

# S-SPACES AND LARGE CONTINUUM

ALAN DOW AND SAHARON SHELAH

ABSTRACT. We prove that it is consistent with large values of the continuum that there are no S-spaces. We also show that we can also have that compact separable spaces of countable tightness have cardinality at most the continuum.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

An S-space is a regular hereditarily separable space that is not Lindelöf. If an S-space exists it can be assumed to be a topology on  $\omega_1$  in which initial segments are open [12]. The continuum hypothesis implies that S-spaces exist [9] and the existence of a Souslin tree implies that S-spaces exist [15]. Therefore it is consistent with any value of  $\mathfrak{c}$  that S-spaces exist. Todorcevic [17] proved the major result that it is consistent with  $\mathfrak{c} = \aleph_2$  that there are no S-spaces. He also remarks that this follows from PFA. We prove that it is consistent with arbitrary large values of  $\mathfrak{c}$  that there are no S-spaces. Our method adapts the approach used in [17] and incorporates ideas, such as *the Cohen real trick* in Lemma 2.15, first introduced in [1, 2].

The outline of the proof (of Theorem 4.3) is that we choose a regular cardinal  $\kappa$  in a model of GCH. We construct a preparatory mixed support iteration sequence  $\langle P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa \rangle$  consisting of iterands that are Cohen posets and cardinal preserving subposets of Jensen's poset for adding a generic cub. Following methods first introduced in [13], but more closely those of [17], the poset  $P_\kappa$  is shown to be cardinal preserving. We then extend the iteration sequence to one of length  $\kappa + \kappa$  with iterands that are ccc posets of cardinality less than  $\kappa$ . These iterands are the same as those used in [17]. For cofinally many  $\beta < \kappa$ ,  $\dot{Q}_{\kappa+\beta}$  is constructed so as to add an uncountable discrete subset to a  $P_\beta$ -name of an S-space. The bookkeeping is routine to ensure that

---

*Date:* June 23, 2022.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54A35, 03E35 .

*Key words and phrases.* S-spaces, forcing .

The research of the second author was supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF Grant no. 2010405), and by the NSF grant No. NSF-DMS 1101597. This is manuscript number F2103.

$P_{\kappa+\kappa}$  forces there are no S-spaces. The challenging part of the proof is to prove that these  $\dot{Q}_\beta$  ( $\kappa \leq \beta < \kappa + \kappa$ ) are ccc in this new setting. In the final section, we use similar techniques to produce a model in which compact separable spaces of countable tightness have cardinality at most  $\mathfrak{c}$ .

## 2. CONSTRUCTING $P_\kappa$

Throughout the paper we assume that GCH holds and that  $\kappa > \aleph_2$  is a regular uncountable cardinal.

**Definition 2.1.** *The Jensen poset  $\mathcal{J}$  is the set of pairs  $(a, A)$  where  $a$  is a countable closed subset of  $\omega_1$  and  $A \supset a$  is an uncountable closed subset of  $\omega_1$ . The condition  $(a, A)$  is an extension of  $(b, B) \in \mathcal{J}$  providing  $a$  is an end-extension of  $b$  and  $A \subset B$ .*

We use  $\mathbf{E}$  to denote the set  $\{\lambda + 2k : \lambda < \kappa \text{ a limit}, k \in \omega\}$ . We also choose a family  $\mathcal{I} = \{I_\gamma : \gamma \in \mathbf{E}\}$  of subsets of  $\kappa$  such that, for each  $\mu < \gamma \in \mathbf{E}$

- (1)  $\gamma \in I_\gamma \subset \gamma + 1$  and  $|I_\gamma| \leq \aleph_1$ ,
- (2) if  $\gamma < \omega_2$ , then  $I_\gamma = \gamma + 1$ ,
- (3) if  $\mu \in I_\gamma \cap \mathbf{E}$ , then  $I_\mu \subset I_\gamma$
- (4) for all  $I \in [\kappa]^{\aleph_1}$ , the set  $\{\gamma : I \subset I_\gamma\}$  is unbounded in  $\kappa$ .

Say that a set  $I \subset \kappa$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -saturated if it satisfies that  $I_\mu \subset I$  for all  $\mu \in I \cap \mathbf{E}$ . Of course, each  $I_\gamma \in \mathcal{I}$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -saturated.

**Definition 2.2. A.** *We define a mixed support iteration sequence  $\langle P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa \rangle$ :*

- (1)  $P_0 = \emptyset$ ,
- (2)  $p \in P_\alpha$  is a function with  $\text{dom}(p)$ , a countable subset of  $\alpha$ , such that  $\text{dom}(p) \cap \mathbf{E}$  is finite,
- (3) for all  $p \in P_\alpha$  and  $\beta \in \text{dom}(p)$ ,  $p(\beta)$  is a  $P_\beta$ -name forced by  $1_{P_\beta}$  to be an element of  $\dot{Q}_\beta$ ,
- (4) the support of a  $P_\alpha$ -name  $\tau$ ,  $\text{supp}(\tau)$ , is defined, by recursion on  $\alpha$  to be the union of the set  $\{\text{supp}(\sigma) \cup \text{dom}(q) : (\sigma, q) \in \tau\}$ ,
- (5) for  $\alpha \in \mathbf{E}$ ,  $\dot{Q}_\alpha$  is the trivial  $P_\alpha$ -name for  $\mathcal{C}_{\omega_1} = \text{Fn}(\omega_1, 2)$  (i.e. each element of  $\dot{Q}_\alpha$  has empty support),
- (6) for  $\alpha \in \mathbf{E}$ ,  $\dot{Q}_{\alpha+1}$  is the subposet of the standard  $P_{\alpha+1}$ -name for  $\mathcal{J}$  consisting of the  $P_{\alpha+1}$ -names that are forced to have the form  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A})$  where  $\text{supp}(\dot{a}) \subset \mathbf{E} \cap I_\alpha$ ,  $\text{supp}(\dot{A}) \subset \alpha$ , and  $1_{P_{\alpha+1}}$  forces that  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A}) \in \mathcal{J}$ .  $\dot{Q}_{\alpha+1}$  is chosen so as to be sufficiently rich in names in the sense that if  $p \in P_{\alpha+1}$  and  $\dot{q}$  is a  $P_{\alpha+1}$ -name

such that  $p \Vdash_{P_\alpha} \dot{q} \in \dot{Q}_{\alpha+1}$ , then there is a  $\dot{q}_1 \in \dot{Q}_{\alpha+1}$  such that  $p \Vdash \dot{q} = \dot{q}_1$ .

**B.** For each  $\alpha \in \mathbf{E}$ , we let  $\dot{C}_\alpha$  denote the  $P_{\alpha+2}$ -name of the generic subset of  $\omega_1$  added by  $\dot{Q}_{\alpha+1}$ .

*Remark 1.* Since we defined the family  $\mathcal{J}$  to have the property that  $I_\gamma = \gamma+1$  for all  $\gamma \in \omega_2 \cap \mathbf{E}$ , it follows that  $P_{\omega_2}$  is isomorphic to that used in [17]. It also follows that for all  $\beta \in \omega_2 \cap \mathbf{E}$ ,  $P_{\beta+1} \Vdash \dot{Q}_{\beta+1}$  is countably closed. We necessarily lose this property for  $\omega_2 \leq \beta$  for any family  $\mathcal{J}$  satisfying our properties (1)-(4). Nevertheless, our development of the properties of  $P_\kappa$  will closely follow that of [17].

*Remark 2.* We prove in Lemma 2.13 that, for each  $\alpha \in \mathbf{E}$ ,  $\dot{C}_\alpha$  is forced, as hoped, to be a cub. However, even though, for  $\beta \geq \omega_2$ ,  $P_{\beta+1}$  does not force that  $\dot{Q}_{\beta+1}$  is countably closed, we make note of subsets of the iteration sequence that have special properties, such as in Lemma 2.9.

For any ordered pair  $(a, b)$ , let  $\pi_0((a, b)) = a$  and  $\pi_1((a, b)) = b$ . For convenience, for an element  $v$  of  $V$  and any  $\alpha < \kappa$ , we identify the usual trivial  $P_\alpha$ -name for  $v$  with  $v$  itself. In particular, if  $s \in \mathcal{C}_{\omega_1}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbf{E}$ , then  $s \in \dot{Q}_\alpha$ . Similarly, if  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A})$  is a pair of the form specified in Definition 2.2(6), then again  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A})$  can be regarded as an element of  $\dot{Q}_{\alpha+1}$ . We will say that a  $P$ -name  $\tau$  for a subset of an ordinal  $\lambda$  and poset  $P$  is canonical if it is a subset of  $\lambda \times P$  (and optionally, if  $\{p : (\alpha, p) \in \tau\}$  is an antichain for all  $\alpha \in \lambda$ ). Let  $\mathcal{D}_\beta$  denote the set of canonical  $P_\beta$ -names of closed and unbounded subsets of  $\omega_1$ .

**Definition 2.3.** For each  $\alpha < \kappa$ , let  $P'_\alpha$  denote the subset of  $P_\alpha$ , where  $p \in P'_\alpha$  providing for all  $\beta \in \text{dom}(p) \cap \mathbf{E}$ ,  $p(\beta)$  is, literally, an element of  $\mathcal{C}_{\omega_1}$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** For all  $\alpha \leq \kappa$ ,  $P'_\alpha$  is a dense subset of  $P_\alpha$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $\alpha \leq \kappa$  and that, by induction,  $P'_\beta$  is a dense subset of  $P_\beta$  for all  $\beta < \alpha$ . Consider any  $p \in P_\alpha$ . If  $\alpha$  is a limit, choose any  $\beta < \alpha$  such that  $\text{dom}(p) \cap \mathbf{E} \subset \beta$ . Choose any  $p' \in P'_\beta$  so that  $p' < p \restriction \beta$ . We then have that  $p' \cup p \restriction (\alpha \setminus \beta)$  is a condition in  $P_\alpha$  that is below  $p$ .

Now let  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ . If  $\beta \in \mathbf{E}$ , then choose  $p' \in P'_\beta$  so that there is an  $s \in \mathcal{C}_{\omega_1}$  such that  $p' \Vdash_{P_\beta} p(\beta) = s$ . Then the desired extension of  $p$  in  $P'_\alpha$  is  $p' \cup \langle \beta, s \rangle$ . Similarly, if  $\beta \notin \mathbf{E}$  and  $p' \in P'_\beta$  with  $p' < p \restriction \beta$ , then  $p' \cup \langle \beta, p(\beta) \rangle \in P'_\alpha$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.5.** If  $p \in P_\kappa$  then for every  $I \subset \kappa$ ,  $p \restriction I \in P_\kappa$  and  $p \leq p \restriction I$ .

**Definition 2.6.** For a subset  $I \subset \kappa$  and  $\alpha \leq \kappa$ , let  $P_\alpha(I)$  denote the subset  $\{p \in P'_\alpha : \text{dom}(p) \subset I\}$ .

Recall that for posets  $(P, <_P)$  and  $(R, <_R)$ ,  $P$  is a complete subposet of  $R$ , i.e.  $P \subset_c R$ , providing

- (1)  $P \subset R$ ,  $<_P = <_R \cap (P \times P)$ ,
- (2)  $\perp_P = \perp_R \cap (P \times P)$ , where  $\perp$  is the incompatibility relation,
- (3) for each  $r \in R$ , the set of projections,  $\text{proj}_P(r)$ , is not empty, where  $\text{proj}_P(r) = \{p \in P : (\forall q \in P)(q <_P p \Rightarrow q \not<_R r)\}$ .

If  $P \subset_c R$ , then  $R/P$  is often used to denote the  $P$ -name of the poset satisfying that  $R \simeq P \star R/P$ . In fact,  $R/P$  can be defined so that simply if  $G \subset P$  is a generic filter, then  $\text{val}_G(R/P) = \{r \in R : \text{proj}_P(r) \cap G \neq \emptyset\}$  with the ordering inherited from  $<_R$ . With this view,  $\text{val}_G(R/P) = G^+$  where, as is standard,  $G^+ = \{r \in R : (\forall p \in G)r \not< p\}$ . Of course it follows that for  $\beta < \alpha \leq \kappa$ ,  $P_\beta \subset_c P_\alpha$ .

It is clear that  $P_\alpha(\mathbf{E})$  is isomorphic to (the usual dense subset of) a finite support iteration of the Cohen poset  $\mathcal{C}_{\omega_1}$ .

**Proposition 2.7.** For each  $\alpha \leq \kappa$ , the set  $P_\alpha(\mathbf{E}) \subset_c P_\alpha$  and is ccc.

**Definition 2.8.** For each  $\alpha \in \mathbf{E}$ , let  $Q'_{\alpha+1}$  be the subset of  $\dot{Q}_{\alpha+1}$  consisting of those pairs  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A})$  as in Definition 2.2(6).

We may note that, for each  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A}) \in Q'_{\alpha+1}$ ,  $\dot{a}$  is a  $P_{\alpha+1}(I_\alpha \cap \mathbf{E})$ -name and  $\dot{A}$  is a  $P_\alpha$ -name that is forced by  $1_{P_\alpha}$  to be a cub subset of  $\omega_1$ . Also, for every  $p \in P_{\alpha+1}$ ,  $p \restriction \alpha \Vdash p(\alpha+1) \in Q'_{\alpha+1}$ .

