A MICROSCOPIC APPROACH TO SOUSLIN-TREE CONSTRUCTION, PART II

ARI MEIR BRODSKY AND ASSAF RINOT

Abstract. In Part I of this series, we presented the microscopic approach to Souslin-tree constructions, and argued that all known ♦-based constructions of Souslin trees with various additional properties may be rendered as applications of our approach. In this paper, we show that constructions following the same approach may be carried out even in the absence of ♦. In particular, we obtain a new weak sufficient condition for the existence of Souslin trees at the level of a strongly inaccessible cardinal.

We also present a new construction of a Souslin tree with an ascent path, thereby increasing the consistency strength of such a tree’s nonexistence from a Mahlo cardinal to a weakly compact cardinal.

This paper also offers a comprehensive exposition of the subject of constructing Souslin trees and the challenges involved; this exposition is targeted at newcomers with minimal background.
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1. Introduction

The systematic study of set-theoretic trees was pioneered by Đuro Kurepa in the 1930s [Kur35], in the context of examining Souslin's Problem. Souslin's Problem goes back a century, to 1920 [Sou20], and its most succinct formulation is:

Is every linearly ordered topological space satisfying the countable chain condition (ccc) necessarily separable?

A counterexample would be called a Souslin line while the conjecture that the answer is “yes” (meaning that a Souslin line does not exist) has come to be called Souslin's Hypothesis (SH).

In the course of attempting to prove SH, Kurepa showed in 1935 [Kur35] that the problem can be reformulated in terms of trees and thus “eliminated topological considerations from Souslin’s Problem and reduced it to a problem of combinatorial set theory” [Kan11, p. 3]. Kurepa’s result is that the existence of a Souslin line is equivalent to the existence of (what we now call) an \( \aleph_1 \)-Souslin tree, that is, a tree of size \( \aleph_1 \) that includes neither an uncountable branch nor an uncountable antichain.

Further progress toward resolving Souslin’s problem came only in the 1960s, after the advent of the forcing technique, when it became apparent that Souslin’s problem (at the level of \( \aleph_1 \)) is independent of ZFC. Jech [Jec67], Tennenbaum [Ten68], and Jensen [Jen68] gave consistent constructions of \( \aleph_1 \)-Souslin trees, while Solovay and Tennenbaum [ST71] proved the consistency of SH. Amazingly enough, the resolution of this single problem led to key discoveries in set theory: various notions of trees [Kur35], forcing axioms and the method of iterated forcing [ST71], the diamond and square principles [Jen72] \( \S 5–6 \), and the theory of iteration without adding reals [DJ74, Chapter VIII].

Most of the early work around Souslin’s problem focused on the level of \( \aleph_1 \), and even to this day, most of the standard references in set theory, including [Dra74], [Kun80], [Tod84], [Roi90], [JW97], [HJ99], [Lev02], provide a construction of a \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree only for the case \( \kappa = \aleph_1 \). However, Souslin’s problem admits a

1If we remove the constraint that the topology be induced by a linear order, then there is no difficulty in obtaining a counterexample, such as the countable complement topology on any uncountable set [SS75 Counterexample 20].
2Kurepa states the equivalence between the topological and tree-based formulations of Souslin’s Problem (at the level of \( \aleph_1 \)) explicitly in [Kur35, §12.D.2, pp. 124–125] [Kur96, p. 111] and [Kur38, Section 8, p. 134] [Kur96, p. 119]. Several sources [Mal96, §2, p. 421] attribute the reformulation to E. W. Miller in 1943 [Mil43], perhaps because Kurepa’s thesis and early papers were written in French. Others ([Alv99, p. 213], [Kan11, p. 3], Todorcevic in [Kur99, p. 9]) acknowledge that Miller rediscovered Kurepa’s result.
3Detailed definitions will be given in Section 2.
natural generalization to higher cardinals. Indeed, Kurepa proved the following more general equivalence:

**Fact 1.1** (Kurepa, [Kur35]). For any regular uncountable cardinal $\kappa$, the following are equivalent:

- Every tree of size $\kappa$ contains either a branch of size $\kappa$ or an antichain of size $\kappa$ (that is, there is no $\kappa$-Souslin tree);
- Every linearly ordered topological space satisfying the $\kappa$-chain condition ($\kappa$-cc) has a dense subset of cardinality $< \kappa$.

The preceding leads to the following definition.

**Definition 1.2** ([Jen72, p. 292]). For any regular uncountable cardinal $\kappa$, the $\kappa$-Souslin hypothesis ($\text{SH}_\kappa$) asserts that there are no $\kappa$-Souslin trees.

Jensen proved [Jen72, Theorem 6.2] that, assuming $V = L$, for every regular uncountable cardinal $\kappa$, $\text{SH}_\kappa$ holds iff $\kappa$ is weakly compact. Subsequently, many combinatorial constructions of $\kappa$-Souslin trees from axioms weaker than $V = L$ have appeared. However, the classical constructions of $\kappa$-Souslin trees generally depend on the nature of $\kappa$: that is, on whether $\kappa$ is the successor of a regular cardinal [Gre76], [She84a], [Vel86]; the successor of a singular cardinal [BS86], [Rin14b, §4]; or an inaccessible cardinal [She99].

Furthermore, the classical ♠-based constructions all require ♠ to concentrate on a nonreflecting stationary set, in order to ensure that we don’t get stuck when scaling antichains. Thus, classical methods cannot be applied in scenarios where all stationary sets reflect, and thus they allow us to infer the consistency of only a Mahlo cardinal from the non-existence of higher Souslin trees.

In addition, there is a zoo of consistent constructions of $\kappa$-Souslin trees satisfying additional properties, such as complete, regressive, rigid, homogeneous, specializable, non-specializable, admitting an ascent path, omitting an ascending path, free and uniformly coherent. Again, construction of a $\kappa$-Souslin tree with any desired property often depends on the nature of $\kappa$, and in some cases even depends on whether $\kappa$ is the successor of a singular cardinal of countable or of uncountable cofinality [Cum97]. To obtain the additional features, constructions include extensive bookkeeping, counters, timers, coding and decoding, whose particular nature makes it difficult to transfer the process from one cardinal to another.

What happens if we want to replace an axiom known to imply the existence of a $\kappa_0$-Souslin tree with strong properties by an axiom from which a plain $\kappa_1$-Souslin tree can be constructed? Do we have to revisit each scenario and tailor each of these particular constructions in order to derive a tree with strong properties?

In [BR17a], which forms the starting point of this research project, we set out to develop new foundations that enable uniform construction of $\kappa$-Souslin trees; we introduced a single (parameterized) proxy principle from which $\kappa$-Souslin trees with various additional features can be constructed, regardless of the identity of $\kappa$. In that paper, we also built the bridge between the old and new foundations, establishing, among other things, that all known ♠-based constructions of $\kappa$-Souslin trees may be redirected through this new proxy principle. There was one scenario that was not covered by that paper, namely, Jensen’s construction from $\square(E) + ♠(E)$ [Jen72, Theorem 6.2], and in Subsection 4.3 of the present paper, we cover it. This means that any $\kappa$-Souslin tree with additional features that will be shown

\footnote{Although Kurepa’s explicit statements (referenced in footnote2) refer specifically to the level of $\aleph_1$, he proves the result for arbitrary infinite cardinals via the equivalence $P_2 \iff P_5$ of the Fundamental Theorem in the Appendix [Kur35, §C.3, pp. 132–133].}

\footnote{See [Dev84, Theorem IV.2.4], [Sch14, Lemma 11.68], as well as Fact 1.2 of [Rin17] and the historical remarks preceding it.}
to follow from the proxy principle will automatically be known to hold in many unrelated models.

But the parameterized proxy principle gives us more:

► It suggests a way of calibrating the fineness of a particular class of Souslin trees, by pinpointing the weakest vector of parameters sufficient for the proxy principle to enable construction of a member of this class. This leads, for instance, to the understanding that coherent > free > specializable > plain. This is explained in Section 6 below.

► It allows comparison and amplification of previous results.

In [Jus01], [KLY07], and [Rin11], new weak forms of ♦ at the successor of a regular cardinal \( \lambda \) were proposed and shown to entail the existence of \( \lambda^+ \)-Souslin trees. In this project, we put all of these principles under a single umbrella by computing the corresponding vector of parameters for which the proxy principle holds in each of the previously studied configurations. From this and the constructions we presented in [BR19c], it follows, for example, that the Gregory configuration [Gre76] suffices for the construction of a specializable \( \lambda^+ \)-Souslin tree, and the König–Larson–Yoshinobu configuration [KLY07] suffices for the construction of a free \( \lambda^+ \)-Souslin tree.

► It allows the construction of various types of trees at a broader class of cardinals. To give two examples:

►► A combinatorial construction of a free \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree for \( \kappa = \aleph_1 \) may be found in [DJ74, Theorem V.1], [Tod84, Theorem 6.6] and [AS93, §2.1]. In [BR17a, §6] and in [BR19c, §4.3], we gave new combinatorial constructions of free \( \kappa \)-Souslin trees, both using the proxy principle, and therefore they automatically apply to all regular uncountable cardinals \( \kappa \), including successors of singular cardinals.

►► A combinatorial construction of a uniformly coherent \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree for a successor of a regular cardinal \( \kappa \) may be found in [DJ74, Theorem IV.1], [Lar99], and [Vel86]. In [BR17a, Theorem 2.5], we gave a proxy-based construction of a uniformly coherent \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree, and therefore it automatically applies to all regular uncountable cardinals \( \kappa \), including inaccessible cardinals.

►► It allows obtaining completely new types of Souslin trees. Once we have suitable foundations, the construction of Souslin trees becomes simple, and it is then easier to carry out considerably more complex constructions. For example, in [BR17b, Theorem 1.1], we gave the first example of a Souslin tree whose reduced powers behave independently of each other; starting from a combinatorial hypothesis that follows from "\( V = L \)", we constructed an ultrafilter \( \mathcal{U}_0 \) over \( \aleph_0 \) and an ultrafilter \( \mathcal{U}_1 \) over \( \aleph_1 \) such that, for every \( (i, j) \in 2 \times 2 \), there exists an \( \aleph_3 \)-Souslin tree \( T \) for which \( T^{\mathcal{U}_0} / \mathcal{U}_0 \) is \( \aleph_3 \)-Aronszajn iff \( i = 1 \) and \( T^{\mathcal{U}_1} / \mathcal{U}_1 \) is \( \aleph_3 \)-Aronszajn iff \( j = 1 \).

►► It paves the way to finding completely new scenarios in which Souslin trees must exist, by finding new configurations in which an instance of the proxy principle holds. To give several examples:

►► In [BR17a, Corollary 1.20], we constructed a model of Martin’s Maximum in which, for every regular cardinal \( \kappa > \aleph_2 \), a strong instance of the proxy principle at \( \kappa \) (strong enough to yield a free \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree) holds.

►► In [BR17a, Theorem 6.3], we proved that the sufficient condition of Gregory for the existence of a Souslin tree at the successor of a regular uncountable cardinal [Gre76] yields an instance of the proxy principle, and then, in [BR19c, Corollary 3.4], this was generalized to include successors of singulars, as well.

►► In [Rin17, Corollary 4.14], the second author proved that for every uncountable cardinal \( \lambda \), \( \text{GCH} + □(\lambda^+) \) entails an instance of the proxy principle sufficient for the construction of a \( \text{cf}(\lambda) \)-complete \( \lambda^+ \)-Souslin tree. It follows that if \( \text{GCH} \)
holds and there are no \( \aleph_2 \)-Souslin trees, then \( \aleph_2 \) is a weakly compact cardinal in \( L \), thus improving the lower bound obtained by Gregory 40 years earlier [Gre76].

In [She84], Shelah proved that adding a single Cohen real indirectly adds an \( \aleph_1 \)-Souslin tree. In the same spirit, in [BR19], we identified a large class of notions of forcing that, assuming a GCH-type hypothesis, add a very strong instance of the proxy principle at the level of \( \lambda^+ \). This class includes (but is not limited to) notions of forcing for changing the cofinality of an inaccessible cardinal \( \lambda \), such as Prikry, Magidor and Radin forcing.

- It gives rise to combinatorial constructions of \( \kappa \)-Souslin trees even in the absence of \( \diamondsuit \), which is something we did not anticipate, but is established in Sections 5 and 6 below.
- It even gives rise to results in other topics, such as special and non-special Aronszajn trees [BR19a], infinite graph theory [LR19] and Ramsey theory [RZ20].

1.1. Two results of particular interest. In the 1980s (see [Dev83]), Baumgartner proved that GCH + \( \square(\kappa) \) entails the existence of an \( \aleph_2 \)-Souslin tree with an \( \omega \)-ascent path (see Definition 6.10 below). A special case of Corollary 6.13 reads as follows.

**Theorem A.** GCH + \( \square(\aleph_2) \) entails the existence of an \( \aleph_2 \)-Souslin tree with an \( \omega \)-ascent path.

**Remark 1.3.** The significance of this improvement is that the consistency strength of the failure of \( \square \) is a Mahlo cardinal, whereas the consistency strength of the failure of \( \square(\aleph_2) \) is a weakly compact cardinal.

As alluded to earlier, Jensen’s construction of \( \kappa \)-Souslin trees in \( L \) [Jen72, Theorem 6.2] goes through the hypothesis that there exists a stationary subset \( E \subseteq \kappa \) for which \( \Diamond(E) \) and \( \Diamond(E) \) both hold. Here, we obtain the same conclusion from weaker hypotheses, which is best seen for \( \kappa \) inaccessible and \( E \subseteq E_{\omega,\omega}^\kappa \).

**Theorem B.** Suppose that \( \kappa \) is a strongly inaccessible cardinal, and there exists a sequence \( \langle A_\alpha \mid \alpha \in E \rangle \) such that:

- \( E \) is a nonreflecting stationary subset of \( E_{\omega,\omega}^\kappa \);
- For every \( \alpha \in E \), \( A_\alpha \) is a cofinal subset of \( \alpha \);
- For every cofinal \( A \subseteq \kappa \), there exists \( \alpha \in E \) for which \( \{ \beta < \alpha \mid \min(A_\alpha \setminus (\beta + 1)) \in A \} \)

is stationary in \( \alpha \).

Then there exists a \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree.

1.2. Conventions. Throughout the paper, \( \kappa \) stands for an arbitrary regular uncountable cardinal; \( \theta, \lambda, \mu, \nu, \chi \) are (possibly finite) cardinals \( \leq \kappa \); and \( \xi, \sigma \) are ordinals \( \leq \kappa \).

1.3. Notation. We let \( H_\kappa \) denote the collection of all sets of hereditary cardinality less than \( \kappa \). We let \( \text{Reg}(\lambda) \) denote the set of all infinite regular cardinals below \( \lambda \). We say that \( \kappa \) is \( (\prec \chi) \)-closed iff \( \lambda^{< \chi} < \kappa \) for every \( \lambda < \kappa \). Denote \( E_\theta^\delta := \{ \alpha < \lambda \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \theta \} \), and define \( E_{\lambda,\theta}^\delta, E_{\geq \lambda, \theta}^\delta, E_{> \lambda, \theta}^\delta \) in a similar fashion. Write \( [\lambda]^\theta \) for the collection of all subsets of \( \lambda \) of cardinality \( \theta \), and define \( [\lambda]^{< \theta} \) similarly. Write \( \text{CH}^\chi_\lambda \) for the assertion that \( 2^\chi = \lambda^+ \).

Suppose that \( C \) is a set of ordinals. Write \( \text{acc}(C) := \{ \alpha \in C \mid \sup(C \cap \alpha) = \alpha > 0 \} \), \( \text{nacc}(C) := C \setminus \text{acc}(C) \), \( \text{acc}^\chi(C) := \{ \alpha < \sup(C) \mid \sup(C \cap \alpha) = \alpha > 0 \} \). In particular, \( \text{acc}(\kappa) \) is the set of all nonzero limit ordinals below \( \kappa \). For any \( j < \text{otp}(C) \), denote by \( C(j) \) the unique element \( \delta \in C \) for which \( \text{otp}(C \cap \delta) = j \).

Write \( \text{succ}_\sigma(C) := \{ C(j + 1) \mid j < \sigma \& j + 1 < \text{otp}(C) \} \). In particular, for all \( \gamma \in C \)
such that \( \text{sup}(\text{otp}(C \setminus \gamma)) \geq \sigma \), \( \text{succ}_\sigma(C \setminus \gamma) \) consists of the next \( \sigma \) many successor elements of \( C \) above \( \gamma \).

The class of ordinals is denoted by ORD. For all \( \alpha < \kappa, \ t : \alpha \rightarrow \kappa, \) and \( i < \kappa, \) we denote by \( t^\frown i \) the unique function \( t' \) extending \( t \) satisfying \( \text{dom}(t') = \alpha + 1 \) and \( t'(\alpha) = i \).

2. HOW TO CONSTRUCT A SOUSLIN TREE THE RIGHT WAY

This section is accessible to novices with just basic background in Set Theory.

2.1. Trees. A tree is a partially ordered set \( (T, <_T) \) with the property that, for every \( t \in T \), the downward cone \( t^- := \{ s \in T \mid s <_T t \} \) is well-ordered by \( <_T \). The height of \( t \in T \), denoted \( \text{ht}(t) \), is the order-type of \( (t^-, <_T) \). Then, for any ordinal \( \alpha \), the \( \alpha^{\text{th}} \) level of \( (T, <_T) \) is the set \( T_\alpha := \{ t \in T \mid \text{ht}(t) = \alpha \} \); the height of the tree \( (T, <_T) \) is the smallest ordinal \( \alpha \) such that \( T_\alpha = \emptyset \). For \( X \subseteq ORD \), we write \( T \upharpoonright X := \{ t \in T \mid \text{ht}(t) \in X \} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in X} T_\alpha \); in particular, if \( \alpha \) is any ordinal, then the tree \( T \upharpoonright \alpha \) has height \( \leq \alpha \). For any \( s, t \in T \), we say that \( s \) and \( t \) are comparable if \( s <_T t \) or \( t <_T s \) or \( s = t \); otherwise they are incomparable.

There are several natural properties that the trees we construct will always satisfy. In particular, a tree \( (T, <_T) \) is said to be:

- Hausdorff if for any limit ordinal \( \alpha \) and \( s, t \in T_\alpha \), \( (s^- \cup t^-) \) is well-ordered by \( <_T \).
- normal if for any pair of ordinals \( \alpha < \beta \) and every \( s \in T_\alpha \), if \( T_\beta \neq \emptyset \) then there exists some \( t \in T_\beta \) such that \( s <_T t \);
- ever-branching if, for every node \( s \in T \), the upward cone \( s^+ := \{ t \in T \mid s <_T t \} \) is not linearly ordered by \( <_T \).

2.2. Souslin trees. Suppose that \( (T, <_T) \) is a tree. We say that a subset \( B \subseteq T \) is a cofinal branch if \( (B, <_T) \) is linearly ordered and \( \{ \text{ht}(t) \mid t \in B \} = \{ \text{ht}(t) \mid t \in T \} \).

We say that \( A \subseteq T \) is an antichain if any two distinct \( s, t \in A \) are incomparable.

A tree \( (T, <_T) \) is a \( \kappa \)-tree whenever its height is \( \kappa \) and \( |T_\alpha| < \kappa \) for all \( \alpha < \kappa \).

A \( \kappa \)-Aronszajn tree is a \( \kappa \)-tree with no cofinal branches. A \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree is a \( \kappa \)-Aronszajn tree that has no antichains of size \( \kappa \).

We shall want to construct, recursively, a sequence \( (T_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa) \) of levels whose union will ultimately be the desired \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree. However, in order to ensure that the outcome tree will have neither any cofinal branches nor any antichains of size \( \kappa \), we must find ways to anticipate these “global properties” of the tree when constructing each level. The following well-known lemma (cf. [Kun80] Lemma II.7.4) shows that if we ensure throughout the construction that our \( \kappa \)-tree is ever-branching (a “local property”, which can be ensured level by level throughout the construction), then we can avoid the necessity of verifying that it has no cofinal branches.

Lemma 2.1. For any ever-branching \( \kappa \)-tree \( T \), the following are equivalent:

- \( T \) is \( \kappa \)-Souslin;
- \( T \) has no antichains of size \( \kappa \).

Proof. The forward implication is obvious. Next, assume that \( T = (T, <_T) \) is an ever-branching \( \kappa \)-tree, having no antichains of size \( \kappa \). Towards a contradiction, suppose that \( T \) admits a cofinal branch, say, \( B \). As \( T \) is ever-branching, for every \( t \in B \), \( t^+ \) is not linearly ordered, so that we may fix \( t' \in t^+ \setminus B \). Recursively construct \( B^* \subseteq [B]^\kappa \) such that, for any two \( s <_T t \) both in \( B^* \), \( \text{ht}(s') < \text{ht}(t) \). As \( \text{ht}(t) < \text{ht}(t') \) for every \( t \in B \), it follows that \( \{ t' \mid t \in B^* \} \) forms an antichain of size \( \kappa \), contradicting our hypothesis and thereby completing the proof. \( \square \)

---

6As 0 is a limit ordinal, any (nonempty) Hausdorff tree is, in particular, rooted — that is, the level \( T_0 \) is a singleton, whose unique element is called the root.
7Recall that \( \kappa \) denotes a regular uncountable cardinal.
It follows that if we construct an ever-branching \( \kappa \)-tree, our main worry is to ensure the non-existence of large antichains. Furthermore, the following well-known fact (cf. [BR17b, Lemma 2.4]) shows that we do not lose any opportunities by insisting that the trees we construct are normal and ever-branching.

**Fact 2.2.** Suppose \((T, <_T)\) is a \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree. Then there is a a normal and ever-branching subtree which is again \( \kappa \)-Souslin. In fact, there is a club \( C \subseteq \kappa \) such that \((T \cap C, <_T)\) is normal and ever-branching.

Thus, the existence of a \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree is equivalent to the existence of a normal ever-branching one. In fact, the the same is true for \( \kappa \)-Aronszajn trees (cf. [Kun80, Lemmas II.5.11–12]).

2.3. **Streamlined trees.** What will our trees \((T, <_T)\) look like? What are the elements of a tree, anyway?

Formally, of course, elements of a tree can be anything we choose. However, for all of the trees that we construct here, elements of the tree will be (transfinite) sequences of ordinals, and the tree-order \( <_T \) will be the initial-sequence ordering (which is the same as ordinary proper inclusion \( \subseteq \), if we view a sequence as a function). To ensure that the height of an element in the tree corresponds to the element’s length as a sequence, we must ensure that our collection of sequences is closed under initial segments (“downward-closed”).

In order to formalize this intuition while retaining some flexibility, we introduce the following definition.

First, for any regular uncountable cardinal \( \kappa \), let \( H_\kappa \) denote the collection of all sets of hereditary cardinality less than \( \kappa \) (cf. [Kun80, IV, §6]). Recall that for an ordinal \( \alpha \) and any set \( X \), \( ^\alpha X \) denotes the set of functions from \( \alpha \) to \( X \), and \( ^\alpha X := \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} {^\beta X} \).

**Definition 2.3.** A set \( T \) is a *streamlined tree* if there exists some cardinal \( \kappa \) such that \( T \subseteq {}^{<\kappa} H_\kappa \) and, for all \( t \in T \) and all \( \beta < \text{dom}(t) \), \( t \restriction \beta \in T \).

We shall freely use the following basic properties, whose verification is left to the reader.

**Lemma 2.4.** For every streamlined tree \( T \subseteq {}^{<\kappa} H_\kappa \) and every ordinal \( \alpha \):

- \((T, \subseteq)\) is a Hausdorff tree in the abstract sense of Subsection 2.1.
- Assuming \( T \) is nonempty, its root is the empty sequence, \( \emptyset \).
- For every \( t \in T \), \( \text{ht}(t) = \text{dom}(t) \) and \( t_\alpha = \{ \gamma \mid \beta < \text{dom}(t) \} \).
- \( T_\alpha = T \cap {}^\alpha H_\kappa \). In particular, \( T \upharpoonright \alpha = T \cap {}^{<\alpha} H_\kappa \).
- For every \( t \in T \), if \( \alpha < \text{dom}(t) \), then \( t \restriction \alpha \) is the unique element of \( t_\alpha \).
- If \( T \) has height \( \alpha \), then any cofinal branch \( B \subseteq T \) can be written as \( B = \{ f \mid \beta < \alpha \} \) for some function \( f : \alpha \to H_\kappa \).
- For all \( s, t \in T \), \( s \) and \( t \) are comparable iff \( s \cup t \in T \).

The main advantage of streamlined trees is the identification of a limit of an increasing sequence of nodes. Indeed, for any \( \subseteq \)-increasing sequence \( \eta \) of nodes, say, \( \eta = \langle t_\gamma \mid \gamma < \beta \rangle \), the unique limit of this sequence, which may or may not be a member of the tree, is nothing but \( \bigcup_{\gamma < \beta} t_\gamma \), that is, \( \bigcup \text{Im}(\eta) \).

It follows that when constructing a streamlined tree, for any limit nonzero ordinal \( \alpha \) such that all the previous levels \( \langle T_\beta \mid \beta < \alpha \rangle \) have already been determined,  
\footnote{In a sense, normality is exactly the portion of König’s Lemma that can be salvaged at the height of an arbitrary regular cardinal, and this is what makes the problem of constructing \( \kappa \)-Aronszajn and \( \kappa \)-Souslin trees challenging.}  
\footnote{All of the \( \kappa \)-trees that we actually construct will be subsets of \( {}^{<\kappa} \kappa \), but we shall also consider the broader \( T \subseteq {}^{<\kappa} H_\kappa \) when analyzing derived trees in Subsection 6.3.}
the definition of $T_\alpha$ amounts to deciding which elements of $\{t \in {}^\alpha H_\kappa \mid \forall \beta < \alpha (t \upharpoonright \beta \in T_\beta)\}$ to take. Equivalently, for any cofinal subset $C$ of $\alpha$, we shall have that $T_\alpha \subseteq \{t \in {}^\alpha H_\kappa \mid \forall \beta \in C (t \upharpoonright \beta \in T_\beta)\}$.

But are there any disadvantages here? It turns out that we lose no generality by insisting on constructing only streamlined trees:

**Lemma 2.5.** Suppose that $(X, <_X)$ is a $\kappa$-tree. Then:

1. If $(X, <_X)$ is Hausdorff, then there exists a streamlined tree $T \subseteq <^\kappa \kappa$ such that $(X, <_X)$ is order-isomorphic to $(T, \subseteq)$.

2. Regardless of whether or not $(X, <_X)$ is Hausdorff, there exists a streamlined tree $S \subseteq <^\kappa \kappa$ such that $(X, <_X)$ is order-isomorphic to a cofinal subset of $(S, \subseteq)$ via a level-preserving map.

**Proof.** As $|X_\alpha| < \kappa$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$, we may recursively find a sequence of injections $(\pi_\alpha : X_\alpha \to \kappa \mid \alpha < \kappa)$ such that for all $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$, $\sup(\text{Im}(\pi_\alpha)) < \min(\text{Im}(\pi_\beta))$.

Let $\pi := \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} \pi_\alpha$. Note that if $y, z \in X$ satisfy $y <_X z$, then $\pi(y) < \pi(z)$.

1. Suppose $(X, <_X)$ is Hausdorff. For all $\delta < \kappa$ and $x \in X_\delta$, the set of ordinals $[x] := \{\pi(y) \mid y \in X, y <_X x\}$ has order-type $\delta$, so we may let $t_\delta : \delta \to [x]$ denote the order-preserving isomorphism. Evidently, $T := \{t_\delta \mid x \in X\}$ is a streamlined tree, and $x \mapsto t_\delta$ forms an isomorphism between $(X, <_X)$ and $(T, \subseteq)$, where injectivity is due to the fact that $(X, <_X)$ is Hausdorff.

2. For all $\delta < \kappa$ and $x \in X_\delta$, the set of ordinals $[x] := \{\pi(y) \mid y \in X, (y <_X x \text{ or } y = x)\}$ has order-type $\delta + 1$, so we may let $s_\delta : \delta + 1 \to [x]$ denote the order-preserving isomorphism. Evidently, $S := \{s_\delta \mid \beta \in X, \beta < \kappa\}$ is a streamlined tree, and $x \mapsto s_\delta$ forms an isomorphism between $(X, <_X)$ and a cofinal subset of $(S, \subseteq)$ sending level $\delta$ to level $\delta + 1$, where this time injectivity is due to the fact that we have included $x$ itself in the definition of $[x]$. \qed

Thus, the existence of a $\kappa$-Aronszajn is equivalent to the existence of a streamlined one, and the same is true for $\kappa$-Souslin trees.

**Convention 2.6.** We shall say that $T$ is a streamlined $\kappa$-tree if $T \subseteq <^\kappa H_\kappa$ is a streamlined tree and $(T, \subseteq)$ is a $\kappa$-tree. Furthermore, whenever we say that a streamlined tree $T$ is normal, ever-branching, Souslin, etc., we mean to refer to the tree $(T, \subseteq)$.

**Remark 2.7.** Notice that any streamlined $\kappa$-tree $T$ is a subset of $H_\kappa$ and also has cardinality $\kappa$; thus $T$ and all of its subsets are elements of $H_{\kappa^+}$.

### 2.4. Completing canonical branches and sealing antichains

What does it take to build a $\kappa$-Souslin tree? Based on our previous discussion, we shall want to build, level by level, a normal, ever-branching, streamlined $\kappa$-tree.

When constructing the level $T_\alpha$, ensuring that the tree remains normal amounts to ensuring that for every $s \in T \upharpoonright \alpha$ we insert some $t$ into $T_\alpha$ satisfying $s \subseteq t$. On the other hand, as all levels must be kept of size $< \kappa$ and as we must prevent the birth of large antichains, there will be a stationary subset $\Gamma \subseteq \kappa$ on which, for every $\alpha \in \Gamma$, $T_\alpha$ necessarily must be some proper subset of $\{f \in {}^\alpha H_\kappa \mid \forall \beta < \alpha (f \upharpoonright \beta \in T_\beta)\}$.

But let us point out the challenge now arising in securing normality at the level $T_\alpha$, where $\alpha < \kappa$ is some nonzero limit ordinal. Suppose $x \in T \upharpoonright \alpha$; we must include a node $b^x_\alpha$ in $T_\alpha$ extending $x$ (the limit of the “canonical $\alpha$-branch for $x$”). The natural way to do so is to pick a club $C_\alpha$ in $\alpha$ (“a ladder climbing up to $\alpha$”), and...
then recursively identify an increasing and continuous sequence \( \langle x_\beta \mid \beta \in C_\alpha \rangle \) of nodes of \( T \upharpoonright \alpha \) comparable with \( x \) and satisfying \( x_\beta \in T_\beta \) for all \( \beta \in C_\alpha \). Normality up to level \( \alpha \) makes the successor step of this recursion possible; however, when we reach a limit step \( \beta \) (that is, \( \beta \in \text{acc}(C_\alpha) \)), this ordinal \( \beta \) may be an element of \( \Gamma \), meaning that the unique limit of our partial sequence might have been excluded from \( T_\beta \). Thus, we have to define \( T_\beta \) for \( \beta \in \Gamma \) in an educated way so as to avoid such an unfortunate scenario. In the special case where \( \kappa = \lambda^+ \) for a (regular) cardinal \( \lambda = \lambda^{<\kappa} \), one can avoid this problem by simply taking \( \Gamma \) to be \( E_\lambda^{\lambda^+} \) and letting each ladder have order-type \( \lambda \). However, in the general case, there is a need for some coherent ladder system, as we shall see in Definition 2.16 below.

Recalling Lemma 2.8, we must also ensure that the resulting tree \( T \) will not have any antichains of size \( \kappa \). The number of candidates for antichains of size \( \kappa \) is \( |<\kappa H_\kappa|^\kappa \), which is bigger than \( \kappa \), the length of our recursive construction. Put differently, there are not enough stages to take care of all of the candidates for large antichains, if we need to deal with them one at a time! In contrast, assuming \( \kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa \), the number of candidates for proper initial segments of antichains is merely \( \kappa \). The upcoming lemma reduces the problem of eliminating antichains of size \( \kappa \) to a problem of addressing their proper initial segments.

**Definition 2.8.** Suppose \( T \) is a streamlined \( \kappa \)-tree. An antichain \( A \subseteq T \) is said to be **sealed at level \( \alpha \)** iff every element of \( T_\alpha \) extends some element of \( A \).

**Lemma 2.9.** Suppose \( T \) is a streamlined \( \kappa \)-tree. Then the following are equivalent:

(1) \( T \) has no antichains of size \( \kappa \);

(2) For every antichain \( A \subseteq T \), there is some ordinal \( \alpha < \kappa \) such that \( A \subseteq T \upharpoonright \alpha \);

(3) For every maximal antichain \( A \subseteq T \), there is some ordinal \( \alpha < \kappa \) such that \( A \cap (T \upharpoonright \alpha) \) is sealed at level \( \alpha \).

**Proof.** (1) \( \implies \) (2): Let \( A \subseteq T \) be any given antichain. By (1), \( |A| < \kappa \), so that by regularity of \( \kappa \), we obtain \( \sup\{\text{dom}(x) \mid x \in A\} < \kappa \), as sought.

(2) \( \implies \) (3): Given any maximal antichain \( A \subseteq T \), fix \( \alpha \) as in Clause (2), so that \( A \subseteq T \upharpoonright \alpha \). Let \( t \in T_\alpha \) be given. As \( A \) is a maximal antichain, there must be some \( s \in A \) comparable with \( t \). But \( \text{dom}(s) < \alpha = \text{dom}(t) \), so it follows that \( t \) extends \( s \).

