : \beta \in \kappa^+\) be a collection of \(\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\gamma\)-names for conditions in \((\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\lambda)^2 / \mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \gamma \ast \hat{Q}^\gamma_\gamma)^2\). We aim to show that there are two compatible conditions in such collection. For each \(\beta \in \kappa^+\) and \(i \in \{0, 1\}\), let \((p_\beta, ((\alpha^{i}_0, \hat{A}^{i}_0), \ldots, (\alpha^{i}_n, \hat{A}^{i}_n)))\), \((q_\beta, ((\beta^{i}_0, \hat{B}^{i}_0), \ldots, (\beta^{i}_m, \hat{B}^{i}_m)))\) and \(q_\beta \leq q_\beta\) witnessing lemma 3.31. By usual counting arguments one may further assume that \(n_\beta = n, m_\beta = m\), for each \(j \leq n, \alpha^{i}_j = \alpha_{j}\), and for each \(j \leq m, \gamma^{i}_{j} = \gamma_{j}\). By the previous lemma there are \(\beta < \beta' < \kappa^+\) such that

\[
(p_\beta, ((\alpha^{i}_0, \hat{A}^{i}_0), \ldots, (\alpha^{i}_{n-1}, \hat{A}^{i}_{n-1}), (\kappa, \hat{A}^{i}_n))) \parallel (p_{\beta'}, ((\alpha^{i}_0, \hat{A}^{i}_0), \ldots, (\alpha^{i}_{n-1}, \hat{A}^{i}_{n-1}), (\kappa, \hat{A}^{i}_n)))
\]
and for each $i \in \{0, 1\}$

$$(q^i_\beta, ((\gamma^i_0, \hat{B}^i_0), \ldots, (\gamma^i_{m_i - 1}, \hat{B}^i_{m_i - 1}), (\kappa, \hat{B}^i_{m_i}))) \parallel (q^i_{\beta'}, ((\gamma^i_0, \hat{B}^i_0), \ldots, (\gamma^i_{m_i - 1}, \hat{B}^i_{m_i - 1}), (\kappa, \hat{B}^i_{m_i}))).$$

It is straightforward to check that the conditions

$$(3.8) \quad (p_\beta \cup p'_{\beta'}, ((\alpha_0, \hat{A}^0_0 \cap \hat{A}^0_{\beta'}), \ldots, (\alpha_{n_i - 1}, \hat{A}^0_{n_i - 1} \cap \hat{A}^0_{\beta'}), (\kappa, \hat{A}^0_{n_i} \cap \hat{A}^0_{\beta'})))$$

$$(3.9) \quad (q^i_\beta \cup q^i_{\beta'}, ((\gamma^i_0, \hat{B}^i_0 \cap \hat{B}^i_{\beta'}), \ldots, (\gamma^i_{m_i - 1}, \hat{B}^i_{m_i - 1} \cap \hat{B}^i_{m_i}), (\kappa, \hat{B}^i_{m_i} \cap \hat{B}^i_{\beta'})))$$

for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, are witness for lemma 3.34. Therefore there is an extension of condition (3.8) forcing the compatibility of $(\check{r}^0_\beta, \check{r}^0_{\beta'})$ and $(\check{r}^1_\beta, \check{r}^1_{\beta'})$ in the quotient. \(\Box\)

**Lemma 3.34.** Let $\check{T}$ be an $\mathbb{R}^+\text{-name}$ such that $\models_{\mathbb{R}} \check{T}$ is $\lambda$-Aronszajn". Then there is some $\gamma \in B^*$ such that $\models_{\mathbb{R} \cdot \gamma} \check{T} \cap \gamma$ is $\gamma$-Aronszajn" and $T \cap \gamma$ has a branch in the generic extension $V[\mathbb{R}^+ \upharpoonright \gamma][(P \upharpoonright \lambda \ast Q_\kappa^\ast) \upharpoonright \gamma \ast Q_\gamma^\ast \upharpoonright \gamma \ast Q_\gamma^\ast] \times U^*_\kappa]$.