**Lemma 2.9.** If  $\alpha \in \mathbf{E}$  and, and  $\{(\dot{a}_n, \dot{A}_n) : n \in \omega\} \subset Q'_{\alpha+1}$  is a sequence that satisfies, for each  $n \in \omega$ ,  $1 \Vdash_{P_{\alpha+1}} (\dot{a}_{n+1}, \dot{A}_{n+1}) \leq (\dot{a}_n, \dot{A}_n)$ , then there is a condition  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A}) \in Q'_{\alpha+1}$  such that

- (1)  $1 \Vdash_{P_{\alpha+1}}$  forces that  $\dot{a}$  is the closure of  $\bigcup \{\dot{a}_n : n \in \omega\}$ ,
- (2)  $1_{P_\alpha}$  forces that  $\dot{A}$  equals  $\bigcap \{\dot{A}_n : n \in \omega\}$ ,
- (3)  $1 \Vdash_{P_{\alpha+1}}$  forces that  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A}) = \bigwedge \{(\dot{a}_n, \dot{A}_n) : n \in \omega\}$ .

*Proof.* In the forcing extension by a  $P_{\alpha+1}$ -generic filter  $G$ , it is clear that  $(\text{cl}(\bigcup \{\text{val}_G(\dot{a}_n) : n \in \omega\}), \bigcap \{\text{val}_G(\dot{A}_n) : n \in \omega\})$  is the meet in  $\mathcal{J}$  of the sequence  $\{(\text{val}_G(\dot{a}_n), \text{val}_G(\dot{A}_n)) : n \in \omega\}$ . We just have to be careful about the supports of the names for these objects. Each  $\dot{a}_n$  is a  $P_{\alpha+1}(I_\alpha)$ -name and so it is clear that there is a  $P_{\alpha+1}(I_\alpha \cap \mathbf{E})$ -name,  $\dot{a}$ , such that  $1 \Vdash_{P_{\alpha+1}} \dot{a} = \text{cl}(\bigcup \{\dot{a}_n : n \in \omega\})$ . This is the only subtle point. Any  $P_\alpha$ -name,  $\dot{A}$ , for  $\bigcap \{\dot{A}_n : n \in \omega\}$  is adequate (although we are using that each  $\dot{A}_n$  is a  $P_\alpha$ -name forced by 1 to be a cub).  $\square$

When we have a sequence  $\{(\dot{a}_n, \dot{A}_n) : n \in \omega\} \subset \dot{Q}'_{\alpha+1}$  as in the hypothesis of Lemma 2.9, we will use  $\bigwedge\{(\dot{a}_n, \dot{A}_n) : n \in \omega\}$  to denote the element  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A})$  in the conclusion of the Lemma.

Let  $<_E$  denote the relation on  $P_\kappa$  defined by  $p_1 <_E p_0$  providing

- (1)  $p_1 \leq p_0$ ,
- (2)  $p_1 \restriction \mathbf{E} = p_0 \restriction \mathbf{E}$ ,
- (3) for  $\beta \in \text{dom}(p_0)$ ,  $\mathbf{1}_{P_\beta} \Vdash p_1(\beta) < p_0(\beta)$ .

For  $r \in P_\kappa(\mathbf{E})$  and compatible  $p \in P_\kappa$ , let  $p \wedge r$  denote the condition with domain  $\text{dom}(p) \cup \text{dom}(r)$  satisfying  $(p \wedge r)(\beta) = p(\beta) \cup r(\beta)$  for  $\beta \in \text{dom}(r)$  and  $(p \wedge r)(\beta) = p(\beta)$  for  $\beta \in \text{dom}(p) \setminus \text{dom}(r)$ . For convenience, let  $p \wedge r$  equal  $p$  if  $r \in P_\kappa$  is not compatible with  $p$ .

**Lemma 2.10.** *Assume that  $\{p_n : n \in \omega\} \subset P'_\kappa$  is a  $<_E$ -descending sequence. Then there is a  $p_\omega \in P'_\kappa$  such that  $\text{dom}(p) = \bigcup_n \text{dom}(p_n)$  and  $p_\omega <_E p_n$  for all  $n \in \omega$ .*

*Proof.* We let  $J = \bigcup\{\text{dom}(p_n) : n \in \omega\}$ . We define  $p_\omega \restriction \beta$  by induction on  $\beta \in \mathbf{E}$  so that  $\text{dom}(p_\omega \restriction \beta) = J \cap \beta$ . For limit  $\alpha$ , simply  $p_\omega \restriction \alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} p_\omega \restriction \beta$ . If  $p_\omega \restriction \beta <_E p_n \restriction \beta$  for all  $n \in \omega$  and  $\beta < \alpha$ , then we have  $p_\omega \restriction \alpha <_E p_n \restriction \alpha$  for all  $n \in \omega$ . Now let  $\alpha = \beta + 2$  with  $\beta \in \mathbf{E}$  and assume that we have defined  $p_\omega \restriction \beta$  as above. If  $\beta \in J$ , then let  $p_\omega(\beta) = p_0(\beta)$ . If  $\beta + 1 \in J$ , then  $\mathbf{1}_{P_{\beta+1}}$  forces that  $\{p_n(\beta + 1) : n \in \omega\}$  is a descending sequence in  $\dot{Q}_{\beta+1}$ . We define  $p_\omega(\beta + 1)$  to equal  $\bigwedge\{p_n(\beta + 1) : n \in \omega\}$ . It follows by the definition of  $\bigwedge\{p_n(\beta + 1) : n \in \omega\}$ , that  $\mathbf{1}_{P_{\beta+1}} \Vdash p_\omega(\beta + 1) < p_n(\beta + 1)$  for all  $n \in \omega$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.11.** *For every  $p_0 \in P'_\kappa$  and dense subset  $D$  of  $P_\kappa$ , there is a  $p <_E p_0$  satisfying that the set  $D \cap \{p \wedge r : r \in P_\kappa(\mathbf{E})\}$  is predense below  $p$ . Moreover, there is a countable subset of  $D \cap \{p \wedge r : r \in P_\kappa(\mathbf{E})\}$  that is predense below  $p$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $r_0 = p_0 \restriction \mathbf{E}$ . There is nothing to prove if  $p_0 \in D$  so assume that it is not. By induction on  $0 < \eta < \omega_1$ , we choose, if possible, conditions  $p_\eta, r_\eta$  such that, for all  $\zeta < \eta$ :

- (1)  $p_\zeta <_E p_\eta$  and  $r_\zeta < r_0$ ,
- (2)  $p_\zeta \wedge r_\zeta \in D$ ,
- (3)  $(p_\eta \wedge r_\eta) \perp (p_\zeta \wedge r_\zeta)$ .

Suppose that we have so chosen  $\{p_\zeta, r_\zeta : \zeta < \eta\}$ . Let  $L_\eta = \bigcup\{\text{dom}(p_\zeta) : \zeta < \eta\}$ . If  $\eta = \beta + 1$ , let  $\bar{p}_\eta = p_\beta$ . If  $\eta$  is a limit, then let  $\bar{p}_\eta$  be a condition as in Lemma 2.10 for some cofinal sequence in  $\eta$ . If  $\{p_\zeta \wedge r_\zeta : \zeta < \eta\}$  is predense below  $\bar{p}_\eta$ , we halt the induction and set  $p = \bar{p}_\eta$ . Otherwise we choose any  $p_\eta <_E \bar{p}_\eta$  and an  $r_\eta \supset r_0$  so that  $p_\eta \wedge r_\eta \in D$ . The induction

will halt for some  $\eta < \omega_1$  since the family  $\{r_\zeta : \zeta < \eta\}$  is evidently an antichain in  $P_\kappa(\mathbf{E})$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.12.** *For each  $\beta \in \mathbf{E}$ ,  $P_\beta$  is proper and  $P_\beta/P_\beta(\mathbf{E} \cap \beta)$  does not add any reals.*

*Proof.* Let  $P_\beta \in M$  where  $M$  is a countable elementary submodel of  $H(\kappa^+)$ . Let  $\{D_n : n \in \omega\}$  be an enumeration of the dense open subsets of  $P_\beta$  that are members of  $M$ . By Lemma 2.11, we have that for each  $q \in P_\beta \cap M$  and  $n \in \omega$ , there is a  $\bar{q} <_E q$  also in  $P_\beta \cap M$  so that  $D_n \cap \{\bar{q} \wedge r : r \in P_\beta(\mathbf{E}) \cap M\}$  is predense below  $\bar{q}$ . Let  $M \cap \omega_1 = \delta$ . Fix any  $p_0 \in P_\beta \cap M$ . By a simple recursion, we may construct a  $<_E$ -descending sequence  $\{p_n : n \in \omega\} \subset M$  so that, for each  $n$ ,  $D_n \cap \{p_{n+1} \wedge r : r \in P_\beta(\mathbf{E}) \cap M\}$  is predense below  $p_{n+1}$ . By Lemma 2.10, we have the  $(P_\beta, M)$ -generic condition  $p_\omega$ . It is clear that for each  $P_\beta$ -name  $\tau \in M$  for a subset of  $\omega$ ,  $p_\omega$  forces that  $\tau$  is equal to a  $P_\beta(\mathbf{E})$ -name. This implies that  $P_\beta/P_\beta(\mathbf{E} \cap \beta)$  does not add reals.  $\square$

We can now prove that  $P_{\beta+2}$  does indeed force that  $\dot{C}_\beta$  is a cub.

**Lemma 2.13.** *For each  $\beta \in \mathbf{E}$ ,  $P_{\beta+2}$  forces that  $\dot{C}_\beta$  is unbounded in  $\omega_1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p \in P_{\beta+2}$  be any condition and let  $\gamma \in \omega_1$ . By possibly strengthening  $p$  we can assume that  $p(\beta+1) \in Q'_{\beta+1}$ . We find  $q < p$  so that  $q \Vdash \dot{C}_\beta \setminus \gamma$  is not empty. Let  $p, P_{\beta+2}$  be members of a countable elementary submodel  $M \prec H(\kappa^+)$ . Let  $\bar{p} < p \restriction \beta$  be  $(P_\beta, M)$ -generic and let  $\dot{D} = \pi_1(p(\beta+1)) \in \mathcal{D}_\beta$ . Since  $p, \dot{D}$  are members of  $M$  and  $p$  forces that  $\dot{D}$  is a cub, it follows that  $\bar{p} \Vdash \delta \in \dot{D}$ . It also follows that  $\bar{p} \Vdash \dot{a} \subset \dot{D} \cap \delta$ . Let  $\dot{a}_1$  be the  $P_{\beta+1}$ -name that has support equal to the support of the name  $\dot{a}$  and satisfies that  $\mathbf{1}_{P_{\beta+1}} \Vdash \dot{a}_1 = \dot{a} \cup \{\delta\}$ . Let  $\dot{E}$  be the  $P_\beta$ -name for  $\dot{D} \cup \{\delta\}$  and notice that, given that  $(\dot{a}, \dot{D}) \in Q'_{\beta+1}$ , we have that  $(\dot{a}_1, \dot{E})$  is also in  $Q'_{\beta+1}$ . Now let  $q \in P_{\beta+2}$  be defined according to  $q \restriction \beta = \bar{p}$ ,  $q(\beta) = p(\beta)$ , and  $q(\beta+1) = (\dot{a}_1, \dot{E})$ . It is immediate that  $q \restriction \beta+1 < p \restriction \beta+1$ . Also,  $q \restriction \beta+1$  forces that  $\dot{a}$  is an initial segment of  $\dot{a}_1$ , that  $\dot{a}_1 \subset \dot{D}$ , and that  $\dot{E} \subset \dot{D}$ . Therefore,  $q < p$  and  $q \Vdash \delta \in \dot{C}_\beta$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.14.** *For each  $\beta \leq \kappa$ ,  $P_\beta$  satisfies the  $\aleph_2$ -cc.*

*Proof.* We prove the lemma by induction on  $\beta$ . If  $\beta \in \mathbf{E}$  and  $P_\beta$  satisfies the  $\aleph_2$ -cc, then it is trivial that  $P_{\beta+1}$  does as well. Similarly  $P_{\beta+2}$  satisfies the  $\aleph_2$ -cc since  $P_{\beta+1} \star Q'_{\beta+1}$  clearly does, and this poset is dense in  $P_{\beta+2}$ . The argument for limit ordinals  $\beta$  with cofinality

less than  $\omega_2$  is straightforward, so we assume that  $\beta$  is a limit with cofinality greater than  $\omega_1$ . Let  $\{p_\gamma : \gamma \in \omega_2\}$  be a subset of  $P'_\beta$ . Choose any elementary submodel  $M$  of  $H(\kappa^+)$  such that  $\{p_\gamma : \gamma \in \omega_2\} \in M$ ,  $|M| = \aleph_1$ , and  $M^\omega \subset M$ . Let  $M \cap \omega_2 = \lambda$  and let  $I = \text{dom}(p_\lambda) \cap M$  and fix any  $\mu \in M \cap \beta$  so that  $I \subset \mu$ . For each  $\beta \in \mathbf{E}$  such that  $\beta + 1 \in I$ , let  $\dot{a}_\beta \in M$  so that  $\pi_0(p_\lambda(\beta + 1)) = \dot{a}_\beta$ . That is,  $p_\lambda(\beta) = (\dot{a}_\beta, \dot{D}_\beta)$  for some  $\dot{D}_\beta \in \mathcal{D}_\beta$ . Clearly the countable sequence  $\{\dot{a}_\beta : \beta \in I \cap \mathbf{E}\}$  is an element of  $M$ . Therefore there is a  $\gamma \in M$  so that  $\text{dom}(p_\gamma) \cap \mu = I$  and so that  $\pi_0(p_\gamma(\beta + 1)) = \dot{a}_\beta$  for all  $\beta \in \mathbf{E}$  such that  $\beta + 1 \in I$ . It follows that  $p_\gamma \not\leq p_\lambda$ .  $\square$

Now we discuss the Cohen real trick, which, though simple and powerful, is burdened with cumbersome notation.