(3) \( \implies \) (1): Using Zorn’s lemma, it is easy to see that every antichain is included in a maximal antichain. Thus, it suffices to verify that \( T \) has no maximal antichains of size \( \kappa \).

Given any maximal antichain \( A \subseteq T \), fix \( \alpha \) as in Clause (3). As \( T \) is a \( \kappa \)-tree, \( |T_\beta| < \kappa \) for every \( \beta \), so that by regularity of \( \kappa \) it follows that \( |T \upharpoonright \alpha| = \sum_{\beta < \alpha} |T_\beta| < \kappa \). Thus, it suffices to prove that \( A \subseteq (T \upharpoonright \alpha) \).

Consider any \( u \in T \upharpoonright [\alpha, \kappa) \); we shall show that \( u \notin A \). Let \( t := u \upharpoonright \alpha \), which is an element of \( T_\alpha \). By our choice of \( \alpha \) we can fix \( s \in A \) with \( s \subseteq t \). Altogether, \( s \subseteq u \). As \( s \) is an element of the antichain \( A \) and \( u \) properly extends \( s \), we infer that \( u \notin A \). \( \square \)

In our discussion of the normality requirement, we already agreed that at limit levels \( \alpha \), \( T_\alpha \) will consist of elements \( b_\alpha^u \) extending nodes \( x \in T \upharpoonright \alpha \). In order to accomplish Clause (3) of the preceding, we now need to ensure that given an antichain \( A \), each \( b_\alpha^u \) extends some element of \( A \cap (T \upharpoonright \alpha) \). For this to be possible, every \( x \in T \upharpoonright \alpha \) must be comparable with some element of \( A \cap (T \upharpoonright \alpha) \), meaning that \( A \cap (T \upharpoonright \alpha) \) must be a maximal antichain in \( T \upharpoonright \alpha \). How do we locate ordinals at which properties of a given structure are replicated? This will be the focus of the next subsection.

\(^{10}\text{Including, for example, the simple case } \kappa = \aleph_1.\)
2.5. **Elementary submodels and diamonds.** Recall that for every regular uncountable cardinal $\kappa$, $(H_\kappa, \in)$ models all axioms of ZFC except possibly for the power-set axiom. We shall be working extensively with elementary submodels $(M, \in)$ of $(H_\kappa, \in)$, though, by a slight abuse of notation, we will identify these structures with their underlying sets $M$ and $H_\kappa$, omitting the mention of the $\in$-relation.

A comprehensive exposition of elementary submodels of $H_\kappa$ may be found in [JW97 Chapter 24] and [HSW10 Chapter 4]. For now, we shall only need to be aware of the following corollary of the downward Löwenheim–Skolem theorem.

**Fact 2.10.** For every parameter $p \in H_{\kappa^+}$, the following set is cofinal in $\kappa$:

$$B(p) := \{ \beta < \kappa | \exists M < H_{\kappa^+} (p \in M \& M \cap \kappa = \beta) \}.$$  

**Remark 2.11.** It is not hard to verify that the set $B(p)$ is, in fact, a club in $\kappa$.

Given a well-founded poset $\mathbb{P} = (P, \prec)$ which is a subset of $H_\kappa$ and $\beta \in B(\mathbb{P})$, for any $M < H_{\kappa^+}$ witnessing that $\beta \in B(\mathbb{P})$, the intersection $P \cap M$ is a subset of $P$ that we can think of as being an initial segment of $\mathbb{P}$. The following proposition shows that this is precisely the case when $\mathbb{P} = (T, \subseteq)$ and $T$ is a streamlined $\kappa$-tree, in which case the initial segment of $\mathbb{P}$ determined by $M$ is nothing but $T \upharpoonright \beta$.

Furthermore, global properties of $(T, \subseteq)$ and its derivatives are reflected down to $\beta$.

**Proposition 2.12.** Suppose that $T$ is a streamlined $\kappa$-tree, and $\beta \in B(T)$ as witnessed by $M < H_{\kappa^+}$. Then:

1. $T \cap M = T \upharpoonright \beta$;
2. If $A \subseteq T$ is a maximal antichain and $A \in M$, then $A \cap M = A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$ is a maximal antichain in $T \upharpoonright \beta$;
3. If $f : T \to T$ is a nontrivial automorphism, and $f \in M$, then $f \cap M = f \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$ is a nontrivial automorphism of $T \upharpoonright \beta$.

**Proof.** (1) For all $\alpha < \beta$, by $\alpha, T \in M$, we obtain $T_\alpha \in M$, and by $M \models |T_\alpha| < \kappa$, we infer that $T_\alpha \subseteq M$. So $T \upharpoonright \beta \subseteq M$.

As dom$(z) \in M \cap \kappa$ for all $z \in T \cap M$, we conclude that $T \cap M = T \upharpoonright \beta$.

(2) Suppose $A \in M$ is a maximal antichain in $T$. Since $H_{\kappa^+} \models A$ is a maximal antichain in $T$, it follows by elementarity that $M \models A$ is a maximal antichain in $T$.

so that in fact $A \cap M$ is a maximal antichain in $T \cap M$. But $T \cap M = T \upharpoonright \beta$ by Clause (1), so that also $A \cap M = A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$. Altogether, we infer that $A \cap M = A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$ is a maximal antichain in $T \upharpoonright \beta$, as sought.

(3) Left to the reader.

It follows from Fact 2.10 and Proposition 2.12 that for any maximal antichain $A \subseteq T$, we can find cofinally many ordinals $\beta < \kappa$ such that $A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$ is a maximal antichain in $T \upharpoonright \beta$. Coming back to our previous discussion, we see that as we build our tree, we will be able to seal maximal antichains of the form $A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$, so that the challenge boils down to predicting $A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$ for each and every maximal antichain $A$ of the eventual tree $T$. This leads us to discussing diamonds.

The combinatorial principle $\diamondsuit(\kappa)$ was coined by Jensen in [Jen72 p. 293]. Rather than giving its original definition, we focus here on an equivalent formulation that is motivated by Fact 2.10.

**Fact 2.13 ([BRIT17 Lemma 2.2]).** $\diamondsuit(\kappa)$ is equivalent to the existence of a sequence $\vec{A} = \langle A_\beta | \beta < \kappa \rangle$ of elements of $H_\kappa$ such that, for every parameter $p \in H_{\kappa^+}$ and every subset $\Omega \subseteq H_\kappa$, the following set is cofinal in $\kappa$:

$$B(\Omega, p) := \{ \beta < \kappa | \exists M < H_{\kappa^+} (M \cap \Omega = A_\beta \& p \in M \& M \cap \kappa = \beta) \}.$$
Remark 2.14. It is not hard to verify that the set \( B(\Omega, p) \) is, in fact, stationary in \( \kappa \).

Also note that a sequence \( \vec{A} \) as above must form an enumeration (with repetition) of all elements of \( H_\kappa \), thus witnessing the fact that \( \diamondsuit(\kappa) \) implies \( |H_\kappa| = \kappa^\kappa = \kappa \).

It follows from Fact 2.13 that \( \diamondsuit(\kappa) \) provides us a way to anticipate instances of Clause (2) of Proposition 2.12.

Lemma 2.15 (cf. [BR17a, Claim 2.3.2]). Suppose \( \diamondsuit(\kappa) \) holds, as witnessed by a sequence \( \vec{A} = \langle A_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \) as in Fact 2.13.

If \( A \) is a maximal antichain in a given streamlined \( \kappa \)-tree \( T \), then the following set is cofinal in \( \kappa \): \( B := \{ \beta < \kappa \mid A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta) = A_\beta \text{ is a maximal antichain in } T \upharpoonright \beta \} \).

Proof. Let \( p := \{ T, A \} \) and \( \Omega := \vec{A} \). Recalling Remark 2.7, we infer that \( p \in H_\kappa^+ \) and \( \Omega \subseteq H_\kappa \), so that by our choice of \( \vec{A} \), the corresponding set \( B(\Omega, p) \) of Fact 2.13 is cofinal in \( \kappa \). To see that \( B(\Omega, p) \subseteq B \), consider any given \( \beta \in B(\Omega, p) \), as witnessed by some \( \mathcal{M} \prec H_\kappa^+ \). Since \( p \in \mathcal{M} \), by elementarity we infer that \( T, A \in \mathcal{M} \). By Proposition 2.12 (2), we then deduce that \( A \cap \mathcal{M} = A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta) \) is a maximal antichain in \( T \upharpoonright \beta \). But \( \mathcal{M} \cap A = \mathcal{M} \cap \Omega = A_\beta \) by our choice of \( \mathcal{M} \), and it follows that \( \beta \in B \), as sought.

Thus, when building the tree at the outset using a fixed sequence \( \vec{A} \), we take advantage of the fact that, for many ordinals \( \beta, A_\beta \) will be a maximal antichain in \( T \upharpoonright \beta \).

2.6. Coherent ladder systems. We now return to a point we alluded to earlier, in Subsection 2.4. Suppose we are building a limit level \( T_\alpha \). For \( x \in T \upharpoonright \alpha \), in order to construct \( b^x_\alpha \), the limit of the “canonical \( \alpha \)-branch for \( x \)”, we want to identify an increasing and continuous sequence \( \langle x_\beta \mid \beta \in C_\alpha \rangle \) of nodes of \( T \upharpoonright \alpha \) comparable with \( x \) and satisfying \( x_\beta \in T_\beta \) for all \( \beta \in C_\alpha \). In order to continue this recursion through a limit step \( \beta \in \text{acc}(C_\alpha) \), we need to ensure that the limit of the partial sequence so-far identified was not excluded from \( T_\beta \). We do this by insisting on a uniform method for constructing \( b^x_\beta \), so that the limit of the partial sequence \( \langle x_\beta \mid \beta \in C_\alpha \cap \beta \rangle \) is exactly \( b^x_\beta \), the limit of the canonical \( \beta \)-branch for \( x \), which we would have inserted into \( T_\beta \) when constructing that level. This insistence suggests several requirements whenever \( \beta \in \text{acc}(C_\alpha) \):

1. Coherence of the ladder system: \( C_\beta = C_\alpha \cap \beta \);
2. Microscopic perspective: the identification of the node \( x_\beta \), for \( \beta' \in C_\beta \), must not depend on whether we are heading towards \( b^x_\beta \) or \( b^x_{\beta'} \);
3. Smoothness: we must never exclude any \( b^x_\beta \) when constructing the level \( T_\beta \).

It should be clear that if we can comply with requirements (1)–(3) above, then we can construct a normal ever-branching \( \kappa \)-tree. But we must not forget the task of sealing antichains, and requirement (3) appears to conflict with the need to comply with Lemma 2.13 (3). How can this be resolved?\footnote{A brief comparison of the classic non-smooth approach (requiring nonreflecting stationary sets) and the modern approach may be found on [BR17a, p. 1965]. The smoothness of our approach is witnessed by Fact 2.20 below.}

The answer lies in the subtlety of how we seal the antichains, more precisely, in how we decide which maximal antichain to seal at level \( T_\alpha \). Constructing the level \( T_\alpha \) will not involve consulting the set \( A_\alpha \) given by Fact 2.13. Rather, when constructing \( T_\alpha \), we will seal antichains that are predicted by \( A_\beta \), for ordinals \( \beta \in \text{acc}(C_\alpha) \). This approach respects requirements (2) and (3) above, but raises the concern of whether every maximal antichain will be predicted by \( A_\beta \) for enough
Then there exists a $\kappa$. Proof.

**Proposition 2.18** (BR17a Proposition 2.3]). Suppose that $2^\kappa < \kappa$ holds. Then there exists a $\kappa$-Souslin tree.

**Proof.** Let $\vec{C} = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ be a witness to $2^\kappa < \kappa$. Let $\vec{A} = \langle A_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ be given by Fact 2.13. In addition, let $<^\kappa$ be some well-ordering of $<^\kappa$.

As outlined earlier, we shall recursively construct a sequence $\langle T_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ of levels such that $T := \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} T_\alpha$ will form a normal, ever-branching, streamlined $\kappa$-Souslin tree. Furthermore, in this construction we shall ensure that for all $\alpha < \kappa$, $T_\alpha$ will be a subset of $\kappa$ of size $\leq \max\{\aleph_0, |\alpha|\}$. 

---

12See Section 3.
➤ Of course, we begin by letting $T_0 := \{\emptyset\}$.

➤ Successor levels are where we will ensure that the tree is ever-branching. The simplest way to do that is to assign two immediate successors to every node from the previous level. That is, for every $\alpha < \kappa$, we let

$$T_{\alpha+1} := \{\ell^\alpha 0, \ell^\alpha 1 \mid t \in T_\alpha\}.$$ 

➤ Suppose that $\alpha \in \Gamma$, where $\Gamma := \text{acc}(\kappa)$, and that $(T_\beta \mid \beta < \alpha)$ has already been defined. Recall that $T \upharpoonright \alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$, and that constructing the level $T_\alpha$ involves deciding which branches through $T \upharpoonright \alpha$ will have their limits placed into the tree. As discussed in Subsection 2.6, we let $b_\alpha$ promised, we let $b_\alpha$.

Proof. First, note that since $\beta \in \text{acc}(C_\alpha)$ and $\bar{C}$ is a $\check{\aleph}_n (\kappa)$-sequence, $C_\alpha \cap \beta = C_\beta$, so that $x \in T \upharpoonright C_\beta$. So, by the induction hypothesis $(\ast)_\beta$, we infer that $b_\alpha^{\beta}$ is in $T_\beta$. As $b_\alpha^\beta = \bigcup \text{Im}(b_\gamma^\beta)$ and $b_\alpha^\beta (\beta) = \bigcup \text{Im}(b_\gamma^\beta \upharpoonright \beta)$, it thus suffices to prove that $b_\alpha^\beta = b_\alpha^\beta \upharpoonright \beta$.

Claim 2.18.2. $b_\alpha^{\beta}(\beta) \in T_\beta$.

Proof. First, note that since $\beta \in \text{acc}(C_\alpha)$ and $\bar{C}$ is a $\check{\aleph}_n (\kappa)$-sequence, $\bar{C}_\alpha \cap \beta = C_\beta$, so that $x \in T \upharpoonright C_\beta$. So, by the induction hypothesis $(\ast)_\beta$, we infer that $b_\alpha^{\beta}$ is in $T_\beta$. As $b_\alpha^\beta = \bigcup \text{Im}(b_\gamma^\beta)$ and $b_\alpha^\beta (\beta) = \bigcup \text{Im}(b_\gamma^\beta \upharpoonright \beta)$, it thus suffices to prove that $b_\alpha^\beta = b_\alpha^\beta \upharpoonright \beta$.

Normality requires that for every $x \in T \upharpoonright \alpha$ we include in $T_\alpha$ some node extending $x$. As $\alpha$ is a nonzero limit ordinal, our choice of the sequence $\bar{C}$ implies that $C_\alpha$ is a club in $\alpha$. Thus, relying on the fact that the tree $T \upharpoonright \alpha$ was constructed to be normal (in particular, it is normal at each level $T_\beta$ for $\beta \in C_\alpha$), and recalling that $T \upharpoonright \alpha = \bigcup_{\beta \in C_\alpha} T_\beta$, the idea for ensuring normality at level $T_\alpha$ is to attach to each node $x \in T \upharpoonright \alpha$ some node $b_\alpha^\alpha$ to the following set:

$$(\ast)_\alpha$$

$$T_\alpha := \{b_\alpha^\alpha \mid x \in T \upharpoonright C_\alpha\}.$$
From $C_\alpha \cap \beta = C_\beta$, we have $\text{dom}(b^\alpha_x) = C_\beta \setminus \text{dom}(x) = C_\alpha \cap \beta \setminus \text{dom}(x) = \text{dom}(b^\beta_x) \cap \beta$. Call the latter by $d$. Now, we prove that, for every $\delta \in d$, $b^\alpha_\delta(\delta) = b^\beta_\delta(\delta)$.

By induction:

- Clearly, $b^\alpha_\delta(\min(d)) = x = b^\beta_\delta(\min(d))$.
- Suppose $\delta^- < \delta$ are successive points of $d$, and $b^\alpha_\delta(\delta^-) = b^\beta_\delta(\delta^-)$. Then by Dependencies 2.15.11 also $b^\alpha_\delta(\delta) = b^\beta_\delta(\delta)$.
- For $\delta \in \text{acc}(d)$: If the sequences are identical up to $\delta$, then their limits must be identical.

This completes the definition of the sequence $b^\alpha_x$, and thus its limit $b^\alpha_x$, for each $x \in T \upharpoonright C_\alpha$. Consequently, the level $T_\alpha$ is defined as promised in $(*)_\alpha$.

Having constructed all levels of the tree, we then let $T := \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} T_\alpha$. It is clear from the construction that $T$ is a normal, ever-branching, streamlined $\kappa$-tree. By Lemma 2.18 to prove that $T$ is $\kappa$-Souslin, it suffices to show that it has no $\kappa$-sized antichains. By Lemma 2.4 we thus fix an arbitrary maximal antichain $A \subseteq T$, and argue that there is some ordinal $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $A \cap (T \upharpoonright \alpha)$ is sealed at level $\alpha$.

To find the sought-after ordinal $\alpha$, let

$$B := \{ \beta < \kappa \mid A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta) = A_\beta \text{ is a maximal antichain in } T \upharpoonright \beta \}.$$ 

By Lemma 2.15 $B$ is cofinal in $\kappa$. Thus, by our choice of the sequence $\tilde{C}$, let us fix an infinite ordinal $\alpha < \kappa$ for which $\sup(\text{nacc}(C_\alpha) \cap B) = \alpha$. Note that by Remark 2.17(1), $\alpha \in \Gamma$.

**Claim 2.18.3.** Every node of $T_\alpha$ extends some element of $A \cap (T \upharpoonright \alpha)$.

**Proof.** Let $t \in T_\alpha$ be arbitrary. As $\alpha \in \Gamma$, the construction of $T_\alpha$ entails that $t = b^\alpha_x$ for some node $x \in T \upharpoonright C_\alpha$. Fix such an $x$. By our choice of $\alpha$, fix $\beta \in \text{nacc}(C_\alpha) \cap B$ above $\text{dom}(x)$. Denote $\beta^- := \sup(C_\alpha \cap \beta)$. Since $\beta \in B$, we know that $A_\beta := A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$ is a maximal antichain in $T \upharpoonright \beta$, and hence there is some $s \in A_\beta$ comparable with $b^\alpha_x(\beta^-)$, so that by normality of the tree, $Q^\alpha_{x,\beta} \neq \emptyset$. It follows that we chose $b^\alpha_\beta(\beta)$ to extend some $s \in A_\beta$. Altogether,

$$s \subseteq b^\alpha_\beta(\beta) \subseteq \bigcup_{\beta \in C_\alpha \setminus \text{dom}(x)} b^\alpha_x(\beta) = b^\alpha_x = t.$$ 

This completes the proof.

Now that we have built a $\kappa$-Souslin tree from $\mathbb{S}^-(\kappa) + \Diamond(\kappa)$, we mention various scenarios in which these hypotheses are known to be valid:

**Fact 2.19.** $\mathbb{S}^-(\kappa) + \Diamond(\kappa)$ holds, assuming any of the following:

1. $\kappa$ is a regular uncountable cardinal that is not weakly compact, and $V = L[\mathbb{BR}17a]$ Corollary 1.10(5)];
2. $\kappa = \aleph_1$ and $\Diamond(\aleph_1)$ holds $[\mathbb{BR}17a]$ Theorem 3.6];
3. $\kappa = \lambda^+$ for $\lambda$ uncountable, and $\square(\lambda^+) + \text{GCH}$ holds $[\mathbb{Rin}17]$ Corollary 4.5];
4. $\kappa = \lambda^+$ for $\lambda$ uncountable, and $\square_\lambda + \text{CH}_\lambda$ holds $[\mathbb{BR}17a]$ Corollary 3.9];
5. $\kappa = \lambda^+$ for $\lambda \geq \aleph_\omega$, and $\square(\lambda^+) + \text{CH}_\lambda$ holds $[\mathbb{Rin}17]$ Corollary 4.7].

It follows from Clause (3) of the preceding that in the Harrington–Shelah model $[\mathbb{HSS}5]$ Theorem A1, $\mathbb{S}^-(\kappa) + \Diamond(\kappa)$ holds for $\kappa = \aleph_2$, and, in addition, every stationary subset of $E^\kappa_{\aleph_2}$ reflects, meaning we are far away from the Gregory scenario $[\mathbb{Gre}8]$. Furthermore, $\mathbb{S}^-(\kappa) + \Diamond(\kappa)$ is compatible with the reflection of all stationary subsets of $\kappa$.

**Fact 2.20** ([Lam17a Theorem 1.12]). Modulo a large cardinal hypothesis, there is a model of $\text{ZFC} + \text{GCH}$ in which $\mathbb{S}^-(\kappa) + \Diamond(\kappa)$ holds, and every stationary subset of $\kappa$ reflects, where $\kappa$ can be taken to be $\aleph_{\omega+1}$, or the first inaccessible cardinal.
By Proposition 2.18 we get a $\kappa$-Souslin tree uniformly in all of these scenarios! After developing some more machinery in the next few sections, we shall return in Section 2 to construct a $\kappa$-Souslin tree from hypotheses considerably weaker than the ones here.

3. INTERLUDE: THE $\clubsuit$ PRINCIPLE

The following principle was introduced by Ostaszewski [Ost76] for the special case $S = \kappa = \aleph_1$.

**Definition 3.1.** For a stationary set $S \subseteq \kappa$, the principle $\clubsuit(S)$ asserts the existence of a sequence $\langle X_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ such that:

1. for every $\delta \in S \cap \text{acc}(\kappa)$, $X_\delta$ is a cofinal subset of $\delta$ with order-type $\text{cf}(\delta)$;
2. for every cofinal subset $X \subseteq \kappa$, the following set is stationary:
\[
\{ \delta \in S \mid X_\delta \subseteq X \}.
\]

As $\clubsuit(\omega_1)$ entails $\square^{-}(\omega_1)$, it is worth spending some time to present some of the techniques involved in manipulating and improving the former.

**Definition 3.2.** For any two sets of ordinals $A$ and $B$, we say that $A$ is $B$-separated iff for every pair $\alpha < \alpha'$ of ordinals from $A$, there exists $\beta \in B$ with $\alpha < \beta < \alpha'$.

**Lemma 3.3.** For any two cofinal subsets $A, B$ of some limit nonzero ordinal $\delta$, there exists a cofinal subset $A' \subseteq A$ such that $A'$ is $B$-separated.

*Proof.* Let $\langle \delta_i \mid i < \text{cf}(\delta) \rangle$ be a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals converging to $\delta$. Recursively construct a sequence $\langle (\alpha_i, \beta_i) \mid i < \text{cf}(\delta) \rangle$ such that, for all $i < j < \text{cf}(\delta)$:

- $\alpha_i \in A$,
- $\beta_i \in B$, and
- $\delta_i < \alpha_i < \beta_i < \alpha_{i+1} \leq \alpha_j$.

Evidently, $A' := \{ \alpha_i \mid i < \text{cf}(\delta) \}$ is as sought.

**Corollary 3.4.** Suppose $S \subseteq \kappa$ is stationary. Then $\clubsuit(S)$ is equivalent to the existence of a sequence $\langle A_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ such that, for every cofinal subset $A \subseteq \kappa$, there exists a nonzero $\delta \in S$ such that $A_\delta \subseteq A \cap \delta$ and $\sup(A_\delta) = \delta$.

*Proof.* We focus on the nontrivial (that is, backward) implication. Let $\bar{A} = \langle A_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ be as above. For every $\delta \in S \cap \text{acc}(\kappa)$, if $A_\delta$ happens to be a cofinal subset of $\delta$, then let $X_\delta$ be a cofinal subset of $A_\delta$ of order-type $\text{cf}(\delta)$; otherwise, let $X_\delta$ be an arbitrary cofinal subset of $\delta$ of order-type $\text{cf}(\delta)$. For every $\delta \in S \setminus \text{acc}(\kappa)$, just let $X_\delta := \emptyset$.

To see that $\langle X_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ is a $\clubsuit(S)$-sequence, fix an arbitrary cofinal subset $X \subseteq \kappa$ and a club $B \subseteq \kappa$; we must find $\delta \in S \cap B$ with $X_\delta \subseteq X$.

By Lemma 3.5 let $A$ be a cofinal subset of $X$ that is $B$-separated. By the choice of $\bar{A}$, let us fix a nonzero ordinal $\delta \in S$ such that $A_\delta \subseteq A \cap \delta$ and $\sup(A_\delta) = \delta$. In particular $\sup(A \cap \delta) = \delta$, and so by $B$-separation, also $\sup(B \cap \delta) = \delta$. But $B$ is closed, so that $\delta \in B$. In addition, $X_\delta \subseteq A_\delta \subseteq A \subseteq X$, as sought.

**Lemma 3.5.** Suppose that $\kappa^{\aleph_0} = \kappa$, $S \subseteq \kappa$, and $\clubsuit(S)$ holds. Then there exists a matrix $\langle X_\delta \mid \delta \in S, n \leq \omega \rangle$ such that, for every sequence $\langle X^n \mid n \leq \omega \rangle$ of cofinal subsets of $\kappa$, there exist stationarily many $\delta \in S$, such that, for all $n \leq \omega$, $X^n_\delta \subseteq X^n \cap \delta$ and $\sup(X^n_\delta) = \delta$.

*Proof.* Let $\langle A_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle$ be a $\clubsuit(S)$-sequence. Fix an enumeration $\langle f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ of $\omega^{\omega+1} \kappa$. Fix a club $D$ such that for all $\delta \in D$ and $\alpha < \delta$, $\sup(\text{Im}(f_\alpha)) < \delta$. For all $\delta \in S$ and $n \leq \omega$, let $X^n_\delta := \{ f_\alpha(n) \mid \alpha \in A_\delta \}$. To see that $\langle X^n_\delta \mid \delta \in S, n \leq \omega \rangle$ is
as sought, fix an arbitrary sequence \( \langle X^n \mid n \leq \omega \rangle \) of cofinal subsets of \( \kappa \). For every \( \iota < \kappa \), let \( X^n(\iota) \) denote the unique element \( \gamma \in X^n \) such that \( \text{otp}(X^n \cap \gamma) = \iota \).

Define \( g : \kappa \to \kappa \) by stipulating:

\[
g(\iota) := \min\{\alpha < \kappa \mid \forall n \leq \omega (f_\alpha(n) = X^n(\iota))\}.
\]

Notice that \( g \) is injective, so that \( \text{Im}(g) \) is a cofinal subset of \( \kappa \). Fix a cofinal subset \( A \) of \( \text{Im}(g) \) such that, for any pair \( \alpha < \alpha' \) of ordinals from \( A \), we have \( \alpha < \min_{\alpha \leq \omega} f_\alpha(n) \). Consider the stationary set:

\[
S := \{ \delta \in S \cap D \cap \text{acc}(\kappa) \mid A_\delta \subseteq A \}.
\]

Let \( \delta \in S' \) and \( n \leq \omega \). We claim that \( X^n_\delta \subseteq X^n \cap \delta \) and \( \sup(X^n_\delta) = \delta \). To see this, let \( \alpha \in A_\delta \) be arbitrary. As \( A_\delta \subseteq A \subseteq \text{Im}(g) \) and \( \alpha \in \delta \) in \( D \), this means that \( f_\alpha(n) \in X^n \cap \delta \). Finally, as \( \sup(A_\delta) = \delta \) and \( \alpha < f_\alpha(n) \) for any pair \( \alpha < \alpha' \) of ordinals from \( A \), we infer that \( \sup(X^n_\delta) = \delta \).

It follows from Remark \([2.14]\) and Corollary \([3.4]\) that \( \diamond(\kappa) \iff \clubsuit(\kappa) \). More generally, we have the following.

**Fact 3.6** (Devlin, [Ost76, p. 507]). For every stationary \( S \subseteq \kappa \), the following are equivalent:

- \( \diamond(S) \);
- \( \clubsuit(S) \) and \( \kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa \).

In [Dev78], Devlin proved that if \( \diamond(S) \) holds for a stationary subset \( S \subseteq \kappa \), then there exists a partition \( \langle S_\iota \mid \iota < \kappa \rangle \) of \( S \) such that \( \diamond(S_\iota) \) holds for every \( \iota < \kappa \). His proof makes essential use of the consequence \( \kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa \) of \( \diamond(S) \). We now generalize Devlin’s theorem and show that its analogue is valid for the weaker principle \( \clubsuit \) (even in the absence of \( \kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa \)), along the way, giving a proof that applies to other variants of \( \clubsuit \) and \( \diamond \).

**Theorem 3.7.** Suppose that \( \clubsuit(S) \) holds for a stationary subset \( S \subseteq \kappa \). Then there exists a partition \( \langle S_\iota \mid \iota < \kappa \rangle \) of \( S \) such that \( \clubsuit(S_\iota) \) holds for every \( \iota < \kappa \).

**Proof.** Fix a sequence \( \vec{X} = \langle X_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle \) witnessing \( \clubsuit(S) \). Fix a bijection \( \pi : \kappa \leftrightarrow \kappa \times \kappa \). Define \( h : S \to \kappa \) by letting \( h(\delta) := 0 \) for \( \delta \in S \setminus \text{acc}(\kappa) \), and, for every \( \delta \in S \cap \text{acc}(\kappa) \),

\[
h(\delta) := \min\{\iota < \kappa \mid (\kappa \times \{\iota\}) \cap \pi[X_\delta] \neq \emptyset \}.
\]

For every \( \iota < \kappa \), let \( S_\iota := \{ \delta \in S \mid h(\delta) = \iota \} \), so that \( \langle S_\iota \mid \iota < \kappa \rangle \) is a partition of \( S \).

Next, for every \( \delta \in S \cap \text{acc}(\kappa) \), let

\[
A_\delta := \{ \gamma < \delta \mid (\gamma, h(\delta)) \in \pi[X_\delta] \},
\]

while for \( \delta \in S \setminus \text{acc}(\kappa) \), just let \( A_\delta := \emptyset \).

**Claim 3.7.1.** Let \( A \subseteq \kappa \) be cofinal. For every \( \iota < \kappa \), there exists a nonzero \( \delta \in S_\iota \) such that \( A_\delta \subseteq A \) and \( \sup(A_\delta) = \delta \).

**Proof.** Let \( \iota < \kappa \) be arbitrary. Put \( X := \pi^{-1}\{A \times \{\iota\}\} \). As \( \pi \) is bijective, \( |X| = |A| = \kappa \), so that \( X \) is cofinal in \( \kappa \). Consider the club \( B := \{ \beta < \kappa \mid \pi[\beta] = \beta \times \beta \} \). By Lemma \([3.3]\) fix a cofinal \( X' \subseteq X \) which is \( B \)-separated. Now, by the choice of \( \vec{X} \), the following set is stationary:

\[
G(X') := \{ \delta \in S \mid X_\delta \subseteq X' \}.
\]

Fix \( \delta \in G(X') \cap \text{acc}(\kappa) \) above \( \iota \). As \( X_\delta \subseteq X' \), we have \( \pi[X_\delta] \subseteq \pi[X'] \subseteq \pi[X] = A \times \{\iota\} \), so that \( h(\delta) = \iota \). It thus follows that \( \delta \in S_\iota \) and \( A_\delta \subseteq A \). Finally, to see that \( \sup(A_\delta) = \delta \), let \( \alpha < \delta \) be arbitrary, and we shall find \( \gamma \in A_\delta \) above \( \alpha \). As \( \sup(X_\delta) = \delta \), we may assume that \( \alpha \in X_\delta \setminus \iota \). Let \( \alpha' := \min(X_\delta \setminus (\alpha + 1)) \). As \( X_\delta \subseteq X' \) and the latter is \( B \)-separated, let us also fix \( \beta \in B \) with \( \alpha < \beta < \alpha' \). Since
\[\pi[X_\delta] \subseteq A \times \{t\}\], we can fix \(\gamma\) such that \(\pi(\alpha') = (\gamma, t)\). Since \(\pi[\beta] = \beta \times \beta\) while \(t \leq \alpha < \beta < \alpha'\), it follows that \(\gamma \geq \beta\). As \(\sup(X_\delta) = \delta\) and \(X_\delta \subseteq X'\), we infer that \(\sup(X' \cap \delta) = \delta\), so that by \(B\)-separation of \(X'\), we also obtain \(\sup(B \cap \delta) = \delta\). But \(B\) is closed, so that \(\delta \in B\), meaning that \(\pi[\delta] = \delta \times \delta\). As \(\alpha' < \delta\), it follows that \(\gamma < \delta\). Altogether, \(\gamma\) is an element of \(A_\delta\) above \(\alpha\).

As \(A_\delta \subseteq A\) for all \(\delta \in S\), it now follows from Corollary 3.4 that \(\Diamond(S)\) holds for all \(t < \kappa\).

**Definition 3.8.** For every \(A \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\kappa)\), let \(\text{mup}(A) := \sup\{\min(a) \mid a \in A, a \neq \emptyset\}\).

A minor variation of the proof of Theorem 3.7 establishes yet another equivalence, which will be utilized in deriving Corollary 4.17 below.

**Lemma 3.9.** For every stationary \(S \subseteq \kappa\), \(\Diamond(S)\) holds iff there exists a sequence \(\langle X_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle\) such that:

1. for every \(\delta \in S \cap \text{acc}(\kappa)\), \(X_\delta \subseteq [\delta]\times\omega\) with \(\text{mup}(X_\delta) = \delta\);
2. for every \(X \subseteq [\kappa]\times\omega\) with \(\text{mup}(X) = \kappa\), the following set is stationary:
   \[\{\delta \in S \mid X_\delta \subseteq X\}\].