**Proof.** Since $T$ is a $\lambda$-tree in $V^\mathbb{R}$ then $T \cap \gamma$ necessarily has a branch in $V[\mathbb{R}^+ \upharpoonright \gamma][(P \upharpoonright \lambda \ast Q_\kappa^\ast) \upharpoonright \gamma \ast Q_\gamma^\ast \upharpoonright \gamma \ast Q_\gamma^\ast] \times U^*_\kappa]$ (see lemma 3.24). On the other hand, $\models_{\mathbb{R} \cdot \gamma} \check{T}$ is $\lambda$-Aronszajn" is a $\Pi^1_1$ true sentence in the structure $\langle V^\mathbb{R}, \in, \mathbb{R}, \lambda, \check{T} \rangle$. Since $\lambda$ is weakly compact, the set of inaccessible cardinals $\gamma < \lambda$ such that

$$(3.10) \quad \langle V^\mathbb{R}, \in \upharpoonright \gamma, \gamma, \check{T} \cap \gamma \rangle \models \models_{\mathbb{R} \cdot \gamma} \check{T} \cap \gamma$ is $\gamma$-Aronszajn"$$

is stationary. Recall that $B^*$ is an unbounded set in $\lambda$ containing all the limits points of cofinality greater than $\kappa$ so that there is $\gamma \in B^*$ witnessing (3.10). Notice that all the maximal antichains of $\mathbb{R}^+ \upharpoonright \gamma$ are subsets of $V^\mathbb{R}$, so that (3.10) is absolute between this structure and $V$. In other words, $\models_{\mathbb{R} \cdot \gamma} \check{T} \cap \gamma$ is $\gamma$-Aronszajn, as wanted. \(\Box\)

Let $\gamma \in B^*$ and $b_\gamma$ be a branch for $T \cap \gamma$ in $V[\mathbb{R}^+ \upharpoonright \gamma][(P \upharpoonright \lambda \ast Q_\kappa^\ast) \upharpoonright \gamma \ast Q_\gamma^\ast \upharpoonright \gamma \ast Q_\gamma^\ast] \times U^*_\kappa]$, as in the previous lemma. Notice that $b_\gamma$ is not added by $U^*_\gamma$ because this forcing is $\kappa^+$-closed in $V[\mathbb{R}^+ \upharpoonright \gamma]$. Nonetheless, all the ordinal segments $b_\gamma \cap \alpha$ are inside $V[\mathbb{R}^+ \upharpoonright \gamma]$. Since $(P \upharpoonright \lambda \ast Q_\kappa^\ast \upharpoonright \gamma \ast Q_\gamma^\ast)^2$ is $\kappa^+$-cc, in particular has the $\kappa^+$-approximation property (see [Ung13, Lemma 2.4]), it does not add the branch $b_\gamma$ either. Thus, $b_\gamma \in V[\mathbb{R}^+ \upharpoonright \gamma]$. Nevertheless, $T \cap \gamma$ was by assumption a $\gamma$-Aronszajn tree in $V[\mathbb{R}^+ \upharpoonright \gamma]$, which provides the desired contradiction.
3.4. Making the gap arbitrarily large. In this last section we tackle the issue of getting an arbitrary gap between \( \kappa \) and \( 2^\kappa \) in theorem 3.1. To this aim we will take advantage of the ideas developed along the previous section and we will point out the minor differences between the case \( 2^\kappa \geq \lambda^+ \) and the general one. The arguments are analogous to those exposed in [FHS18].

(1) Suppose that after some preparatory forcing the strength of \( \kappa \) has been made indestructible under adding any new Cohen subset to \( \kappa \). Fix \( \gamma \geq \lambda \) with \( \text{cof}(\gamma) > \kappa \).