**Lemma 2.15.** *Let  $\alpha \in \mathbf{E}$  and let  $p_0 \in P_{\alpha+2} \in M$  be a countable elementary submodel of  $H(\kappa^+)$  and let  $\delta = M \cap \omega_1$ . There is a  $(P_{\alpha+2}, M)$ -generic condition  $p_1 < p_0$  satisfying that for all  $P_\alpha$ -generic filters satisfying  $p_1 \restriction \alpha \in G_0$  and  $\dot{Q}_\alpha$ -generic filters  $p_1(\alpha) \in G_1$ , the collection, in  $V[G_0 \star G_1]$ ,*

$$p_{1\alpha}^\uparrow = \{p(\alpha + 1) : p \in M \cap P_{\alpha+2}, p \restriction (\alpha + 1) \in G_0 \star G_1, p_1 < p\}$$

*is  $\text{val}_{G_0 \star G_1}(\dot{Q}_{\alpha+1} \cap M)$ -generic over  $V[G_0 \star (G_1 \restriction \delta)]$ .*

*Moreover, for any  $P_\alpha$ -name  $\dot{Q}$  of a ccc poset and  $P_\alpha \star \dot{Q}$ -generic filter  $G_0 \star G_2$ ,  $p_{1\alpha}^\uparrow$  is also generic over the model  $V[G_0 \star G_2][G_1 \restriction \delta]$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\dot{Q}$  be any  $P_\alpha$ -name of a ccc poset. Choose any  $\bar{p}_1 < p_0 \restriction (\alpha + 1)$  that is  $(M, P_\alpha)$ -generic with  $\bar{p}_1(\alpha) = p(\alpha)$ . We will let  $p_1 \restriction \alpha = \bar{p}_1 \restriction \alpha$  and then we simply have to choose a value for  $p_1(\alpha + 1)$ . We may assume that  $\bar{p}_1 \restriction \mathbf{E} = p_0 \restriction \mathbf{E}$ . Let  $\tilde{G}$  denote the filter  $(G_0 \star G_1) \cap P_{\alpha+1}(I_\alpha \cap \mathbf{E})$  and let  $R = (M \cap \dot{Q}_{\alpha+1})/\tilde{G}$ . For  $r \in R$  we may regard  $r$  in the extension  $V[\tilde{G}]$  to have the form  $(a_r, \dot{A}_r)$ , with  $a_r \subset \omega_1$ , because, for each  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A}) \in M \cap \dot{Q}_{\alpha+1}$ ,  $\dot{a}$  has support contained in  $P_{\alpha+1}(I_\alpha \cap \mathbf{E})$ . We have no such reduction for  $\dot{A}$ . We adopt the subordering,  $<_R$ , on  $R$  where  $(a, \dot{A}) <_R (b, \dot{B})$  in  $R$  will mean that  $\mathbf{1}_{P_{\alpha+1}} \Vdash \dot{A} \subset \dot{B}$ . The fact that  $(a, \dot{A}) \in R$  already means that  $\mathbf{1}_{P_{\alpha+1}} \Vdash a \subset \dot{A}$ . If  $p \in M \cap P_{\alpha+1}$  and  $(a, \dot{A}_1) \in R$  is such that  $p \Vdash (a, \dot{A}_1) < (b, \dot{B})$ , then there is an  $(a, \dot{A}) \in R$  such that  $p \Vdash \dot{A} = \dot{A}_1$  and  $(a, \dot{A}) <_R (b, \dot{B})$ .

The quotient poset  $(R/\tilde{G}, <_R)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$ . Let  $\psi \in V[\tilde{G}]$  be an isomorphism from  $\mathcal{C}_{(\delta, \delta+\omega)}$  to  $(R/\tilde{G}, <_R)$ . We regard  $\mathcal{C}_{(\delta, \delta+\omega)}$  as the canonical subposet of  $\dot{Q}_\alpha$  and let  $G_\alpha^\delta$  denote a generic filter for this subposet of  $\dot{Q}_\alpha$ . Now we have, in the extension  $V[\tilde{G}][G_\alpha^\delta]$ , a  $<_R$ -filter  $R_\alpha^\delta \subset R$  given by  $\{\psi(\sigma) : \sigma \in G_\alpha^\delta\}$ . Let  $a_\omega = \{\delta\} \cup \bigcup \{a_r : r \in R_\alpha^\delta\}$ .

Note that  $\bar{p}_1$  forces that  $\delta \in \dot{C}$  for all  $\dot{C} \in M \cap \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ . By the construction, it follows that we may fix a  $P_{\alpha+1}$ -name,  $\dot{a}_\omega$ , for  $a_\omega$ , that has support contained in  $I_\alpha \cap \mathbf{E}$ . Let  $\dot{A}_\omega$  be the  $P_{\alpha+1}$ -name satisfying that  $\bar{p}_1$  forces that  $\dot{A}_\omega$  equals the intersection of all  $\dot{C} \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha \cap M$  such that  $\dot{a}_\omega \subset \dot{C}$ . It follows that for  $r \in R_\alpha^\delta$  and  $\tilde{p} \restriction \alpha + 1 < \bar{p}_1$ ,  $\tilde{p}(\alpha) \in G_\alpha^\delta$ , and  $\tilde{p}(\alpha + 1) = r$ , we have that  $\tilde{p} \wedge r \Vdash \dot{A}_\omega \subset \dot{A}_r$  (and this takes place in  $V[\tilde{G}]$ ). We may choose  $\dot{A}_\omega$  so that  $\tilde{p} \Vdash \dot{A}_\omega = \omega_1$  for all  $\tilde{p} \perp \bar{p}_1$  in  $P_{\alpha+1}$ . It then follows that  $(\dot{a}_\omega, \dot{A}_\omega)$  is an element of  $\dot{Q}_{\alpha+1}$ . We now define  $p_1$  so that  $p_1 \restriction \alpha + 1 = \bar{p}_1$  and  $p_1(\alpha + 1) = (\dot{a}_\omega, \dot{A}_\omega)$ . The fact that  $p_1$  is  $(M, P_{\alpha+2})$ -generic follows from the stronger claim below.

*Claim 3.* Let  $G_0$  be a  $P_\alpha$ -generic with  $\bar{p}_1 \restriction \alpha \in G_0$  and let  $G_1$  be a  $\dot{Q}_\alpha$ -generic filter with  $\bar{p}_1(\alpha) \in M \cap G_1$ . Also let  $G_0 \star G_2$  be  $P_\alpha \star \dot{Q}$ -generic. Let  $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}_{(\delta, \delta+\omega)}$  be arbitrary. Let  $\dot{D}$  be a  $P_{\alpha+1} \star \dot{Q}$ -name of a dense subset of  $\text{val}_{G_0 \star G_1}(\dot{Q}_{\alpha+1} \cap M)$ . Then there is a  $\tau \supset \sigma$  such that  $\tau \Vdash p_{1\alpha}^\uparrow \cap \text{val}_{G_0 \star (G_1 \times G_2)}(\dot{D}) \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof of Claim.* Fix the generic filter  $\tilde{G} \subset G_0 \star G_1$  as used in the construction of  $(\dot{a}_\omega, \dot{A}_\omega)$  and let  $\psi : \mathcal{C}_\alpha^\delta \rightarrow (R/\tilde{G}, <_R)$  denote the above mentioned isomorphism. Let  $(b, \dot{B}) = \psi(\sigma)$  and, using the density of  $\text{val}_{G_0 \star (G_1 \times G_2)}(\dot{D})$ , choose  $(a, A) < (b, \text{val}_{G_0 \star G_1}(\dot{B}))$ , so that  $(a, A) \in \text{val}_{G_0 \star (G_1 \times G_2)}(\dot{D})$ . By elementarity, choose  $(\dot{a}, \dot{A}) \in M \cap \dot{Q}_{\alpha+1}$  such that  $\text{val}_{G_0 \star G_1}((\dot{a}, \dot{A})) = (a, A)$ . Again by elementarity and using that  $\bar{p}_1$  is  $(M, P_{\alpha+1})$ -generic, there is a  $p \in M \cap (G_0 \star G_1)$  such that  $p \Vdash \dot{A} \subset \dot{B}$ . Now choose  $\tau \supset \sigma$  so that  $\psi(\tau) = (a, \dot{A}_1)$  satisfies that  $(a, \dot{A}_1) <_R (b, \dot{B})$  and  $p \Vdash \dot{A}_1 = \dot{A}$ . It follows that  $\tau \Vdash (a, \dot{A}_1) \in \text{val}_{G_0 \star (G_1 \times G_2)}(\dot{D})$ . Since  $p_1 \wedge \tau$  also forces that  $p_1(\alpha + 1) < (a, \dot{A}_1)$  we have that  $p_1 \wedge \tau \Vdash (a, \dot{A}_1) \in p_{1\alpha}^\uparrow$ .  $\square$

This completes the proof of the Lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.16.** *Let  $\lambda < \kappa$  with  $\lambda \in \mathbf{E}$  and let  $\dot{Q}$  be a  $P_\lambda$ -name of a ccc poset. Then  $P_\kappa$  forces that  $\dot{Q}$  is ccc.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a  $P_\lambda$ -generic filter and let  $Q = \text{val}_G(\dot{Q})$ . Since  $P_\kappa$  satisfies the  $\aleph_2$ -cc, we can assume that  $Q$  is of the form  $(\omega_1, <_Q)$ . We work in the extension  $V[G]$  and we view, for each  $\lambda < \alpha \leq \kappa$ ,  $\bar{P}_\alpha = P_\alpha/G$  as a subset of  $P_\alpha$ . We prove, by induction on  $\lambda \leq \alpha \in \mathbf{E}$ , that for any countable elementary submodel  $\{Q, \lambda, \bar{P}_\alpha\} \in M$  and any  $p \in \bar{P}_\alpha \cap M$ , there is a  $p_M <_E p$  such that  $(1_Q, p_M)$  is  $(M, Q \times \bar{P}_\alpha)$ -generic. Note that this inductive hypothesis, i.e. the fact that it is  $(1_Q, p_M)$  that is the generic condition rather than  $(q, p_M)$  for some



other  $q \in Q$ , is equivalent to the statement that  $P_\alpha$  preserves that  $Q$  is ccc.

The proof at limit steps follows the standard proof (as in [16]) that the countable support iteration of proper posets is proper. We feel that this can be skipped. So let  $\alpha = \beta + 2$  for some  $\beta \in \mathbf{E}$ . Let  $M$  be a suitable countable elementary submodel and let  $p \in P_\alpha \cap M$  (such that  $p \restriction \lambda \in G$ ). Let  $M \cap \omega_1 = \delta$ . By the inductive hypothesis, we can assume that we have  $\bar{p}_1 \in P_\beta$  so that,  $\bar{p}_1 \restriction \lambda \in G$ ,  $\bar{p}_1 <_E p \restriction \beta$  and so that  $(1_Q, \bar{p}_1)$  is an  $(M, Q \times P_\beta)$ -generic condition. Of course it is also clear that  $(1_Q, \bar{p}_1)$  is an  $(M, Q \times P_{\beta+1})$ -generic condition. Now let  $p_1 \in P_{\beta+2}$  be chosen as in Lemma 2.15. That is,  $p_1$  is chosen so that for any  $P_\beta$ -generic filter  $G_\beta \supset G$  with  $p_1 \restriction \beta \in G_\beta$ , any  $\mathcal{C}_{\omega_1}$ -generic  $G_1$  with  $p_1(\beta) \in G_1$ , and, since  $Q$  is ccc in  $V[G_\beta]$ , any  $Q$ -generic filter  $G_Q$ , we have that  $p_1^\uparrow_\beta$  is generic over  $V[G_\beta \star (G_1 \times G_Q)]$ . Let  $G_{\beta+1} = G_\beta \star G_1$ .

Let  $D \in M$  be any dense open subset of  $P_{\beta+2} \star Q$ . Let  $R$  denote  $\dot{Q}_{\beta+1}/(G_\beta \star G_1)$ . It follows that  $D/(G_\beta \star G_1)$  or

$$E = \{(r, q) : (\exists d \in D) (d \restriction \beta+1 \in G_\beta \star G_1 \text{ \& } d = d \restriction \beta+1 \star (r, q))\}$$

is a dense open subset of  $R \times Q$  and  $E \in M[G_{\beta+1}]$ . By standard product forcing theory, we have that for each  $r \in R$ ,  $E_r = \{q \in Q : (\exists s \in R)(s < r \text{ \& } (s, q) \in E)\}$  is a dense subset of  $Q$ . For each  $r \in R \cap M[G_{\beta+1}]$ ,  $E_r \in M[G_{\beta+1}]$  and so,  $E_r \cap M[G_{\beta+1}]$  is a predense subset of  $Q$ . This implies that, for each  $\bar{q} \in Q$ , the set  $E(\bar{q}) = \{s \in R \cap M[G_{\beta+1}] : (\exists (s, q) \in E \cap M[G_{\beta+1}])(\bar{q} \not\leq q)\}$  is a dense subset of  $R \cap M[G_{\beta+1}]$ . Although  $E(\bar{q})$  need not be an element of  $M[G_{\beta+1}]$ , it is an element of  $V[G_\beta \star (G_1 \restriction \delta)]$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.15,  $E(\bar{q}) \cap p_1^\uparrow_\beta$  is not empty for all  $\bar{q} \in G_Q$ . By elementarity, it then follows that  $p_1$  is an  $(M, P_{\beta+2} \star Q)$ -generic condition.  $\square$

### 3. S-SPACE TASKS

Following [1] and [17] we define a poset of finite subsets of  $\omega_1$  separated by a cub.