**Proof.** We focus on the nontrivial (that is, forward) implication. Fix a sequence \(\tilde{A} = \langle A_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle\) witnessing \(\Diamond(S)\). Fix a bijection \(\pi : \kappa \leftrightarrow [\kappa]\times\omega\). For every \(\delta \in S\), let
   \[X_\delta := \begin{cases} \pi[A_\delta], & \text{if } \delta \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \& \pi[A_\delta] \subseteq [\delta]\times\omega \& \text{mup}[\pi[A_\delta]] = \delta; \\ [\delta]\times\omega, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}\]

To see that \(\langle X_\delta \mid \delta \in S \rangle\) satisfies Clause (2) of the lemma, fix an arbitrary \(X \subseteq [\kappa]\times\omega\) with \(\text{mup}(X) = \kappa\). By thinning \(X\) out, we may assume that \(\emptyset \notin X\) and that \(x \mapsto \min(x)\) is injective over \(X\). Now, let \(A := \pi^{-1}[X]\), so that \(|A| = \kappa\). Consider the following set:
   \[B := \{\beta < \kappa \mid \pi[\beta] = [\beta]\times\omega \& \forall x \in X(\min(x) < \beta \implies \max(x) < \beta)\}\].

It is not hard to see that for \(p := \langle \pi, X\rangle\), our set \(B(p)\) of Fact 2.11 so that \(B\) is cofinal in \(\kappa\). By Lemma 3.3, fix a cofinal \(A' \subseteq A\) which is \(B\)-separated. Now, by the choice of \(\tilde{A}\), there are stationarily many \(\delta \in S \cap \text{acc}(\kappa)\) for which \(A_\delta \subseteq A'\). Fix such a \(\delta\), and we shall show that \(X_\delta \subseteq X\).

As \(A_\delta \subseteq A'\), we have \(\pi[A_\delta] \subseteq \pi[A'] \subseteq \pi[\tilde{A}] = X\). By definition of \(X_\delta\), then, it suffices to prove that \(\pi[A_\delta] \subseteq [\delta]\times\omega\) and \(\text{mup}([\pi[A_\delta]]) = \delta\). To prove the former: As \(\sup(A_\delta) = \delta\) and \(A_\delta \subseteq A'\), we infer that \(\text{sup}(A' \cap \delta) = \delta\), so that by \(B\)-separation of \(A'\), we also obtain \(\text{sup}(B \cap \delta) = \delta\). But \(B\) is closed, so that \(\delta \in B\), and as \(A_\delta \subseteq \delta\) we infer that \(\pi[A_\delta] \subseteq \pi[\delta] = [\delta]\times\omega\). To see that \(\text{mup}([\pi[A_\delta]]) = \delta\), let \(\alpha < \delta\) be arbitrary, and we shall find \(\alpha' \in A_\delta\) with \(\min([\pi(\alpha')]) > \alpha\). As \(\sup(A_\delta) = \delta\), we may assume that \(\alpha \in A_\delta\). Let \(\alpha' := \min(A_\delta \setminus \{\alpha + 1\})\). As \(A_\delta \subseteq A'\) and the latter is \(B\)-separated, we fix \(\beta \in B\) with \(\alpha < \beta < \alpha'\). Since \([\pi[\beta]] = [\beta]\times\omega\), we know that \(\max([\pi(\beta)]) \geq \beta\). Since \(\beta \in B\) and \(\pi(\alpha') \in \pi[A_\delta] \subseteq X\), we infer that also \(\min([\pi(\alpha')]) \geq \beta > \alpha\), as sought.

4. A GENERALIZATION OF \(\text{Ext}^-(\kappa)\)

In this section and the next one, we shall present generalizations of the concepts that arose in Section 3. Here, we present a principle \(P^*_\varsigma(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, S, \nu, \sigma)\) that generalizes the ladder system principle \(\text{Ext}^-(\kappa)\). Then, in the next section, we shall present \(P^*_{\kappa}(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, S, \nu)\), which serves as a generalization and weakening of the conjunction \(\text{Ext}^-(\kappa) \& \Diamond(\kappa)\).
4.1. Ladder systems. We assume the reader is comfortable with Conventions 1.2 from Page 5.

Definition 4.1 (BR19a). Let \( \mathcal{K}(\kappa) := \{ x \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \mid x \neq \emptyset \& \text{acc}^+(x) \subseteq x \& \sup(x) \notin x \} \) denote the collection of all nonempty \( x \subseteq \kappa \) such that \( x \) is a club subset of \( \sup(x) \).

For each \( C \in \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \), denote \( \alpha_C := \sup(C) \)

For a binary relation \( R \) over \( \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \), and a nonempty collection \( S \) of stationary subsets of \( \kappa \), we shall define a principle \( P^-_{\kappa}(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu, \sigma) \) in two stages. In the first stage, we focus on the first four parameters.

Definition 4.2. We say that \( (C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa) \) is a \( P^-_{\kappa}(\kappa, \mu, R, \ldots) \)-sequence iff, for every \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \), all of the following hold:

- \( C_\alpha \subseteq \{ C \in \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \mid \text{otp}(C) \leq \xi \& \alpha_C = \alpha \} \);
- \( 0 < |C_\alpha| < \mu \);
- for all \( C \in C_\alpha \) and \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(C) \), there exists \( D \in C_\alpha \) with \( D \not\subseteq C \).

Convention 4.3. If we omit the subscript \( \xi \), then we mean that \( \xi := \kappa \).

Convention 4.4. We shall always assume that \( C_0 := \{ \emptyset \} \) and \( C_{\alpha+1} := \{ \{ \alpha \} \} \) for all \( \alpha < \kappa \). Likewise, whenever we construct a \( P^-_{\kappa}(\kappa, \mu, R, \ldots) \)-sequence \( (D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa) \), we shall never bother to define \( D_0 \) and \( D_{\alpha+1} \) for \( \alpha < \kappa \).

Example 4.5. The binary relations over \( \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \) that fit as the parameter \( R \) should be understood as coherence relations. The basic example is the end-extension relation, \( \subseteq \), where for \( C, D \in \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \), we define \( C \subseteq D \) iff \( C = D \cap \alpha_C \). More nuanced binary relations over \( \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \) are obtained by modifying the \( \subseteq \) relation as follows:

- We define \( C \subseteq^+ D \) iff there exists \( \gamma < \alpha_C \) such that \( C \setminus \gamma \subseteq D \setminus \gamma \);
- For \( R \in \{ \subseteq, \subseteq^+ \} \), we define \( C^-_\lambda R D \) iff (\( (C R D) \) or (cf(\( \alpha_C \)) < \( \chi \)));
- We define \( C \subseteq^*_\lambda D \) iff (\( (C \subseteq D \) or (\text{otp}(D) < \( \chi \) and nacc(D) consists only of successor ordinals));
- For \( R \in \{ \subseteq, \subseteq^+, \subseteq^*_\lambda, \subseteq^*_\lambda \} \) and a class \( \Omega \subseteq \text{ORD} \), we define \( C^-^{\Omega R} D \) iff (\( (C \subseteq D \) and (\( \alpha_C \notin \Omega \))).

\( P^-_{\kappa}(\kappa, 2, \subseteq, \ldots) \) and \( P^-_{\lambda}(\lambda^+, 2, \subseteq, \ldots) \)-sequences may be constructed in ZFC, but there are stronger variations. For instance, Jensen’s axiom \( \square_{\chi} \) (resp. \( \square^*_{\lambda} \)) is equivalent to the existence of a \( P^-_{\lambda}(\lambda^+, 2, \subseteq, \ldots) \)-sequence (resp. \( P^-_{\lambda}(\lambda^+, \lambda^+, \subseteq, \ldots) \)-sequence). More examples in this spirit may be found in [BR17a].

Convention 4.6. We may put “\( \infty \)” in place of \( \mu \) in Definition 4.2, in which case we mean that \( |C_\alpha| \leq |\alpha| \) for every nonzero \( \alpha < \kappa \).

Remark 4.7. The relation \( \subseteq \) coincides with \( \subseteq^* \) for \( (\Omega, \chi) := (\emptyset, 0) \), as well as \((\Omega, \chi) := (\emptyset, \omega) \). Note that if \( \kappa = \lambda^+ \) is a successor cardinal, then for every relation \( R \in \{ \subseteq, \subseteq^*, \subseteq^*_\lambda \} \) with \( \Omega \cap \lambda = \emptyset \), any \( P^-_{\kappa}(\kappa, \kappa, R, \ldots) \)-sequence may be improved into a \( P^-_{\kappa}(\kappa, \infty, R, \ldots) \)-sequence while preserving its further crucial features. The simple proof may be found in the construction before Claim 3.4.6 of [BR19a].

Let us stress that a study of coherence relations weaker than \( \subseteq \) is necessary. For instance, unlike coherent square sequences that are refuted by large cardinals, \( \subseteq \)-coherent square sequences provide an effective means to obtain optimal incompactness results above large cardinals (cf. [LR19]), as well as \( \kappa \)-Souslin trees in a model in which all \( \kappa \)-Aronszajn trees are nonspecial (cf. [BR17a Corollary 1.20, Examples 1.26 and 1.27]).

In [BR19a], we introduced the following definition as a means to manipulate and improve ladder systems.
Definition 4.8 ([BR19a Definition 1.8]). A function $\Phi : \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \to \mathcal{K}(\kappa)$ is a post-
processing function iff for every $C \in \mathcal{K}(\kappa)$:

- $\sup(\Phi(C)) = \sup(C)$;
- $\text{acc}(\Phi(C)) \subseteq \text{acc}(C)$;
- $\Phi(C) \cap \check{\alpha} = \Phi(C \cap \check{\alpha})$ for every $\check{\alpha} \in \text{acc}(\Phi(C))$.

If, in addition, $\min(\Phi(C)) = \min(C)$ (resp. $\text{acc}(\Phi(C)) = \text{acc}(C)$) for every $C \in \mathcal{K}(\kappa)$, then $\Phi$ is said to be min-preserving (resp. acc-preserving).

The point is that whenever $\langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is a P-$\langle \kappa, \mu, \Omega, \ldots \rangle$-sequence, then for every postprocessing function $\Phi$, by setting $D_\alpha := \{\Phi(C) \mid C \in C_\alpha\}$, we get that $\langle D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is yet again a P-$\langle \kappa, \mu, \Omega, \ldots \rangle$-sequence. We now present a sufficient condition for preserving all binary relations from Example [\ref{ex:binary_relations}].

Lemma 4.9. Suppose that $x = (x_{\gamma, \beta} \mid \gamma < \beta < \kappa)$ is a triangular array of nonempty finite sets such that, for all $\gamma < \beta < \kappa$, $x_{\gamma, \beta} \subseteq (\gamma, \beta]$, and if $\beta$ is a successor ordinal, then $x_{\gamma, \beta} = \{\beta\}$. Define a function $\Phi_\gamma : \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \to \mathcal{K}(\kappa)$ via:

$$\Phi_\gamma(C) := \min(C) \cup \bigcup \{x_{\gamma, \beta} \mid \gamma \in C, \beta = \min(C \setminus (\gamma + 1))\} \cup \text{acc}(C).$$

Then $\Phi_\gamma$ is a min-preserving, acc-preserving postprocessing function. Furthermore, for every P-$\langle \kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \ldots \rangle$-sequence with $\mathcal{R}$ taken from Example [\ref{ex:binary_relations}], if we set $D_\alpha := \{\Phi_\gamma(C) \mid C \in C_\alpha\}$, then $\langle D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is yet again a P-$\langle \kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \ldots \rangle$-sequence.

Proof. Left to the reader (cf. [BR19a Lemma 2.8]). \qed

4.2. Ladder systems with hitting features. We now arrive at the second stage of the definition of the proxy principle.

Definition 4.10 (Proxy principle). P-$\langle \kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, S, \nu, \sigma \rangle$ asserts the existence of a P-$\langle \kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \ldots \rangle$-sequence $C = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ satisfying the following hitting feature.

For every sequence $\langle B_i \mid i < \theta \rangle$ of cofinal subsets of $\kappa$, and every $S \in \mathcal{S}$, there exist stationarily many $\alpha \in S$ such that:

1. $|C_\alpha| < \nu$; and
2. for all $C \in C_\alpha$ and $i < \min(\alpha, \theta)$,

$$(\ast) \quad \sup\{\gamma \in C \mid \text{succ}_\sigma(C \setminus \gamma) \subseteq B_i\} = \alpha.$$

Remark 4.11. The reader can verify that the proxy principle satisfies monotonicity properties with respect to most of its parameters: Any sequence witnessing P-$\langle \kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, S, \nu, \sigma \rangle$ remains a witness to the principle if any of $\xi$, $\mu$, or $\nu$ are increased; if $\theta$ or $\sigma$ are decreased; if $\mathcal{R}$ is weakened; if $\mathcal{S}$ is shrunk; or if any element of $\mathcal{S}$ is expanded. Furthermore, increasing $\chi$ or shrinking $\Omega$ both weaken the relations $\Omega_{\chi}^{-1}$, $\Omega_{\ma{\chi}}^{-1}$, and $\Omega_{\ma{\chi}}$. Note also that P-$\langle \kappa, \mu, \Omega_{\chi}, \ldots \rangle$ entails P-$\langle \kappa, \mu, \Omega_{\chi}, \ldots \rangle$. These monotonicity properties will be used freely without explanation as the need arises.

Remark 4.12. In the special case $\sigma = 1$, Equation [\ref{eq:proxy_principle}] above is equivalent to the assertion that $\sup(\text{acc}(C) \cap B_1) = \alpha$. Thus, applying an argument just as in the proof of Corollary [\ref{cor:proxy_principle}], we infer that the principle $\mathbb{P}^{-}(\kappa)$ of Definition [\ref{def:proxy_principle}] is equivalent to the instance P-$\langle \kappa, 2, \{\kappa\}, 2, 1 \rangle$.

Convention 4.13. In Definition [\ref{def:proxy_principle}] by putting “$< \theta$” in place of $\theta$, we mean that $C$ simultaneously witnesses P-$\langle \kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta', S, \nu, \sigma \rangle$ for all $\theta' < \theta$. Likewise, by putting

---

\footnotetext{In fact, postprocessing functions can be viewed as actions on square-like sequences, see Notation 2.15, Lemma 2.16 and Lemma 4.17 of [BR19a]. Also, please keep Convention \ref{conv:proxy_principle} in mind.}
“$<\sigma$” in place of $\sigma$, we mean that $\mathcal{C}$ simultaneously witnesses $P^-(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu, \sigma')$ for all $\sigma' < \sigma$.

Convention 4.14. We may put “$<\infty$” in place of $\sigma$, in which case we mean to replace the assertion of Equation \((\text{⋆})\) of Definition 4.10 by:
\[
\forall \sigma < \text{otp}(C) \sup \{\gamma \in C \mid \text{succ}_\sigma(C \setminus \gamma) \subseteq B_i\} = \alpha.
\]

We may also put “$1\frac{1}{2}$” in place of $\sigma$, in which case we mean to replace the assertion of Equation \((\text{⋆})\) of Definition 4.10 by:
\[
\sup \{\beta \in \text{nacc}(C) \cap B_i \mid \exists \delta \in B_i(\sup(C \cap \beta) \leq \delta < \beta)\} = \alpha.
\]

Clearly, for any vector of parameters $\mathbf{i}$, we have:
\[
P^\xi_{\mathbf{i}}(\kappa, \mathbf{a}, <\omega) \implies P^\xi_{\mathbf{i}}(\kappa, \mathbf{a}, 2) \implies P^\xi_{\mathbf{i}}(\kappa, \mathbf{a}, 1\frac{1}{2}) \implies P^\xi_{\mathbf{i}}(\kappa, \mathbf{a}, 1).
\]

It turns out that in the presence of $\mathfrak{A}$, the above arrows may be reversed (Corollary 4.17 below). In fact, a slightly more general theorem holds:

Theorem 4.15. Suppose $\mathfrak{A}(\kappa)$ and $P^\xi_{\mathbf{i}}(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu, 1)$ both hold, with $R$ taken from Example 4.5. Then there exists a $P^\xi_{\mathbf{i}}(\kappa, \mu, \ldots)$-sequence $\langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ satisfying the following. For every $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and every sequence $\langle B_i \mid i < \theta \rangle$ with $B_i \subseteq [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ and $\text{mup}(B_i) = \kappa$ for all $i < \theta$\(^{14}\) there exist stationarily many $\alpha \in S$ such that:
\begin{enumerate}
  \item $|C_\alpha| < \nu$; and
  \item for all $C \in C_\alpha$, $i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\}$ and $\epsilon < \alpha$, there exist $\gamma, \beta$ with $\epsilon \leq \gamma < \beta < \alpha$ for which $C \cap (\gamma, \beta)$ is in $B_i$.
\end{enumerate}

Proof. Denote $\Omega := \text{acc}(\kappa)$. By $\mathfrak{A}(\kappa)$ and Lemma 3.9, we may fix a sequence $\vec{X} = \langle X_\beta \mid \beta \in \Omega \rangle$ such that:
\begin{enumerate}
  \item for every $\beta \in \Omega$, $X_\beta \subseteq [\beta]^{<\omega}$ with $\text{mup}(X_\beta) = \beta$;
  \item for every $X \subseteq [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ with $\text{mup}(X) = \kappa$, there are stationarily many $\beta \in \Omega$ for which $X_\beta \subseteq X$.
\end{enumerate}

Fix a triangular array $\tau = \langle x_{\gamma, \beta} \mid \gamma < \beta < \kappa \rangle$ such that for all $\gamma < \beta < \kappa$:
\begin{itemize}
  \item if $\beta \in \Omega$, then $x_{\gamma, \beta} \in X_\beta \setminus \{0\}$ with $\text{min}(x_{\gamma, \beta}) > \gamma$;
  \item if $\beta \notin \Omega$, then $x_{\gamma, \beta} = \{\beta\}$.
\end{itemize}

Now, consider the corresponding postprocessing function $\Phi_1$ from Lemma 4.9. Let $\vec{C} = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ be a sequence witnessing $P^\xi_{\mathbf{i}}(\kappa, \mu, \ldots)$-sequence $\langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$. For every $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$, let $\mathcal{D}_\alpha := \{\Phi_1(C) \mid C \in C_\alpha\}$, so that $\langle \mathcal{D}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is a $P^\xi_{\mathbf{i}}(\kappa, \mu, \ldots)$-sequence.

Claim 4.15.1. Suppose $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\langle B_i \mid i < \theta \rangle$ is a sequence with $B_i \subseteq [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ and $\text{mup}(B_i) = \kappa$ for all $i < \theta$. Then there exist stationarily many $\alpha \in S$ such that:
\begin{enumerate}
  \item $|\mathcal{D}_\alpha| < \nu$; and
  \item for all $D \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$, $i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\}$ and $\epsilon < \alpha$, there exist $\gamma, \beta$ with $\epsilon \leq \gamma < \beta < \alpha$ for which $D \cap (\gamma, \beta)$ is in $B_i$.
\end{enumerate}

Proof. For every $i < \theta$, we know from our choice of $\vec{X}$ that $B_i := \{\beta \in \Omega \mid X_\beta \subseteq B_i\}$ is stationary. Thus, by our choice of $\vec{C}$, the following set is stationary:
\[
S' := \{\alpha \in S \mid |C_\alpha| < \nu \land \forall i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\}(\forall C \in C_\alpha[\sup(\text{nacc}(C) \cap B_i) = \alpha])\}.
\]

Now, let $\alpha \in S'$ be arbitrary. We have $|\mathcal{D}_\alpha| \leq |C_\alpha| < \nu$. Finally, let $i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\}$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ be arbitrary. Pick $C \in C_\alpha$ such that $D = \Phi_1(C)$. For all $\beta$ in $\text{nacc}(C) \cap B_i$, the set $\text{sup}(C \cap \beta)$, we

\(^{14}\)For the definition of mup, see Definition 3.8.
have \( x_{\gamma, \beta} \in \mathcal{B}_i \) and \( x_{\gamma, \beta} \subseteq (\gamma, \beta) \), and we infer from the definition of \( \Phi_1 \) that \( D \cap (\gamma, \beta) = x_{\gamma, \beta} \in \mathcal{B}_i \).

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

By increasing the last parameter from 1 to \( 1^{\frac{1}{2}} \), we can drop the \( \heartsuit(\kappa) \) hypothesis, while retaining the same conclusion.

**Theorem 4.16.** Suppose \( P_\xi^- (\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \mathcal{S}, \nu, 1^{\frac{1}{2}}) \) holds, with \( \mathcal{R} \) taken from Example 3.4. Then there exists a \( P_\xi^- (\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \mathcal{S}, \nu, 1^{\frac{1}{2}}) \)-sequence \( \langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \) satisfying the following. For every \( S \in \mathcal{S} \) and every sequence \( \langle \mathcal{B}_i \mid i < \theta \rangle \) with \( \mathcal{B}_i \subseteq [\kappa]^{<\omega} \) and \( \text{mup}(\mathcal{B}_i) = \kappa \) for all \( i < \theta \), there exist stationarily many \( \alpha \in S \) such that:

1. \( |\mathcal{C}_\alpha| < \nu \); and
2. for all \( C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha \), \( i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\} \) and \( \epsilon < \alpha \), there exist \( \gamma, \beta \) with \( \epsilon \leq \gamma < \beta < \alpha \) for which \( C \cap (\gamma, \beta) \) is in \( \mathcal{B}_i \).

**Proof.** Let \( \tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \) be a sequence witnessing \( P_\xi^- (\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \mathcal{S}, \nu, 1^{\frac{1}{2}}) \). Set \( \Omega := \text{acc}(\kappa) \).

**Claim 4.16.1.** There exists a surjection \( \pi : \Omega \to [\kappa]^{<\omega} \) such that:

- \( \sup(\pi(\beta)) < \beta \) for all \( \beta \in \Omega \);
- \( E := \{ \varepsilon \in \Omega \mid \pi^{-1}[[\varepsilon]^{<\omega} \setminus \{\emptyset\}] = \varepsilon \} \) is a club.

**Proof.** Fix a bijection \( \psi : \Omega \leftrightarrow \kappa \times [\kappa]^{<\omega} \). For every \( x \in [\kappa]^{<\omega} \), fix a large enough \( \beta_x \in \Omega \) such that \( \sup(x) < \beta_x \) and \( \psi(\beta_x) = (i, x) \) for some \( i < \kappa \). Now, define \( \pi : \Omega \to [\kappa]^{<\omega} \), as follows. Given \( \beta \in \Omega \), if there exists \( x \in [\kappa]^{<\omega} \) such that \( \beta = \beta_x \), then \( x \) is unique, and we let \( \pi(\beta) := x \). Otherwise, let \( \pi(\beta) := \emptyset \). For every nonempty \( x \in [\kappa]^{<\omega} \), \( \pi^{-1}\{x\} \) is a singleton, and hence \( \pi \) is as sought. \( \square \)

Let \( \pi : \Omega \to [\kappa]^{<\omega} \) be given by the preceding claim. Then fix a triangular array \( r = (x_{\gamma, \beta} \mid \gamma < \beta < \kappa) \) such that for all \( \gamma < \beta < \kappa \):

- if \( \beta \in \Omega \), then \( x_{\gamma, \beta} = (\pi(\beta) \setminus (\gamma + 1)) \cup \{\beta\} \);
- if \( \beta \notin \Omega \), then \( x_{\gamma, \beta} = \{\beta\} \).

Now, consider the corresponding postprocessing function \( \Phi_1 \) from Lemma 4.9. For every \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \), let \( \mathcal{D}_\alpha := \{ \Phi_1(C) \mid C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha \} \), so that \( \langle \mathcal{D}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \) is a \( P_\xi^- (\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \ldots) \)-sequence.

**Claim 4.16.2.** Suppose \( S \in \mathcal{S} \) and \( \langle \mathcal{B}_i \mid i < \theta \rangle \) is a sequence with \( \mathcal{B}_i \subseteq [\kappa]^{<\omega} \) and \( \text{mup}(\mathcal{B}_i) = \kappa \) for all \( i < \theta \). Then there exist stationarily many \( \alpha \in S \) such that:

1. \( |\mathcal{D}_\alpha| < \nu \); and
2. for all \( D \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha \), \( i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\} \) and \( \epsilon < \alpha \), there exist \( \gamma, \beta \) with \( \epsilon \leq \gamma < \beta < \alpha \) for which \( D \cap (\gamma, \beta) \) is in \( \mathcal{B}_i \).

**Proof.** Let \( i < \theta \). Without loss of generality, \( \emptyset \notin \mathcal{B}_i \) and \( x \mapsto \min(x) \) is injective over \( \mathcal{B}_i \). Let \( A_i := \pi^{-1}[\mathcal{B}_i] \) and \( E_i := \{ \varepsilon \in E \mid \forall x \in \mathcal{B}_i(\min(x) < \varepsilon \rightarrow \max(x) < \varepsilon) \} \).

As in the proof of Lemma 3.9, \( A_i \) and \( E_i \) are cofinal subsets of \( \kappa \), so, by Lemma 3.3, we may fix a cofinal subset \( \mathcal{B}_i \subseteq A_i \) which is \( E_i \)-separated.

Now, by the choice of \( \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \), fix a stationary subset \( S' \subseteq S \) such that, for all \( \alpha \in S' \):

- \( |\mathcal{C}_\alpha| < \nu \), and
- for all \( i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\} \) and \( C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha \), \( \sup\{\beta \in \text{nacc}(C) \cap \mathcal{B}_i \mid \exists \delta \in \mathcal{B}_i(\sup(C \cap \beta) \leq \delta < \beta)\} = \alpha \).
Let $\alpha \in S'$ be arbitrary. We have $|D_\alpha| \leq |C_\alpha| < \nu$. Finally, let $i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\}$ and $D \in D_\alpha$ be arbitrary. Fix $C \in C_\alpha$ such that $D = \Phi_x(C)$. Let 
$$
\Gamma := \{\gamma \in C \mid \exists \delta, \beta \in B_i[\gamma \leq \delta < \beta \& \beta = \min(C \setminus (\gamma + 1))]\}.
$$

By the choice of $\alpha$, $\Gamma$ is cofinal in $\alpha$. Let $\gamma \in \Gamma$ be arbitrary, and fix witnesses $\beta$ and $\delta$, as above. As $B_i$ is $E_i$-separated, we may find $\varepsilon \in E_i$ with $\delta < \varepsilon < \beta$. Since $\varepsilon \in E_i$, we know that $\max(\pi(\beta)) \geq \varepsilon$. Also, $\pi(\beta) \in B_i$, since $\beta \in B_i \subseteq A_i$. We thus infer from $\varepsilon \in E_i$ that $\min(\pi(\beta)) \geq \varepsilon > \gamma$, so that $x_{\gamma, \beta} = \pi(\beta) \cup \{\beta\}$. But $\sup(\pi(\beta)) < \beta$, so it follows from the definition of $\Phi_x$ that $D \cap (\gamma, \beta) = x_{\gamma, \beta} \cap (\gamma, \beta) = \pi(\beta) \in B_i$, as sought.

This completes the proof.

**Corollary 4.17.** Suppose $P_\xi^-(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu, \sigma)$ holds, for $R$ from Example 4.3. Then:

- If $\sigma = 1$ and $\clubsuit_{\kappa}(\kappa)$ holds, then so does $P_\xi^-(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu, <\omega)$;
- If $\sigma = \theta = 1$ and $\clubsuit_{\kappa}(\kappa)$ holds, then so does $P_\xi^-(\kappa, \mu, R, <\omega, S, \nu, <\omega)$;
- If $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, then $P_\xi^-(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu, <\omega)$ holds;
- If $\sigma = 1 + \frac{1}{2}$ and $\theta = 1$, then $P_\xi^-(\kappa, \mu, R, <\omega, S, \nu, <\omega)$ holds.

**Remark 4.18.** The first bullet of the preceding is used in the proofs of Theorems 3.11 and 3.12 of [LR19], and also, implicitly, in the proof of Corollary 3.15(2) of the same paper.

The last corollary leads us to adopt the following convention.

**Convention 4.19.** If we omit $\sigma$, then we mean that we put “$1 + \frac{1}{2}$” in place of $\sigma$.

We conclude this subsection, pointing out yet another consequence of the proof of Theorem 4.10 (note that each of the sets $E_i$ in the proof of Claim 4.16.2 is, in fact, a club in $\kappa$.)

**Theorem 4.20.** Suppose that $\bar{C} = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is a $P_\xi^-(\kappa, \mu, R, \ldots)$-sequence with:

- $R$ taken from Example 4.3;
- For every sequence $(B_i \mid i < \theta)$ of cofinal subsets of $\kappa$, and every $S \in S$, there exist stationarily many $\alpha \in S \cap E^*_\omega$ such that:
  1. $|C_\alpha| < \nu$; and
  2. for all $C \in C_\alpha$ and $i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\}$, 
     $$
     \{\gamma < \alpha \mid \min(C \setminus (\gamma + 1)) \in B_i\} \text{ is stationary in } \alpha.
     $$

Then $P_\xi^-(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu)$ holds, and if $\theta > 0$, then so does $P_\xi^-(\kappa, \mu, R, <\omega, S, \nu)$.

**4.3. Jensen’s classical result and nonreflecting sets.** In [Jen72] Theorem 6.2, Jensen showed that, assuming $V = L$, there is a $\kappa$-Souslin tree for every regular uncountable cardinal $\kappa$ that is not weakly compact. The proof of that theorem actually derives a $\kappa$-Souslin tree from the existence of a stationary set $E \subseteq \kappa$ for which $\square(E) + \diamondsuit(E)$ holds[15], where $\square(E)$ is the principle asserting the existence of a $P^-(\kappa, 2, E, \ldots)$-sequence. Here, we show how to redirect this result through our framework:

**Corollary 4.21.** Suppose $\square(E) + \diamondsuit(E)$ holds for some stationary $E \subseteq \kappa$. Then:

1. $P^-(\kappa, 2, \subseteq^-, 1, \{E\}, 2, 1)$;
2. If $\kappa > \aleph_1$, then $P^-(\kappa, 2, \subseteq^-, 1, \{S\}, 2, 1)$ holds for every stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$.

---

Remark 4.22. The preceding result is of interest mostly for the case that \( \kappa \) is an inaccessible cardinal, as the case \( \kappa = \aleph_1 \) is addressed by Remark 2.4(5) and the case \( \kappa = \lambda^+ \) for \( \lambda \) uncountable is addressed by [Rin17] Corollary 4.5 and Corollary 4.7. Note that for a strongly inaccessible cardinal, we may also appeal to Corollary 4.31 it requires a weaker hypothesis and provides a weaker instance of the proxy principle.

The main technical lemma of this subsection reads as follows.

**Lemma 4.23.** Suppose \( \kappa^{n_0} = \kappa, S \subseteq \kappa \) is stationary, \( \text{w}(S) \) holds, \( \mu \leq \kappa, \) and there exists a \( P^-(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{X}^-_\ast, \ldots) \)-sequence. Then there exist:

1. a subset \( \Omega \subseteq S \cap \text{acc}(\kappa); \)
2. a sequence \( \langle X_\beta \mid \beta \in \Omega \rangle, \) where each \( X_\beta \) is a cofinal subset of \( \beta; \)
3. a \( P^-(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{X}^-_\ast, \ldots) \)-sequence, \( \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle, \)
together satisfying the following hitting feature:

   4. for every cofinal \( X \subseteq \kappa, \) there exists some \( \alpha \in \Omega \) such that \( \mathcal{C}_\alpha \) is a singleton, say, \( \mathcal{C}_\alpha = \{ \alpha \}, \) and

\[
\sup \{ \beta \in \text{nacc}(\mathcal{C}_\alpha) \cap \Omega \mid X_\beta \subseteq X \} = \alpha.
\]

**Proof.** (1) By Corollary 4.25 below, there exists a stationary \( \Omega \subseteq E \) such that \( P^-(\kappa, 2, \mathcal{X}^-_\ast, 1, \{ \Omega \}, 2, 1) \) holds for \( \chi := \omega. \) In particular, \( P^-(\kappa, 2, \mathcal{X}^-_\ast, 1, \{ E \}, 2, 1) \) holds.

(2) This follows from Clause (1) and [Rin17] Theorem 4.13. \( \square \)

The enumeration \( \{ C^\alpha_{\omega, \ell} \mid \ell < \kappa \} \) of \( C^\alpha_{\omega} \) is necessarily with repetition, as \( |C^\alpha_{\omega}| < \mu \leq \kappa. \)

---

16The enumeration \( \{ C^\alpha_{\omega, \ell} \mid \ell < \kappa \} \) of \( C^\alpha_{\omega} \) is necessarily with repetition, as \( |C^\alpha_{\omega}| < \mu \leq \kappa. \)
Proof. \(\Omega\) has already been defined, then, for every \(\vec{\text{induction hypothesis}}\), that the restriction of \(C\) is, sup(\(n\text{acc}(\alpha,\iota)\)) for all \(\alpha,\iota < \kappa\).