Let \( P = \text{Add}(\kappa, \gamma) \) and let \( U \) be a coherent sequence of measures in \( V^P \) with \( d^U(\kappa) = \delta \). Define \( D \) in the same way as in Subsection 3.1 and

\[
D^+ = \{ X \subseteq [\gamma]^{\lambda} : \sup(X) = \gamma, \forall x \in X (\lambda + 1 \subseteq x) \text{ and } X \text{ is } (> \kappa) \text{-closed} \}.
\]

Arguing as in lemma 5.3 one gets a family \( A \) of \( x \in [\gamma]^{\lambda} \) where the coherent sequence of measures \( U \) reflects. Namely, for every \( x \in A \) and every \( P \)-generic filter \( G \),

\[
U_x := (U(\alpha, \beta)^G \cap V[G \upharpoonright x] : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < d^U(\alpha))
\]

defines a coherent sequence of measures over \( V[G \upharpoonright x] \). Let \( \dot{U}_x \) be a \( P \upharpoonright x \)-name for this coherent sequence of measures.

(2) Let \( Q = Q_U \) be the Magidor forcing as defined in \( V[G] \) using the coherent sequence of measures \( U \). Similarly for each \( x \in A \) let \( Q_x = Q_{U_x} \) be the Magidor forcing defined in \( V[G \upharpoonright x] \) using \( U_x \). Choose \( x_0 \in A \) arbitrary and let \( \pi : P \upharpoonright x_0 \to P \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\lambda) \) an isomorphism. Notice that \( t\pi(\dot{U}_{x_0}) \) is a \( P \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\lambda) \)-name for a coherent sequence of measures.

(3) Set \( \dot{A} := \{ x \in A : x_0 \subseteq x \} \). Now argue as in lemma 3.5 to get \( B \in D \) a set of reflection points for the coherent sequence of measures \( \pi(\dot{U}_{x_0}) \) and the corresponding projections

\[
\sigma^2_x : P \ast Q \to \text{RO}^+(P \upharpoonright x \ast Q_x), \text{ for } x \in \dot{A},
\]

\[
\hat{\sigma}^x_\alpha : \text{RO}^+(P \upharpoonright x \ast Q_x) \to \text{RO}^+(P \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\alpha) \ast Q^x_\alpha), \text{ for } x \in \dot{A} \text{ and } \alpha \in B,
\]

\[
\sigma^3_\alpha : P \ast Q \to \text{RO}^+(P \upharpoonright \text{Even}(\alpha) \ast Q^3_\alpha), \text{ for } \alpha \in B,
\]

commuting: namely, \( \sigma^2_x = \hat{\sigma}^x_\alpha \circ \sigma^3_\alpha \), for \( x \in \dot{A} \) and \( \alpha \in B \).
(4) Using these projections define $\mathbb{R}$ as in definition 3.8 and the corresponding $x$-truncations $\mathbb{R} \upharpoonright x$, for each $x \in \hat{A}$. Arguing in the same way as in lemma 3.13 one gets a set $x^* \neq x_0$ in $\hat{A}$ such that $\mathbb{R} \upharpoonright x^*$ forces the existence of a $\lambda$-Aronszajn tree. Let $\pi^*$ be a bijection between $\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright x^*$ and $\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda$ extending $\pi$ and denote by $\mathbb{Q}^*_\lambda$ the Magidor forcing in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda$ defined using $\pi^*(\dot{U}_{x^*})$. Argue as in lemma 3.15 to show that $\pi^*$ extends to an isomorphism between $\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright x^* \ast \mathbb{Q}^*_x$ and $\mathbb{P} \upharpoonright \lambda \ast \dot{\mathbb{Q}}^*_\lambda$, and use it to define $\mathbb{R}^*$ as in definition 3.16. Mimicking the arguments from lemma 3.17 $\mathbb{R}^*$ and $\mathbb{R} \upharpoonright x^*$ are isomorphic, hence $\mathbb{R}^*$ must add a $\lambda$-Aronszajn tree.

(5) Finally all the results and definitions from lemma 3.18 in advance still apply in the general context. Therefore $\mathbb{R}^*$ does not add any $\lambda$-Aronszajn tree and hence $\text{TP}(\lambda)$ holds in the generic extension by $\mathbb{R}$. In summary, we have obtained a generic extension $V^{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $V^{\mathbb{R}} \models \langle 2^\kappa \geq \gamma \land \lambda = \kappa^{++} \land \text{TP}(\lambda) \land \text{cof}(\kappa) = \delta \rangle$.
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