**Definition 3.1.** For a family  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  and a cub  $C \subset \omega_1$ , define the poset  $Q(\mathcal{U}, C) \subset [\omega_1]^{<\aleph_0}$ , to be the set of finite sets  $H \subset \omega_1$  such that for  $\xi < \eta$  both in  $H$

- (1)  $\xi \notin U_\eta$  and  $\eta \notin U_\xi$ ,
- (2) there is a  $\gamma \in C$  such that  $\xi < \gamma \leq \eta$ .

$Q(\mathcal{U}, C)$  is ordered by  $\supset$ .

**Definition 3.2.** A family  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\}$  is an  $S$ -space task if it satisfies:

- (1)  $\xi \in U_\xi \in [\omega_1]^{<\aleph_1}$ ,
- (2) every uncountable  $A \subset \omega_1$  has a countable subset that is not contained in any finite union from the family  $\mathcal{U}$ .

*Remark 4.* If  $\mathcal{T}$  is a regular locally countable topology on  $\omega_1$  that contains no uncountable free sequence (see Definition 5.1), then each neighborhood assignment  $\{U_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  consisting of open sets with countable closures, is an S-space task. An uncountable  $A \subset \omega_1$  failing property (2) would contain an uncountable free sequence. Suppose that there is a cub  $C \subset \omega_1$  such that  $Q(\mathcal{U}, C)$  is ccc. Then, as usual, there is a  $q \in Q(\mathcal{U}, C)$  such that any generic filter including  $q$  is uncountable. If  $G \subset Q(\mathcal{U}, C)$  is a filter (even pairwise compatible), then  $\bigcup G$  is a discrete subspace of  $(\omega_1, \mathcal{T})$ . Of course this cub  $C$  can be assumed to satisfy that if  $\xi < \eta$  are separated by  $C$ , then  $\eta \notin U_\xi$ . This means that requirement (1) in the definition of  $Q(\mathcal{U}, C)$  can be weakened to only require that  $\xi \notin U_\eta$ .

The following result is a restatement of Lemma 1 from [17]. It also uses the Cohen real trick. We present a proof that is more adaptable to the modifications needed for the consistency with  $\mathfrak{c} > \aleph_2$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $R$  be a ccc poset and let  $\mathcal{U} = \{\dot{U}_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  be a sequence of  $R$ -names such that  $\mathcal{U}$  is forced to be an S-space task. Then  $R \times P_2$  forces that for every  $n \in \omega$ , every uncountable pairwise disjoint subfamily  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $Q(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_1) \cap [\omega_1]^n$ , has a countable subset  $\mathcal{H}_0$  satisfying that, for some  $\delta \in \omega_1$  and all  $F \in [\omega_1 \setminus \delta]^n$ , there is an  $H \in \mathcal{H}_0$  such that  $H \cap \bigcup \{U_\xi : \xi \in F\} = \emptyset$ . In particular,  $R \times P_2$  forces that  $Q(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_1)$  is ccc.*

*Proof.* Of course  $P_2$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{C}_{\omega_1} \star \dot{J}$ . Fix any  $n \in \omega$  and let  $\{\dot{H}_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  be  $R \times P_2$ -names of pairwise disjoint elements of  $[\omega_1]^n \cap Q(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_1)$ . Since we can pass to an uncountable subcollection of  $\{\dot{H}_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  we may assume that for all  $\xi \in \omega_1$ , it is forced that there is a  $\delta \in \dot{C}_1$  such that  $\xi < \delta \leq \min(\dot{H}_\xi)$ .

For each  $(r, p) \in R \times P_2$  and  $H \in [\omega_1]^n$ , let  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  be the set  $\{s \in R : (\exists q \in P_2)((s, q) < (r, p) \ \& \ (s, q) \Vdash H = \dot{H}_\xi)\}$ . In other words,  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  is not empty if and only if  $(r, p) \Vdash H \neq \dot{H}_\xi$ . We say that  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full simply if it is not empty.

Now we define what it means for  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  to be  $\omega_1$ -full for  $H \in [\omega_1]^{n-1}$ . We require that there is a set  $\{\dot{\eta}_\zeta : \zeta \in \omega_1\}$  of canonical  $R$ -names such that  $r \Vdash \dot{\eta}_\zeta \in \omega_1 \setminus \zeta$  and for  $(\eta, s) \in \dot{\eta}_\zeta$ ,  $s \leq r$  and satisfies that  $\Gamma_\xi(H \cup \{\eta\}, (s, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full. It is worth noting that  $(r, p)$  has been changed to  $(s, p)$  rather than to some  $(s, q)$  with  $q < p$ . This definition

generalizes to  $H \in [\omega_1]^i$ . We say that  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full if there is a set of canonical  $R$ -names  $\{\dot{\eta}_\zeta : \zeta \in \omega_1\}$  such that, for each  $\zeta \in \omega_1$ ,  $r \Vdash \dot{\eta}_\zeta \in (\omega_1 \setminus \zeta)$ , and for  $(\eta, s) \in \dot{\eta}_\zeta$ ,  $s \leq r$  and  $\Gamma_\xi(H \cup \{\eta\}, (s, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full.

*Claim 5.* Suppose that  $\Gamma_\xi(\emptyset, (r, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full and that  $M \prec H(\kappa^+)$  is countable and  $\{\xi, \mathcal{U}, R, (r, p)\} \in M$ . Then for any  $\bar{r} < r \in R$  and finite  $F \subset \omega_1 \setminus M$ , there are  $(s, q), H \in M$  such that

- (1)  $(s, q) < (r, p) \in R \times P_2$ ,
- (2)  $H \cap \bigcup\{\dot{U}_\zeta : \zeta \in F\}$  is empty,
- (3)  $(s, q) \Vdash \dot{H}_\xi = H$ ,
- (4)  $s \not\leq \bar{r}$ .

*Proof of Claim:* Let  $\dot{W}_F = \bigcup\{\dot{U}_\zeta : \zeta \in F\}$ . Since  $R \in M \prec H(\kappa^+)$  is ccc and forces that  $\mathcal{U}$  is an S-space task, it follows that for each  $R$ -name  $\dot{A} \in M$  for an uncountable subset of  $\omega_1$ , the set  $\dot{A} \cap M$  is forced to not be contained in  $\dot{W}_F$ . By induction on  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we choose  $(\eta_i, s_i) \in (\omega_1 \times R) \cap M$  and  $\bar{r}_i < s_i$  so that  $\bar{r}_i \Vdash \eta_i \notin \dot{W}_F$ ,  $s_i \leq s_j \leq r$  and  $\bar{r}_i \leq \bar{r}_j$  for  $j < i$ , and  $\Gamma_\xi(\{\eta_j : 1 \leq j < i\}, (s_i, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full.

Let  $\bar{r}_0 = \bar{r}$ ,  $(s_0, q_0) = (r, p)$ ,  $\emptyset = \{\eta_j : 1 \leq j < 1\}$  and we assume by induction that, at stage  $i$ ,  $\Gamma(\{\eta_j : 1 \leq j < i\}, (s_i, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full. Fix any sequence  $\{\dot{\eta}_\zeta : \omega \leq \zeta \in \omega_1\} \in M$  witnessing that  $\Gamma_\xi(\{\eta_j : j < i\}, (s_i, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full. We have that  $\{\dot{\eta}_\zeta : \omega \leq \zeta \in \omega_1\} \in M$  is an  $R$ -name for an uncountable subset of  $\omega_1$ . It follows that  $\bar{r}_{i-1}$  forces that there is a  $\zeta \in M$  such that  $\dot{\eta}_\zeta \notin \dot{W}_F$ . We find an extension  $\bar{r}_{i+1}$  of  $\bar{r}_i$  so that we may choose  $\zeta \in M$  and  $(\eta, s) \in \dot{\eta}_\zeta$  such that  $\eta \notin \dot{W}_F$ ,  $\bar{r}_{i+1} < s \leq s_i$ . Therefore we set  $(\xi_i, s_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) = (\eta, s, q)$  and this completes the construction.

Setting  $H = \{\xi_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  and  $(s, q) = (s_n, q_n)$  completes the proof of the Claim.  $\square$

*Claim 6.* If  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  is not  $\omega_1$ -full, there is an  $s < r$  in  $R$  and a  $\zeta < \omega_1$  such that  $\Gamma_\xi(H \cup \{\eta\}, (s, p))$  is not  $\omega_1$ -full for all  $\zeta < \eta \in \omega_1$ .

*Proof of Claim:* Since  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  is not  $\omega_1$ -full, there is some  $\zeta \in \omega_1$  so that the suitable nice name  $\dot{\eta}_\zeta$  does not exist. It follows immediately that  $\dot{\eta}_\gamma$  does not exist for all  $\zeta < \gamma \in \omega_1$ . In addition, since  $\dot{\eta}_\zeta$  fails to exist, it is because  $\Gamma_\xi(H \cup \{\eta\}, (s', r))$  is not  $\omega_1$ -full for all  $s' \not\leq s$ .  $\square$

*Claim 7.* For every  $(r, p) \in R \times P_2$ , there is a  $\delta$  so that  $\Gamma_\delta(\emptyset, (r, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full.

*Proof of Claim:* Let  $M_0$  be a countable elementary submodel of  $H(\kappa^+)$  so that  $\{\mathcal{U}, (r, p), R\} \in M_0$ . Choose any  $p_1 <_E p$  (i.e.  $p_1(0) = p(0)$ ) and

$p_1(0) \Vdash p_1(1) < p(1)$ ) that is  $(M_0, P_2)$ -generic. Notice that  $(r, p_1)$  is therefore  $(M, R \times P_2)$ -generic since  $R$  is ccc. Let  $\delta_0 = M_0 \cap \omega_1$ . Choose any continuous  $\in$ -chain  $\{M_\alpha : 0 < \alpha < \omega_1\}$  of countable elementary submodels of  $H(\kappa^+)$  such that  $p_1 \in M_1$ . For each  $\alpha \in \omega_1$ , let  $\delta_\alpha = M_\alpha \cap \omega_1$ . We did not actually have to choose  $p_1$  before choosing  $M_1$  of course. Let  $C$  be the cub  $\{\delta_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$  and let  $p_2 \in P_2$  be a common extension of  $p_1$  and  $(\emptyset, (\emptyset, \delta_0 \cup (C \setminus \delta_0)))$  (or equivalently  $p_2(0) \leq p_1(0)$  and  $p_2(0) \Vdash p_2(1) \leq (\pi_0(p_1(1)), \pi_1(p_1(1)) \cap C)$ ). It follows that  $p_2 \Vdash \dot{C}_1 \setminus \delta_0 \subset C$ .

Assume  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(\emptyset, (r, p))$  is not  $\omega_1$ -full. Choose  $s_0 < r$  and  $\zeta_0 \in \omega_1$  as in Claim 5. By elementarity we may assume that  $s_0, \zeta_0$  are in  $M_1$ .

Now choose any  $\bar{s}_0 < s_0$  so that there is a  $q_0 < p_1$  and an  $H \in [\omega_1 \setminus \delta_0]^n$  such that  $(\bar{s}_0, q_0) \Vdash \dot{H}_{\delta_0} = H$ . Of course this implies that  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(H, (r, p))$  is not empty and therefore, it is  $\omega_1$ -full. Let  $H$  be enumerated in increasing order  $\{\eta_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ .

Since  $(\bar{s}_0, q) \Vdash \dot{H}_{\delta_0} \in Q(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_1)$ , we can assume that  $q$  has already determined the members of  $\dot{C}_1$  that separate the elements of  $\{\delta_0\} \cup H$ . In other words, there is a set  $\{\alpha_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \subset \omega_1$  so that  $\{\delta_{\alpha_i} : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \subset \pi_0(q(1)) \subset C$  such that, for each  $1 \leq i < n$ ,  $\delta_0 \leq \delta_{\alpha_{i-1}} \leq \eta_i$ . Therefore,  $\{\eta_j : 1 \leq j < i\} \in M_{\alpha_i}$  for all  $i < n$  and  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(\{\eta_j : 1 \leq j \leq n\}, (r, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full. Clearly, for all  $s' < \bar{s}_0$ ,  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(\{\eta_j : 1 \leq j \leq n\}, (s', p))$  is also  $\omega_1$ -full.