We proceed by recursion. Fix \(n < \omega\) for which \(\Omega^n\) and \(\vec{C}^n\) have already been successfully constructed. By (a) and (b), \(\langle\alpha,\iota\rangle\) is a club subset of \(\Omega^n\), and also find some \(\vec{\text{ARI MEIR BRODSKY AND ASSAF RINOT}}\)

\[\Omega^{n+1} = \{\beta \in \Omega^n \mid X^{n+1}_\beta \subseteq X^n\}.\]

Define \(\vec{C}^{n+1} = \{\alpha,\iota < \kappa\}\) by recursion over \(\alpha < \kappa\), as follows. Let \(C^{0+1}_\alpha = \{\emptyset\}\), and \(C^{n+1}_\alpha = \{\{\alpha\}\}\) for every \(\alpha < \kappa\). Now, if \(\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)\) and \(C^{n+1}_\alpha\) has already been defined, then, for every \(\iota < \kappa\), let:

\[(n)\quad C^{n+1}_\alpha = C^{n+1}_\alpha \cup \bigcup \{C^{n+1}_{\beta,\iota} \mid \beta \in \text{acc}(\alpha,\iota) \land \beta < \alpha\} = \text{nacc}(\alpha,\iota) \setminus \Omega^{n+1}\).

**Claim 4.23.1.** \(\Omega^{n+1}, \vec{C}^{n+1},\) and \(X^n\) satisfy properties \((a)-(f)\) of the recursion.

**Proof.** (a), (c), (d), (e), (g), (h), and (i) are easily verified from the construction.

**(i)** Consider any given \(\alpha \in \Omega^n\). By \(\vec{\text{Claim coherence of}}\) \(\vec{C}^n\), we have \(\text{acc}(\alpha,\iota) \setminus \Omega^{n+1} = \emptyset\). Thus \(C^{n+1}_\alpha \cap \Omega^{n+1} = \text{nacc}(\alpha,\iota) \cap \Omega^{n+1}\), and it follows from our choice of \(X^n\) and \(D^n\) that

\[\sup(C^{n+1}_\alpha \cap \Omega^{n+1}) = \sup(\text{nacc}(\alpha,\iota) \cap \Omega^{n+1}) < \kappa.\]

**(b)** It is clear from the construction that \(C^{n+1}_\alpha\) is a club subset of \(\alpha\) for every limit ordinal \(\alpha < \kappa\), that \(0 < |C^{n+1}_\alpha| < \mu\) for every \(\alpha < \kappa\) and (using (d)) that \(0 < |C^{n+1}_\alpha| < \mu\) for every \(\alpha < \kappa\) and (using (d)) that \(0 < |C^{n+1}_\alpha| < \mu\) for every \(\alpha < \kappa\) and (using (d)) that \(0 < |C^{n+1}_\alpha| < \mu\) for every \(\alpha < \kappa\) and (using (d)) that \(0 < |C^{n+1}_\alpha| < \mu\) for every \(\alpha < \kappa\) and (using (d)) that

To verify \(\vec{\text{Claim coherence of}}\) the sequence \(\vec{C}^{n+1}\), consider any given \(\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)\), \(\iota < \kappa\), and \(\alpha \in \text{acc}(\alpha,\iota)\); we shall show that \(\alpha \not\in \Omega^{n+1}\), and also find some \(\iota' < \kappa\) such that \(C^{n+1}_{\alpha,\iota'} \subseteq \alpha,\iota+1\), by considering three cases. We may assume, as an induction hypothesis, that the restriction of \(\vec{C}^{n+1}\) up to \(\alpha\), that is, \(C^{n+1}_{\beta,\iota} \cap \Omega^{n+1}\), is already known to be \(\vec{\text{Claim coherence of}}\) \(\vec{C}^{n+1}\).

**Claim 4.23.2.** If \(\alpha \in \text{acc}(\alpha,\iota)\), then by \(\vec{\text{Claim coherence of}}\) \(\vec{C}^n\), it follows that \(\alpha \not\in \Omega^n\) and also we can choose some \(\iota' < \kappa\) such that \(C^{n+1}_{\alpha,\iota'} \subseteq \alpha,\iota+1\). As \(\Omega^{n+1} \subseteq \Omega^n\), we obtain \(\alpha \not\in \Omega^{n+1}\). If \(\text{cf}(\alpha) < \chi\), then we consider

\[C^{n+1}_{\alpha,\iota} \subseteq \alpha,\iota+1\].

Otherwise, we have \(C^{n+1}_{\alpha,\iota'} \subseteq \alpha,\iota+1\), and we find \(\eta \in C^{n+1}_{\alpha,\iota'} \cap \Omega^{n+1}\) such that \(C^{n+1}_{\alpha,\iota'} \setminus \eta = \alpha,\iota + \eta,\alpha\). Then, by Claim (g) we obtain

\[C^{n+1}_{\alpha,\iota'} \setminus \eta = \alpha,\iota+1 \setminus \eta,\alpha\], so that \(C^{n+1}_{\alpha,\iota'} \subseteq \alpha,\iota+1\).

**Claim 4.23.3.** If \(\alpha \in \text{nacc}(\alpha,\iota)\), as we have assumed that \(\alpha \in \text{nacc}(\alpha,\iota)\), we obtain from Claim (h) that \(\alpha \not\in \Omega^{n+1}\). Furthermore, it follows from Claim (i) (with \(\beta := \alpha\) and \(\beta' := \sup(C^{n+1}_{\alpha,\iota})\)) that \(C^{n+1}_{\alpha,\iota} \subseteq \alpha,\iota+1\).

**Claim 4.23.4.** The remaining case is \(\alpha \not\in \text{nacc}(\alpha,\iota)\). Let \(\beta' < \beta\) be the two consecutive points of \(\alpha,\iota+1\), such that \(\beta' < \alpha < \beta\). In particular, \(\beta \in \text{nacc}(\alpha,\iota)\). Since \(\alpha \in \text{nacc}(\alpha,\iota) \cap \beta', \beta\), it follows from Claim (i) that \(C^{n+1}_{\beta,\iota'} \setminus \beta' =

\[\vec{\text{We do not assume here that}}\) \(\beta\) is a limit ordinal.\]

\[\vec{\text{We do not assume here that}}\) \(\beta\) is a limit ordinal.\]
\[ C_{\alpha,0}^{n+1} \cap [\beta^{-}, \beta), \text{ so that } \bar{\alpha} \in \text{acc}(C_{\beta,0}^{n+1} \setminus \beta^{-}). \] As \( \beta < \alpha \) and \( \bar{\alpha} \in \text{acc}(C_{\beta,0}^{n+1}) \), by induction hypothesis we can choose some \( \iota' < \kappa \) such that \( C_{\alpha,\iota'}^{\iota'+1} \subseteq C_{\beta,0}^{n+1} \). Thus, in particular, \( \bar{\alpha} \notin \Omega^{n+1} \) and \( \bar{\alpha} \notin \Omega^{n+1} \). If \( \text{acc}(\bar{\alpha}) < \chi \), then automatically \( C_{\alpha,\iota'}^{\iota'+1} \subseteq C_{\beta,0}^{n+1} \). Otherwise, we have \( C_{\alpha,\iota'}^{\iota'+1} \subseteq C_{\beta,0}^{n+1} \), and as \( \beta^{-} < \bar{\alpha} \), it follows that \( C_{\alpha,\iota'}^{\iota'+1} \subseteq C_{\beta,0}^{n+1} \), as sought. \( \square \)

If we reach the end of the above recursive process, then we are altogether equipped with a sequence \( \langle (\mathcal{C}^n, \Omega^n, X^n) \mid n < \omega \rangle \), from which we shall derive a contradiction. By the choice of \( X^\omega \), the following set must be stationary:

\[ \Omega^* := \bigcap_{n < \omega} \Omega^n = \{ \beta \in \Omega^0 \mid \forall n < \omega (X^0_n \subseteq X^n) \}. \]

Thus, \( \text{acc}^+(\Omega^*) \) is a club in \( \kappa \), and we may pick \( \alpha \in \Omega^* \cap \text{acc}^+(\Omega^*) \). For every \( n < \omega \), put \( \alpha_n := \sup(C_{\alpha,0}^n \cap \Omega^{n+1}) \), which by Clause (f) is \( \alpha \). As \( \alpha \in \Omega^* \subseteq \Omega^0 \subseteq E^* \), we infer that \( \alpha^* := \sup_{n<\omega} \alpha_n \) is smaller than \( \alpha \). Clearly, \( \alpha^* \subseteq \alpha \).

Since \( \Omega^* \cap \alpha \) is cofinal in \( \alpha \), let us pick \( \beta \in \Omega^* \cap (\alpha^*, \alpha) \).

For all \( n < \omega \), let \( \beta_n := \min(C_{\alpha,0}^n \setminus \beta) \). As \( \{ C_{\alpha,0}^n \mid n < \omega \} \) is a \( \subseteq \)-increasing chain, it follows that \( \langle \beta_n \mid n < \omega \rangle \) is a \( \subseteq \)-decreasing sequence of ordinals, and hence stabilizes. Fix \( n < \omega \) such that \( \beta_n = \beta_{n+1} \). Since \( \beta \in \Omega^* \subseteq \Omega^{n+1} \), \( \beta \notin \alpha \).

In particular, \( \beta_n = \min(C_{\alpha,0}^n \setminus (\beta + 1)) \), so that \( \beta_n \in \alpha \). By \( \langle \beta_n \mid n < \omega \rangle \) again and \( \alpha > \beta_n > \beta > \alpha^* \), it follows that \( \beta_n \in \text{nacc}(C_{\alpha,0}^n) \setminus \Omega^{n+1} \). Thus we infer from \( \bullet \) that

\[ C_{\alpha,0}^{n+1} \cap \sup(C_{\alpha,0}^n \cap \beta_n) = C_{\alpha,0}^{n+1} \cap \sup(C_{\alpha,0}^n \cap \beta_n) \cap \beta_n, \]

and by \( \beta_n = \min(C_{\alpha,0}^n \setminus \beta) \), we have \( C_{\alpha,0}^{n+1} \cap \beta_n \leq \beta_n \), and hence

\[ C_{\alpha,0}^{n+1} \cap [\beta, \beta_n) = C_{\alpha,0}^{n+1} \cap [\beta, \beta_n). \]

Since \( \beta < \beta_n \), it follows that \( \beta_{n+1} = \min(C_{\alpha,0}^{n+1} \setminus \beta) < \beta_n \), contradicting the choice of \( n \) and completing the proof. \( \square \)

**Remark 4.24.** It follows from Lemma 3.3 that, in Clause (4) of the preceding, the existence of an \( \alpha \) is equivalent to the existence of stationarily many such \( \alpha \).

**Corollary 4.25.** Suppose \( \kappa^\kappa_0 = \kappa \), and \( \check{\Phi}(S) \) holds for a stationary \( S \subseteq \kappa \). If there exists a \( P^{-}(\kappa, \mu, \prod \gamma^+, \ldots) \)-sequence, then there exists a stationary \( \Omega \subseteq S \) such that \( P^{-}(\kappa, \mu, \prod \gamma^+, 1, \{ \Omega \}, 2, 1) \) holds.

**Proof.** Let \( \Omega \subseteq S \cap \text{acc}(\kappa), \{ X_\beta \mid \beta \in \Omega \} \), and \( \{ C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \} \) be given by Lemma 4.23. For every \( \beta \in \Omega \), let \( X_\beta := \{ \delta \mid \delta \in X_\beta \} \).

Set \( \nu := 2 \). By Clause (4) of Lemma 4.23 together with Remark 4.24 for every cofinal \( X \subseteq \kappa \), letting \( X := \{ \delta \mid \delta \in X \} \) and \( B_0 := \{ \beta \in \Omega \mid X_\beta \subseteq X \} \), the set \( S \) of all \( \alpha \) of \( \Omega \) such that:

- \( |C_\alpha| < \nu \), and
- for every \( C \in C_\alpha \), \( \text{sup}(\text{nacc}(C) \cap B_0) = \alpha \)

is stationary. The rest of the proof is now identical to that of Lemma 4.15 using \( \mathcal{R} := \Omega \setminus \chi^+ \) and \( \theta := 1 \). \( \square \)

**Remark 4.26.** Consequences of Corollary 4.25 (in the spirit of Corollary 4.21(2)) may be drawn by appealing to [BR19c, Lemma 3.8].

In [BR19c], many applications of the existence of nonreflecting stationary sets were presented.
Fact 4.27 ([BR19c Theorem A]). Suppose that $\text{CH}_\lambda$ holds for a regular uncountable cardinal $\lambda = 2^{\lambda^+}$, and there exists a nonreflecting stationary subset of $E^+_{\text{cf}(\lambda)}$. Then $P_\lambda(\lambda^+,\lambda^+,\subset,\lambda,\lambda)$ and $P^-(\lambda^+,\lambda^+,\subset^*,1,(E^+_{\text{cf}(\lambda)}),2,1)$ both hold.

Fact 4.28 ([BR19c Theorem B]). Suppose that $\square^+_\lambda + \text{CH}_\lambda$ holds for a singular cardinal $\lambda = 2^{\lambda^+}$, and either of the following two conditions holds:

1. there exists a nonreflecting stationary subset of $E^+_{\text{cf}(\lambda)}$; or
2. there exists a regressive function $f : E^+_{\text{cf}(\lambda)} \rightarrow \lambda^+$ such that $f^{-1}(\{i\})$ is nonreflecting for each $i < \lambda^+$.

Then $P_{\lambda^2}(\lambda^+,\lambda^+,\subset,\lambda^+)$ holds.

Analogous results are available for strongly inaccessible cardinals.

Theorem 4.29. Suppose that $S$ is a nonreflecting stationary subset of a strongly inaccessible cardinal $\kappa$ and $\diamond(S)$ holds. Then:

1. $P^-((\kappa,\kappa,\kappa^+),1,(\{\omega\},2,\kappa))$ holds;
2. If either $\diamond((\text{Reg}(\kappa)))$ holds or $\sup\{\theta \in \text{Reg}(\kappa) \mid \diamond(E^\theta_{\kappa})\} = \kappa$, then $P^-((\kappa,\kappa,\kappa^+),\{\omega\},2,\kappa)$ holds for some stationary $\Omega \subseteq S$.

Proof. Let $\Theta := \{\theta \in \text{Reg}(\kappa) \mid \diamond(E^\theta_{\kappa})\}$ and $\Gamma := \text{acc}(\kappa)$.

Claim 4.29.1. There exist a stationary $\Omega \subseteq S$, a partition $(T_i \mid i < \kappa)$ of $\Gamma \setminus \Omega$, and a sequence $\vec{X} = \langle X_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ such that each $X_\alpha$ is a cofinal subset of $\alpha$ of order-type $\text{cf}(\alpha)$, and such that:

- $\vec{X} \upharpoonright \Omega$ is a $\clubsuit(\Omega)$-sequence;
- if $\diamond((\text{Reg}(\kappa)))$ holds, then $\vec{X} \upharpoonright ((\text{Reg}(\kappa)) \cap T_i)$ is a $\clubsuit((\text{Reg}(\kappa)) \cap T_i)$-sequence for all $i < \kappa$;
- if $\diamond((\text{Reg}(\kappa)))$ fails, then $\vec{X} \upharpoonright (E^\theta_{\kappa} \cap T_i)$ is a $\clubsuit(E^\theta_{\kappa} \cap T_i)$-sequence for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and $i < \kappa$.

Proof. There are two cases to consider:

- If $\diamond((\text{Reg}(\kappa)))$ holds, then by Fact 4.27 so does $\clubsuit((\text{Reg}(\kappa)))$. Then, by Theorem 4.24, we may find a stationary $\Omega \subseteq S \cap \text{Reg}(\kappa)$ such that $\clubsuit(\Omega)$ and $\clubsuit(S \cap \text{Reg}(\kappa) \setminus \Omega)$ both hold. It now follows from Theorem 2.7 that there exists a partition $(T_i \mid i < \kappa)$ of $\Gamma \setminus \Omega$ such that $\clubsuit(S \cap \text{Reg}(\kappa) \cap T_i)$ holds for all $i < \kappa$. At this point, finding a sequence $\vec{X}$ as above is easy.

- Otherwise, $\diamond(S)$ holds but $\diamond((S \cap \text{Reg}(\kappa)))$ fails, so, by the normality of the non-diamond ideal, we may pick $\theta' \in \text{Reg}(\kappa)$ such that $\diamond((S \cap E^\theta_{\kappa}) \setminus \Omega)$ holds. In particular, $\clubsuit(S \cap E^\theta_{\kappa})$ holds. Then, by Theorem 3.7, we may find a stationary $\Omega \subseteq S \cap E^\theta_{\kappa}$ such that $\clubsuit(\Omega)$ and $\clubsuit(S \cap E^\theta_{\kappa} \setminus \Omega)$ both hold. So by invoking Theorem 2.7 with $S \cap E^\theta_{\kappa} \setminus \Omega$ and with $E^\theta_{\kappa}$ for each $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \{\theta'\}$, it easy to find a partition $(T_i \mid i < \kappa)$ of $\Gamma \setminus \Omega$ such that $\clubsuit(E^\theta_{\kappa} \cap T_i)$ holds for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and $i < \kappa$. At this point, finding a sequence $\vec{X}$ as above is easy.

For every $\alpha \in E^\omega_{\text{acc}}$, pick a club $B_\alpha$ in $\alpha$ which is disjoint from $S$.

Write $\Gamma := \text{acc}(\kappa)$. Define a sequence $\vec{C} = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Gamma \rangle$, as follows.

- If $\alpha \in E^\omega_{\text{acc}} \cap T_\iota$ for some $\iota < \alpha$, then let $C_\alpha := (X_\alpha \setminus \iota) \cup \{\iota\}$ for this unique $\iota$.
- If $\alpha \in E^\omega_{\text{acc}}$ and the above fails, then let $C_\alpha := X_\alpha$.
- If $\alpha \in E^\omega_{\text{acc}} \cap T_\iota$ for some $\iota < \alpha$, then by Lemma 3.3 fix a cofinal subset $A_\alpha$ of $X_\alpha \setminus \iota$ which is $B_\alpha$-separated, and then let $C_\alpha$ be the closure of $A_\alpha \cup \{\iota\}$ in $\alpha$.
- Otherwise, fix a cofinal subset $A_\alpha$ of $X_\alpha$ which is $B_\alpha$-separated, and then let $C_\alpha$ be the closure of $A_\alpha$ in $\alpha$.

Claim 4.29.2. For every $\alpha \in \Gamma$, $\text{acc}(C_\alpha) \cap S = \emptyset$. In addition:
(1) \(<\text{nacc}(C_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \Omega)\> is a \(\blacktriangle(\Omega)\)-sequence;
(2) if either \(\Diamond(\text{Reg}(\kappa))\) holds or \(\text{sup}(\Theta) = \kappa\), then, for every cofinal \(B \subseteq \kappa\) and every \(\theta < \kappa\), the following set is stationary:
\[\{ \alpha \in \Gamma \setminus \Omega \mid \text{min}(C_\alpha) = \text{min}(B), \theta \leq \text{otp}(C) < \kappa, \text{nacc}(C_\alpha) \subseteq B \}.\]

Proof. This is by design. \(\square\)

Next, for every \(\alpha \in S \cap \Gamma\), set \(C_\alpha := \{C_\alpha\}\). For every \(\alpha \in \Gamma \setminus S\), let \(C_\alpha\) denote the collection of all clubs \(C\) in \(\alpha\) such that \(\text{acc}(C) \cap S = \emptyset\).

As \(\kappa\) is a strongly inaccessible cardinal, \(\hat{C} = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle\) is a \(P^- (\kappa, \kappa, S, \ldots)\)-sequence. As \(C_\alpha = \{C_\alpha\}\) for all \(\alpha \in \Omega\), Claim 4.29(1) entails that \(\hat{C}\) is furthermore a \(P^- (\kappa, \kappa, S, \ldots, 1, \{\Omega\}, 2, \kappa)\)-sequence.

Finally, suppose that \(\Diamond(\text{Reg}(\kappa))\) holds or \(\text{sup}(\Theta) = \kappa\). Then, by appealing to [BR19a, Lemma 4.9] with \(\chi := \kappa, \hat{C}\) and \(\hat{C}\), we obtain a \(P^- (\kappa, \kappa, S, \ldots, 1, \{\Omega\}, 2, \kappa)\)-sequence \(\langle D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle\) with the property that for every cofinal \(A \subseteq \kappa\), there are stationarily many \(\alpha \in S\) such that \(D_\alpha\) is a singleton consisting of a club \(D_\alpha\) in \(\alpha\) such that \(\text{otp}(D_\alpha) = \alpha\) and \(\text{nacc}(D_\alpha) \subseteq A\). Now appeal to [BR19a, Lemma 3.7] and [BR19c, Lemma 3.14]. \(\square\)

The proof of the preceding makes clear that the following is true, as well.

**Theorem 4.30.** Suppose that \(S\) is a nonreflecting stationary subset of a strongly inaccessible cardinal \(\kappa\) and \(\Diamond(S \cap \text{Reg}(\kappa))\) holds. Then \(P^- (\kappa, \kappa, S, \ldots, \{\kappa\}, 2, <\infty)\) holds, as well.

Recalling Theorem 4.20, we also have the following easy variation.

**Corollary 4.31.** Suppose that \(\kappa\) is a strongly inaccessible cardinal, and there exists a sequence \(\langle A_\alpha \mid \alpha \in S \rangle\) such that:

- \(S\) is a nonreflecting stationary subset of \(E^\kappa_{\omega+1}\);
- for every \(\alpha \in S\), \(A_\alpha\) is a cofinal subset of \(\alpha\);
- for every cofinal \(A \subseteq \kappa\), there exists \(\alpha \in S\) for which
  \[\{ \beta < \alpha \mid \text{min}(A_\alpha \setminus (\beta + 1)) \in A \}\]
  is stationary in \(\alpha\).

Then \(P^- (\kappa, \kappa, S, \ldots, 1, \{\kappa\}, 2, 2)\) holds.

**Proof.** For every \(\alpha \in E^\kappa_{\omega+1}\), pick a club \(B_\alpha\) in \(\alpha\) which is disjoint from \(S\). Now, for every \(\alpha \in S\), let \(C_\alpha := \{C_\alpha\}\), where \(C_\alpha\) denotes the closure in \(\alpha\) of \(\{\text{min}(A_\alpha \setminus (\beta + 1)) \mid \beta \in B_\alpha\}\). For every \(\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \setminus \Gamma\), let \(C_\alpha\) consists of all clubs \(C\) in \(\alpha\) such that \(\text{acc}(C) \cap S = \emptyset\). It is easy to see that \(\langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle\) is a \(P^- (\kappa, \kappa, S, \ldots)\)-sequence satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 4.20 with \(\theta := 1, S := \{S\}\) and \(\nu := 2\). Therefore, \(P^- (\kappa, \kappa, S, \ldots, <\omega, \{S\}, 2, 2)\) holds. \(\square\)

We conclude this subsection, pointing out a few additional connections between instances of \(P^- (\kappa, \ldots)\) and the existence of nonreflecting stationary subsets of \(\kappa\).

**Proposition 4.32.** Assume \(\chi \in \text{Reg}(\kappa)\) and \(\text{min}(\theta, \sigma) > 0\).

1. Let \(\xi < \kappa\). For any \(\kappa \subseteq E^\kappa_{\omega+1}\), \(P^- (\kappa, \kappa, \chi, \omega+1, 1, \{\kappa\}, 2, 1)\) entails the existence of a nonreflecting stationary subset of \(S\). In addition, for any \(\kappa \subseteq \kappa\), \(P^- (\kappa, \kappa, \chi, \omega+1, 1, \{\kappa\}, 2, 1)\) entails the existence of stationary subset \(\Omega \subseteq \kappa\) such that, for every \(\alpha \in E^\kappa_{\omega+1}\), \(\Omega \cap \alpha\) is nonstationary in \(\alpha\).
2. For any \(\sigma \in \text{Reg}(\kappa)\), \(P^- (\kappa, 2, \sigma, \omega+1, 1, \{E^\kappa_{\omega+1}\}, 2, \sigma)\) entails the existence of a nonreflecting stationary subset of \(E^\kappa_{\omega+1}\).
3. \(P^- (\kappa, \mu, \kappa, \forall \kappa, 1, \{\kappa\}, \nu, \sigma)\) implies that \(\Omega\) is a nonreflecting stationary subset of \(\kappa\) and that \(P^- (\kappa, \mu, \forall \kappa, 1, \{\kappa\}, \nu', \sigma)\) holds with \(\nu' = 2\).
(4) If $\kappa = \lambda^+$ for a regular cardinal $\lambda$, then $P_\kappa^- (\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu, \sigma)$ is equivalent to $P^- (\kappa, \mu, E^\kappa R, \theta, S, \nu, \sigma)$.

(5) If $\kappa = \lambda^+$ for a regular cardinal $\lambda$, then, for every $S \subseteq P(E^\kappa R)$, $P_\kappa^- (\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu, \sigma)$ is equivalent to $P_\lambda^- (\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, 2, \sigma)$.

(6) If $\kappa = \lambda^+$ for an infinite cardinal $\lambda$, then, for every $\theta \geq \lambda$, $P_\kappa^- (\kappa, \mu, \subseteq, \{ \kappa \}, \nu, \sigma)$ is equivalent to $P_\lambda^- (\kappa, \mu, \subseteq, \{ E^\kappa_{\xi(\lambda)} \}, 2, \sigma)$.

Proof. (1) The easy argument may be extracted from the proof of (2) $\implies$ (1) of [BR19b] Corollary 3.4.

(2) The proof is a straightforward generalization of the proof of [Lam17a] Theorem 4.1.

(3) From $P_\kappa^\kappa (\kappa, \cdot, \{ \Omega \}, \cdot, \sigma)$ with $\min \{ \theta, \sigma \} > 0$, we infer that $\Omega$ is stationary. Now, for every $\alpha \in E_\kappa^\omega$, we may pick a club $C \in C_\alpha$, and so by $^R \mathcal{R}$, we know that the club $\text{acc}(C)$ is disjoint from $\Omega$, so that $\Omega \cap \alpha$ is nonstationary in $\alpha$. In effect, for every $\alpha \in \Omega$, we may replace $C_\alpha$ by some singleton subset of itself, and then see that $P_\kappa^\kappa (\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \{ \Omega \}, 2, \sigma)$ holds, as well.

(4) This is obvious.

(5) By Clauses (3) and (4).

(6) By Clause (3) and [BR19b] Remarks 3.22.

4.4. Hitting on a club. Let $\text{NS}_\kappa$ denote the nonstationary ideal over $\kappa$, so that $\text{NS}_\kappa^+$ forms the collection of all stationary subsets of $\kappa$. For every stationary $T \subseteq \kappa$, one denotes $\text{NS}_\kappa^+ T := \text{NS}_\kappa^+ \cap \mathcal{P}(T)$.

The following result shows that hitting on a club allows us to increase the number of sets being hit simultaneously to the maximal possible value. It is used in the proof of [BR19b] Corollary 3.6, and in the justification of [BR19b] Remark ii. following Definition 3.3 and [Lam17a] Theorem 1.10(2)].

Lemma 4.33. Suppose that $S = \text{NS}_\kappa^+ T$ for some stationary $T \subseteq \kappa$. Then $P^- (\kappa, \mu, R, 1, S, \nu, \sigma)$ is equivalent to $P^- (\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu, \sigma)$ with $\theta = \kappa$.

Proof. We focus on the forward implication. Fix a sequence $\tilde{C} = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ witnessing $P_\kappa^- (\kappa, \mu, R, 1, S, \nu, \sigma)$. In particular, for every cofinal $B \subseteq \kappa$, if we let $G(B)$ denote the set of all $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $|C_\alpha| < \nu$, and for all $C \in C_\alpha$ and $i < \min \{ \alpha, \theta \}$,

$$
\sup \{ \gamma \in C \mid \text{succ}(C \setminus \gamma) \subseteq B_i \} = \alpha,
$$

then, for every $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, $G(B) \cap S$ is stationary. Recalling that $S = \{ S \subseteq T \mid T \text{ is stationary} \}$, this means that $T \setminus G(B)$ is nonstationary.

Claim 4.33.1. $\tilde{C}$ witnesses $P_\kappa^- (\kappa, \mu, R, \kappa, S, \nu, \sigma)$, as well.

Proof. Suppose that $\langle B_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$ is a given sequence of cofinal subsets of $\kappa$. For every $i < \kappa$, let us fix a club $D_i \subseteq \kappa$ such that $D_i \cap T \subseteq G(B_i)$. Consider the club $D := \text{acc}(\kappa) \cap (\Delta_{i < \kappa} D_i)$. Let $\alpha \in D \cap T$ be arbitrary. By $\alpha \in D_0 \cap T$, we have $|C_\alpha| < \nu$. Let $C \in C_\alpha$ be arbitrary. Given $i < \alpha$, we have $\alpha \in D_i \cap T$, and hence

$$
\sup \{ \beta \in C \mid \text{succ}(C \setminus \beta) \subseteq B_i \} = \alpha,
$$

as required. \hfill $\Box$

This completes the proof. \hfill $\Box$

Remark 4.34. Recalling Conventions 4.2.3 and 4.2.7, the principle $P^\ast (T, \xi)$ of [BR19b] Definition 3.3] is nothing but $P_\kappa^- (\kappa, \infty, \subseteq, 1, \text{NS}_\kappa^+ T, 2, \infty)$. In particular, $P^\ast (T, \kappa)$ entails $P^\ast (\kappa, \kappa, \subseteq, \kappa, \kappa, 2, 1)$, which, by the results of Subsection 6.7, entails the existence of a free $\kappa$-Souslin tree. This justifies remark (ii) after Definition 3.3 of [BR19b].
Consider a regular infinite cardinal $\lambda$ and some stationary set $S \subseteq E^\lambda_+$. Similar to the fact that $\Diamond(S)$ implies $P_\lambda^\lambda(\lambda^+, 2, \lambda^\subseteq, 1, \{S\}, 2, \sigma)$ (cf. [BR17a Theorem 5.1(2)]), it is the case that $\Diamond^*(S)$ implies $P_\lambda^\lambda(\lambda^+, 2, \lambda^\subseteq, 1, NS^+_\lambda, S, 2, \sigma)$. To prove this, let us first dispose of the following:

**Proposition 4.35.** Suppose $\alpha$ is some limit ordinal, and $A$ is a collection of $\text{cf}(\alpha)$ many cofinal subsets of $\alpha$. Then there exists a club $C$ in $\alpha$ of order-type $\text{cf}(\alpha)$ satisfying the following. For all $A \subseteq A$ and $\sigma < \text{cf}(\alpha)$:

$$\sup\{\gamma \in C \mid \text{succ}(C \setminus \gamma) \subseteq A\} = \alpha.$$  

Proof. Let $\lambda := \text{cf}(\alpha)$. Let $(\alpha_i \mid i < \lambda)$ be the strictly increasing enumeration of a club in $\alpha$. Fix a surjection $g: \lambda \to A$ such that for all $\sigma < \lambda$ and $A \subseteq A$, the set $\{k < \lambda \mid g(k, k + \sigma) = \{A\}\}$ is cofinal in $\lambda$. Now, recursively construct a strictly increasing and continuous sequence $\langle \gamma_i \mid i < \lambda \rangle$ such that, for all $i < \lambda$, $\gamma_i > \alpha_i$, and $\gamma_{i+1} \in g(i)$. Evidently, $C := \langle \gamma_i \mid i < \lambda \rangle$ is as sought. \[\square\]

Clause (2) of the next Theorem is used in the proof of [BR17b Proposition 3.10].

**Theorem 4.36.** Suppose $\lambda$ is any regular infinite cardinal, and $S \subseteq E^\lambda_+$ is a stationary subset such that $\Diamond^*(S)$ holds\footnote{See [Kun07] for the definition of $\Diamond^*(S)$.}. Set $\Omega := E^\lambda_+$. Then:

1. $P_\lambda^\lambda(\lambda^+, 2, \Omega^\subseteq, 1, NS^+_\lambda, S, 2, <\infty)$ holds.
2. If, in addition, $\lambda^\alpha = \lambda$, then $P_\lambda^\lambda(\lambda^+, \infty, \Omega^\subseteq, 1, NS^+_\lambda, S, 2, <\infty)$ holds.

Proof. 1 Fix a sequence $\tilde{A} = \langle A_\alpha \mid \alpha \in S \rangle$ witnessing $\Diamond^*(S)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that, for all $\alpha \in S$, $A_\alpha := \{A \in A_\alpha \mid \text{sup}(A) = \alpha\}$ is of size $\lambda$. We define a sequence $\langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, as follows:

- For each $\alpha \in \lambda^+ \setminus S$, pick a closed subset $C_\alpha$ of $\alpha$ with $\text{sup}(C_\alpha) = \text{sup}(\alpha)$ and $\text{otp}(C_\alpha) = \text{cf}(\alpha)$.
- For each $\alpha \in S$, let $C_\alpha$ be given by Proposition 4.34 when fed with $A_\alpha$.

Now, set $\tilde{C} = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ where $C_\alpha := \{C_\alpha\}$ for all $\alpha < \lambda^+$. We have that $\tilde{C}$ is $P_\lambda^\lambda(\lambda^+, 2, \Omega^\subseteq, \ldots)$-sequence, since, for every $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\lambda^+)$, $C_\alpha$ is a club subset of $\alpha$ of order-type $\leq \lambda$, so that $\Omega^\subseteq$-coherence is satisfied vacuously.

To see that $\tilde{C}$ witnesses $P_\lambda^\lambda(\lambda^+, 2, \Omega^\subseteq, 1, NS^+_\lambda, S, 2, <\infty)$, consider any cofinal set $A \subseteq \lambda^+$. By our choice of $\tilde{A}$, we can fix a club $D \subseteq \lambda^+$ such that, for every $\alpha \in D \cap S$, $A \cap A_\alpha \in A_\alpha$. Consider the club $E := \text{acc}^+(A) \cap D$. For any $\alpha \in E \cap S$, we have $A \cap A_\alpha \in A_\alpha$, so that by our choice of $C_\alpha$ it follows that, for all $\sigma < \lambda$,

$$\sup\{\gamma \in C \mid \text{succ}(C \setminus \gamma) \subseteq A\} = \alpha,$$

as sought.

2 Let $\tilde{C} = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be given by Clause (1). Define $\tilde{D} = \langle D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ as follows:

- For all $\alpha \leq \lambda$, let $D_\alpha := \{\alpha\}$.
- For all $\alpha \in E^\lambda_+ \setminus \lambda$, let $D_\alpha$ be the collection of all clubs $d$ in $\alpha$ such that $|min(d)| \geq \lambda$ and $|d| < \lambda$.
- For all $\alpha \in E^\lambda_+ \setminus \{\lambda\}$, let $D_\alpha := \{C \setminus \lambda \mid C \in C_\alpha\}$.

Then $\tilde{D}$ witnesses $P_\lambda^\lambda(\lambda^+, \infty, \Omega^\subseteq, 1, NS^+_\lambda, S, 2, <\infty)$. \[\square\]

4.5. **Improving the coherence.** In this subsection, we show that we can improve the coherence of a sequence witnessing the proxy principle by inserting all necessary initial segments of the clubs into the relevant collections, as long as we allow its width to grow large enough. The main result is the following:

**Corollary 4.37.** $P_\xi^\theta(\kappa, \kappa, \subseteq, \theta, S, \kappa, \sigma)$ is equivalent to $P_\xi^\theta(\kappa, \kappa, \subseteq, \theta, S, \kappa, \sigma)$.\footnote{See [Kun07] for the definition of $\Diamond^*(S)$.}
Fix a sequence \( \mathcal{C} \). Consider any given \( \alpha \). By \( \mathcal{C} \) being determined by setting \( \langle \mathcal{C} \rangle \), we may assume that \( \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^\mathcal{C}_\chi \). Furthermore, as sup(\( \mathcal{C} \)) is a singleton, we consider several cases:

1. If \( \mathcal{C} \) is a singleton, then \( \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^\mathcal{C}_\chi \).
2. If \( \mathcal{C} \) is not a singleton, then \( \mathcal{C} \) is a \( P \)-sequence witnessing the syntactically-stronger principle \( P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \). Otherwise, \( \mathcal{C} \) is a \( P \)-sequence witnessing the syntactically-weaker principle \( P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \).

Claim 4.38.1. Suppose \( \alpha \in E^\chi_\kappa \). Then every element \( c \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha \) can be written as \( c = (c \cap \beta) \cup (D \setminus \beta) \) for some \( D \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha \) and \( \beta < \alpha \), where \( c \cap \beta \in \mathcal{A}_\beta \).

Claim 4.38.2. \( \mathcal{D} \) is a \( P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{G}) \)-sequence satisfying \( \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \) for every \( \alpha \in \Omega \cap \text{acc}(\kappa) \).

Proof. Consider any given \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \). It is clear that \( \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \), so that, in particular, \( \mathcal{D}_\alpha \neq \emptyset \). Now, fix any given \( c \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha \). By definition of \( \mathcal{D}_\alpha \), we can fix some \( C \in \Sigma \) such that \( c = C \cap \alpha \) and \( \sup(c) = \alpha \). In particular, \( c \in \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \) and \( \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha \). Furthermore, \( \sup(c) \leq \text{otp}(\mathcal{C}_\alpha) \). As \( \mathcal{C} \) is a \( P \)-sequence, we have \( \mathcal{D} \cap \alpha \subseteq \mathcal{C} \). Thus, we can write \( c = c \cap \beta \cup (\mathcal{D} \setminus \beta) \), where \( c \cap \beta \in \mathcal{A}_\beta \) and \( \beta < \alpha \).

To see that \( |\mathcal{G}_\alpha| < \kappa \) for every \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \), we consider several cases:

- If \( \alpha = 0 \), then \( \mathcal{G}_\alpha = \{0\} \) is a singleton.
- If \( \alpha \) is a successor ordinal, then \( \mathcal{G}_\alpha \) is empty.

Thus we may assume that \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \).

• Suppose \( \alpha \in E^\chi_\kappa \). Set \( \eta := \text{cf}(\alpha) \), and fix an increasing sequence \( \langle \gamma_i \mid i < \eta \rangle \) of ordinals converging to \( \alpha \). Define a function \( \varphi : \mathcal{G}_\alpha \to \prod_{i < \eta} \mathcal{A}_{\gamma_i} \) by setting \( \varphi(c) := \langle c \cap \gamma_i \mid i < \eta \rangle \) for every \( c \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha \). For every \( i < \eta \), we have \( |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_i}| < \kappa \) by the induction hypothesis, since \( \gamma_i < \alpha \). Let \( \lambda := \sup_{i < \eta} |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_i}| \). We infer from the regularity of \( \kappa \) that \( \lambda < \kappa \), and then since \( \eta < \chi \), it follows from \( (\chi) \)-closedness of \( \kappa \) that \( |\text{Im}(\varphi)| \leq \lambda^\eta < \kappa \). As \( c \subseteq \bigcup_{i < \eta} (c \cap \gamma_i) \) for every \( c \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha \), it is clear that \( \varphi \) is injective. Altogether, \( |\mathcal{G}_\alpha| < \kappa \), as sought.
Finally, suppose $\alpha \in E_{\geq \chi}$. In this case, define a function

$$\varphi : G_\alpha \to \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} A_\beta \times \alpha \times C_\alpha$$

by setting $\varphi(c) := (c \cap \beta_\epsilon, \beta_\epsilon, D_\epsilon)$, where the representation $c = (c \cap \beta_\epsilon) \cup (D_\epsilon \setminus \beta_\epsilon)$ is given by Claim [4.38.1]. As $|A_\beta| < \kappa$ for every ordinal $\beta < \alpha$, and $|C_\alpha| < \kappa$ by our choice of $C$, it follows from regularity of $\kappa$ that $|\Im(\varphi)| < \kappa$.

Furthermore, it is clear that $\varphi$ is injective. Altogether, $|G_\alpha| < \kappa$, as sought.

In all cases we have shown that $|G_\alpha| < \kappa$. Of course, $G_\beta \subseteq A_\beta$ for every ordinal $\beta < \kappa$, so that our induction hypothesis implies that $|G_\beta| < \kappa$ for every ordinal $\beta < \alpha$. We use these facts as we continue to show that $|A_\alpha| < \kappa$.

Notice that every element $c \in A_\alpha$ can be written as $c = (c \cap \beta_\epsilon) \cup (c \setminus \beta_\epsilon)$, where $\beta_\epsilon$ is some (possibly 0) limit ordinal $\leq \alpha$. Let $c \cap \beta_\epsilon$, and let $c \setminus \beta_\epsilon$ be finite. To see this, consider any given $c \in A_\alpha$. Define $\beta_\epsilon := \min\{|\beta \mid |c \setminus \beta| < \aleph_0\}$. As $c \subseteq \alpha$, it is clear that $\beta_\epsilon$ is an ordinal $\leq \alpha$. By minimality of $\beta_\epsilon$, it follows that $\beta_\epsilon$ is a limit ordinal (possibly 0) and $\sup(c \cap \beta_\epsilon) = \beta_\epsilon$. Fix $C \in \Sigma$ such that $c = C \cap \beta_\epsilon$. Then $c \cap \beta_\epsilon \subseteq C \cap \beta_\epsilon$, so that, in particular, $c \cap \beta_\epsilon \in G_{\beta_\epsilon}$. It is clear that $c = (c \cap \beta_\epsilon) \cup (c \setminus \beta_\epsilon)$, and by our definition of $\beta_\epsilon$, it is clear that $c \setminus \beta_\epsilon$ is finite.

Thus, to show that $|A_\alpha| < \kappa$, define a function

$$\pi : A_\alpha \to \bigcup_{\beta \in \acc(\alpha+1) \cup \{0\}} G_\beta \times [\alpha]^{<\aleph_0}$$

by setting $\pi(c) := (c \cap \beta_\epsilon, c \setminus \beta_\epsilon)$, where the representation $c = (c \cap \beta_\epsilon) \cup (c \setminus \beta_\epsilon)$ is the one given above. Since $|\alpha| < \kappa$ and $\kappa$ is infinite, we infer that $|[\alpha]^{<\aleph_0}| < \kappa$.

Then, by regularity of $\kappa$ and the fact that $|G_\beta| < \kappa$ for every ordinal $\beta \leq \alpha$, it follows that $|\Im(\pi)| < \kappa$. As $c = (c \cap \beta_\epsilon) \cup (c \setminus \beta_\epsilon)$ for every $c \in A_\alpha$, it is clear that $\pi$ is injective. Altogether, $|A_\alpha| < \kappa$, as sought.

Next, to verify that $\overline{D}$ satisfies the required hitting, consider any given sequence $\langle B_i \mid i < \theta \rangle$ of cofinal subsets of $\kappa$, and any given $S \in S$. Let $S^* \subseteq S$ be the stationary set witnessing the hitting of the original sequence $C$. We infer from the hypothesis that $S^* \subseteq E_{\geq \chi}^\kappa$ and we may assume that $S^* \subseteq \acc(\kappa)$. We shall show that the same set $S^*$ witnesses the hitting of $\overline{D}$. To that end, consider any $\alpha \in S^*$. Clause (1) of Definition [4.10] is automatically satisfied, since here $\nu = \kappa$, and we have already shown that $|D_\alpha| < \kappa$ for every $\alpha < \kappa$. Thus it remains to verify Clause (2).

Let $c \in D_\alpha$ and $i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\}$ be given. By Claim [4.38.1] we can fix some $D \subseteq C_{\alpha,i}$ and $\beta < \alpha$ such that $D \setminus \beta = c \setminus \beta$. By our choice of $\alpha$, applying Clause (2) of the hitting to $D$ of the original sequence $C$, we obtain

$$\sup\{\gamma \in D \mid \text{succ}(\gamma) \subseteq B_i\} = \alpha,$$

which, since the tails of $c$ and $D$ coincide, is equivalent to

$$\sup\{\gamma \in c \mid \text{succ}(\gamma) \subseteq B_i\} = \alpha,$$

thereby verifying Clause (2) for $c$ of the sequence $\overline{D}$, as sought.

4.6. **Indexed ladders.** Our proof of Theorem A will go through the following concept.

**Definition 4.39** ([Lam17b]). $\square^{\text{ind}}(\kappa, \mu)$ asserts the existence of a sequence $\langle C_{\alpha,i} \mid \alpha < \kappa, i(\alpha) \leq i < \mu \rangle$ such that for all $\alpha \in \acc(\kappa)$:

- $i(\alpha) < \mu$, and, for all $i \in [i(\alpha), \mu)$, $C_{\alpha,i}$ is a club in $\alpha$;
- for all $i \in [i(\alpha), \mu)$ and $\alpha \in \acc(C_{\alpha,i})$, $i \geq i(\alpha)$ and $C_{\alpha,i} \cap \alpha = C_{\alpha,i}^\mu$;
- $\langle C_{\alpha,i} \mid i(\alpha) \leq i < \mu \rangle$ is a $\subseteq$-increasing with $\acc(\alpha) = \bigcup_{i(i(\alpha))}^{\mu} \acc(C_{\alpha,i})$. 
and such that, for every club $D$ in $\kappa$, there exists $\alpha \in \text{acc}(D)$ such that $D \cap \alpha \neq C_{\alpha,i}$ for all $i \in [i(\alpha), \mu)$.

Motivated by the preceding definition, we introduce the following strengthening of $P_\kappa^-(\kappa, \mu^+, \subseteq, \ldots)$ (compare with Definition 4.2).

**Definition 4.40.** We say that $(\mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa)$ is a $P_\kappa^-(\kappa, \mu^\text{ind}, \subseteq, \ldots)$-sequence iff there exists a sequence $(i(\alpha) \mid \alpha < \kappa)$ of ordinals in $\mu$, and a club $\Gamma \subseteq \kappa$ such that, for every $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$, all of the following hold:

- $\mathcal{C}_\alpha \subseteq \{C \in \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \mid \text{otp}(C) \leq \xi \land \alpha_C = \alpha\}$;
- there exists a canonical enumeration $(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i} \mid i(\alpha) \leq i < \mu)$ of $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$;
- for all $i \in [i(\alpha), \mu)$ and $\bar{a} \in \text{acc}(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i})$, $i \geq i(\bar{a})$ and $C_{\alpha,i} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i}$;
- if $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\Gamma)$, then $(\text{acc}(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i})) \mid i(\alpha) \leq i < \mu$ is $\subseteq$-increasing with $\Gamma \cap \alpha \subseteq \bigcup_{i=i(\alpha)}^\mu \text{acc}(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i})$.

**Lemma 4.41.** Suppose that $(\mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa)$ is a $P_\kappa^-(\kappa, \mu^\text{ind}, \subseteq, \ldots)$-sequence satisfying that, for every club $D \subseteq \kappa$, there exists $\alpha \in \text{acc}(D)$ with $D \cap \alpha \notin \mathcal{C}_\alpha$.

If $\forall \alpha \leq \mu^+ < \kappa$, then for every stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$, there is a $P_\kappa^-(\kappa, \mu^\text{ind}, \subseteq, \ldots)$-sequence $(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^S \mid \alpha < \kappa)$ with the additional property that for every club $E \subseteq \kappa$, there exist stationarily many $\alpha \in S$ such that, for all $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha^S$, $\text{sup}(\text{acc}(C)) \cap E = \alpha$.

**Proof.** Fix a sequence $(i(\alpha) \mid \alpha < \kappa)$ of ordinals in $\mu$, and a club $\Gamma \subseteq \kappa$ as in Definition 4.40. For every club $D \subseteq \kappa$, we define a map $\Phi_D : \mathcal{K}(\kappa) \to \mathcal{K}(\kappa)$ via

$$\Phi_D(x) := \begin{cases} x \setminus \text{sup}(D \cap \text{sup}(x)) & \text{if } \text{sup}(D \cap \text{sup}(x)) < \text{sup}(x); \\ \text{sup}(D \cap \eta) & \text{if } \text{sup}(D \cap \text{sup}(x)) = \text{sup}(x). \end{cases}$$

By [BR19a] Lemma 2.2, $\Phi_D$ is a postprocessing function. Furthermore, by [BR19a] Claim 2.5.1, assuming $\forall \alpha \leq \mu^+ < \kappa$, we may fix a club $D \subseteq \kappa$ such that, for every club $E \subseteq \kappa$, there exists $\alpha \in S$ with $\text{sup}(\text{acc}(\Phi_D(C)) \cap E) = \alpha$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$. As this works for any club subset of $\kappa$, in fact, for every club $E \subseteq \kappa$, there exist stationarily many $\alpha \in S$ with $\text{sup}(\text{acc}(\Phi_D(C)) \cap E) = \alpha$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$.

For every $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$, set $\mathcal{C}_\alpha := \{\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i}^\Gamma \mid i(\alpha) \leq i < \mu\}$, where $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i}^\Gamma := \Phi_D(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i})$.

Clearly, $(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^S \mid \alpha < \kappa)$ is a $P_\kappa^-(\kappa, \mu^\text{ind}, \subseteq, \ldots)$-sequence. To see it is moreover a $P_\kappa^-(\kappa, \mu^\text{ind}, \subseteq, \ldots)$-sequence, let $\Gamma^S := D \cap \Gamma$, and note that, by definition of $\Phi_D$, for every $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\Gamma^S)$ and $i \geq i(\alpha)$, $\text{acc}(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i}^\Gamma) = \text{acc}(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i}) \cap \text{acc}(D)$. Consequently, for every $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\Gamma^S)$, $(\text{acc}(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i}^\Gamma)) \mid i(\alpha) \leq i < \mu$ is $\subseteq$-increasing with $\Gamma^S \cap \alpha \subseteq \bigcup_{i=i(\alpha)}^\mu \text{acc}(\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,i}^\Gamma)$. $\square$

**Fact 4.42** ([LL18] Theorem 3.4). If $\square(\kappa)$ holds, then so does $\square^{\text{ind}}(\kappa, \mu)$ for every $\mu \in \text{Reg}(\kappa)$.

**Theorem 4.43.** Suppose that $\kappa = \lambda^+ = 2^\lambda$ and $\square(\lambda^+)$ holds. For every pair $\mu \leq \chi$ of infinite regular cardinals with $\lambda^\chi = \lambda$, $P^-\chi(\kappa, \mu^\text{ind}, \subseteq, 1, \{E^\chi_\kappa\}, \mu^+)$ holds.

**Proof.** Suppose $\mu \leq \chi$ is a pair as above. By Fact 4.2 $\square^{\text{ind}}(\kappa, \mu)$ holds, so that the hypothesis of Lemma 4.41 is satisfied. Consequently, we may fix a $P^-\chi(\kappa, \mu^\text{ind}, \subseteq, \ldots)$-sequence $(\mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa)$ with the additional property that, for every club $D \subseteq \kappa$, there exist stationarily many $\alpha \in E^\chi_\kappa$, such that $\text{sup}(\text{acc}(C) \cap D) = \alpha$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$.

Assuming $\lambda^\chi = \lambda$, there exists a sequence $(f_j \mid j < \lambda)$ of functions from $\lambda^+$ to $\lambda$ with the property that, for every $z \in [\lambda^+]^\chi$ and every function $f : z \to \lambda$, there exists $j < \lambda$ with $f \subseteq f_j$. Consequently, we may fix a sequence $(f_j \mid j < \lambda)$ of...
functions from $\lambda^+$ to $\lambda^+$ with the property that, for every $z \in [\lambda^+]^\chi$ and every regressive function $f : z \to \lambda^+$, there exists $j < \lambda$ with $f \subseteq j$.

Fix a bijection $\pi : \lambda^+ \leftrightarrow \lambda^+$. For every $j < \lambda$, define a martix $\tau^j = \{x^j_{\gamma, \beta} \mid \gamma < \beta < \kappa\}$ via:

$$x^j_{\gamma, \beta} := \begin{cases} \{\pi(f_j(\beta))(j), \beta\} \setminus (\gamma + 1), & \text{if } \beta \in \text{acc}(\kappa); \\ \{\beta\}, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

and then consider the corresponding acc-preserving postprocessing function $\Phi_{\tau^j}$ given by Lemma 4.3. Denote $C_\alpha^\beta := \{\Phi_{\tau^j}(C) \mid C \in C_\alpha\}$, so that, for every $j < \lambda$, $\check{C}^\beta := \langle C_\alpha^\beta \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ is yet again a $P^-(\kappa, \mu^+, \bigcup_{\cdots})$-sequence.

**Claim 4.43.1.** There is $j < \lambda$ such that $\check{C}^\beta$ witnesses $P^-(\kappa, \mu^+, \bigcup_{\cdots}, \{E^\chi_{\gamma}\}, \mu^+, 1)$.

**Proof.** Suppose not. Then, for every $j < \lambda$, there exists a cofinal subset $B_j \subseteq \kappa$ such that, for all $\alpha \in E^\chi_{\gamma}$, there exists $C \in C_\alpha^\beta$ for which $\sup(\text{nacc}(C) \cap B_j) < \alpha$.

Now, let $g : \kappa \to \kappa$ denote the unique function to satisfy that, for every $\gamma < \kappa$:

$$g(\gamma) = \delta \iff \bigwedge_{j < \lambda} \left(\pi(\delta)(j) = \min(B_j \setminus \gamma + 1)\right).$$

Fix a club $E \subseteq \text{acc}(\kappa)$ such that, for all $\beta \in E$ and $\gamma < \beta$,

$$\sup\{g(\gamma), \min(B_j \setminus \gamma + 1) \mid j < \lambda\} < \beta.$$ 

By the choice of $C$, let us now fix $\alpha \in E^\chi_{\gamma}$ such that $\sup(\text{nacc}(C) \cap E) = \alpha$ for all $C \in C_\alpha$. As $|C_\alpha| \leq \chi = \text{cf}(\alpha)$, we may find a sequence $\langle z_C \mid C \in C_\alpha\rangle$ of pairwise disjoint sets such that, for all $C \in C_\alpha$, $z_C$ is a cofinal subset of $\text{nacc}(C) \cap E \setminus \{\min(C)\}$. Now, let $z := \bigcup_{C \in C_\alpha} z_C$. Define a function $f : z \to \lambda^+$ as follows.

For all $\beta \in z$, find the unique $C \in C_\alpha$ such that $\beta \in z_C$ and then let $f(\beta) := g(\gamma)$, for $\gamma := \sup(C \cap \beta)$. Note that as $\beta \in z \subseteq \text{nacc}(C) \cap E \setminus \{\min(C)\}$, $\gamma < \beta$ and hence also $f(\beta) < \beta$. That is, $f$ is regressive.

Pick $j < \lambda$ such that $f_j \subseteq f$. By the choice of $B_j$, let us now pick $C^* \in C_\alpha^\beta$ such that $\epsilon := \sup(\text{nacc}(C^*) \cap B_j)$ is smaller than $\alpha$. Find $C \in C_\alpha$ such that $C^* = \Phi_{\tau^j}(C)$. Pick a large enough $\beta \in z_C$ for which $\gamma := \sup(C \cap \beta)$ is greater than $\epsilon$. Let $\eta := \pi(f_j(\beta))(\eta)$. As $\gamma \in E$, we have that

$$\eta = \pi(f_j(\beta))(\eta) = \pi(g(\gamma))(\eta) = \min(B_j \setminus \gamma + 1) < \beta,$$

and hence $x^j_{\gamma, \beta} = \{\tau, \beta\}$. Recalling the definition of $\Phi_{\tau^j}$ from Lemma 4.3, we see that $\eta \in \text{nacc}(C^*)$ contradicting the fact that $\eta \in B_j \setminus (\epsilon + 1)$.

As $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$ and $\lambda^\mu = \lambda$, [Gre76] Lemma 2.1 entails that $\Diamond(\kappa)$ holds. Recalling Fact 3.6 and Corollary 4.11 it follows that $P^-(\kappa, \mu^+, \bigcup, 1, \{E^\chi_{\gamma}\}, \mu^+, 1)$ holds, as sought.

**5. Departing from $\Diamond$**

As seen in Section 3, instances of $P^-(\kappa, \ldots)$ together with $\Diamond(\kappa)$ suffice for the construction of a $\kappa$-Souslin tree. For this, in [BR17a, Definition 1.6], we defined the principle $P(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \mathcal{S}, \nu, \sigma)$ to assert both $P^-(\kappa, \mu^+, \bigcup_{\cdots})$ and $\Diamond(\kappa)$, and then, in that paper as well as other papers in this project, we presented a gallery of constructions of $\kappa$-Souslin trees having various additional features as applications of the principle $P(\kappa, \ldots)$.

The goal of this section is to present a principle $P^*(\kappa, \ldots)$ which is strong enough to still allow all of the said constructions, and weak enough to not rely on $\Diamond$. Note, however, that assuming $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$, $P^-(\kappa, \infty, \ldots, \sigma)$ with $\sigma \geq \omega$ implies $\Diamond(\kappa)$; hence, one should really only focus on the case $\sigma = \omega$. For this, we shall adopt
Convention [4.10] at the outset, and will always omit the mention of $\sigma$. We shall prove the following, which is a special case $\mathcal{R} := \subseteq$ of Corollary [5.13]

**Corollary 5.1.** Suppose $\theta > 0$. Then $P^\kappa_\chi(\kappa, \mu, \subseteq, \theta, S, \nu)$ iff $P^\kappa_\chi(\kappa, \mu, \subseteq, \theta, S, \nu)$ and $(\kappa^\kappa = \kappa)$.

**Definition 5.2.** Let $F(\kappa) := \bigcup_{x \in K(\kappa)} x H_x$ denote the collection of all functions from an element of $K(\kappa)$ to $H_x$.

For each $C \in F(\kappa)$, denote $\hat{C} := \text{dom}(C)$ and $\alpha_C := \text{sup}(\hat{C})$.

**Example 5.3.** For any $C \in F(\kappa)$, $\hat{C}$ is an element of $K(\kappa)$. Going in the other direction, for every sequence $\langle A_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ of elements of $H_\kappa$, for any $x \in K(\kappa)$, $C_x := \langle A_\beta \mid \beta < x \rangle$ is an element of $F(\kappa)$.

For a binary relation $\mathcal{R}$ over $F(\kappa)$, and a nonempty collection $S$ of stationary subsets of $\kappa$, we shall define a principle $P^\kappa_\chi(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, S, \nu)$ in two stages. In the first stage, we focus on the first four parameters.

**Definition 5.4.** We say that $\langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is a $P^\kappa_\chi(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \ldots)$-sequence iff, for every $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$, all of the following hold:

- $C_\alpha \subseteq \{ C \in F(\kappa) \mid \text{otp}(\hat{C}) \leq \xi \land \alpha_C = \alpha \}$;
- $0 < |C_\alpha| < \mu$;
- For all $C \in C_\alpha$ and $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\hat{C})$, there exists $D \in C_\alpha$ with $D \mathcal{R} C$.

Convention 5.5. We shall always assume that $C_0 := \{ \emptyset \}$ and $C_{\alpha+1} := \{ \{(\alpha, \emptyset)\} \}$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$. Likewise, whenever we construct a $P^\kappa_\chi(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \ldots)$-sequence $\langle D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$, we shall never bother to define $D_0$ and $D_{\alpha+1}$ for $\alpha < \kappa$. We also adopt Conventions [4.13] [4.10] and [4.13].

**Example 5.6.** The binary relations over $F(\kappa)$ that fit as the parameter $\mathcal{R}$ should be understood as coherence relations. The basic example is the end-extension relation, $\subseteq$, where, for $C, D \in F(\kappa)$, we define $C \subseteq D$ iff $C = D \upharpoonright \alpha_C$. More nuanced binary relations over $F(\kappa)$ are obtained by modifying the $\subseteq$ relation as follows:

- We define $C \subseteq^* D$ iff there exists $\gamma < \alpha_C$ such that $C \upharpoonright (\hat{C} \setminus \gamma) \subseteq D \mathcal{R} (D \setminus \gamma)$;
- For $\mathcal{R} \in \{ \subseteq, \subseteq^* \}$, we define $C \mathcal{R} D$ iff $((C \mathcal{R} D) \mathcal{R} D)$ or $\text{cf}(\alpha_C) < \chi$;
- We define $C \subseteq^*_\chi D$ iff $((C \subseteq D) \mathcal{R} (\text{otp}(D) < \chi$ and $\text{nacc}(D)$ consists only of successor ordinals$)$;
- For $\mathcal{R} \in \{ \subseteq, \subseteq^*, \subseteq^*_\chi, \subseteq^*_\chi, \subseteq^*_\omega, \subseteq^*_\omega \}$ and a class $\Omega \subseteq \text{ORD}$, we define $C \mathcal{R} D$ iff $((C \mathcal{R} D) \mathcal{R} D)$ and $(\alpha_C \notin \Omega)$.

The principle $P^-_\kappa(\kappa, \ldots)$ of the previous section (Definition [4.10]) dealt with hitting of arbitrary cofinal subsets of $\kappa$. The new principle $P^\kappa_\chi(\kappa, \ldots)$ focuses on hitting sets of the sort arising by Proposition [2.12] and by the following strengthening of Fact [2.13].

**Fact 5.7 ([BR17a], Lemma 2.2).** $\Diamond(\kappa)$ is equivalent to the existence of a sequence $\langle A_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ of elements of $H_\kappa$ and a partition $\langle B_\iota \mid \iota < \kappa \rangle$ of $\kappa$, such that, for every subset $\Omega \subseteq H_\kappa$, every parameter $p \in H_\kappa^+$, and every $\iota < \kappa$, the following set is cofinal in $\kappa$:

\[ B_\iota(\Omega, p) := \{ \beta \in B_\iota \mid \exists M \prec H_\kappa^+(M \cap \Omega = A_\beta \land p \in M \land M \cap \kappa = \beta) \}. \]

As the reader by now probably expects, the cofinal sets considered by $P^\kappa_\chi(\kappa, \ldots)$ take the following form.

**Definition 5.8.** Given $B \subseteq \kappa$, $\Omega \subseteq H_\kappa$, $p \in H_\kappa^+$ and $C \in F(\kappa)$, we let $B(\Omega, p, C)$ denote the set of all $\beta \in B \cap \hat{C}$ such that there exists an elementary submodel $M \prec H_\kappa^+$ satisfying:
• \( p \in \mathcal{M} \);
• \( \mathcal{M} \cap \kappa = \beta \);
• \( \mathcal{M} \cap \Omega = C(\beta) \).

We now arrive at the second stage of the definition of this principle.

**Definition 5.9.** \( P_0^*(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu) \) asserts the existence of a \( P_0^*(\kappa, \mu, R, \ldots) \)-sequence \( (C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa) \) and a partition \( \langle B_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle \) of \( \kappa \), satisfying the following.

For every sequence \( \langle (\Omega_i, p_i, t_i) \mid i < \theta \rangle \) of elements of \( P(H_\kappa) \times H_{\kappa+1} \times \kappa \), every \( S \in \mathcal{S}, \) and every \( \eta < \omega \), there exist stationarily many \( \alpha \in S \) such that:

1. \( |C_\alpha| < \nu \); and
2. for all \( C \in C_\alpha \) and \( i < \min \{ \alpha, \theta \} \),

\[ \sup \{ \gamma \in \check{C} \mid \text{acc}(\check{C} \setminus \gamma) \subseteq B_i(\Omega_i, p_i, C) \} = \alpha. \]

Before we prove the main result of this section, let us point out that \( P_0^*(\kappa, \ldots) \) is indeed a consequence of \( P(\kappa, \ldots) \).

**Proposition 5.10.** Suppose that \( P_0^*(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu) \) + \( \Diamond(\kappa) \) holds, with \( R \) from Example 5.7. Then so does \( P_0^*(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu) \).

**Proof.** Let \( (C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa) \) be a \( P_0^*(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu) \)-sequence. As \( \Diamond(\kappa) \) holds, let \( \langle A_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle \) and \( \langle B_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle \) be given by Fact 5.7.

For every \( \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha \), let \( D_\alpha := \{ A_\beta \mid \beta \in \check{C}_\alpha \} \). Then, for every \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \), let \( D_\alpha := \{ D_\beta \mid x \in C_\alpha \} \). Evidently, \( \langle D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \) and \( \langle B_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle \) together witness \( P_0^*(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu) \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.11.** If \( P_0^*(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu) \) holds with \( \theta > 0 \), then \( \kappa_{<\kappa} = \kappa \).

**Proof.** Let \( \check{C} = (C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa) \) be a sequence that, together with some partition \( \langle B_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle \) of \( \kappa \), witnesses \( P_0^*(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu) \) with \( \theta > 0 \).

**Claim 5.11.1.** \( H_\kappa = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)} \bigcup_{C \in C_\alpha} \text{Im}(C) \).

**Proof.** We focus on the nontrivial inclusion. Let \( A \in H_\kappa \). Set \( \Omega_0 := p_0 := A, \quad t_0 := 0, \) and \( n := 1 \). Then by the hypothesis on the sequence \( \check{C} \), we can choose some \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \) such that for all \( C \in C_\alpha \), Equation 5.13 holds with \( i := 0 \). Choose some \( C \in C_\alpha \) and some \( \beta \in \text{acc}(\check{C}) \cap B_0(A, A, C) \). Then we can fix an elementary submodel \( \mathcal{M} \prec H_\kappa \) such that \( A \in \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M} \cap \kappa = \beta \), and \( \mathcal{M} \cap A = C(\beta) \). But \( |A| < \kappa \) and \( |A| \in \mathcal{M} \) by elementarity, so that \( |A| \in \mathcal{M} \cap \kappa = \beta \), and we infer that \( A \subseteq \mathcal{M} \). Thus, \( A = A \cap \mathcal{M} = C(\beta) \in \text{Im}(C) \).

In particular, \( |H_\kappa| = \kappa \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.12.** Suppose \( R \) is taken from Example 5.7. Then \( P_0^*(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu) \) implies \( P_0^*(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu) \).

**Proof.** For every \( C \in \mathcal{F}(\kappa) \), let \( x_C := \text{Im}(g_C) \), where the function \( g_C : \check{C} \to \alpha_C \) is defined by setting

\[ g_C(\beta) := \begin{cases} \min((C(\beta) \cup \{ \beta \}) \cap (\text{sup}(\check{C} \cap \beta), \beta)), & \text{if } \beta \in \text{nacc}(\check{C}) \cap \text{acc}(\kappa) \smallsetminus \text{acc}(\check{C}); \\ \beta, & \text{if } \beta \in \text{acc}(\check{C}) \cup \text{nacc}(\kappa). \end{cases} \]

**Claim 5.12.1.** For all \( C, C' \in \mathcal{F}(\kappa) \):

1. \( x_C \) is a club in \( \alpha_C \) with \( \text{acc}(x_C) = \text{acc}(\check{C}) \).
2. If \( \mathcal{R} C' \) then \( x_C \mathcal{R} x_{C'} \).

**Proof.** Left to the reader (cf. Lemma 5.9). \( \square \)
Fix a sequence $\vec{C} = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ and a partition $\vec{B} = \langle B_\iota \mid \iota < \kappa \rangle$ of $\kappa$ together witnessing $P_\kappa^* (\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \mathcal{S}, \nu)$. Then, for every $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$, let $D_\alpha = \{ x \in C \mid C \in C_\alpha \}$. It follows from Claim 5.12.1 that $\vec{D} := \langle D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is a $P_*^\kappa (\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \ldots)$-sequence. To show that $\vec{D}$ witnesses $P_*^\kappa (\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \mathcal{S}, \nu)$, we shall now verify that it satisfies the hitting feature of Definition 4.10 recalling Convention 4.19.