By the choice of  $s_0$  and  $\zeta_0$ , we have that  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(\{\eta_1\}, (s_0, p)) \in M_{\alpha_2}$  is not  $\omega_1$ -full. We note that  $\bar{s}_0$  is  $(M_{\alpha_2}, R)$ -generic condition. There is therefore, by Claim 5, a  $\zeta_1 \in M_{\alpha_2}$  and a pair  $\bar{s}_1 < s_1$  so that  $s_1 \in M_{\alpha_2}$ ,  $\bar{s}_1 < \bar{s}_0$  and  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(\{\eta_1, \eta\}, (s_1, p))$  is not  $\omega_1$ -full for all  $\eta > \zeta_1$ . Following this procedure we can recursively choose a pair of descending sequences  $\{s_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \subset R$  and  $\{\bar{s}_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \subset R$  so that

- (1)  $s_{i-1} \in M_{\alpha_i}$  and  $\bar{s}_i < s_i$ ,
- (2)  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_i\}, (s_i, p))$  is not  $\omega_1$ -full.

We now have a contradiction that completes the proof. We noted above that since  $\bar{s}_n < \bar{s}_0$ ,  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_i\}, (\bar{s}_n, p))$  is  $\omega_1$ -full. However since  $\bar{s}_n < s_n$ , this contradicts that  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n\}, (s_n, p))$  is not  $\omega_1$ -full.  $\square$

Now we complete the proof of the Proposition. Consider any countable elementary submodel  $M$  as in Claim 5 and let  $\delta = M \cap \omega_1$ . Let  $p_1$  be a condition as in Lemma 2.15 applied to the case  $\alpha = 0$ . Let  $G_R$  be any  $R$ -generic filter and let  $G_1 \subset \mathcal{C}_{\omega_1}$  be any generic filter, which is generic over the model  $V[G_R]$ . Pass to the extension  $V[G_R]$ .

Fix any  $F \in [\omega_1 \setminus \delta]^n$ . It follows from Claim 5 and Claim 6, that the set  $\mathcal{W}_F$  of those  $(t, (\dot{b}, \dot{B})) \in M \cap (\mathcal{C}_{\omega_1} \star \dot{\mathcal{J}})$  for which

$$(\exists \xi \in \delta)(\exists s \in G_R) \ (s \Vdash H \cap \dot{W}_F = \emptyset \ \& \ (s, (t, (\dot{b}, \dot{B}))) \Vdash H = \dot{H}_\xi)$$

is a dense subset of  $M \cap (\mathcal{C}_{\omega_1} \star \dot{\mathcal{J}})$ . The proof is that Claim 6 provides a potential  $\xi \in M$  to strive for, and Claim 5 provides an  $(s, q)$  to yield an element of  $\mathcal{W}_F$ .

It then follows easily that, in the extension  $V[G_R \times G_1]$ , the set

$$\text{val}_{G_1 \restriction \delta}(\mathcal{W}_F) = \{\text{val}_{G_1}(\dot{b}, \dot{B}) : (\exists t \in G_1) ((t, (\dot{b}, \dot{B}))) \in \mathcal{W}_F\}$$

is a dense subset of  $\text{val}_{G_1}(M \cap \dot{\mathcal{J}})$  which is an element of  $V[G_R \times (G_1 \restriction \delta)]$ . Since  $p_1$  forces that the generic filter meets  $\text{val}_{G_1 \restriction \delta}(\mathcal{W}_F)$ , this completes the proof.  $\square$

For any  $\alpha \leq \kappa$  and subset  $I \subset \alpha$ , we will say that a  $P_\alpha$ -name  $\dot{E}$  is a  $P_\alpha(I)$ -name if it is a  $P_\alpha(I)$ -name in the usual recursive sense. This definition makes technical sense even if  $P_\alpha(I)$  is not a complete subposet of  $P_\alpha$ .

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $\lambda \in \mathbf{E}$  and let  $\dot{R}_0$  be a  $P_\lambda(I_\lambda)$ -name that is forced by  $P_\lambda$  to be ccc poset. Let  $\dot{R}$  be a  $P_\lambda$ -name of a ccc poset such  $\mathbf{1}_{P_\lambda}$  forces that  $\dot{R}_0 \subset_c \dot{R}$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{U} = \{\dot{U}_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  is a sequence of  $P_\lambda(I_\lambda) \star \dot{R}_0$ -names of subsets of  $\omega_1$  such that  $P_\lambda \star \dot{R}$  forces that  $\mathcal{U}$  is an S-space task. Then the  $P_{\lambda+2}$ -name  $Q(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_\lambda)$  satisfies that  $P_{\lambda+2}$  forces that  $\dot{R} \times Q(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_\lambda)$  is ccc.*

*Proof.* Let  $G_\lambda$  be a  $P_\lambda$ -generic filter and pass to the extension  $V[G_\lambda]$ . Let  $R = \text{val}_{G_\lambda}(\dot{R})$  and observe that we may now regard  $\mathcal{U}$  as a family of  $R$ -names of subsets of  $\omega_1$  that is forced to be an S-space task. We would like to simply apply Lemma 3.3 but unfortunately,  $P_{\lambda+2}$  is not isomorphic to  $P_\lambda \star P_2$ . Naturally the difference is that  $\dot{Q}_{\lambda+1}$  is a proper subset of  $\dot{\mathcal{J}}$ . It will suffice to identify the three key places in the proof of Lemma 3.3 that depended on consequences of the properties of  $\dot{\mathcal{J}}$  and to verify that the consequences also hold for  $\dot{Q}_{\lambda+1}$ . The first was in the proof of Claim 7 where we selected a condition  $p_2(1) \in \dot{\mathcal{J}}$  that satisfied that  $\pi_1(p_2(1))$  was forced to be a subset of  $C \cup \delta_0$  for the cub  $C$ . Since, in this proof,  $C$  will be an cub set in the model  $V[G_\lambda]$ , it follows from condition (6) of Definition 2.2, this can be done. The next property of  $P_2$  that we used was that Lemma 2.15 holds, but of course this also holds for  $P_{\lambda+2}$ . The third is in the proof and statement of Claim 5. When choosing the pair  $(s, q)$  in  $R \times P_2$  we require that it satisfies condition (2) in Claim 5. In the current situation, each  $\dot{U}_\zeta$  is not simply

an  $R$ -name but rather it is a  $P_\lambda(I_\lambda) \star \dot{R}_0$ -name. Therefore, there is a  $P_\lambda(I_\lambda)$ -name for a suitable  $q$  so that  $(s, q) \Vdash H \cap \bigcup \{\dot{U}_\zeta : \zeta \in F\}$  is empty. This causes no difficulty since  $P_\lambda(I_\lambda)$ -names for elements of  $\dot{Q}_{\lambda+1}$  are, in fact, elements of  $\dot{Q}_{\lambda+1}$ . That is, a choice for  $(s, q)$  in  $R \times (\dot{Q}_\lambda \star \dot{Q}_{\lambda+1})$  can be made in  $V[G_\lambda]$  as required in Claim 5.  $\square$

#### 4. BUILDING THE FINAL MODEL

In this section we present the construction of the iteration sequence of length  $\kappa + \kappa$  extending that of Definition 2.2 that will be used to prove the main theorem.

We introduce more terminology.

**Definition 4.1.** Fix any  $\mu \leq \lambda \leq \kappa$  and define  $\mathcal{Q}(\lambda, \mu)$  to be the set of all iterations  $\mathbf{q}$  of the form  $\langle P_\alpha^\mathbf{q}, \dot{Q}_\beta^\mathbf{q} : \alpha \leq \lambda + \mu, \beta < \lambda + \mu \rangle \in H(\kappa^+)$  satisfying that

- (1)  $\langle P_\alpha^\mathbf{q}, \dot{Q}_\beta^\mathbf{q} : \alpha \leq \lambda, \beta < \lambda \rangle$  is our sequence  $\langle P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \alpha \leq \lambda, \beta < \lambda \rangle$  from Section 2,
- (2) for all  $\lambda \leq \beta < \lambda + \mu$ ,  $\dot{Q}_\beta^\mathbf{q} \in H(\kappa)$  is a  $P_\beta^\mathbf{q}$ -name of a ccc poset,
- (3) for all  $\alpha \leq \mu$  and  $p \in P_\alpha^\mathbf{q}$ ,  $p \restriction \lambda \in P_\lambda^\mathbf{q}$  and  $\text{dom}(p) \setminus \lambda$  is finite,
- (4) if  $\lambda < \kappa$ , then  $\mathbf{q} \in H(\kappa)$ .

For  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{Q}(\lambda, \mu)$ , let  $\mathbf{q}(\kappa)$  denote the element of  $\mathcal{Q}(\kappa, \mu)$  where  $\dot{Q}_{\kappa+\beta}^{\mathbf{q}(\kappa)} = \dot{Q}_{\lambda+\beta}^\mathbf{q}$  for all  $\beta < \mu$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** Let  $\mu < \kappa$  and let  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{Q}(\kappa, \mu)$  and let  $\mathcal{U} = \{\dot{U}_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  be a sequence of  $P_{\kappa+\mu}^\mathbf{q}$ -names. Assume that  $P_{\kappa+\mu}^\mathbf{q}$  forces that  $\mathcal{U}$  is an S-space task. Let  $\bar{M}$  be an elementary submodel of  $H(\kappa^+)$  of cardinality  $\aleph_1$  that is closed under  $\omega$ -sequences and contains  $\{\mathcal{U}, \mathbf{q}\}$ . Choose any  $\lambda \in \mathbf{E} \cap \kappa$  so that  $\bar{M} \cap \kappa \subset I_\lambda$ . Then  $P_{\kappa+\mu}^\mathbf{q}$  forces that  $Q(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_\lambda)$  is ccc.

*Proof.* Since  $\mu \in \bar{M}$ , it follows that  $\mu \leq \lambda$ . Furthermore, by the assumptions on  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{q} \in \bar{M}$ , it follows that there is a  $\gamma \in \bar{M} \cap \kappa$  such that  $\dot{Q}_\beta$  is a  $P_\gamma$ -name for all  $\kappa \leq \beta < \kappa + \mu$ . In addition, for each  $\beta \in \bar{M} \cap \mu$ ,  $\dot{Q}_\beta$  is a  $P_\gamma(\bar{M} \cap \gamma)$ -name. Since  $\gamma < \lambda$ , there is a  $P_\lambda$ -name,  $\dot{R}$ , of a finite support iteration of length  $\mu$  such that  $P_\kappa \star \dot{R}$  is isomorphic to  $P_{\kappa+\mu}^\mathbf{q}$ . More precisely, the  $\beta$ -th iterand for  $\dot{R}$  is the name  $\dot{Q}_{\kappa+\beta}$ . Similarly, let  $\dot{R}_0$  be the set of conditions in  $\dot{R}$  with support contained in  $\bar{M} \cap \mu$  and values taken in  $\bar{M} \cap \dot{Q}_{\kappa+\beta}$  for each  $\beta$  in the support. Then we have that  $\mathbf{1}_{P_\lambda} \Vdash \dot{R}_0 \subset_c \dot{R}$ . By minor re-naming, we may treat  $\mathcal{U}$  as a sequence of  $P_\lambda(I_\lambda) \star \dot{R}_0$ -names. Since  $P_{\kappa+\mu}^\mathbf{q}$  forces that  $\mathcal{U}$  is an S-space task, it follows that  $P_\lambda \star \dot{R}$  also forces that  $\mathcal{U}$  is

an S-space task. By Corollary 3.4,  $P_{\lambda+2}$  forces that  $\dot{R} \times Q(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_\lambda)$  is ccc. By Lemma 2.16,  $P_\kappa$  forces that  $\dot{R} \times Q(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_\lambda)$  is ccc. Since  $P_{\kappa+\mu}^{\mathbf{q}}$  is isomorphic to  $P_\kappa \star \dot{R}$ , this completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $\kappa > \aleph_2$  be a regular cardinal in a model of GCH. There is an iteration sequence  $\langle P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa + \kappa, \beta < \kappa + \kappa \rangle$  such that  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}$  forces that there are no S-spaces and, for all  $\mu < \kappa$ ,  $\langle P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa + \mu, \beta < \kappa + \mu \rangle$  is in  $\mathcal{Q}(\kappa, \mu)$ . It therefore follows that  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}$  is cardinal preserving and forces that  $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa = \mathfrak{c}$ .*

*The iteration can be chosen so that, in addition, Martin's Axiom holds in the extension.*

*Proof.* Fix a sequence  $\mathcal{I} = \{I_\gamma : \gamma \in \kappa\}$  as described in the construction of the sequence  $\langle P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa \rangle$ . Also let  $\mathcal{Q}(\lambda, \mu)$  for  $\mu \leq \lambda < \kappa$  be defined as in Definition 4.1.

We introduce still more notation. For all  $\alpha \leq \lambda < \kappa$ , let  $P_\alpha^\lambda$  simply denote  $P_\alpha$  and  $\dot{Q}_\alpha^\lambda = \dot{Q}_\alpha$ . Also for any  $\mu \leq \lambda < \kappa$  and sequence  $\mathbf{q}' = \langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \mu \rangle \in H(\kappa)$ , let  $\dot{Q}'_{\lambda+\beta}(\mathbf{q}')$  denote  $\dot{Q}'_\beta$ . By recursion on  $\alpha < \mu$ , let  $P_{\lambda+\alpha}^\lambda(\mathbf{q}')$  denote the limit of the iteration sequence  $\langle P_\zeta^\lambda(\mathbf{q}'), \dot{Q}'_\beta(\mathbf{q}') : \zeta < \alpha, \beta < \alpha \rangle$  so long as this sequence (and its limit) is in  $\mathcal{Q}(\lambda, \alpha)$ . Say that a sequence  $\mathbf{q}' = \langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle \in H(\kappa)$  is suitable if for all  $\alpha \in \mathbf{E} \cap \lambda + 1$ ,  $\langle P_\zeta^\lambda(\mathbf{q}'), \dot{Q}'_\beta(\mathbf{q}') : \zeta \leq \alpha, \beta < \alpha \rangle$  is in  $\mathcal{Q}(\lambda, \alpha)$ . We state for reference two properties of suitable sequences.

*Fact 1.* If  $\lambda$  is a limit ordinal, then  $\langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta \in \lambda \rangle \in H(\kappa)$  is suitable so long as  $\langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \mu \rangle$  is suitable for all  $\mu < \lambda$ .

*Fact 2.* If  $\mathbf{q}' = \langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta \in \lambda \rangle \in H(\kappa)$  is suitable, then  $\langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta \in \lambda + 1 \rangle$  is suitable for any  $P_{\lambda+\lambda}^\lambda(\mathbf{q}')$ -name  $\dot{Q}'_\lambda$  of a ccc poset of cardinality at most  $\aleph_1$ .

Now that we have this cumbersome, but necessary, notation out of the way, the proof of the theorem is a routine consequence of the prior results. Let  $\sqsubset$  be a well ordering of  $H(\kappa)$  in type  $\kappa$ . We recursively define a sequence  $\langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \kappa \rangle$  and a 1-to-1 sequence  $\langle \mathcal{U}_\beta : \beta < \kappa \rangle$ . One inductive assumption is that every initial segment of  $\langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \kappa \rangle$  is a suitable sequence. The list  $\{\mathcal{U}_\beta : \beta < \kappa\}$  will contain the list the potential S-space tasks as we deal with them.

Let  $\lambda < \kappa$  and assume that  $\langle \dot{Q}'_\beta, \mathcal{U}_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle \in H(\kappa)$  has been chosen. If  $\lambda \notin \mathbf{E}$ , then  $\dot{Q}'_\lambda$  is the trivial poset and  $\mathcal{U}_\lambda = \lambda$ . Now let  $\lambda \in \mathbf{E}$  and let  $\mathbf{q}' = \langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle$ . Consider the set of all  $P_{\lambda+\lambda}^\lambda(\mathbf{q}')$ -names  $\mathcal{U} = \{\dot{U}_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  that are forced to be S-space tasks. Consider only those  $\mathcal{U}$  for

which there is an elementary submodel  $\bar{M}$  of  $H(\kappa^+)$  as in Lemma 4.2. More specifically, such that  $\bar{M} \cap \lambda \subset I_\lambda$ ,  $\{\mathcal{U}, P_{\lambda+\lambda}^\lambda(\mathbf{q}')\} \in \bar{M}$ ,  $|\bar{M}| = \aleph_1$ , and  $\bar{M}^\omega \subset \bar{M}$ . The final requirement of such  $\mathcal{U}$  is that they are not in the set  $\langle \mathcal{U}_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle$ . If any such  $\mathcal{U}$  exist, then let  $\mathcal{U}_\lambda$  be the  $\sqsubset$ -minimal one. Loosely,  $\mathcal{U}_\lambda$  is the  $\sqsubset$ -minimal S-space task that has not yet been handled and can be handled at this stage. Otherwise, let  $\mathcal{U}_\lambda = \lambda$  (so as to preserve the 1-to-1 property). Now we choose  $\dot{Q}'_\lambda$ . If  $\mathcal{U}_\lambda = \lambda$ , then  $\dot{Q}_\lambda$  is the trivial poset. Otherwise, of course,  $\dot{Q}_\lambda$  is the  $P_{\lambda+\lambda}^{\lambda+2}(\mathbf{q}')$ -name for  $Q(\mathcal{U}_\lambda, \dot{C}_\lambda)$ . By Lemma 4.2 and Fact 2,  $\langle \dot{Q}_\beta : \beta \leq \lambda \rangle$  is suitable.

This completes the recursive construction of the suitable sequence  $\mathbf{q}' = \langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \kappa \rangle$  and the listing  $\langle \mathcal{U}_\beta : \beta < \kappa \rangle$ . It remains only to prove that if  $\mathcal{U} = \{\dot{U}_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  is a  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}^\kappa(\mathbf{q}')$ -name of an S-space task, then there is an  $\alpha < \kappa$  such that  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ . Fix any such  $\mathcal{U}$  and elementary submodel  $\bar{M} \prec H(\kappa^+)$  such that  $\{\mathcal{U}, P_{\kappa+\kappa}^\kappa(\mathbf{q}')\} \in \bar{M}$ ,  $|\bar{M}| = \aleph_1$ , and  $\bar{M}^\omega \subset \bar{M}$ . Let  $\Lambda$  be the set of  $\lambda \in \kappa$  such that  $\bar{M} \cap \lambda \subset I_\lambda$ . Let  $\gamma$  be the order type of the set of predecessors of  $\mathcal{U}$  in the well ordering  $\sqsubset$ . Choose any  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  such that the order type of  $\Lambda \cap \lambda$  is greater than  $\gamma$ . Note that  $\Lambda \subset \mathbf{E}$ . For every  $\mu \in \Lambda \cap \lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{U}$  would have been an appropriate choice for  $\mathcal{U}_\mu$  and if not chosen, then  $\mu \neq \mathcal{U}_\mu \sqsubset \mathcal{U}$ . Since the sequence is 1-to-1, there is therefore a  $\mu \in \Lambda \cap \lambda$  such that  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_\mu$ .

It should be clear that we can ensure that Martin's Axiom holds in the extension by making minor adjustments to the choice of  $\dot{Q}'_\beta$  for  $\beta \notin \mathbf{E}$  in the sequence  $\langle \dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \kappa \rangle$  together with some additional bookkeeping,  $\square$

## 5. MOORE-MROWKA TASKS

The Moore-Mrowka problem asks if every compact space of countable tightness is sequential. A space has countable tightness if the closure of a set is equal to the union of the closures of all its countable subsets. A space is sequential providing that each subset is closed so long as it contains the limits of all its converging (countable) subsequences. To illustrate that a sequential space has countable tightness, note that a space has countable tightness if a set is closed so long as it contains the closures of all of its countable subsets. Say that a compact non-sequential space of countable tightness is a Moore-Mrowka space.

Results on the Moore-Mrowka problem have closely resembled those of the S-space problem. In particular, there are proofs that PFA implies there are no Moore-Mrowka spaces that have many similarities to the proof that PFA implies there are no S-spaces. While it is independent with CH as to whether Moore-Mrowka spaces exist [5], it is known that



$\diamond$  implies there are (Cohen indestructible) Moore-Mrowka spaces of cardinality  $\aleph_1$  [14]. In addition,  $\diamond$  implies there is a separable compact space of countable tightness with cardinality  $2^{\aleph_1}$  (greater than  $\mathfrak{c}$ ) [8]. It is also known that the addition of  $\aleph_2$  Cohen reals over a model of  $\diamond + \aleph_2 < 2^{\aleph_1}$  results in a model in which there is a compact separable space of countable tightness that has cardinality greater than  $\mathfrak{c}$  [6]. Of course these spaces are Moore-Mrowka spaces since every separable sequential space has cardinality at most  $\mathfrak{c}$ .

Here are two open problems and a third that we solve in the affirmative in this section.

**Question 5.1.** Is it consistent with  $\mathfrak{c} > \aleph_2$  that every compact space of countable tightness is sequential?

**Question 5.2.** Is it consistent with  $\mathfrak{p} > \aleph_2$  that there is a Moore-Mrowka space?

**Question 5.3.** Is it consistent with  $\mathfrak{c} > \aleph_2$  that every separable Moore-Mrowka space has cardinality at most  $\mathfrak{c}$ ?

A Moore-Mrowka task mentioned in the title of the section is similar to an S-space task. The difference will be that rather than using the poset  $Q(\mathcal{U}, C)$  to force an uncountable discrete subset, we will hope to force an uncountable (algebraic) free sequence. We define these notions and indicate their relevance.

**Definition 5.1.** A sequence  $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$  is a free sequence in a space  $X$  if, for every  $\delta < \omega_1$ , the initial segment  $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in \delta\}$  and the final segment  $\{x_\beta : \beta \in \omega_1 \setminus \delta\}$  have disjoint closures.

A sequence  $\{x_\alpha, U_\alpha, W_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$  is an algebraic free sequence in a space  $X$  providing

- (1)  $x_\alpha \in U_\alpha$  and  $W_\alpha$  are open sets with  $\overline{U_\alpha} \subset W_\alpha$ ,
- (2) for every  $\alpha < \delta \in \omega_1$ ,  $x_\delta \notin W_\alpha$  and there is a finite  $H \subset \delta+1$  such that  $\{x_\eta : \eta \leq \delta\} \subset \bigcup \{U_\beta : \beta \in H\}$ .

Free sequences were introduced by Arhangel'skii. Algebraic free sequences were introduced by Todorćević in a slightly different formulation. The advantage of an algebraic free sequence is that the only reference to the (second order) closure property is with the pairs  $U_\alpha, W_\alpha$ . If  $\{x_\alpha, U_\alpha, W_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$  is an algebraic free sequence, then the set  $\{x_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \omega_1\}$  is a free sequence. This follows from the fact that for all  $\delta \in \omega_1$ , there is a finite  $H \subset \delta + 1$  satisfying that  $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta\} \subset U_H = \bigcup \{U_\alpha : \alpha \in H\}$  and  $\{x_\beta : \delta < \beta \in \omega_1\}$  is disjoint from  $W_H = \bigcup \{W_\alpha : \alpha \in H\}$ . The free sequence property now follows from

the fact that  $U_H$  and  $X \setminus W_H$  have disjoint closures. This was crucial in Balogh's proof [4] that PFA implies there are no Moore-Mrowka spaces.

**Proposition 5.2** ([3]). *A compact space has countable tightness if and only if it contains no uncountable free sequence.*

**Definition 5.3.** *A sequence  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$  is a Moore-Mrowka task if, for all  $\alpha \in \omega_1$ ,  $\alpha \in A_\alpha \subset \alpha + 1$ , and*

- (1) *for all  $\beta < \alpha$  there is a  $\gamma$  such that  $A_\gamma \cap \{\beta, \alpha\} = \{\alpha\}$ , and*
- (2) *for all uncountable  $A \subset \omega_1$ , there is a  $\delta \in \omega_1$  such that for all  $\beta \in \omega_1 \setminus \delta$ ,  $(A \cap \delta) \cap \bigcap_{\gamma \in H} A_\gamma$  is not empty for all finite  $H \subset \{\gamma : \beta \in A_\gamma\}$ .*

The idea behind a Moore-Mrowka task is that we identify  $\omega_1$  with a set of points in space  $X$  and so that there is a collection  $\{U_\alpha, W_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$  that is a neighborhood assignment for those points. For each  $\alpha$ ,  $\overline{U_\alpha} \subset W_\alpha$  and  $W_\alpha \cap \omega_1$  is also contained in  $\alpha + 1$ . Then we set  $A_\alpha = U_\alpha \cap \omega_1$ . Condition (1) is trivial to arrange but condition (2) is a  $\diamond$ -like condition. A distinction with S-space task is that the non-existence of a Moore-Mrowka task extracted from a compact space of countable tightness does not imply that the space is sequential. The similarity with S-space task is that we will use a Moore-Mrowka task to generically introduce an algebraic free sequence.

**Definition 5.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$  be a Moore-Mrowka task and let  $C \subset \omega_1$  be a cub. The poset  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}, C)$  is the set of finite subsets of  $\omega_1 \setminus \min(C)$  that are separated by  $C$ . For each  $H \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}, C)$  and each  $\beta \in H$ , let  $A(H, \beta)$  be the intersection of the family  $\{A_\gamma : \gamma \in H, \beta \in A_\gamma\}$ . We define  $H < K$  from  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}, C)$  providing  $H \supset K$  and for each  $\alpha \in H \cap \max(K)$ ,  $\alpha \in A(K, \min(K \setminus \alpha))$ .*

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\lambda \in \mathbf{E}$  and let  $\dot{R}_0$  be a  $P_\lambda(I_\lambda)$ -name that is forced by  $P_\lambda$  to be ccc poset. Let  $\dot{R}$  be a  $P_\lambda$ -name of a ccc poset such  $\mathbf{1}_{P_\lambda}$  forces that  $\dot{R}_0 \subset_c \dot{R}$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{A} = \{\dot{A}_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  is a sequence of  $P_\lambda(I_\lambda) \star \dot{R}_0$ -names of subsets of  $\omega_1$  such that  $P_\lambda \star \dot{R}$  forces that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a Moore-Mrowka task. Then the  $P_{\lambda+2}$ -name  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_\lambda)$  satisfies that  $P_{\lambda+2}$  forces that  $\dot{R} \times \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_\lambda)$  is ccc.*

*Proof.* The proof proceeds much as it did in Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 3.4 for S-space tasks. To show that a poset of the form  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}, C)$  is ccc, it again suffices to prove that, for each  $n \in \omega$ , there is no uncountable antichain consisting of pairwise disjoint sets of cardinality  $n$ . So we consider an arbitrary family of pairwise disjoint sets of cardinality  $n$ . Fix  $P_{\lambda+2} \star \dot{R}$ -names  $\{\dot{H}_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$  for a set of pairwise disjoint elements

of  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}, \dot{C}_\lambda) \cap [\omega_1]^n$ . Following Lemma 3.3, we may assume that, for each  $\xi \in \omega_1$ , it is forced that  $\xi < \min(\dot{H}_\xi)$  and that  $\{\xi\} \cup \dot{H}_\xi$  is also separated by  $\dot{C}_\lambda$ . We prove that no condition forces this to be an antichain.