Claim 5.12.2. Suppose $S \in S$ and $\langle A_\iota \mid \iota < \theta \rangle$ is a sequence of cofinal subsets of $\kappa$. Then there exist stationarily many $\alpha \in S$ such that $|D_\alpha| < \nu$ and, for all $x \in D_\alpha$ and all $i < \min \{ \alpha, \theta \}$, $\sup \{ \delta \in x \mid \text{succ}_2(x \setminus \delta) \subseteq A_i \} = \alpha$.

Proof. For every $i < \theta$, let $\Omega_i := p_i := A_i$ and $i_0 := 0$. Let $n := 3$. By the choice of $\vec{C}$ and $\vec{B}$, there are stationarily many $\alpha \in S \cap \text{acc}(\kappa)$ such that $|C_\alpha| < \mu$ and, for all $C \in C_\alpha$ and all $i < \min \{ \alpha, \theta \}$, $\sup \{ \gamma \in \vec{C} \mid \text{succ}_2(C \setminus \gamma) \subseteq B_0(A_i, A_i, C) \} = \alpha$. Consider any such $\alpha$. Clearly, $|D_\alpha| \leq |C_\alpha| < \nu$. Now, consider any given $x \in D_\alpha$, $i < \min \{ \alpha, \theta \}$, and $\varepsilon < \alpha$. By definition of $D_\alpha$, we can fix some $C \in C_\alpha$ such that $x = x_C$. By our choice of $\alpha$, we can fix $\gamma \in \vec{C}$ with $\varepsilon < \gamma < \alpha$ such that $\text{succ}_2(C \setminus \gamma) \subseteq B_0(A_i, A_i, C)$.

Consider each $j < 3$. Set $\beta_j := (\vec{C} \setminus \gamma)(j + 1)$. Then $\beta_j \in B_0(A_i, A_i, C)$, meaning that we can fix an elementary submodel $M_j \prec H_{\alpha+1}$ satisfying $A_i \in M_j$, $M_j \cap \kappa = \beta_j$, and $M_j \cap \alpha = C(\beta_j)$. As $A_i$ is a cofinal subset of $\kappa$, it follows by elementarity that $M_j \models " A_i$ is a cofinal subset of $\kappa", so that in fact $C(\beta_j)$ is a cofinal subset of $\beta_j$. Of course, $\beta_j \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$. Thus, as $\beta_j \in \text{nacc}(\vec{C})$, we infer from the definition of $g_{\vec{C}}$ that $g_{\vec{C}}(\beta_j) \in C(\beta_j) \subseteq A_i$.

It is clear that $\gamma, \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2$ are four consecutive points of $\vec{C}$. Altogether, we infer from the definition of $x_C$ that $g_{\vec{C}}(\beta_0), g_{\vec{C}}(\beta_1), g_{\vec{C}}(\beta_2)$ are three consecutive points of $x_C$, all above $\gamma$. Letting $\delta := g_{\vec{C}}(\beta_0)$, we obtain $\varepsilon < \gamma < \delta$, $\delta \in x$, and $\text{succ}_2(x \setminus \delta) \subseteq A_i$, as sought. $\square$

It follows that $\vec{D}$ is as sought. $\square$

We now improve Proposition 5.10 in two ways. First, we reduce $\diamondsuit(\kappa)$ down to $\kappa^{< \kappa} = \kappa$. Second, and more surprisingly, we let our reader choose the partition of $\kappa$.

Theorem 5.13. Suppose that $\kappa^{< \kappa} = \kappa$ and $P_*^\kappa (\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \mathcal{S}, \nu)$ holds with $\mathcal{R}$ from Example 5.6. Suppose $\vec{B} = \langle B_\iota \mid \iota < \kappa \rangle$ is a given partition of $\kappa$ into stationary sets. Then there exists a sequence $\langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ that, together with $\vec{B}$, witnesses $P_*^\kappa (\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \mathcal{S}, \nu)$.

Proof. Using $\kappa^{< \kappa} = \kappa$, let $\prec$ be some well-ordering of $\kappa$. Also, fix a sequence $\vec{A} = \langle A_\gamma \mid \gamma < \kappa \rangle$ of elements of $\kappa$ such that:

- for each $\gamma \in \text{nacc}(\kappa)$, $A_\gamma = \emptyset$, and
- for all $\iota < \kappa$ and $A \in H_\kappa$, $\{ \gamma \in B_\iota \mid A_\gamma = A \}$ is stationary in $\kappa$.

For every $\gamma < \kappa$, let $\beta_\gamma := \text{otp}(A_\gamma, <)$. $\square$

Claim 5.13.1. Let $\iota < \kappa$, $\Omega \in [H_\kappa]^\kappa$ and $p \in H_{\kappa^+}$. There exists $G \subseteq \kappa$ such that $\{ \beta_\gamma \mid \gamma \in G \}$ is cofinal in $\kappa$, and, for every $\gamma \in G$, there exists an elementary submodel $M \prec H_{\kappa^+}$ such that:

$p \in M$, $M \cap \kappa = \beta_\gamma$, $M \cap \Omega = A_\gamma$, and $\beta_\gamma \in B_\iota \cap \gamma$.

Proof. Let $\epsilon < \kappa$ be arbitrary; we shall exhibit the existence of an ordinal $\gamma < \kappa$ with $\beta_\gamma > \epsilon$ satisfying all the four requirements.

As $B_\iota$ is stationary, we may pick $M \prec H_{\kappa^+}$ with $p < , \Omega \in M$ such that $M \cap \kappa \in B_\iota \setminus (\epsilon + 1)$. Denote $\beta := M \cap \kappa$. As $\prec \in M$, we infer that $|M \cap H_\kappa| = |\beta| < \kappa$, so
that \( M \cap \Omega \in H_\kappa \). Thus, by the choice of \( \vec{A} \), let us fix \( \gamma > \beta \) such that \( M \cap \Omega = A_\gamma \).

Finally, as \( H_\kappa = \text{otp}(\Omega) = \kappa \), we infer that \( \beta_\gamma = \text{otp}(A_\gamma) = \text{otp}(M \cap \Omega, <\kappa) = \kappa^M = \beta \).

Define \( c : [\kappa]^2 \to \kappa \) by letting, for all \( \delta < \gamma < \kappa \),

\[
c(\delta, \gamma) := \begin{cases} 
  \beta_\gamma, & \text{if } \beta_\gamma \in \{\delta, \gamma\}; \\
  \gamma, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

Let \( x \in K(\kappa) \) be arbitrary. We define an element \( C_x \) of \( F(\kappa) \), as follows:

- \( \text{dom}(C_x) := \text{acc}(x) \cup \{c(\sup(x \setminus \gamma), \gamma) \mid \gamma \in \text{nacc}(x) \text{ and } \gamma \neq \min(x)\} \)
- for all \( \beta \in \text{dom}(C_x) \), we let \( C_x(\beta) := \text{min}(x \setminus \beta) \).

Claim 5.13.2. For all \( x, y \in K(\kappa) \):

1. \( \text{dom}(C_x) \) is a club in \( \sup(x) \) with \( \text{acc}(\text{dom}(C_x)) = \text{acc}(x) \)
2. If \( x R y \), then \( C_x \not R C_y \).

Proof. Let to the reader.

Recalling Convention \[4.13\] and applying the third bullet of Corollary \[4.17\] fix a sequence \( \vec{D} = \{D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\} \) witnessing \( P^{\vec{\kappa}}(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu, <\omega) \). Then, for every \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \), let \( C_\alpha := \{C_x \mid x \in D_\alpha\} \).

Claim 5.13.3. Suppose that \( S \in S \) and \( \langle (\Omega_i, p_i, t_i) \mid i < \theta \rangle \) is a sequence of elements of \( P(H_\kappa) \times H_\kappa \times \kappa \), and \( n \) is a positive integer. Then there exist stationarily many \( \alpha \in S \) such that \( |C_\alpha| < \nu \) and, for every \( C \in C_\alpha \) and \( i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\} \),

\[
\sup\{\beta \in C \mid \text{succ}_\alpha(C \setminus \beta) \subseteq B_n(\Omega_i, p_i, C)\} = \alpha.
\]

Proof. Let \( i < \theta \) be arbitrary.

\( \triangleright \) If \( |\Omega_i| = \kappa \), then, by Claim 5.13.1, we may fix a cofinal subset \( G_i \subseteq \kappa \) such that, for every \( \gamma \in G_i \), there exists an elementary submodel \( M \prec H_\kappa \), such that:

\[
p_i \in M, \quad M \cap \kappa = \beta_\gamma, \quad \beta_\gamma \in B_i \cap \gamma, \quad \text{and } G_i \cap \gamma = G_i \cap \beta_\gamma.
\]

\( \triangleright \) If \( |\Omega_i| < \kappa \), then as \( \{\gamma \in B_i \mid A_\gamma = \Omega_i\} \) is stationary, we may fix a cofinal subset \( G_i \subseteq \kappa \) such that, for every \( \gamma \in G_i \), there exists an elementary submodel \( M \prec H_\kappa \), such that:

\[
p_i \in M, \quad M \cap \kappa \subseteq \gamma, \quad \Omega_i = A_\gamma, \quad \text{and } \gamma \in B_i.
\]

Next, fix a club \( E \subseteq \kappa \) with the property that, for every \( \alpha \in E \) and \( i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\} \), if \( |\Omega_i| < \kappa \), then \( \text{otp}(\Omega_i, <\alpha) < \alpha \). By the choice of \( \vec{D} \), we may find a stationary \( S' \subseteq S \cap E \) such that, for every \( \alpha \in S' \), \( |D_\alpha| < \nu \) and, for all \( x \in D_\alpha \) and \( i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\} \):

\[
\sup\{\gamma \in x \mid \text{succ}_{n+1}(x \setminus \gamma) \subseteq G_i\} = \alpha.
\]

Let \( \alpha \in S' \) be arbitrary. Clearly, \( |C_\alpha| \leq |D_\alpha| < \nu \). Fix \( x \in D_\alpha \) and \( i < \min\{\alpha, \theta\} \); we need to prove that for every \( \epsilon < \alpha \), there exists \( \beta \in \vec{C}_\alpha \setminus \epsilon \) with

\[
\text{succ}_\alpha(\vec{C}_\alpha \setminus \beta) \subseteq B_n(\Omega_i, p_i, C_x).
\]

As \( \alpha \in S' \), let us fix a large enough \( \gamma \in x \setminus \epsilon \) such that \( \text{succ}_{n+1}(x \setminus \gamma) \subseteq G_i \). If \( |\Omega_i| < \kappa \), then we also require that \( \text{otp}(\Omega_i, <\gamma) \leq \gamma \), which is possible since \( \alpha \in E \).

Let \( \{\gamma_j \mid j < n + 1\} \) denote the increasing enumeration of \( \text{succ}_{n+1}(x \setminus \gamma) \). Set \( \beta := c(\gamma, \gamma_0) \), so that \( \beta \in \vec{C}_\alpha \setminus \epsilon \) and \( \text{succ}_\alpha(\vec{C}_\alpha \setminus \beta) = \{c(\gamma_j, \gamma_{j+1}) \mid j < n\} \).

Fix an arbitrary \( j < n \), and we shall show that \( c(\gamma_j, \gamma_{j+1}) \in B_n(\Omega_i, p_i, C_x) \).

\( \triangleright \) If \( |\Omega_i| = \kappa \), then as \( \gamma_{j+1} \in G_i \), pick \( M \prec H_\kappa \) such that:

- \( p_i \in M \);
- \( M \cap \kappa = \beta_{\gamma_{j+1}} \);
- \( M \cap \Omega_i = A_{\gamma_{j+1}} \);
• $\beta_{j+1} \in B_i \cap \gamma_{j+1}$;
• $G_i \cap \gamma_{j+1} = G_i \cap \beta_{j+1}$.

By the last two bullets, $\gamma_j < \beta_{j+1} < \gamma_{j+1}$, so that $c(\gamma_j, \gamma_{j+1}) = \beta_{j+1}$. Furthermore, $\beta_{j+1}$ is the unique element of the interval $C_x \cap (\gamma_j, \gamma_{j+1})$, so that $C_x(\beta_{j+1}) = A_{\min(x, \beta_{j+1})} = A_{\gamma_{j+1}} = \mathcal{M} \cap \Omega_i$. Altogether, $\mathcal{M}$ witnesses that $c(\gamma_j, \gamma_{j+1}) \in B_i(\Omega_i, p_i, C_x)$.

If $|\Omega_i| < \kappa$, then as $\gamma_{j+1} \in G_i$, pick $\mathcal{M} < H_{\kappa^+}$ such that:
• $p_i, \Omega_i \in \mathcal{M}$;
• $\mathcal{M} \cap \kappa = \gamma_{j+1}$;
• $\Omega_i = A_{\gamma_{j+1}}$;
• $\gamma_{j+1} \in B_i$.

As $\beta_{j+1} = \text{otp}(A_{\gamma_{j+1}}) = \text{otp}(\Omega_i, c) \leq \gamma < \gamma_j < \gamma_{j+1}$, we infer that $\mathcal{M} \cap \Omega_i = \Omega_i = A_{\gamma_{j+1}}$ and $c(\gamma_j, \gamma_{j+1}) = \gamma_{j+1}$. In particular, $C_x(\gamma_{j+1}) = A_{\min(x, \gamma_{j+1})} = A_{\gamma_{j+1}} = \mathcal{M} \cap \Omega_i$. Altogether, $\mathcal{M}$ witnesses that $c(\gamma_j, \gamma_{j+1}) \in B_i(\Omega_i, p_i, C_x)$.

It follows that $\langle \alpha | \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is as sought.

Combining the last three results, we obtain:

**Corollary 5.14.** Suppose that $\theta > 0$, and $\mathcal{R}$ is taken from Example 5.3. Then $P^\kappa(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, S, \nu) \text{ is equivalent to } P^\kappa(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, S, \nu)$ and $(\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa)$.

The following combines Definition 4.40 with Definition 5.9.

**Definition 5.15.** $P^\kappa(\kappa, \mu^\text{ind}, \subseteq, \theta, S, \nu)$ asserts the existence of sequences $\vec{C} = \langle C_\alpha | \alpha < \kappa \rangle$, $\vec{B} = \langle B_i | i < \kappa \rangle$, $\langle i(\alpha) | \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ and a club $\Gamma \subseteq \kappa$ such that, for every $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)$, all of the following hold:
• $C_\alpha \subseteq \{ C \in F(\kappa) | \text{otp}(C) \leq \xi \& \alpha_C = \alpha \}$;
• there exists a canonical enumeration $\langle C_{\alpha,i} | i(\alpha) \leq i < \mu \rangle$ of $C_\alpha$;
• for all $i \in [i(\alpha), \mu)$ and $\bar{\alpha} \in \text{acc}(C_{\alpha,i})$, $i \geq i(\bar{\alpha})$ and $C_{\alpha,i} \subseteq C_{\alpha,i}$;
• if $\alpha \in \text{acc}(\Gamma)$, then $\langle \text{acc}(C_{\alpha,i}) | i(\alpha) \leq i < \mu \rangle$ is $\subseteq$-increasing with $\Gamma \cap \alpha \subseteq \bigcup_{i=i(\alpha)}^{\mu} \text{acc}(C_{\alpha,i})$.
• $\vec{C}$ and $\vec{B}$ together witness $P^\kappa(\kappa, \mu^+, \subseteq, \theta, S, \nu)$.

The proofs in this section make clear that the following holds as well.

**Corollary 5.16.** Suppose that $\theta > 0$. Then $P^\kappa(\kappa, \mu^\text{ind}, \subseteq, \theta, S, \nu)$ is equivalent to $P^\kappa(\kappa, \mu^+, \subseteq, \theta, S, \nu) \text{ and } (\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa)$.

### 6. TREE CONSTRUCTIONS

In this section, we present various constructions from instances of the proxy principle $P^\kappa(\kappa, \ldots)$. The next table summarizes the kind of $\kappa$-Souslin trees we obtain from the instance $P^\kappa(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \{ S \}, \nu)$. Of course, for the $\chi$-complete trees, we must also assume that $\kappa$ is $(\chi\chi)$-closed, e.g., assume that $\chi = \aleph_0$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorem</th>
<th>$\mu$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{R}$</th>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$S$</th>
<th>$\nu$</th>
<th>Type of $\kappa$-Souslin tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$\chi^+ \subseteq \kappa$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$E_{\geq\chi}^\kappa$</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$\chi$-complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>$\mu^\text{ind}$</td>
<td>$\chi^+ \subseteq \kappa$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$E_{\geq\chi}^\kappa$</td>
<td>$\mu^+$</td>
<td>$\chi$-complete with a $\mu$-ascent path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$\chi^+ \subseteq \kappa$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$E_{\geq\max(\chi, \lambda)}^\kappa$</td>
<td>$2^\star$</td>
<td>$\chi$-complete with no $&lt;\lambda$-ascent path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$\chi^+ \subseteq \kappa$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$E_{\geq\max(\chi, \lambda)}^\kappa$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\chi$-complete with no $&lt;\lambda$-ascent path, rigid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$\chi^+ \subseteq \kappa$</td>
<td>$E_{\geq\chi}^\kappa$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$\chi$-complete, $\chi$-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$\chi^+ \subseteq \kappa$</td>
<td>$E_{\geq\chi}^\kappa$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$\chi$-complete and uniformly homogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\chi^+ \subseteq \kappa$</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>uniformly coherent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theorem 6.1.  

(1) \( \diamond \omega_1 \) entails \( \mathbf{P}^*(\omega_1, 2, 1, \omega_1, \{ \omega_1 \}, 2) \). More generally, for an infinite regular cardinal \( \lambda \), \( \diamond (E_\lambda^+ \setminus \{ \omega_1 \}) \) entails \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, 1, \{ \lambda^+ \}, 2) \).

(2) For a singular cardinal \( \lambda \), GCH + \( \square (\lambda^+ \setminus \omega_1) \) entails \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, 1, \{ \lambda^+ \}, 2) \).

(3) For an infinite cardinal \( \lambda \), \( \square \lambda \) entails \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, 1, \{ \lambda^+ \}, 2) \).

(4) For a regular uncountable cardinal \( \lambda \) satisfying \( \lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda \), after forcing to add a single Cohen subset of \( \lambda \), \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, 1, \{ \lambda^+ \}, 2) \) holds.

(5) If \( V = L \) and \( \kappa \) is not weakly compact, then \( \mathbf{P}^*(\kappa, 1, \kappa, 2) \) holds for \( \mathbf{S} := \{ E_\kappa^+ \mid \chi \in \text{Reg}(\kappa) \} \) and \( \kappa \) is \( (\kappa^+) \)-closed.

(6) For \( \kappa = \lambda^+ \) and regular cardinals \( \mu \leq \chi \) with \( \chi = \lambda \), \( \square^+ (\kappa, \mu) + \text{CH}_\lambda \) entails \( \mathbf{P}^*(\kappa, \mu, 1, 1, \{ E_\kappa^+ \}, 2) \).

(7) For a regular uncountable cardinal \( \lambda \), if GCH holds and there exists a non-reflecting stationary subset of \( E_\lambda^+ \), then \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 1, \{ \lambda^+ \}, 2) \) holds, and so does \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, \lambda^+ \setminus \omega_1, \{ \lambda^+ \}, 2) \).

(8) For a singular cardinal \( \lambda \), if \( \square \lambda \) holds and there is a non-reflecting stationary subset of \( E_\lambda^+ \), then \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, \mu, 1, \{ \lambda^+ \}, 2) \) holds.

(9) For a regular uncountable cardinal \( \lambda \) satisfying \( \lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda \) and \( \text{CH}_\lambda \), after forcing with a \( \lambda^+ \)-cc notion of forcing, \( \mathbf{P}^*(\kappa, \omega_1, \kappa, \Delta, \lambda^+, \{ \lambda^+ \}, 2) \) holds.

(10) For an uncountable cardinal \( \lambda \), \( \square (\lambda^+) + \text{GCH} \) implies \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, 1, \{ E_\kappa^+ \}, 2) \) for every regular cardinal \( \eta < \lambda \), as well as \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, \kappa, 1, \{ \mathbf{S} \}, 2) \) for every stationary \( \mathbf{S} \subseteq \lambda^+ \).

(11) For \( \kappa \) strongly inaccessible, if there exists a sequence \( (A_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{S}) \) satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem B, then \( \mathbf{P}^*(\kappa, \kappa, \mathbf{S}, 1, \{ \mathbf{S} \}, 2) \) holds.

(12) For any infinite regular cardinal \( \kappa \), \( \square (\lambda^+) + \text{CH}_\lambda \) entails \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, 1, \{ \lambda^+ \}, 2) \) for every regular cardinal \( \kappa \) and \( \mathbf{S} \subseteq \lambda^+ \).

(13) For any cardinal \( \lambda \), \( \square (\lambda^+) + \text{CH}_\lambda \) entails \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, 1, \{ \lambda^+ \}, 2) \) for every \( \mathbf{S} \subseteq \lambda^+ \).

(14) For any cardinal \( \lambda \) such that \( \square (\lambda^+) + \text{CH}_\lambda \), \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, 1, \{ \mathbf{S} \}, 2) \) holds for every stationary \( \mathbf{S} \subseteq \lambda^+ \).

(15) If \( \lambda = \theta^+ \) for a regular cardinal \( \theta \), and \( \text{NS} \setminus E_\theta^0 \) is saturated, then \( \text{CH}_\lambda \) entails \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, \{ \mathbf{S} \}, \theta, \{ E_\kappa^+ \}, 2) \).

(16) For an uncountable cardinal \( \lambda \) and a cardinal \( \mu \) with \( 1 \leq \mu < \text{cf}(\lambda) \), \( \square (\lambda^+, \mu^+) + \text{CH}_\lambda \) entails \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, \mu^+, \{ \mathbf{S} \}, 2) \) for every \( \mathbf{S} \subseteq \lambda^+ \).

(17) For infinite regular cardinals \( \theta < \lambda \) satisfying \( \lambda^{<\theta} = \lambda \) and \( \text{CH}_\lambda \), after Lévy-collapsing \( \lambda \) to \( \theta \), \( \mathbf{P}^*(\kappa, \kappa, \kappa, \mathbf{S}, \{ \mathbf{S} \}, 2) \) holds, where \( \kappa := \lambda^+ \) and \( T := E_\kappa^0 \) are defined in the ground model.

(18) For a regular infinite cardinal \( \lambda \), \( \diamond^+ (E_\lambda^+) \) implies \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, 2, \{ \mathbf{S} \}, \{ \mathbf{S} \}, 2) \).

(19) For a regular infinite cardinal \( \lambda \) satisfying \( \lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda \), and a strongly inaccessible cardinal \( \kappa > \lambda \), after forcing by a \( (\kappa^+) \)-distributive \( \kappa \)-cc notion of forcing, \( \mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, \kappa, \kappa, \{ \mathbf{S} \}, 2) \) holds.

\[ \text{Remark 6.11} \]

Keep in mind the monotonicity properties of the proxy principle, as described in Remark 6.11.
(20) For a regular uncountable cardinal $\lambda$ satisfying $\lambda^\lambda = \lambda$ and $\text{CH}_\lambda$, after forcing with a $\lambda^+$-cc notion of forcing of size $\leq \lambda^+$ that preserves the regularity of $\lambda$ and is not $\lambda^+$-bounding, $\mathbf{P}^*(\lambda^+, \infty, \subseteq, \lambda^+, \text{NS}_{\lambda^+}, E_{\lambda^+})$ holds.

Proof. The proofs of all of the statements rely on Theorem 5.13.

(1) By [BR17a, Theorem 3.6] and [BR17a, Corollary 1.12]. (2) By [BR19a, Corollary 4.22] using $\chi = \aleph_0$, since under GCH every singular cardinal is strong limit. (3) By [BR17a Theorem 3.6]. (4) By [BR17a, Theorem 4.2] and Lemma 4.33 above. (5) By [BR17a, Corollary 1.10(5)] or [BR19a Corollary 4.14]. (6) This is the content of Theorem 4.33. (7) By [BR19c Theorem A]. (8) By [BR19c, Theorem B]. (9) By [BR19b, Proposition B(2) and Theorem 3.4] followed by Lemma 4.33 above (cf. Remark 4.34). (10) By [Rin17] Corollaries 4.5 and 4.13. (11) This is Corollary 4.31. (12) This is Corollary 4.31. (13) By [BR17a Corollary 3.9] and [Rin17 Corollary 4.13]. (14) By [Rin17a, Corollaries 4.7 and 4.13]. (15) By [BR17a, Theorem 6.4]. (16) By the work of [Rin19] and [BR19c, Lemma 3.8]. (17) By [BR19c Proposition 3.9] followed by Lemma 4.33 above (cf. Remark 4.34). (18) By Theorem 4.30(1) followed by Lemma 4.33 (19) By [BR19c, Proposition 3.10] (which relies on Theorem 4.30(2) above) followed by Lemma 4.33 (20) By [BR19c, Proposition B(1) and Theorem 3.4] followed by Lemma 4.33 above (cf. Remark 4.34). □

6.1. Basic characteristics of trees. Examining our construction of the $\kappa$-Souslin tree in the proof of Proposition 2.18, we notice that all of the hard work took place when constructing the nonzero limit levels of the tree. It was at those levels that we balanced the normality requirement with the need to bound the size of $T_\alpha$ and to seal antichains.

In contrast, the only constraint we addressed at successor levels was the requirement that the tree be ever-branching, in consideration of Lemma 2.1, and we did that by assigning two immediate successors to every node from the previous level. But here we have the flexibility to impose some additional features, without affecting the most important global properties of the tree.

Definition 6.2. A streamlined $\kappa$-tree $T$ is said to be:

- **binary** iff $T \subseteq \kappa^2$;
- **$\varsigma$-splitting** (for an ordinal $\varsigma < \kappa$) iff every node in $T$ admits at least $\varsigma$ many immediate successors;
- **splitting** iff it is 2-splitting;
- **prolific** iff $\{ t \geq^\ast i \mid i < \max\{\omega, \alpha\} \} \subseteq T$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$ and $t \in T_\alpha$.

While a $\varsigma$-splitting tree, for any value $\varsigma > 2$, cannot be binary, we observe the following implications between properties of a streamlined $\kappa$-tree:

prolific $\implies$ $\omega$-splitting $\implies$ splitting $\implies$ ever-branching.

Referring back to our construction in the proof of Proposition 2.18, we note that the tree constructed there was binary. However, we can easily tweak the construction of the successor levels in order to ensure that the resulting tree ends up being (no longer binary, but rather) prolific and/or $\varsigma$-splitting for some value of $\varsigma < \kappa$, without affecting the validity of any other aspects of the proof. Precisely, for an ordinal $\varsigma < \kappa$, to obtain a $\kappa$-Souslin tree that is prolific and $\varsigma$-splitting, we modify the successor level in the proof of Proposition 2.18, setting, for every $\alpha < \kappa$,

$$T_{\alpha+1} := \{ t \geq^\ast i \mid t \in T_\alpha, i < \max(\alpha, \varsigma, \omega) \}.$$

Of course, it is no longer true that each $T_\alpha$ is a subset of $\kappa^2$ of size $\leq \max\{\aleph_0, |\alpha|\}$ as claimed in the original proof, but that was simply a matter of preference. The

---

20For two nodes $x, y$ in a streamlined tree $T$, we say that $y$ is an immediate successor of $x$ iff $x \preceq y$ and $\text{dom}(y) = \text{dom}(x) + 1$. 
important constraint, to be maintained for all \( \alpha < \kappa \) throughout the recursive construction, is that \( T_\alpha \) is a subset of \( {}^\alpha \kappa \) of size \(< \kappa \); this follows at successor levels from the fact that \( \zeta < \kappa \), and at limit levels from regularity of \( \kappa \) together with the property \((*)_\alpha \) of the construction. Furthermore, \( \triangleleft \) must be chosen at the outset to be a well-ordering of \(<^\alpha \kappa \) instead of \(<^\kappa 2 \).

As we present the more involved Souslin-tree constructions throughout the rest of this paper, the reader should have no trouble adapting them between binary and prolific/\( \zeta \)-splitting, as desired. Note also that an abstract translation between various kinds of trees is offered in the appendix of [BR17b].

But even at the limit levels, there is some degree of flexibility, as witnessed by the two alternatives of the following definition.

**Definition 6.3.** A streamlined tree \( T \) is said to be:

- **slim** if \( |T_\alpha| \leq \max\{\|\alpha\|, \aleph_0\} \) for every ordinal \( \alpha \).
- **\( \chi \)-complete** if, for any \( \subseteq \)-increasing sequence \( \eta \), of length \(< \chi \), of elements of \( T \), the limit of the sequence, \( \bigcup \text{Im}(\eta) \), is also in \( T \).

Notice that the \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree constructed in the proof of Proposition 6.2.18 is slim. This is a result of adhering to property \((*)_\alpha \) in the definition of levels \( T_\alpha \) for every \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \). Recalling the discussion in Subsection 2.4 there needs to be some stationary \( \Gamma \subseteq \kappa \) on which, for every \( \alpha \in \Gamma \), not every branch through \( T | \alpha \) will have its limit placed into \( T_\alpha \). In the proof of Proposition 6.2.18, we took the simplest approach by setting \( \Gamma := \text{acc}(\kappa) \). A much more complicated approach is taken in [BR17b] \S 5. In the upcoming treatment, we shall focus on a relatively simple form of a set \( \Gamma \), namely, \( \Gamma := E_{\geq \chi}^\kappa \) for some regular cardinal \( \chi < \kappa \). Note that this means that the resulting \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree would be \( \chi \)-complete. Nevertheless, a minor tweaking would allow one to also obtain slim \( \kappa \)-Souslin trees; simply set \( \chi := \omega \) and make sure to impose \( \omega_1 \) as the value of the second parameter of the proxy principle. 22

**6.2. The underlying setup.** Throughout the rest of this section, we fix a well-ordering \( \triangleleft_\kappa \) of \( H_\kappa \). All the constructions in this section will be using instances of the form \( P^*_\kappa, \ldots \) which imply that \( \kappa^{< \kappa} = \kappa \). So, we shall moreover assume that \( \text{otp}(H_\kappa, \triangleleft_\kappa) = \kappa \).

**Definition 6.4.** For every \( T \in H_\kappa \), denote \( \beta(T) := 0 \) unless there is \( \beta < \kappa \) such that \( T \subseteq H_\beta \) and \( T \nsubseteq H_\beta \), in which case, we let \( \beta(T) := \beta \) for this unique \( \beta \).

We collect here a gallery of actions which we will be using later on. The reader may skip this definition at the moment, and come back to it upon its use.

**Definition 6.5.** (1) The default extension function, \( \text{extend} : (H_\kappa)^2 \to H_\kappa \), is defined as follows.

Let \( \text{extend}(x, T) := x \), unless \( Q := \{ z \in T|_{\beta(T)} \mid x \subseteq z \} \) is nonempty, in which case, we let \( \text{extend}(x, T) := \min(Q, \triangleleft_\kappa) \).

(2) The function for sealing antichains, \( \text{anti} : (H_\kappa)^3 \to H_\kappa \), is defined as follows.

Let \( \text{anti}(x, T, U) := \text{extend}(x, T) \), unless \( Q := \{ z \in T|_{\beta(T)} \mid \exists y \in U(x \cup y \subseteq z) \} \) is nonempty, in which case, we let \( \text{anti}(x, T, U) := \min(Q, \triangleleft_\kappa) \).

---

21As a result of taking this simplest approach, the tree also satisfies the property of being club-regressive (in addition to being slim), as explored in [BR17a] Proposition 2.3.

22The notion of slimness is more prevalent in the context of \( \kappa \)-Kurepa trees as a property that rules out some trivial examples. Our interest in slim \( \kappa \)-Souslin trees comes from [BR17b], where we constructed \( \kappa \)-Souslin trees whose reduced powers are \( \kappa \)-Kurepa.
The function for sealing ascending paths, \( \text{sealpath} : (H_κ)^3 \to H_κ \), is defined as follows. Given \((x, T, \bar{u}) \in (H_κ)^3\), if the set \( Q := \{ z \in T_{β(T)} : x ⊆ z \ \& \ \forall y \in \bar{u}[\text{dom}(y) = \text{dom}(x) + 1 \implies y \nsubseteq z]\} \) is nonempty, then let \( \text{sealpath}(x, T, \bar{u}) := \min(Q, <_κ) \). Otherwise, let \( \text{sealpath}(x, T, \bar{u}) := \text{extend}(x, T) \).

(4) The function for sealing automorphisms, \( \text{auto} : (H_κ)^4 \to H_κ \), is defined as follows. Given \((x, T, b, \bar{u})\): If \( x \in T \cap (β(T)) \) and \( b \) is a partial function from \( T \cap (β(T)) \), \( \bar{u} \) is an automorphism of \( T \cap (β(T)) \), and the set \( \mathcal{Q} := \{ x_0 \in \text{dom}(b) \mid \bar{u}(x_0) \neq x_0 \} \) is nonempty, then let \( x_0 := \min(Q, <_κ) \), \( \tilde{x}_0 := \text{extend}(b(x_0), T) \), \( \tilde{y}_0 := \bigcupγ < β(T) \bar{u}(\tilde{x}_0 \upharpoonright γ) \), and \( \text{auto}(x, T, b, \bar{u}) := \text{extend}(x, T \setminus \{ \tilde{y}_0 \}) \). Otherwise, let \( \text{auto}(x, T, b, \bar{u}) := \text{extend}(x, T) \).

(5) The function for sealing antichains in a derived tree, \( \text{free} : (H_κ)^4 \to H_κ \), is defined as follows. Given \((x, T, \tilde{b}, \bar{u})\) in \((H_κ)^4\), if \( \tilde{b} \in \text{<}^{<κ} T \) and \( \tilde{b} \neq 0 \), then put \( z := \text{anti}(0, T(\tilde{b}), \bar{u}) \), and consider the following options:

\( \begin{align*}
\text{If there exists some } ξ < \text{dom}(\tilde{b}) \text{ such that } x \cup (z)_ξ \text{ is in } T \ \text{then let } \\
\text{free}(x, T, \tilde{b}, \bar{u}) := (z)_ξ \text{ for the least such } ξ.
\end{align*} \)

Otherwise, let \( \text{free}(x, T, \tilde{b}, \bar{u}) := \text{extend}(x, T) \).

The following is obvious.

**Lemma 6.6 (Extension Lemma).** Suppose \( x \in T \in H_κ \), \( \bar{u}, b, \tilde{b} \in H_κ \), and \( T \) is a normal subtree of \( \leq β(T)κ \). Then \( \text{extend}(x, T) \), \( \text{anti}(x, T, \bar{u}) \), \( \text{sealpath}(x, T, \bar{u}) \), and \( \text{free}(x, T, \tilde{b}, \bar{u}) \) are elements of \( T \cap β(T)κ \) extending \( x \). If \( T \) is moreover ever-branching, then \( \text{auto}(x, T, b, \bar{u}) \) is an element of \( T \cap β(T)κ \) extending \( x \), as well. \( \Box \)

6.3. The prototype construction. In this subsection, we present a construction of a \( κ \)-Souslin tree from the weakest instance of the proxy principle.

**Corollary 6.7.** If \( P^*(κ, κ, \subseteq, 1, \{κ\}, κ) \) holds, then there exists a \( κ \)-Souslin tree.

**Proof.** Appeal to Theorem 6.8 below with \( χ := \aleph_0 \) and \( z := 0 \). \( \Box \)

All the other constructions of this section, with the exception of the construction of a uniformly homogeneous tree in Subsection 6.8, will be modeled after the following construction.

**Theorem 6.8.** Suppose that \( κ \) is \((<χ)-closed\) for a given \( χ \in \text{Reg}(κ) \). Let \( z < κ \).

If \( P^*(κ, κ, χ^{<κ}, 1, \{E^κ_χ\}) \) holds, then there exists a normal, prolific, \( z \)-splitting, \( χ \)-complete \( κ \)-Souslin tree.

**Proof.** The proof is very similar in spirit to the one from Proposition 2.18 one just needs to be a little bit more careful.

Suppose \( P^*(κ, κ, χ^{<κ}, 1, \{E^κ_χ\}) \) holds, as witnessed by \( \breve{C} = \langle C_α \mid α < κ \rangle \).

\( \breve{B} := (B_i \mid i < κ) \). We shall recursively construct a sequence \( \langle T_α \mid α < κ \rangle \) of levels whose union will ultimately be the desired tree \( T \).

Let \( T_0 := \{∅\} \), and for all \( α < κ \), let \( T_{α+1} := \{ψ \cap i \mid i ∈ T_α, i < \max(α, ω, ω_1)\} \).

Next, suppose that \( α < κ \) is a nonzero limit ordinal, and that \( \langle T_β \mid β < α \rangle \) has already been defined. Constructing the level \( T_α \) involves deciding which cofinal branches through \( T \upharpoonright α \) will have their limits placed into the tree.\(^{23}\)

Denote \( Γ := E^κ_χ \). The construction splits into two cases, depending on whether \( α \in Γ \):

\( \begin{align*}
\text{Case } 1: & \quad α ∈ Γ; \\
\text{Case } 2: & \quad α ∉ Γ.
\end{align*} \)

\( \text{Case } 1 \) The notation \((z)_ξ \) will be introduced in Definition 6.22 below.

\( \text{Case } 2 \) A cofinal branch through \( T \upharpoonright α \) is a function \( b : α \to H_κ \) all of whose proper initial segments belong to \( T \upharpoonright α \).
Claim 6.8.2. requires an argument: \( T \) may assume that

Proof. If \( D \ ⊑ \alpha \) containing \( \alpha \), and the limit of such a branch will necessarily be in \( T_\alpha \).

Now suppose \( \alpha \in \Gamma \). The idea for ensuring normality at level \( T_\alpha \) is to attach to each \( C \in C_\alpha \) and \( x \in T \upharpoonright C \) some node \( b_x^C : \alpha \rightarrow \kappa \) above \( x \), and then let

\[ T_\alpha := \{ b_x^C \mid C \in C_\alpha , x \in T \upharpoonright C \} \]

By the induction hypothesis, \( |T_\beta| < \kappa \) for all \( \beta < \alpha \), and by the choice of \( C \), we have \( |C_\alpha| < \kappa \), so that by regularity of \( \kappa \) we are guaranteed to end up with \( |T_\alpha| < \kappa \).

As for every \( C \in C_\alpha \) and \( x \in T \upharpoonright C \), \( b_x^C \) will be the limit of some branch through \( T \upharpoonright \alpha \) and above \( x \), we opt to describe \( b_x^C \) as the limit \( \bigcup \text{Im}(b_x^C) \) of a sequence \( b_x^C \in \prod_{\beta \in C \setminus \text{dom}(x)} T_\beta \) such that:

- \( b_x^C(\text{dom}(x)) = x \);
- \( b_x^C(\beta') \subseteq b_x^C(\beta) \) for any pair \( \beta' < \beta \) of ordinals from \( \langle C \setminus \text{dom}(x) \rangle \);
- \( b_x^C(\beta) = \bigcup \text{Im}(b_x^C \upharpoonright \beta) \) for all \( \beta \in \text{acc}(C \setminus \text{dom}(x)) \).

Let \( C \in C_\alpha \) be arbitrary. By recursion over \( \beta \in C \), we shall assign a value \( b_x^C(\beta) \) in \( T_\beta \) for all \( x \in T \upharpoonright (C \cap (\beta + 1)) \).

Fix \( \beta \in C \), and assume that for every \( x \in T \upharpoonright (C \cap \beta) \) we have already defined \( b_x^C(\beta) \). We must define the value of \( b_x^C(\beta) \) for all \( x \in T \upharpoonright (C \cap (\beta + 1)) \).

1. For every \( x \in T_\beta \), let \( b_x^C(\beta) := x \). We take care of these nodes separately, because for any such node \( x \), the sequence \( b_x^C \) is just starting here.
2. Next, let \( x \in T \upharpoonright (C \cap \beta) \) be arbitrary. In particular, assume that \( C \cap \beta \neq \emptyset \).
   a. If \( \beta \in \text{nacc}(C) \), then let \( \beta^- := \sup(C \cap \beta) \) denote the predecessor of \( \beta \) in \( C \), and then set
      \[
      b_x^C(\beta) := \begin{cases} 
      \text{anti}(b_x^C(\beta^-), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1), C(\beta)), & \text{if } \beta \in B_0; \\
      \text{extend}(b_x^C(\beta^-), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)), & \text{otherwise}.
      \end{cases}
      \]
   b. If \( \beta \in \text{acc}(C) \), then we let \( b_x^C(\beta) := \bigcup \text{Im}(b_x^C \upharpoonright \beta) \), as promised.

The following is obvious, and is aligned with the microscopic perspective described in requirement (2) of Subsection 2.8

Dependencies 6.8.1. For any two consecutive points \( \beta^- < \beta \) of dom(\( b_x^C(\beta^-) \)), the value of \( b_x^C(\beta) \) is completely determined by \( b_x^C(\beta^-) \), \( T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1) \) and \( C(\beta) \).

In the case \( \beta \in \text{nacc}(C) \), since \( b_x^C(\beta^-) \) belongs to the normal tree \( T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1) \), we infer from the Extension Lemma (Lemma 6.12) that \( b_x^C(\beta) \) is an element of \( T_\beta \) extending \( b_x^C(\beta^-) \). In the case \( \beta \in \text{acc}(C) \), the fact that \( b_x^C(\beta) \) belongs to \( T_\beta \) requires an argument:

Claim 6.8.2. Let \( \beta \in \text{acc}(C) \). Then \( b_x^C(\beta) \in T_\beta \).

Proof. If \( \beta \notin \Gamma \), then \( T_\beta \) was constructed to consist of the limits of all branches through \( T \upharpoonright \beta \), including the limit of the branch \( b_x^C \upharpoonright \beta \), which is \( b_x^C(\beta) \). Thus, we may assume that \( \beta \in \Gamma \).

Since \( \beta \in \text{acc}(C) \), let us fix \( D \in C_\beta \) such that \( D \nsubseteq C \). As \( \Gamma = E_\gamma^C \), in fact, \( D \nsubseteq C \). Fix \( \gamma \in C \) such that \( C \upharpoonright (C \setminus \gamma) \subseteq D \upharpoonright (D \setminus \gamma) \). Set \( d := D \setminus \gamma \) and \( y := b_x^C(\gamma) \). We now prove, by induction on \( \delta \in d \), that \( b_x^C(\delta) = b_y^D(\delta) = b_y(\min(d)) \).

- Clearly, \( b_x^C(\min(d)) = y = b_y^C(\min(d)) = b_y^D(\min(d)) \).
• Suppose $\delta^- < \delta$ are successive points of $d$, and $b^C_x(\delta^-) = b^C_y(\delta^-) = b^D_y(\delta^-)$.
  Then, by Dependencies \ref{6.8.1}, also $b^C_x(\delta) = b^C_y(\delta) = b^D_y(\delta)$.
• For $\delta \in \text{acc}(d)$: If the sequences are identical up to $\delta$, then their limits must be identical.
  It follows that $b^C_x(\beta) = \bigcup_{\delta \in d} b^C_x(\delta) = \bigcup_{\delta \in d} b^D_y(\delta) = b^D_y(\delta)$, and the latter is in $T_{\beta}$. So $b^C_x(\beta) \in T_{\beta}$, as sought.

This completes the definition of $b^C_x$ for each $C \in C_\alpha$ and each $x \in T \upharpoonright \dot{C}$, and hence of the level $T_{\alpha}$.

**Claim 6.8.3.** Let $\alpha \in \Gamma$ and $t \in T_{\alpha}$. Then there exists $C \in C_\alpha$ such that $\{ \delta \in \dot{C} \mid t = b^C_{t(\delta)} \}$ is a final segment of $\dot{C}$.

**Proof.** By the same analysis from the proof of Claim \ref{6.8.2}.

Having constructed all levels of the tree, we then let $T := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \kappa} T_{\alpha}$. It is clear from the construction that $T$ is a normal, prolific, $\xi$-splitting, $\chi$-complete streamlined $\kappa$-tree. By Lemma \ref{2.1} to prove that $T$ is $\kappa$-Souslin, it suffices to show that it has no $\kappa$-sized antichains. By Lemma \ref{2.9} it suffices to prove the following.

**Claim 6.8.4.** Let $A \subseteq T$ be a maximal antichain. Then there exists $\alpha < \kappa$ such that every node of $T_\alpha$ extends some element of $A \cap (T \upharpoonright \alpha)$.

**Proof.** Set $\Omega := A$ and $p := \{ T, A \}$. Recalling Definition \ref{5.9} we now fix $\alpha \in E^*_x$ such that, for all $C \in C_\alpha$,

$$\sup\{ \gamma \in \dot{C} \mid \text{succ}_1(\dot{C} \setminus \gamma) \subseteq B_0(\Omega, p, C) \} = \alpha.$$ 

Let $t \in T_{\alpha}$ be arbitrary. As $\alpha \in E^*_x = \Gamma$, we appeal to Claim \ref{6.8.3} to find $C \in C_\alpha$ and $x \in T \upharpoonright \dot{C}$ such that $t = b^C_x$. By our choice of $\alpha$, fix $\gamma \in \dot{C} \setminus \text{dom}(x)$ with $\text{succ}_1(\dot{C} \setminus \gamma) \subseteq B_0(\Omega, p, C)$. Let $\beta := \min(\dot{C} \setminus (\gamma + 1))$, so that $\beta \in B_0(\Omega, p, C)$.

Recalling Definition \ref{5.8} and Proposition \ref{2.12}, we infer that $\text{cond}(\beta) = A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$ and the latter is a maximal antichain in $T \upharpoonright \beta$.

As $\gamma$ is the predecessor of $\beta$ in $\dot{C}$, and as $\beta \in B_0$, we infer that $b^C_{\beta}(\beta) := \text{anti}(b^C_x(\gamma), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1), C(\beta)).$

Write $\tilde{x} := b^C_x(\gamma)$, $\tilde{T} := T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)$ and $\tilde{U} := C(\beta)$. Recalling Definition \ref{5.8} \ref{5.8.1}, we consider the set:

$$Q := \{ z \in \tilde{T}(\tilde{T}) \mid \exists y \in \tilde{U}(\tilde{x} \cup y \subseteq z) \}.$$ 

By now, we know that

$$Q = \{ z \in T_\beta \mid \exists y \in A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)(b^C_x(\gamma) \cup y \subseteq z) \}.$$ 

As $A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$ is a maximal antichain in $T \upharpoonright \beta$, $Q$ is nonempty, meaning that $b^C_x(\beta)$ extends some element of $A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$. In particular, $t$ extends some element of $A \upharpoonright \alpha$.

This completes the proof.

**Remark 6.9.** By applying Theorem \ref{1.3.8} with $(\xi, \Omega, \theta, S, \sigma) := (\kappa, \emptyset, 1, \{ E^*_x \}, \kappa)$, the hypotheses of Theorem \ref{0.8} imply $P^*(\kappa, \kappa, 1, \{ E^*_x \}, \kappa)$. Thus, we could have simplified the construction in the proof of Theorem \ref{0.8} by beginning with a $\subseteq$-coherent sequence rather than one that is merely $\chi^\kappa$-coherent, thereby avoiding the need for extra complications in proving Claims \ref{6.8.2} and \ref{6.8.3}. Nevertheless, it is important to master the general technique of building Souslin trees from a sequence satisfying the weaker $\chi^\kappa$-coherence, as presented in the prototype construction above. This is because we will need to apply the technique in subsequent constructions, where we build Souslin trees with additional properties. In some
such constructions, such as that of a Souslin tree omitting an ascending path (Subsection 6.5), we will not have the luxury of allowing the width of our sequence to expand to \( \kappa \), as required by Theorem 4.35.

6.4. A tree with an ascent path. In [BR17b], a gallery of constructions of \( \kappa \)-Souslin trees with ascent paths was presented. Each of the constructions assumed an instance of the form \( P(\kappa, \ldots, \sigma) \) with \( \sigma = \omega \), which, by Proposition 4.32.2, requires the existence of a nonreflecting stationary subset of \( E_\omega^\kappa \). In this section, we present a construction from a weaker instance of the proxy principle which is compatible with reflection, thereby improving an old theorem of Baumgartner (see [Dev83]). Note, however, that the objects we obtain here are not as complex and flexible as the ones obtained from the stronger instances in [BR17b].

Definition 6.10. Suppose that \( T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa \) is a stream-lined \( \kappa \)-tree. We say that \( \vec{f} = \langle f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \) is a \( \mu \)-ascent path through \( T \) iff for every pair \( \alpha < \beta < \kappa \):

1. \( f_\alpha \) is a function from \( \mu \) to \( T_\alpha \);
2. \( \{ i < \mu \mid f_\alpha(i) \subseteq f_\beta(i) \} \) is co-bounded in \( \mu \).

Remark 6.11. In the general language of [BR17b] Definition 1.2, the above is called an \( \mathcal{F}_\mu \)-ascent path.

Theorem 6.12. Suppose that \( \kappa < \chi \) is closed for a given \( \chi \in \text{Reg}(\kappa) \). Let \( \chi < \kappa \). If \( \text{P}^*(\kappa, \mu^{\text{ind}}, \subseteq, 1, \{ E^\infty_{\omega, \chi} \}, \nu^+) \) holds, then there exists a normal, prolific, \( \varsigma \)-splitting, \( \chi \)-complete \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree admitting a \( \mu \)-ascent path.

Proof. Recalling Definition 5.15 we fix sequences \( \vec{C} = \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \), \( \vec{B} = \langle B_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle \) and a club \( \Gamma \subseteq \kappa \) such that:

1. \( C_\alpha \subseteq \{ C \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \mid \alpha_\Gamma = \alpha \} \);
2. there exists a canonical enumeration \( \langle C_{\alpha,i} \mid i(\alpha) \leq i < \mu \rangle \) of \( C_\alpha \);
3. for all \( i \in [i(\alpha)] \) and \( \bar{a} \in \text{acc}(C_{\alpha,i}), i \geq i(\bar{a}) \) and \( C_{\alpha,i} \subseteq C_{\alpha,i} \);
4. if \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\Gamma) \), then \( \text{acc}(C_{\alpha,i}) \mid i(\alpha) \leq i < \mu \) is \( \subseteq \)-increasing with \( \Gamma \cap \alpha \subseteq \bigcup_{i(i(\alpha))}^{\mu} \text{acc}(C_{\alpha,i}) \).
5. \( \vec{C} \) and \( \vec{B} \) together witness \( \text{P}^*(\kappa, \mu^{\text{ind}}, \subseteq, 1, \mathcal{S}, \nu) \).

Without loss of generality, we may also assume that:

6. \( 0 \in \vec{C} \) for every \( C \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)} C_\alpha \).

Now, the construction of the tree \( T \) is identical to that in Theorem 6.8 using \( \vec{C} \) and \( \vec{B} \). We are left with demonstrating that \( T \) admits a \( \mu \)-ascent path.

For every \( \alpha < \kappa \), let \( \alpha' := \min(\text{acc}(\Gamma) \setminus \alpha) \) and then define \( f_\alpha : \mu \to T_\alpha \) via

\[
f_\alpha(i) := C_{\alpha', \max(i, \langle \alpha' \rangle)}^\kappa \mid \alpha.
\]

Claim 6.12.1. \( \langle f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \) forms a \( \mu \)-ascent path through \( T \).

Proof. Fix an arbitrary pair \( \alpha < \beta \) of ordinals in \( \kappa \). Let \( \alpha' := \min(\text{acc}(\Gamma) \setminus \alpha) \) and \( \beta' := \min(\text{acc}(\Gamma) \setminus \beta) \).

If \( \alpha' = \beta' \), then we trivially get that \( f_\alpha(i) \subseteq f_\beta(i) \) for all \( i < \mu \).

If \( \alpha' < \beta' \), then \( \alpha' \in \text{acc}(\Gamma) \cap \beta' \). By Clause (4), find a large enough \( j < \mu \) such that \( \alpha' \in \text{acc}(C_{\beta', i}) \) for all \( i \in [j, \mu) \). For any such \( i \), we have \( C_{\alpha', i} \subseteq C_{\beta', i} \), so that, by Dependencies 6.8.1, \( b_{\alpha'}^{\beta', i} = b_{\alpha'}^{\beta', i} \mid \alpha' \). In particular, \( f_\alpha(i) \subseteq f_\beta(i) \) on a tail of \( i \)'s.

This completes the proof.

Theorem A is the case \( \langle \lambda, \mu \rangle := (\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N}_0) \) of the following:
Corollary 6.13. Suppose that \( \lambda \) is an uncountable cardinal, and \( \square(\lambda^+) + \text{CH}_\lambda \) holds. For every \( \mu \in \text{Reg}(\lambda) \) satisfying \( \lambda^\mu = \lambda \), there exists a \( \lambda^+ \)-Souslin tree admitting a \( \mu \)-ascent path.

Proof. By Theorem 6.8, Corollary 5.16 and Theorem 6.12, setting \( \chi := \mu \).

Corollary 6.14. In the Harrington–Shelah model \( \text{HSS} \) Theorem A] in which every stationary subset of \( E_{\aleph_2}^\aleph_2 \) reflects, there also exists an \( \aleph_2 \)-Souslin tree with an \( \omega \)-ascent path.

Proof. The Harrington–Shelah model is a model of GCH in which \( \omega_2 \) is a Mahlo cardinal in \( L \). By standard results in inner model theory, \( \square(\omega_2) \) holds, and hence Corollary 6.13 applies.

6.5. Omitting an ascending path. In \[\text{L" uc17}\] Definition 1.3, L" ucke considered a weakening of a \( \mu \)-ascent path which he calls \( \mu \)-ascending path. This is obtained by replacing Clause (2) of Definition 6.10 by:

(2') there are \( i, j < \mu \) such that \( f_\alpha(i) \subseteq f_\beta(j) \).

L" ucke proved (see \[\text{L" uc17}\] Theorem 1.9 and subsequent comment) that, assuming \( \lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda \), for every \( \lambda^+ \)-Aronszajn tree \( T \), the following are equivalent:

- for every \( \Lambda < \lambda \), there is no \( \Lambda \)-ascending path through \( T \);
- \( T \) is specializable, that is, there exists a notion of forcing \( P \) that does not change the cardinal structure up to and including \( \lambda^+ \), and such that, in \( V^P \), \( T \) is the union of \( \lambda \) many antichains.

We next show that by decreasing the value of \( \nu \) in Theorem 6.8 we can get a \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree satisfying the additional property of omitting an ascending path.

Definition 6.15. Let \( P^*_\xi(\kappa, \mu, R, \theta, S, \nu^*) \) be the assertion obtained by replacing Clause (1) of Definition 5.9 by the weaker property:

(1) there exists \( C \in [\mathcal{C}_\alpha]^{<\nu} \) such that, for all \( C' \in C \), there is some \( C'' \in C \) such that \( C'' \subseteq^* C''\).

Clearly, for any vector of parameters \( \Box \), we have:

\[
P^*_\xi(\kappa, \mu, \Box, \nu) \implies P^*_\xi(\kappa, \mu, \Box, \nu^*) \implies P^*_\xi(\kappa, \mu, \Box, \mu).
\]

Theorem 6.16. Suppose that \( \kappa \) is \( (<\chi) \)-closed for a given \( \chi \in \text{Reg}(\kappa) \). Let \( \zeta < \kappa \).

Given an infinite cardinal \( \lambda < \kappa \), put \( S := \{E^\setminus_{\geq \chi} \in E^\setminus_{> \lambda} \mid \Lambda < \lambda \} \).

If \( P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \chi^{<\zeta}, 1, S, 2^*) \) holds, then there exists a normal, prolific, \( \zeta \)-splitting, \( \chi \)-complete, \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree \( T \) such that, for all \( \Lambda < \lambda \), there is no \( \Lambda \)-ascending path through \( T \).

Proof. Suppose \( P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \chi^{<\zeta}, 1, S, 2^*) \) holds, as witnessed by \( \tilde{C} = \langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \) and \( \tilde{B} = \langle B_\iota \mid \iota < \kappa \rangle \). We recursively construct a sequence \( \langle T_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \) of levels whose union will ultimately be the desired tree \( T \), as in the proof of Theorem 6.8 using \( \Gamma := E^\setminus_{\geq \chi} \). In particular, for every \( \alpha \in \Gamma \), we shall have:

\[
T_\alpha := \{b_\xi^\alpha \mid C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha, x \in T \upharpoonright \tilde{C} \}.
\]

The only difference is in the definition of \( b_\xi^\alpha \) in the case \( \alpha \in \Gamma \), where stage (2)(a) is now done as follows.

\[
b_\xi^\alpha(\beta) := \begin{cases} \text{anti}(b_\xi^{\alpha}(\beta^-), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1), C(\beta)), & \text{if } \beta \in B_\alpha; \\ \text{sealpath}(b_\xi^{\alpha}(\beta^-), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1), C(\beta)), & \text{if } \beta \in B_1; \\ \text{extend}(b_\xi^{\alpha}(\beta^-), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)), & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}
\]

\[\text{When restricted to a particular collection } \mathcal{C}_\alpha, \text{ the relation } \subseteq^* \text{ is an equivalence relation.}\]
In all cases, since $b^C_\xi(\beta^-)$ belongs to the normal tree $T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)$, we infer from the Extension Lemma (Lemma 6.6) that $b^C_\xi(\beta)$ is an element of $T_\beta$ extending $b^C_\xi(\beta^-)$.

Now, it is clear that Claims 6.5.1, 6.5.2, 6.5.3 and 6.5.4 are all valid, so that $T := \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} T_\alpha$ is a normal, prolific, $\gamma$-splitting, $\lambda$-complete streamlined $\kappa$-Souslin tree. Thus, we are left with verifying the following.

**Claim 6.16.1.** For every $\Lambda < \lambda$, $T$ admits no $\Lambda$-ascending path.

**Proof.** Fix nonzero $\Lambda < \lambda$, and suppose toward a contradiction that $\vec{f} = (f_\alpha : \Lambda \to T_\alpha \upharpoonright \alpha < \kappa)$ is a $\Lambda$-ascending path through $T$. Let $p := \vec{f}$ and $\Omega := \{f_\alpha(\xi) \upharpoonright \xi < \Lambda, \alpha < \kappa\}$, so that $p \in H_{\kappa^+}$ and $\Omega \subseteq H_\kappa$. Now fix $\alpha \in E^\kappa_\chi \cap E^\kappa_{\kappa^+} \setminus \lambda$ such that:

1. there exists $C' \in C_\alpha$ such that, for all $C \in C_\alpha$, $C \subseteq C'$; and
2. for all $C \in C_\alpha$,
   \[
   \sup\{\gamma \in \dot{C} \mid \text{succ}(\dot{C} \setminus \gamma) \subseteq B_1(\Omega, p, C)\} = \alpha.
   \]

For every $\xi < \Lambda$, since $f_\alpha(\xi) \in T_\alpha$ and $\alpha \in \Gamma$, by the construction of the level $T_\alpha$, we can fix $\xi < \Lambda$, $\alpha < \kappa$, $x_\xi \in T \upharpoonright \dot{C}_\xi$ such that $f_\alpha(\xi) = b^C_\xi x_\xi$.

For all $\xi < \xi' < \Lambda$, since $C_\xi \subseteq^* C'$ and $C_{\xi'} \subseteq^* C'$, we can fix some $\delta_{\xi,\xi'} < \alpha$ such that $C_\xi \upharpoonright (\dot{C}_\xi \setminus \delta_{\xi,\xi'}) = C_{\xi'} \upharpoonright (\dot{C}_{\xi'} \setminus \delta_{\xi,\xi'})$. Now let
\[
\delta := \sup\{\text{dom}(x_\xi) \mid \xi < \Lambda \cup \{\delta_{\xi,\xi'} \mid \xi < \xi' < \Lambda \cup \{(\Lambda)^+\} \}
\]
Since $\text{dom}(x_\xi) < \alpha$ for every $\xi < \Lambda$, $\delta_{\xi,\xi'} < \alpha$ for all $\xi < \xi' < \Lambda$, and $(\Lambda)^+ < \alpha$, it follows that from $\text{cf}(\alpha) > \Lambda$ that $\delta < \alpha$. Thus, we may find a large enough $\beta \in nacc(C') \cap B_1(\Omega, p, C)$ such that $\beta' := \sup(C' \cap \beta)$ is greater than $\delta$. Denote $\overline{\Omega} := C'(\beta)$. It follows that, for all $\xi < \Lambda$:

- $\beta' \in \dot{C}_\xi \subseteq C_\alpha$;
- $x_\xi \in T \upharpoonright (\dot{C}_\xi \cap \beta')$;
- $f_\alpha(\xi) = b^C_\xi x_\xi$;
- $C_\xi(\beta) = \overline{\Omega}$.

Since we have assumed that $\vec{f}$ is an ascending path of width $\Lambda$ through $T$, we can fix $\xi < \Lambda$ such that, for some $\xi < \Lambda$, $f_{\beta'+1}(\xi) \subseteq f_\alpha(\xi)$. As $\text{dom}(x_\xi) \in \dot{C}_\xi \cap \beta$, we have $b^C_\xi(\beta') \subseteq b^C_\xi x_\xi = f_\alpha(\xi)$. Let us examine how $b^C_\xi(\beta')$ was chosen.

As $\beta \in nacc(C_\xi) \cap B_1$, and $\beta' = \sup(\dot{C}_\xi \cap \beta)$, we have
\[
b^C_\xi(\beta') = \text{sealpath}(b^C_\xi(\beta'), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1), C_\xi(\beta)).
\]
Returning to Definition 6.5.3, we consider the following set:
\[
Q := \{z \in T_\beta \mid b^C_\xi(\beta') \subseteq z \land \forall y \in \overline{\Omega}[\text{dom}(y) = \beta' + 1 \implies y \not\subseteq z]\}.
\]
Recalling Definition 6.5.3, let us fix an elementary submodel $M \prec H_{\kappa^+}$ satisfying:
\[
p \in M, \quad M \cap \kappa = \beta, \quad \text{and} \quad M \cap \Omega = \overline{\Omega}.
\]

Clearly, $\beta$ is a limit ordinal, and $\overline{\Omega} = \{f_\gamma(\xi) \mid \xi < \Lambda, \gamma < \beta\}$. In particular, $\{y \in \overline{\Omega} \mid \text{dom}(y) = \beta' + 1\} = \{f_{\beta'+1}(\xi) \mid \xi < \Lambda\}$. Since $T$ is a prolific tree and $\beta' \geq (\Lambda)^+$, the node $b^C_\xi(\beta')$ must have at least $(\Lambda)^+$ many immediate successors in $T_{\beta'+1}$. Thus we can fix $w \in T_{\beta'+1}$ extending $b^C_\xi(\beta')$ that is distinct from $f_{\beta'+1}(\xi)$ for every $\xi < \Lambda$. By normality, we can extend $w$ to some element $z \in T_\beta$. It follows that $Q$ is nonempty, so that $b^C_\xi(\beta')$ was chosen from $Q$, and in particular is incomparable with $f_{\beta'+1}(\xi)$ for every $\xi < \Lambda$. It follows that $f_\alpha(\xi)$ is incomparable with $f_{\beta'+1}(\xi)$ for every $\xi < \Lambda$, contradicting our choice of $\xi$ and completing the proof. □
This completes the proof. □

6.6. Rigid. Compared to the previous subsection, here, we increase \((R, \nu)\) from \((\chi \subseteq^*, 2^*)\) to \((\chi \subseteq, 2)\), and gain rigidity.

**Corollary 6.17.** If \(P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \subseteq, 1, \{E^\chi_{\omega}\}, 2)\) holds, then there exists a rigid \(\kappa\)-Souslin tree admitting no \(\Lambda\)-ascending path for every \(\Lambda < \lambda\).

**Proof.** Appeal to next theorem with \(\chi := \aleph_0\) and \(\varsigma := 0\). □

**Theorem 6.18.** Suppose that \(\kappa\) is \((< \chi)\)-closed for a given \(\chi \in \text{Reg}(\kappa)\). Let \(\varsigma < \kappa\). Given an infinite cardinal \(\lambda < \kappa\), put \(S := \{E^\chi_{\omega} \cap E^\chi_{\omega} \mid \lambda < \lambda\}\).

If \(P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \subseteq, 1, S, 2)\) holds, then there exists a normal, prolific, \(\varsigma\)-splitting, \(\chi\)-complete, rigid \(\kappa\)-Souslin tree \(T\) such that, for all \(\Lambda < \lambda\), there is no \(\Lambda\)-ascending path through \(T\).

**Proof.** Suppose \(P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \subseteq, 1, S, 2)\) holds, as witnessed by \(\langle B_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle\) and \(\langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle\). We recursively construct a sequence \(\langle T_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle\) of levels whose union will ultimately be the desired tree \(T\), as in the proof of Theorem 6.8, using \(\Gamma := E^\chi_{\omega}\).

In particular, for every \(\alpha \in \Gamma\), we shall have:

\[
T_\alpha := \{b^\alpha_C \mid C \in C_\alpha, x \in T \upharpoonright \hat{C}\}.
\]

The only difference is in the definition of \(b^\alpha_C\) in the case \(\alpha \in \Gamma\), where stage (2)(a) is now done as follows.

\[
b^\alpha_C(\beta) := \begin{cases} \text{anti}(b^\alpha_C(\beta^{-}), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1), C(\beta)), & \text{if } \beta \in B_0; \\ \text{sealpath}(b^\alpha_C(\beta^{-}), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1), C(\beta)), & \text{if } \beta \in B_1; \\ \text{auto}(b^\alpha_C(\beta^{-}), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1), (b^\alpha_C(\beta^{-})) \upharpoonright y \in T \upharpoonright (\hat{C} \cap \beta), C(\beta)), & \text{if } \beta \in B_2; \\ \text{extend}(b^\alpha_C(\beta^{-}), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)), & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}
\]

In all cases, since \(b^\alpha_C(\beta^{-})\) belongs to the normal tree \(T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)\), we infer from the Extension Lemma (Lemma 6.6) that \(b^\alpha_C(\beta)\) is an element of \(T_\beta\) extending \(b^\alpha_C(\beta^{-})\).

The following is obvious.

**Dependencies 6.18.1.** For any two consecutive points \(\beta^{-} < \beta\) of \(\text{dom}(b^\alpha_C(\beta))\), the value of \(b^\alpha_C(\beta)\) is completely determined by \(b^\alpha_C(\beta^{-})\), \(T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)\), \(C(\beta)\), and the map \(y \mapsto b^\alpha_C(\beta^{-})\) over \(T \upharpoonright (\hat{C} \cap \beta)\).