Let  $M$  be a countable elementary submodel containing all the above and let  $p_1 \in P_{\lambda+2}$  be chosen as in Lemma 2.15 so that  $p_1$  is  $(M, P_{\lambda+2})$ -generic and so that  $p_1(\lambda) \in M$ . Let  $p_1 \restriction \lambda \in G_\lambda$  be a  $P_\lambda$ -generic filter and pass to the extension  $V[G_\lambda]$ . Let  $R = \text{val}_{G_\lambda}(\dot{R})$  and let  $G_1 \subset \mathcal{C}_{\omega_1}$  so that  $p_1 \restriction \lambda + 1 \in G_\lambda \star G_1$  is  $P_{\lambda+1}$ -generic. Let  $\delta = M \cap \omega_1$ . We will prove that  $p_1$  forces that  $\dot{H}_\delta$  is compatible with some element of  $\{\dot{H}_\eta : \eta \in \delta\}$ .

For each  $\zeta \in \omega_1$ , let, in  $V[G_\lambda]$ ,  $\dot{J}_\zeta$  denote the  $R$ -name for the set  $\{\gamma : \zeta \in \dot{A}_\gamma\}$  and, for each finite  $F \subset \omega_1$ , also let  $\dot{A}_F$  denote the  $R$ -name for  $\bigcap_{\gamma \in F} \dot{A}_\gamma$ . We leave the reader to check that it suffices to prove that  $p_1$  forces that for each finite  $F \subset \dot{J}_{\min(\dot{H}_\delta)}$ , there is an  $\eta < \delta$  such that  $\dot{H}_\eta \subset \dot{A}_F$ . For each  $\zeta \in \omega_1$  and finite  $F \subset \omega_1$ , we will let  $J_\zeta$  and  $A_F$  denote  $\text{val}_{G_R}(\dot{J}_\zeta)$  and  $\text{val}_{G_R}(\dot{A}_F)$  respectively. Also, for the remainder of the proof we will treat each  $\dot{H}_\xi$  as the canonical  $R \times (Q_\lambda \star \dot{Q}_{\lambda+1})$ -name obtained from the evaluation of the original  $P_{\lambda+2} \star \dot{R}$ -name by  $G_\lambda$ . For each  $\xi \in \omega_1$  and  $H \in [\omega_1]^n$ , let  $\Gamma_\xi(H)$  be the (possibly empty) set of conditions in  $R \times (Q_\lambda \star \dot{Q}_{\lambda+1})$  that force  $H$  to equal  $\dot{H}_\xi$ .

We need an updated version of  $\omega_1$ -full. Say that a countable set  $B$ , in  $V[G_\lambda][G_R]$ , is  $\mathcal{A}$ -large if there is a  $\gamma \in \omega_1$  such that  $B \cap A_F \neq \emptyset$  for all  $\beta \in \omega_1 \setminus \gamma$  and finite  $F \in J_\beta$ . We may interpret this as that  $\overline{B}$  contains  $\omega_1 \setminus \gamma$ .

For  $\xi \in \omega_1$  and  $(r, p) \in R \times (Q_\lambda \star \dot{Q}_{\lambda+1})$ , let  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  be the set of conditions in  $\Gamma_\xi(H)$  that are below  $(r, p)$ . In other words,  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  is not empty if and only if  $(r, p) \Vdash H \neq \dot{H}_\xi$ . Similarly, for each  $0 < i < n$  and  $H \in [\omega_1]^i$ , let  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p)) = \bigcup \{\Gamma_\xi(H \cup \{\eta\}, (r, p)) : \eta \in \omega_1\}$ . For  $H \in [\omega_1]^n$ , say that  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  is full if  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (\bar{r}, p))$  is not empty for all  $\bar{r} \leq r$ . For  $0 < i < n$  and  $H \in [\omega_1]^{n-i}$ , say that  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r, p))$  is full if there is a  $R$ -name  $\dot{B}$  that is forced to be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -large set of  $\eta \in \omega_1$  and, for each  $\eta$  and  $s \Vdash \eta \in \dot{B}$ ,  $\Gamma_\xi(H \cup \{\eta\}, (s, p))$  is full.

*Claim 8.* Suppose that  $\xi, r, p \in M[G_\lambda]$  and that  $\Gamma_\xi(\emptyset, (r, p))$  is full. Suppose also that  $\bar{r} \in R$  forces that  $F$  is a finite subset of  $\dot{J}_\zeta$  for some  $\delta \leq \zeta \in \omega_1$ . Then there are  $(s, q), H \in M[G_\lambda]$  and  $\bar{s} < \bar{r}$  such that

- (1)  $(s, q) < (r, p)$  in  $R \times (Q_\lambda \star \dot{Q}_{\lambda+1})$ ,
- (2)  $\bar{s} < s$ ,
- (3)  $\bar{s} \Vdash H \subset \dot{A}_F$ ,

(4)  $(s, q) \Vdash \dot{H}_\xi = H$ .

*Proof of Claim:* There is an  $R \times Q_\lambda$ -name  $\dot{B}_0 \in M[G_\lambda]$  that is forced to be a  $\mathcal{A}$ -large subset of  $\delta$  and witnesses that  $\Gamma_\xi(\emptyset, (r, p))$  is full. Therefore there are  $\eta < \delta$  and  $r' < \bar{r}$  such that  $\bar{r}_1 \Vdash \eta \in \dot{B}_0 \cap A_F$ . There is no loss to assuming, by elementarity, that  $\bar{r}_1$  extends some  $r_1 \in M[G_\lambda]$  such that  $r_1 \Vdash \eta \in \dot{B}_0$ . Since  $r_1 \Vdash \eta \in \dot{B}_0$ , we have that  $\Gamma_\xi(\{\eta\}, (r_1, p))$  is full. Following a recursion of length  $n$ , there is an  $\bar{r}_n < \bar{r}$  in  $R$ , an  $H = \{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n\} \in M[G_\lambda]$ , and an  $\bar{r}_n < r_n \in M[G_\lambda]$  such that  $\bar{r}_n \Vdash H \subset A_F$  and  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (r_n, p))$  is full. Since  $\bar{r}_n < r_n$ ,  $\Gamma_\xi(H, (\bar{r}_n, p))$  is not empty. Therefore there is a pair  $(\bar{s}, \bar{q}) < (\bar{r}, p)$  forcing that  $H = \dot{H}_\xi$ . By elementarity, since  $\xi, H, p \in M[G_\lambda]$ , the set of  $\{s \in R \cap M : (\exists q)((s, q) < (r_n, p) \ \& \ (s, q) \Vdash H = \dot{H}_\xi)\}$  is predense below  $r_n$ . Therefore there is an  $(s, q) < (r_n, p) \in M[G_\lambda]$  with  $s \not\leq \bar{r}_n$  such that  $(s, q) \Vdash H = \dot{H}_\xi$ . Let  $\bar{s}$  be any extension of  $s, \bar{r}_n$ .  $\square$

*Claim 9.* For every  $(r, p) \in R \times (Q_\lambda \star \dot{Q}_{\lambda+1})$ , there is a  $\delta$  so and a  $r_0 < r$  such that  $\Gamma_\delta(\emptyset, (r_0, p))$  is full.

*Proof of Claim:* Let  $(r, p) \in M_0$  be a countable elementary submodel of  $H(\kappa^+)[G_\lambda]$  so that  $\{\mathcal{A}, R, P_{\lambda+2}\} \in M_0$ . Choose any  $(\bar{r}, \bar{p}) < (r, p)$  that is an  $(M_0, R \times (Q_\lambda \star \dot{Q}_{\lambda+1}))$ -generic condition. Let  $\delta_0 = M_0 \cap \omega_1$ . Choose any continuous  $\in$ -chain  $\{M_\alpha : 0 < \alpha < \omega_1\}$  of countable elementary submodels of  $H(\kappa^+)[G_\lambda]$  such that  $\{M_0, (\bar{r}, \bar{p})\} \in M_1$ .

For each  $\alpha \in \omega_1$ , let  $\delta_\alpha = M_\alpha \cap \omega_1$ . Let  $C^*$  be the cub  $\{\delta_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ . Choose any extension  $(r_n, p_n)$  of  $(\bar{r}, \bar{p})$  such that  $\pi_1(p_2(\lambda + 1)) \subset C^* \cup \delta_0$ , and so that there is an  $H = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\} \in [\omega_1]^n$  with  $(r_n, p_n) \Vdash H = \dot{H}_{\delta_0}$ . Of course this implies that  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(H, (r_n, p)) \supset \Gamma_{\delta_0}(H, (r_n, p_n))$  is actually full. Okay, then  $H_{n-1} = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}\}$  is in  $M_{\alpha_n}$ . Let's take the  $R$ -name  $\dot{E}_{n-1}$  to the set of  $(\eta, \tilde{r})$  such that  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(\{\eta\} \cup H_{n-1}, (\tilde{r}, p))$  is full. The condition  $r_n$  forces that  $\dot{E}_{n-1}$  is uncountable. Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is a Moore-Mrowka task in  $V[G_\lambda \star G_R]$ ,  $r_n$  forces that  $\dot{E}_{n-1} \in M_{\alpha_n}$  contains an  $\mathcal{A}$ -large set. By elementarity and the fact that  $r_n$  is  $(M_{\alpha_n}, R)$ -generic, there is an  $r_{n-1}$  in  $M_{\alpha_n}$  that forces  $\dot{E}_{n-1}$  contains an  $\mathcal{A}$ -large set. Therefore, for such an  $r_{n-1} \in M_{\alpha_n}$ , we have that  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(H_{n-1}, (r_{n-1}, p))$  is full. This recursion continues as above and for each  $i < n$ , there is an  $r_i \in M_{\alpha_i}$  such that  $\Gamma_{\delta_0}(\{\xi_j : j < i\}, (r_i, p))$  is full. Setting  $\delta = \delta_0$ , this completes the proof of the Claim.  $\square$

Following the proof of Corollary 3.4 we can complete the proof using that  $p_1$  satisfied the conclusion of Lemma 2.15. Using Claim 9, it follows from Claim 8 that in  $V[G_\lambda][G_R]$ , for each  $\delta \leq \zeta \in \omega_1$  and finite  $F \subset J_\zeta$ , the set  $\mathcal{W}_F$  consisting of those  $p \in M[G_\lambda] \cap (Q_\lambda \star \dot{Q}_{\lambda+1})$  for which there

is a  $\bar{s} \in G_R$  and  $\xi \in \delta$  such that  $(\bar{s}, p) \Vdash \dot{H}_\xi \subset A_F$ , is a dense subset of  $M[G_\lambda] \cap (Q_\lambda \star \dot{Q}_{\lambda+1})$ . By the genericity of  $((G_1) \restriction \delta) \star (p_{1\lambda}^\uparrow)$  over the model  $V[G_\lambda \star R]$  as in Lemma 2.15, it meets  $\mathcal{W}_F$ . It follows that  $p_1$  forces that there is a  $\xi \in \delta$  such that  $\dot{H}_\xi \subset A_F$ . Applying this fact to  $\zeta = \min(H_\delta)$  completes the proof.  $\square$

Now we show that Moore-Mrowka tasks will arise that will allow us to prove there is a minor additional condition that we can place on the construction of  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}$  (assuming an extra  $\diamond$ -principle) that will force there are no separable Moore-Mrowka spaces of cardinality greater than  $\mathfrak{c}$ . Let  $S_1^\kappa$  denote the set of  $\lambda \in \kappa$  that have cofinality  $\omega_1$ . We will assume there is a  $\diamond(S_1^\kappa)$ -sequence.

We begin with this Lemma.

**Lemma 5.6** ( $\mathfrak{c}^{<\mathfrak{c}} = \mathfrak{c}$ ). *Let  $X$  be a separable Moore-Mrowka space of cardinality greater than  $\mathfrak{c}$ . Let  $X \in M$  be an elementary submodel of  $H(\theta)$  for some sufficiently large  $\theta$  such that  $|M| = \mathfrak{c}$  and  $M^\mu \subset M$  for all  $\mu < \mathfrak{c}$ . For any point  $z \in X \setminus M$  there is a sequence  $\{B_\eta : \eta < \mathfrak{c}\}$  of countable subsets of  $M \cap X$  satisfying, for all  $\eta < \zeta < \mathfrak{c}$ ,*

- (1)  $\overline{B_\eta}$  contains  $B_\zeta \cup \{z\}$
- (2) for all  $A \subset M \cap X$  with  $z \in \overline{A}$ , there is an  $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$  such that  $\overline{A}$  contains  $B_\alpha$ .