Note that, unlike Dependencies 6.8.1 that only involves the value of \(\beta\) at \(C\), here we have a dependency on \(\hat{C} \cap \beta\), as well. The price we pay for it is that we carry out our construction under the stronger hypothesis of \(\chi \subseteq\); instead of \(\chi \subseteq^*\).

Claims 6.8.2 6.8.3 and 6.8.4 remain valid, so that \(T := \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} T_\alpha\) is a normal, prolific, \(\varsigma\)-splitting, \(\chi\)-complete streamlined \(\kappa\)-Souslin tree. Also, Claim 6.16.1 remains valid, so that for all \(\Lambda < \lambda\), there is no \(\Lambda\)-ascending path through \(T\). Thus, we are left with proving the following.

**Claim 6.18.2.** \(T\) is rigid.

**Proof.** Suppose \(\Omega : T \rightarrow T\) is a nontrivial automorphism, and we will derive a contradiction. Let \(p := \{\Omega, T\}\), so that \(p \in H_{\kappa^+}\) and \(\Omega \subseteq H_\kappa\). Now fix \(\alpha \in E^\chi_{\omega}\) such that \(C_\alpha\) is a singleton, say, \(C_\alpha = \{C_\alpha\}\), and

\[
\sup\{\gamma \in C_\alpha \mid \text{succ}_{\langle\hat{C}\rangle}(\hat{C} \setminus \gamma) \subseteq B_2(\Omega, p, C_\alpha)\} = \alpha.
\]

By Proposition 2.12(3), for any \(\beta \in B_2(\Omega, p, C_\alpha)\), \(C(\beta) = \Omega \upharpoonright (T \upharpoonright \beta)\) and the latter is a nontrivial automorphism. In particular, \(\Omega \upharpoonright (T \upharpoonright \alpha)\) is a nontrivial automorphism. Thus, by normality, we can let \(x_0\) be the \(\varsigma\)-least element of \(T \upharpoonright \hat{C}_\alpha\) such that \(\Omega(x_0) \neq x_0\).
As $\alpha \in \Gamma$, by the nature of the construction of $T_\alpha$, it makes sense to consider the particular node $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}$. Since $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0} \in T_\alpha$ and $\Omega$ is an automorphism of $T$, we have $\Omega(b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}) \in T_\alpha$, so that we may choose some $x \in T \upharpoonright C_\alpha$ such that $\Omega(b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}) = b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}$.26

Fix a large enough $\beta \in \text{nacc}(C_\alpha) \cap B_2(\Omega, p, C_\alpha)$ such that $\text{sup}(C_\alpha \cap \beta) > \text{max}\{\text{ht}(x_0), \text{ht}(x)\}$. Then $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta) = b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0} \upharpoonright \beta$ and $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta) = b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0} \upharpoonright \beta$. Since $\Omega$ is an automorphism, it follows that

$$\Omega(b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta)) = \Omega(b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0} \upharpoonright \beta) = \Omega(b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}) \upharpoonright \beta = b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0} \upharpoonright \beta = b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta).$$

Write $\tilde{T} := T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)$, $b := (b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}) \mid y \in T \upharpoonright (C_\alpha \cap \beta))$ and $\tilde{\Omega} := C(\beta)$. By $\beta \in \text{nacc}(C_\alpha) \cap B_2$, letting $\beta^{-} := \text{sup}(C_\alpha \cap \beta)$, we get:

- $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta) = \text{auto}(\tilde{b}^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}), \tilde{T}, b, \tilde{\Omega})$;
- $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta) = \text{auto}(\tilde{b}^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}), \tilde{T}, b, \tilde{\Omega})$.

Consider an arbitrary $z \in \{\tilde{b}^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}), b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-})\}$. Recall Definition [9, 11, 14], and let us analyze $\text{auto}(z, T, b, \tilde{\Omega})$. We have $z \in \tilde{T}$, and dom($z$) $\subset \beta^{-} < \beta = \beta(T)$. Since $\beta \in B_2(\Omega, p, C_\alpha)$, $\beta$ is a limit ordinal and $\tilde{\Omega}$ is the automorphism $\Omega \upharpoonright (\tilde{T} \upharpoonright \beta)$. Also, $\tilde{b}$ is a partial function from $\tilde{T} \upharpoonright (\beta(T))$ to $\tilde{T} \upharpoonright (\beta(T))$. Since $x_0 \in \text{dom}(\tilde{b})$ and $\Omega(x_0) \neq x_0$, the set $Q := \{x_0 \in \text{dom}(\tilde{b}) \mid \tilde{\Omega}(x_0) \neq x_0\}$ is nonempty. By the very choice of $x_0$, moreover, $x_0 = \min(Q, <\lambda)$. Write $\tilde{x}_0 := \text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T})$ and $\tilde{y}_0 := \bigcup_{\gamma < \beta(T)} \tilde{\Omega}(\tilde{x}_0 \upharpoonright \gamma)$. Since $\beta(T) = \beta$ is a limit ordinal and $\tilde{\Omega}$ is the automorphism $\Omega \upharpoonright (T \upharpoonright \beta)$, we have $\tilde{y}_0 = \Omega(\tilde{x}_0)$. Altogether:

- $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta) = \text{auto}(\tilde{b}^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}), \tilde{T}, b, \tilde{\Omega}) = \text{extend}(\tilde{b}^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}), \tilde{T}, \{\Omega(\text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T}))\})$;
- $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta) = \text{auto}(\tilde{b}^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}), \tilde{T}, b, \tilde{\Omega}) = \text{extend}(\tilde{b}^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}), \tilde{T}, \{\Omega(\text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T}))\})$.

Since $x_0 \leq_T \tilde{b}(x_0) \leq_T \text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T})$, we have $\Omega(x_0) \leq_T \Omega(\text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T}))$. So, by $x_0 \leq_T b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-})$, and the fact that $\Omega(x_0), x_0$ are two distinct elements of the same level, we get that $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-})$ is incomparable with $\Omega(\text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T}))$. Consequently,

$$b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta) = \text{extend}(\tilde{b}^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}), \tilde{T}, \{\Omega(\text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T}))\}) = \text{extend}(\tilde{b}^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}), \tilde{T}) = \text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T}),$$

so that

$$\Omega(b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta)) = \Omega(\text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T})).$$

As $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta) = \text{extend}(\tilde{b}^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta^{-}), \tilde{T}, \{\Omega(\text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T}))\})$, we have $b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta) \in \tilde{T} \setminus \{\Omega(\text{extend}(\tilde{b}(x_0), \tilde{T}))\}$. So

$$\Omega(b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta)) \neq b^{C_\alpha}_{x_0}(\beta).$$

This is a contradiction. □

This completes the proof. □

Theorem B is the case $\lambda := \aleph_1$ of the following corollary.

**Corollary 6.19.** Suppose that $\kappa$ is a strongly inaccessible cardinal, $\lambda < \kappa$ is regular and uncountable, and there exists a sequence $\langle A_\alpha \mid \alpha \in S \rangle$ such that:

- $S$ is a nonreflecting stationary subset of $E_{\kappa, \lambda}$;
- For every $\alpha \in S$, $A_\alpha$ is a cofinal subset of $\alpha$;
- For every cofinal $A \subseteq \kappa$, there exists $\alpha \in S$ for which
  $$\{\beta < \alpha \mid \text{min}(A_\alpha \setminus (\beta + 1)) \in A\}$$
  is stationary in $\alpha$.

Then there is a rigid $\kappa$-Souslin tree admitting no $\lambda$-ascending path for any $\alpha < \kappa$.26

---

26 Recall that $C_\alpha$ is the sole element in $C_\alpha$. 
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Proof. By Corollary \ref{cor:main} in particular, $P^-(\kappa, \kappa, \subseteq, 1, \{E^\kappa_{\lambda}\}, 2)$ holds. As $\kappa$ is strongly inaccessible, it follows from Theorem \ref{thm:main} that $P^+(\kappa, \kappa, \subseteq, 1, \{E^\kappa_{\lambda}\}, 2)$ holds, as well. Now appeal to Theorem \ref{thm:main} with $\chi := \aleph_0$ and $\varsigma := 0$. \hfill \Box

6.7. Free. Recall that the square of a tree $(T, \prec_T)$ is the poset $(\tilde{T}, \prec_{\tilde{T}})$, where

- $\tilde{T} := \{(t, t') \mid t, t' \in T, \text{ht}(t) = \text{ht}(t')\}$,
- $(s, s') <_{\tilde{T}} (t, t')$ if $s <_T t$ and $s' <_T t'$.

By a theorem of Kurepa (see \cite{JW97} Lemma 14.14, Theorem 14.15), the square of an ever-branching tree of cardinality $\kappa$ has an antichain of size $\kappa$. In particular:

**Fact 6.20** (Kurepa, \cite{Kur52}). The square of a $\kappa$-Souslin tree is not $\kappa$-Souslin.

In contrast, as we shall soon see, the product of two $\kappa$-Souslin trees may still be Souslin. In fact, this is also true for longer products:

**Definition 6.21.** For a sequence of trees $(T^i \mid i < \tau)$ with $T^i = (T^i, \prec_{T^i})$ for each $i < \tau$, the product $\bigotimes_{i < \tau} T^i$ is defined to be the tree $(\tilde{T}, \prec_{\tilde{T}})$, where:

- $\tilde{T}$ consists of all $\tilde{i} \in \prod_{i < \tau} T^i$ that are level sequences, that is, $i \mapsto \text{ht}_{T^i}(\tilde{i}(i))$ is constant over $\tau$;
- $\tilde{s} <_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{i}$ iff $s(i) <_T i(i)$ for every $i < \tau$.

Now, consider a fixed tree $T = (T, \prec_T)$. For a node $s \in T$, let us denote $T(s) := \{x \in T \mid x \text{ is comparable with } s\}$. That is, $T(s) = s \cup \{s\} \cup s^\frown$. Then, for any level sequence $\tilde{s} = (s_i \mid i < \tau)$ in $\bigotimes_{i < \tau} T$, we can consider the derived tree $\bigotimes_{i < \tau} (T(s_i), \prec_{T(s_i)})$ and ask whether it is $\kappa$-Souslin.

In order to bring the notion of derived trees within our framework of streamlined trees, we work with a slightly different definition, as follows.

**Notation 6.22** ($i^{th}$-component). For every function $x : \alpha \to T^\kappa$ and every $i < \tau$, let $(x)_i : \alpha \to H_\kappa$ denote the sequence $\langle x(i) \mid \varepsilon < \alpha \rangle$.

**Definition 6.23** (Derived tree, \cite{BR19c} Definition 4.4]). Suppose that $T \subseteq T^\kappa$ is a streamlined tree, and $\tilde{s} = (s_i \mid i < \tau)$ is a nonempty sequence of elements of $T$. We let $T(\tilde{s})$ stand for the collection of all $x : \alpha \to T^\kappa$ such that:

- $\alpha$ is an ordinal; and
- for all $i < \tau$, $(x)_i \cup s_i$ is in $T$.

Note that for a given level sequence $\tilde{s} = (s_i \mid i < \tau)$ of elements of a streamlined tree $T$, the tree $(T(\tilde{s}), \subseteq)$ is order-isomorphic to $\bigotimes_{i < \tau} (T(s_i), \subseteq)$.

**Fact 6.24** (cf. \cite{BR19c} Lemma 4.7]). Suppose that $T \subseteq T^\kappa$ is a streamlined tree. For every $\chi < \kappa$ and every nonempty sequence $\tilde{s} \in T^\kappa$:

1. $T(\tilde{s}) \subseteq T^\kappa$ is a streamlined tree;
2. If $T$ is normal, then so is $T(\tilde{s})$;
3. If $T$ is a normal $\kappa$-tree and $\kappa$ is $\langle \chi \rangle$-closed, then $T(\tilde{s})$ is a $\kappa$-tree;
4. If $T$ is ever-branching, then so is $T(\tilde{s})$;
5. If $\tilde{s} = (\emptyset)$, then $(T(\tilde{s}), \subseteq)$ is order-isomorphic to $(T, \subseteq)$ via the isomorphism $x \mapsto (x)_0$. Likewise, if $\tilde{s} = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$, then $(T(\tilde{s}), \subseteq)$ is order-isomorphic to the square of $(T, \subseteq)$.

By Fact 6.20 if a level-sequence $\tilde{s}$ is not injective, then the derived tree $T(\tilde{s})$ will not be Souslin. Altogether, this leads us to the following definition.

**Definition 6.25** (\cite{BR19c} Definition 4.5]). A $\kappa$-Souslin tree $T$ is said to be $\chi$-free if for every $\delta < \kappa$ and every nonempty injection $\tilde{s} \in T^\kappa$, the derived tree $T(\tilde{s})$ is again a $\kappa$-Souslin tree.

\footnote{Recall the last bullet of Lemma 2.4}
exists some $\alpha \langle y A$

We rely throughout on the various clauses of Fact 6.24.

Proof. $\tau < \chi$ nonzero ordinal

Extension Lemma (Lemma 6.6) that

need to show that the derived tree $\hat{T}$

It follows that Claims 6.8.2 and 6.8.3 remain valid, so that

value of $\alpha \langle w A$

Dependencies 6.28.1.

Suppose that $\alpha \langle w A$

The main theorem of this subsection reads as follows.

Theorem 6.28. Suppose that $\kappa$ is $<\chi$-closed for a given $\chi \in \text{Reg}(\kappa)$. Let $\zeta < \kappa$.

If $P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \xi, \kappa, \{\kappa\}, 2)$ holds, then there exists a normal, prolific, $\zeta$-splitting, $\chi$-complete, $\kappa$-free $\kappa$-Souslin tree.

Proof. $\tau < \chi$ nonzero ordinal

We recursively construct a sequence $(T_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa)$ of levels whose union will ultimately be the desired tree $T$, as in the proof of Theorem 6.25 using $\Gamma := E_{\kappa \chi}$. In particular, for every $\alpha \in \Gamma$, we shall have:

$$T_\alpha := \{ b_\alpha^C : C \in C_\alpha, x \in T \upharpoonright \hat{C} \}.$$ 

The only difference is in the definition of $b_\alpha^C$ in the case $\alpha \in \Gamma$, where stage (2)(a) is now done as follows.

$$b_\alpha^C(\beta) := \begin{cases} 
\text{free}(b_\alpha^C(\beta^-), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1), \langle b_\alpha^C(\beta^-) \rangle, \xi \in \text{dom}(\psi(\beta)), C(\beta)), & \text{if } \psi(\beta) \in < \chi(T \upharpoonright (\hat{C} \cap \beta)) ; \\
\text{extend}(b_\alpha^C(\beta^-), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)), & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}$$

The following is obvious.

Dependencies 6.28.1. For any two consecutive points $\beta^- < \beta$ of $\text{dom}(b_\alpha^C)$, the value of $b_\alpha^C(\beta)$ is completely determined by $b_\alpha^C(\beta^-)$, $T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)$, $C(\beta)$, and the map $y \mapsto b_\beta^C(\beta^-)$ over $T \upharpoonright (\hat{C} \cap \beta)$.

In all cases, since $b_\alpha^C(\beta^-)$ belongs to the normal tree $T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)$, we infer from the Extension Lemma (Lemma 6.6) that $b_\alpha^C(\beta)$ is an element of $T_\beta$ extending $b_\alpha^C(\beta^-)$. It follows that Claims 6.8.2 and 6.8.3 remain valid, so that $T := \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} T_\alpha$ is a normal, prolific, $\zeta$-splitting, $\chi$-complete streamlined Souslin tree. Thus, we are left with verifying the following.

Claim 6.28.2. $T$ is a $\chi$-free $\kappa$-Souslin tree.

Proof. We rely throughout on the various clauses of Fact 6.24. $T$ is $\kappa$-Souslin iff $T(\emptyset)$ is $\kappa$-Souslin, and hence it suffices to prove $\chi$-freeness. Fix an arbitrary nonzero ordinal $\tau < \chi$, some $\delta < \kappa$, and an injection $\bar{w} := \langle w_\xi : \xi \in \tau \rangle \in \tau T_\delta$. We need to show that the derived tree $\hat{T} := T(\bar{w})$ is a $\kappa$-Souslin tree. For this, fix an arbitrary maximal antichain $A$ in $\hat{T}$. Let $\Omega := A$ and $p := \{ A, T \}$. Fix a transversal $(C_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa) \in \prod_{\alpha < \kappa} C_\alpha$. Recalling Definition 5.9 we now infer that the following set is stationary:

$$W := \{ \alpha \in E_{\kappa \chi} : C_\alpha = \{ C_\alpha \} \text{ and } \forall i < \alpha [\sup(\text{nacc}(C_\alpha)) \cap B_i(\Omega, p, C_\alpha)) = \alpha] \}.$$ 

Since $\{ \alpha \in E_{\kappa \chi} \mid < \chi(T \upharpoonright \alpha) \subseteq \phi[\alpha] \}$ is a club relative to $E_{\kappa \chi}$, let us fix an ordinal $\alpha \in W \setminus (\delta + 1)$ such that $< \chi(T \upharpoonright \alpha) \subseteq \phi[\alpha]$.

Fix $\nu \in T_\alpha$ be arbitrary, and we shall show that it extends some element of $\hat{T} \upharpoonright \alpha$.

Let $\xi < \tau$ be arbitrary. As $(v)_{\xi} \in T_\alpha$ and $\alpha \in W \subseteq \Gamma$, by Claim 6.8.3 there exists some $x_\xi \in T \upharpoonright \hat{C}_\alpha$ such that $(v)_{\xi} = b_{\xi}^C$. Furthermore, by $\tau < \chi \leq \text{cf}(\alpha)$,
and Claim 6.8.3 we may fix a large enough $\gamma \in \dot{C}_\alpha \setminus \delta$ along with $\bar{x} := \langle x_\xi \mid \xi < \tau \rangle \in {}^\tau T_\gamma$ such that $(v)_\xi = b_{\xi,\gamma}^\alpha$ for all $\xi < \tau$. Of course, $\bar{x} \in {}^{<\chi}(T \upharpoonright \alpha) \subseteq \phi[\alpha]$. In particular, $i := \phi^{-1}(\bar{x})$ is $\alpha$, so that our choice of $\alpha$ guarantees that

$$sup(nacc(\dot{C}_\alpha) \cap B_\gamma(\Omega, p, C_\alpha)) = \alpha.$$  

Fix a large enough $\beta \in nacc(\dot{C}_\alpha) \cap B_\gamma(\Omega, p, C_\alpha)$ with $\gamma \leq sup(\dot{C}_\alpha \cap \beta) < \beta < \alpha$. Write $T := T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1) = sup(\dot{C}_\alpha \cap \beta)$, and $\bar{b} := (b_{\xi,\gamma}^\alpha(\beta -) \mid \xi < \tau)$. By $\beta \in B_\gamma$, we have

$$\psi(\beta) = \psi(i) = \bar{x} \in {}^\tau(T_\gamma) \subseteq {}^{<\chi}(T \upharpoonright (\dot{C}_\alpha \cap \beta)),$$

so that, for all $x \in T \upharpoonright (\dot{C}_\alpha \cap \beta)$,

$$b_{\xi,\gamma}^\alpha(\beta) = free(b_{\xi,\gamma}^\alpha(\beta -), T, \bar{b}, C_\alpha(\beta)).$$

Recalling Definition 6.30, we must analyze $z := anti(\emptyset, \bar{T}(\bar{b}), C_\alpha(\beta))$. Clearly, $\beta(\bar{T}(\bar{b})) = \beta(T) = \beta$ and $T(\bar{b}) = T(\bar{b}) \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)$. Thus, consider the set

$$Q := \{ z \in T(\bar{b}) \beta \mid \exists y \in C_\alpha(\beta) (y \subseteq z) \}.$$  

Let $a : \beta^{-} \rightarrow {}^\tau H_\kappa$ be the unique function to satisfy $(a)_\xi = \bar{b}(\xi)$ for all $\xi < \tau$. For all $\xi < \tau$, we have $x_\xi \subseteq b_{\xi,\gamma}^\alpha(\beta -) = (a)_\xi \subseteq b_{\xi,\gamma}^\alpha = (v)_\xi$, so that $a = v \upharpoonright \beta^{-}$ is in $T \upharpoonright \beta$. Since $\beta \in B_\gamma(A, \{ A, T \}, C_\alpha)$, Proposition 2.12(2) entails that $C_\alpha(\beta) = A \cap (\bar{T} \upharpoonright \beta)$ is a maximal antichain in $\bar{T} \upharpoonright \beta$, and we may pick some $y \in C_\alpha(\beta)$ such that $a \upharpoonright y \in \bar{T} \upharpoonright \beta$. Since $T$ is normal, $\bar{T}$ is normal, and hence there exists some $z' \in \bar{T}_\beta$ such that $a \upharpoonright y \subseteq z'$. As $a \subseteq z'$, we have $z' \in T(\bar{b})$. Therefore, $Q$ is nonempty, and $z = \min(Q, \prec_a)$. Since $\{ z_\xi \mid \xi < \tau \}$ is an antichain and $w_\xi \subseteq (z_\xi)$ for every $\xi < \tau$, it follows that $\{ (z_\xi) \mid \xi < \tau \}$ is also an antichain. Thus, we infer that, for all $\xi < \tau$,  

$$\{ \xi' < \tau \mid b_{\xi' \gamma}^\alpha(\beta -) \cup (z_{\xi'}) \subseteq T \} = \{ \xi \}.$$  

Consequently, for all $\xi < \tau$, $b_{\xi,\gamma}^\alpha(\beta) = free(b_{\xi,\gamma}^\alpha(\beta -), \bar{T}, \bar{b}, C_\alpha(\beta)) = (z_\xi)$. Let $y \in A \cap (\bar{T} \upharpoonright \beta)$ be a witness to the choice of $z$. Then for all $\xi < \tau$ we have

$$\langle y \rangle_\xi \subseteq (z_\xi) = b_{\xi,\gamma}^\alpha(\beta) \subseteq b_{\xi,\gamma}^\alpha = (v)_\xi.$$

This completes the proof.

Note that the above construction would be equally successful had we aimed for a $\chi'$-complete $\chi$-free $\kappa$-Souslin tree for a cardinal $\chi' < \chi$, provided that we have the following.

**Theorem 6.29.** Suppose that $\kappa$ is $(\prec \chi)$-closed for a given $\chi \in Reg(\kappa)$.

If $P^*\kappa, \mathfrak{N}_1, \subseteq, \kappa, \{ E^\kappa_\omega \} \setminus 2$ holds, then there exists a normal, prolific, slim, $\chi$-free $\kappa$-Souslin tree.  

6.8. Uniformly homogeneous and uniformly coherent.

**Definition 6.30.** For two elements $x, y$ of $H_\kappa$, we define $x \ast y$ to be the empty set, unless $x, y \in {}^{<\chi}H_\kappa$ with $dom(x) < dom(y)$, in which case $x \ast y : dom(y) \rightarrow H_\kappa$ is defined by stipulating:

$$(x \ast y)(\epsilon) := \begin{cases} x(\epsilon), & \text{if } \epsilon \in dom(x); \\ y(\epsilon), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Definition 6.31.** A streamlined $\kappa$-tree $T$ is said to be:

- **coherent** if $\{ \epsilon \in dom(x) \cap dom(y) \mid x(\epsilon) \neq y(\epsilon) \}$ is finite for all $x, y \in T$;

---

28 For more results in this direction, see [BR175 §6].
**Corollary 6.32.** If \( P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \subseteq, \kappa, \{ \kappa \}, \kappa) \) holds, then there exists a uniformly homogeneous \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree.

*Proof.* Appeal to the next theorem with \( \chi := \aleph_0 \) and \( \varsigma := 0 \). \( \square \)

**Theorem 6.33.** Suppose that \( \kappa \) is \( (\varsigma \chi) \)-closed for a given \( \chi \in \text{Reg}(\kappa) \). Let \( \varsigma < \kappa \).

If \( P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \chi \subseteq, \kappa, \{ E^\chi_\varsigma \}, \kappa) \) holds, then there exists a normal, prolific, \( \varsigma \)-splitting, \( \chi \)-complete, uniformly homogeneous \( \kappa \)-Souslin tree.

*Proof.* Suppose \( P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \chi \subseteq, \kappa, \{ E^\chi_\varsigma \}, \kappa) \) holds, as witnessed by \( \langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \) and \( \langle B_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \). We may assume that \( 0 \in \mathcal{C} \) for every \( C \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa)} C_\alpha \). Let \( \pi : \kappa \to \kappa \) be such that \( \alpha \in B_{\pi(\alpha)} \) for all \( \alpha < \kappa \). Let \( \phi : \kappa \leftrightarrow H_\kappa \) witness the isomorphism \( (\kappa, \in) \cong (H_\kappa, \in_{\alpha}) \). Put \( \psi := \phi \circ \pi \).

We recursively construct a sequence \( \{ T_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \} \) of levels whose union will ultimately be the desired tree \( T \). Denote \( \Gamma := E^\varsigma_\chi \). For every \( \alpha \in \Gamma \) and \( C \in C_\alpha \), we shall define an \( \alpha \)-branch \( b^C \); then, we will ensure that, for every \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \):

\[
\bigcirc_\alpha T_\alpha = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\{ x \ast b^C \mid C \in C_\alpha, x \in T \upharpoonright \alpha \}, & \text{if } \alpha \in \Gamma; \\
\{ t \in H_\kappa \mid \forall \bar{\alpha} < \alpha (t \upharpoonright \bar{\alpha} \in T_\alpha) \}, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{array} \right.
\]

Here we go. Let \( T_0 := \{ \emptyset \} \), and for all \( \alpha < \kappa \), let \( T_{\alpha+1} := \{ t^{-\varsigma} i \mid t \in T_\alpha, i < \max\{ \varsigma, \varsigma, \omega \} \} \). Next, suppose that \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \) and that \( \langle T_\beta \mid \beta < \alpha \rangle \) has already been defined. The construction splits into two cases:

- If \( \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \setminus \Gamma \), then \( \text{cf}(\alpha) < \chi \), and we let \( T_\alpha \) consist of the limits of all branches through \( T \upharpoonright \alpha \). This coheres with \( \bigcirc_\alpha \) and ensures that the outcome tree will be \( \chi \)-complete.
- Now suppose \( \alpha \in \Gamma \). For every \( C \in C_\alpha \), we shall define a node \( b^C \), and then, we would let:

\[
T_\alpha := \{ x \ast b^C \mid C \in C_\alpha, x \in T \upharpoonright \alpha \}.
\]

To obtain \( b^C \), we define a sequence \( b^C \in \prod_{\beta \in C} T_\beta \) by recursion. Let \( b^C(0) := \emptyset \). Next, suppose \( \beta^{-} < \beta \) are successive points of \( \hat{\Theta} \), and \( b^C(\beta^{-}) \) has already been defined. Let

\[
b^C(\beta) := b^C(\beta^{-}) \ast \text{ant}(\psi(\beta) \ast b^C(\beta^{-}), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1), C(\beta)).
\]

By the induction hypothesis \( \langle \bigcirc_\beta \rangle_\beta \), \( \psi(\beta) \ast b^C(\beta^{-}) \) belongs to the normal tree \( T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1) \), so that the Extension Lemma (Lemma 6.32) together with \( \langle \bigcirc_\beta \rangle_\beta \) imply \( b^C(\beta) \) is an element of \( T_\beta \) extending \( b^C(\beta^{-}) \).

The following is obvious.

**Dependencies 6.33.1.** For any two consecutive points \( \beta^{-} < \beta \) of \( \text{dom}(b^C) \), the value of \( b^C(\beta) \) is completely determined by \( b^C(\beta^{-}), \psi(\beta), T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1) \) and \( C(\beta) \).

In the case \( \beta \in \text{acc}(\hat{C}) \), we let \( b^C(\beta) := \bigcup(\text{Im}(b^C \upharpoonright \beta)) \). The fact that the latter belongs to \( T_\beta \) follows from Dependencies 6.33.1 \( \langle \bigcirc_\beta \rangle_\beta \) and \( \chi \subseteq \)-coherence.

This completes the definition of the level \( T_\alpha \).

Having constructed all levels of the tree, we then let \( T := \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} T_\alpha \). It is clear that \( T \) is a normal, prolific, \( \varsigma \)-splitting, \( \chi \)-complete and uniformly homogeneous.

**Claim 6.33.2.** Let \( A \subseteq T \) be a maximal antichain. Then there exists \( \alpha < \kappa \) such that every node of \( T_\alpha \) extends some element of \( A \cap (T \upharpoonright \alpha) \).

*Proof.* Let \( \Omega := A \) and \( p := \{ T, A \} \). Consider the club \( D := \{ \alpha \in \text{acc}(\kappa) \mid T \upharpoonright \alpha \subseteq \phi(\alpha) \} \), and then pick \( \alpha \in D \cap \Gamma \) such that, for all \( C \in C_\alpha \) and \( i < \alpha \),

\[
\text{sup}(\text{nacc}(\hat{C}) \cap B_i(\Omega, p, C)) = \alpha.
\]
Now, let $v \in T_\alpha$ be arbitrary, and we shall show that $v$ extends some element of $C \cap (T \upharpoonright \alpha)$. As $\alpha \in \Gamma$, let us fix $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ and $x \in T \upharpoonright \alpha$ such that $v = x \ast b^C$. As $\alpha \in D$ and $x \in T \upharpoonright \alpha$, we may also find $i < \alpha$ such that $\phi(i) = x$.

Fix $\beta \in \text{nacc}(C) \cap B_i(\Omega, p, C)$ large enough to ensure that $\beta^- > \text{dom}(x)$ for $\beta^- := \sup(C \cap \beta)$. Clearly, $\varphi(\beta) = \phi(\pi(\beta)) = \phi(i) = x$. So, that, by writing $\bar{x} := x \ast b^F(\beta^-)$, $T := T \upharpoonright (\beta + 1)$ and $\mathcal{O} := C(\beta)$, we get that

$$b^C(\beta) := b^C(\beta^-) \ast \text{anti}(\bar{x}, \bar{T}, \mathcal{O}).$$

Recalling Definition 6.35, we consider the set:

$$Q := \{z \in \bar{T}_{\beta}(T) \mid \exists y \in \mathcal{O}(x \cup y \subseteq z)\}.$$

By now, we know that

$$Q = \{z \in T_\beta \mid \exists y \in A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)((x \ast b^C(\beta^-)) \cup y \subseteq z)\}.$$

Since $\beta \in B_i(A, \{T, A\}, C)$, we infer from Proposition 2.12 that $C(\beta) = A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$ is a maximal antichain in $T \upharpoonright \beta$. So $Q$ is nonempty, and $b^C_\mathcal{O}(\beta) = b^C(\beta^-) \ast z$, for $z = \min(Q, \trianglelefteq_\kappa)$. Pick $y \in A \cap (T \upharpoonright \beta)$ witnessing that $z \in Q$. Then:

$$v \supseteq v \upharpoonright \beta = x \ast b^C(\beta) = x \ast (b^C(\beta^-) \ast z) = z \supseteq y,$$

as sought. \hfill \Box

This completes the proof. \hfill \Box

**Theorem 6.34.** If $\kappa$ is $(<\chi)$-closed, then $P^*(\kappa, \kappa, \chi \subseteq \kappa, \kappa, \{E^\kappa_{<\chi}\}, \kappa)$ implies the existence of a normal, prolific, $\chi$-complete, homogeneous $\kappa$-Souslin tree.

**Proof.** By Theorem 6.33 using Theorem 4.38. \hfill \Box

**Definition 6.35.** For a streamlined $\kappa$-tree $T$ and a subset $\Delta \subseteq \kappa$, we say that $T$ is $\Delta$-similar iff, for all $\delta \in \Delta \cap \text{acc}(\kappa)$ and $x, y \in T_\delta$, $\sup\{\varepsilon < \delta \mid x(\varepsilon) \neq y(\varepsilon)\} < \delta$.

It is easy to see that a streamlined $\kappa$-tree is coherent iff it is $\kappa$-similar. It is also easy to see that in the construction of Theorem 6.33 the outcome tree $T$ is $\Delta$-similar for the set $\Delta := \{\delta < \kappa \mid |\mathcal{C}_\delta| = 1\}$. Therefore, we get:

**Theorem 6.36.** Suppose $P^*(\kappa, 2, \subseteq, \kappa, \{\kappa\}, 2)$ holds. Then there exists a normal, slim, prolific, club-regressive, uniformly coherent $\kappa$-Souslin tree. \hfill \Box

**Remark 6.37.** For further analysis, see [BR17a, Proposition 2.5].

7. Acknowledgements

The first author was supported by the Center for Absorption in Science, Ministry of Aliyah and Integration, State of Israel. The second author was partially supported by the European Research Council (grant agreement ERC-2018-StG 802756) and by the Israel Science Foundation (grant agreement 2066/18).

This paper is submitted to the proceedings of 50 Years of Set Theory in Toronto. The two authors first met at the Toronto Set Theory Seminar, when Brodsky was a Ph.D. student of Stevo Todorcevic and Rinot was a Fields-Ontario postdoctoral fellow of Ilias Farah, Stevo Todorcevic and Bill Weiss.

We thank James Cummings, Moti Gitik, Yair Hayut, Adi Jarden, Menachem Kojman, Chris Lambie-Hanson, Philipp Lücke, Matti Rubin (of blessed memory), Stevo Todorcevic, and Bill Weiss with whom we had stimulating discussions on the subject matter of this project throughout the years.
References


**Department of Mathematics, Ariel University, Ariel 4070000, Israel.**  
*URL: http://u.math.biu.ac.il/~brodska/*

**Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 5290002, Israel.**  
*URL: http://www.assafrinot.com*