*Proof.* Since  $X$  is separable, we can let  $B_0 \in M$  be any countable dense subset. Fix an enumeration  $\{S_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\}$  of all the countable subsets of  $M \cap X$  that have  $z$  in their closure. Let  $\mathcal{W} \in M$  be a base for the topology. Assume we have chosen  $\{B_\xi : \xi < \eta\}$  for some  $\eta < \mathfrak{c}$ . Assume, by induction, that  $B_\xi$  is also a subset of  $\overline{S_\xi}$ . The set  $\overline{S_\eta} \cup \{\overline{B_\xi} : \xi < \eta\}$  is an element of  $M$  and every member contains  $z$ . Let  $K_\eta$  denote the intersection of this family. Choose any neighborhood  $U \in \mathcal{W}$  of  $z$ . Since  $z \in W \cap K$ , it follows from elementarity that  $M \cap W \cap K_\eta$  is non-empty. Therefore,  $z$  is in the closure of some countable  $B_\eta \subset M \cap K_\eta$ . This completes the inductive construction of the family. We simply have to verify that property (2) holds. Let  $z \in \overline{A}$  for some  $A \subset M \cap X$ . By countable tightness, there is an  $\eta$  such that  $S_\eta \subset A$ . Therefore  $\overline{A} \supset B_\eta$ .  $\square$

*Remark 10.* A compact separable space of cardinality at most  $\mathfrak{c}$  will have a  $G_\delta$ -dense set of points of character less than  $\mathfrak{c}$ . Therefore, in a model with  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{c}$ , any such space has the property that the sequential closure of any subset is countably compact. In particular, in such a model a Moore-Mrowka space necessarily has weight at least  $\mathfrak{c}$  and will have a countably compact subset that is not closed. A space is said to be C-closed if it has no such subspace, see [7, 10].

**Definition 5.7.** Say that a sequence  $\langle y_\alpha, U_\alpha, W_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  is a  $\kappa$ -MM sequence of a space  $X$  if

- (1)  $U_\alpha, W_\alpha$  are open in  $X$  and  $y_\alpha \in U_\alpha \subset \overline{U_\alpha} \subset W_\alpha$ ,
- (2)  $y_\gamma \notin U_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha < \gamma \in \kappa$ ,
- (3) for all  $\beta < \alpha < \kappa$ ,  $U_\gamma \cap \{y_\beta, y_\alpha\} = \{y_\alpha\}$  for some  $\alpha \leq \gamma \in \kappa$ ,
- (4) for every  $A \subset \kappa$ , there is a countable  $B \subset A$  and a  $\gamma < \kappa$  such that the closure of  $\{y_\alpha : \gamma < \alpha < \kappa\}$  is either contained in the closure of  $\{y_\beta : \beta \in B\}$  or is disjoint from the closure of  $\{y_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$ .

**Theorem 5.8.** Let  $\langle P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa + \kappa, \beta < \kappa + \kappa \rangle$  be an iteration sequence in the sense of Theorem 4.3. In particular, assume that for all  $\mu < \kappa$  there is a  $\mathbf{q}_\mu \in \mathcal{Q}(\mu, \mu)$  satisfying that  $P_{\kappa+\lambda}$  is equal to  $P_{\kappa+\mu}^{\mathbf{q}_\mu(\kappa)}$ .

Let  $\dot{X}$  be a  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}$ -name of a compact separable space of countable tightness. Assume also that  $\langle \dot{y}_\alpha, \dot{U}_\alpha, \dot{W}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  is forced to be a  $\kappa$ -MM sequence of  $\dot{X}$ . Then there is a cub  $C_{\dot{X}} \subset \kappa$  such that for each  $\lambda \in C_{\dot{X}} \cap S_1^\kappa$ , there is an injection  $f_\lambda : \omega_1 \rightarrow \lambda$  such that  $\mathcal{A} = \langle \dot{A}_\eta : \eta < \omega_1 \rangle$ , where  $\dot{A}_\eta = \{\xi : y_{f_\lambda(\xi)} \in \dot{U}_{f_\lambda(\eta)}\}$ , is forced by  $P_{\lambda+\lambda}^{\mathbf{q}_\lambda}$  to be a Moore-Mrowka task.

*Proof.* We may assume, since it is forced to be compact and separable, that  $\dot{X}$  is a  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}$ -name of a closed subspace of  $[0, 1]^\kappa$ . Let  $G$  be a  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}$ -generic filter so that we may make some observations about  $\dot{X}$  and the  $\kappa$ -MM sequence  $\langle y_\alpha, U_\alpha, W_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ . There is a point  $z \in \text{val}_G(\dot{X})$  that is a  $\kappa$ -accumulation point of  $\{y_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$ . We check that  $z$  is the unique such point. If  $U, W$  are open neighborhoods of  $z$  with  $\overline{U} \subset W$ , then  $A = \{\alpha \in \kappa : y_\alpha \in U\}$  is cofinal in  $\kappa$ . By condition (4) of the  $\kappa$ -MM property, there is a countable  $B \subset A$  so that the closure of  $\{y_\beta : \beta \in B\}$  contains  $\{y_\alpha : \sup(B) < \alpha < \kappa\}$ . It thus follows that that  $\{y_\alpha : \sup(B) < \alpha < \kappa\}$  is contained in  $W$  and shows that  $X \setminus W$  contains no  $\kappa$ -accumulation points of  $\{y_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$ . Now assume that  $z$  is in the closure of  $\{y_\beta : \beta \in A\}$  for some  $A \subset \kappa$ . Since the second clause of condition (4) of the  $\kappa$ -MM property fails, it follows that there is a countable  $B \subset A$  such that the closure of  $\{y_\beta : \beta \in B\}$  contains a final segment of  $\{y_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$ . We will be interested in the subspace  $X_\lambda = \{x \restriction \lambda : x \in X\}$  of  $[0, 1]^\lambda$ . Since this space is a continuous image of  $X$ , it also has countable tightness. Let  $\dot{z}$  be a canonical  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}$ -name for  $z$ .

Let  $M \prec H(\kappa^+)$  so that  $\sup(M \cap \kappa) = \lambda \in S_1^\kappa$  and  $M^\omega \subset M$ . We note that it follows from Corollary 2.14, and the fact that  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}/P_\kappa$  is ccc, that every countable subset of  $M \cap \kappa$  in  $V[G]$  has a name in  $M$ . Assume also that  $\dot{z}, \dot{X}, P_{\kappa+\kappa}$  and the  $\kappa$ -MM sequence are elements of

$M$ . Choose any continuous  $\in$ -increasing sequence  $\{M_\eta : \eta \in \omega_1\}$  of countable elementary submodels of  $M$  such that  $Y_\lambda = \bigcup \{M_\eta \cap \lambda : \eta \in \omega_1\}$  is cofinal in  $\lambda$ . Define  $f_\lambda$  so that  $f_\lambda(\eta) = \sup(M_\eta \cap \lambda)$ . It should be clear that to show that  $\mathcal{A}$ , as in the statement of the Theorem, is forced by  $P_{\lambda+\lambda}^{\mathfrak{q}_\lambda}$  to be a Moore-Mrowka task it is sufficient to check that condition (2) of Definition 5.3 is forced to hold. Let  $\dot{A}$  be any  $P_{\lambda+\lambda}^{\mathfrak{q}_\lambda}$ -name of an uncountable subset of  $\omega_1$ . We may regard  $P_{\lambda+\lambda}^{\mathfrak{q}_\lambda}$  as a complete subposet of  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}$  and so consider  $\text{val}_G(\dot{A})$  in  $V[G]$ . In the space  $X_\lambda$ , it is clear that  $z \restriction \lambda$  is in the closure of the set  $\{y_{f_\lambda(\eta)} : \eta \in \dot{A}\}$ . Therefore, there is a countable  $B \subset \dot{A}$  such that  $z \restriction \lambda$  is in the closure of the set  $\vec{y}(f_\lambda(B)) = \{y_{f_\lambda(\eta)} : \eta \in B\}$ . Now  $B$  is a countable subset of  $M \cap \lambda$ , and so there is a  $P_{\lambda+\lambda}^{\mathfrak{q}_\lambda}$ -name  $\dot{B}$  in  $M$  such that  $\text{val}_G(\dot{B})$  is  $B$ . Now we can apply elementarity (using that  $f_\lambda \restriction B \in M$ ) and observe that  $\dot{z}$  is forced to be in the closure of  $\{\dot{y}_{f_\lambda(\beta)} : \beta \in \dot{B}\}$ . Moreover, by elementarity and the  $\kappa$ -MM property, there is a  $\gamma \in \kappa \cap M$  such that the closure of  $\vec{y}(f_\lambda(\dot{B}))$  is forced to contain  $\{\dot{y}_\alpha : \gamma < \alpha < \kappa\}$ . For each  $\gamma < \alpha < \kappa$ ,  $\vec{y}(f_\lambda(\dot{B}))$  is forced to meet  $\bigcap_{\zeta \in H} \dot{U}_\zeta$  for all finite  $H \subset \{\zeta : \alpha \in \dot{U}_\zeta\}$ . Of course there is an  $\delta \in \omega_1$  such that  $\gamma < f_\lambda(\delta)$ . This completes the proof that, for all  $\beta \in \omega_1 \setminus \delta$ ,  $\dot{A} \cap \delta$  is forced to meet  $\bigcap_{\zeta \in H} \dot{A}_\zeta$  for all finite  $H \subset \{\zeta : \beta \in \dot{A}_\zeta\}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.9.** *It is consistent with Martin's Axiom and  $\mathfrak{c} > \aleph_2$  that there are no S-spaces and that compact separable spaces of countable tightness have cardinality at most  $\mathfrak{c}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\kappa > \aleph_2$  be a regular cardinal in a model of GCH. Using an iteration sequence as in Theorem 4.3, it follows from Theorem 5.8 and Lemma 5.6 that it suffices to ensure that for each  $\dot{X}$  and  $\kappa$ -MM-sequence as in Theorem 5.8, there is a  $\lambda \in C_{\dot{X}} \cap S_1^\kappa$  so that  $I_\lambda$  is chosen suitably and so that  $\dot{Q}_{\kappa+\lambda}$  is chosen to be  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}, \dot{C}_\lambda)$  for a sequence  $\mathcal{A}$  as identified in Theorem 5.8. This is a somewhat routine application of  $\diamond(S_1^\kappa)$ .

Since  $S_1^\kappa$  is stationary, we may assume that  $\diamond(S_1^\kappa)$  holds in  $V$ . There are many equivalent formulations of  $\diamond(S_1^\kappa)$  and we choose this one: There is a sequence  $\langle h_\alpha : \alpha \in S_1^\kappa \rangle$  satisfying

- (1) for each  $\alpha \in S_1^\kappa$ ,  $h_\alpha : \alpha \times \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$  is a function,
- (2) for all functions  $h : \kappa \times \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ , the set  $\{\alpha \in S_1^\kappa : h_\alpha \subset h\}$  is stationary.

We will also have to recursively define our sequence  $\mathcal{I} = \{I_\gamma : \gamma \in \mathbf{E}\}$  since special choices will have to be made for indices in  $S_1^\kappa$  and which, due to conditions (3) and (4) impact all the subsequent choices. To

assist with the condition (4) of the requirements on  $\mathcal{I}$ , we choose an enumeration  $\{J_\xi : \xi \in \kappa\}$  of  $[\kappa]^{\aleph_1}$  as follows. Let  $D \subset \kappa$  be a cub consisting of  $\lambda$  such that  $\mu + \mu^{\aleph_1} < \lambda$  for all  $\mu < \lambda$ . For each  $\mu \in D$ , the list  $\{J_\xi : \mu \leq \xi < \mu + \mu^{\aleph_1}\}$  is an enumeration of  $[\mu]^{\aleph_1}$ .

Say that a sequence  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda = \{I_\gamma : \gamma \in \mathbf{E} \cap \lambda\} \subset [\lambda]^{\leq \aleph_1}$  is an acceptable sequence if it satisfies the properties (1), (2), and (3) that we assume for the sequence  $\mathcal{I}$  in section 2, and, it also satisfies that, for each  $\xi < \mu \in \lambda$  such that  $\mu + \mu^{\aleph_1} < \lambda$ , there is a  $\zeta \in \mathbf{E} \cap \mu + \mu^{\aleph_1}$  such that  $J_\xi \subset I_\zeta$ . If  $\{\mathcal{I}_\lambda : \lambda \in D\}$  is an increasing sequence of acceptable sequences, then the union,  $\mathcal{I}$ , satisfies the requirements of section 2. Similarly, once we have chosen an acceptable sequence  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda$ , we will assume that the sequence  $\langle P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta : \alpha \leq \lambda, \beta < \lambda \rangle$  is defined as in Definition 2.2 using the sequence  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda$ .

In a similar fashion, we relativize the definition of  $\mathcal{Q}(\lambda, \mu)$  from Definition 4.1. Given an acceptable sequence  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda$ , say that a sequence  $\mathbf{q}' = \{\dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \lambda\} \in H(\kappa)$  is  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda$ -suitable providing (as in Theorem 4.3), by induction on  $\beta < \lambda$ ,  $\dot{Q}'_\beta(\mathbf{q}) = \dot{Q}'_\beta$  is a  $P_{\lambda+\beta}^\lambda(\mathbf{q})$ -name of a ccc poset, where  $P_\alpha^\lambda(\mathbf{q}) = P_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \leq \lambda$  and, for  $\beta > 0$ ,  $P_{\lambda+\beta}^\lambda(\mathbf{q})$  is the usual poset from the iteration sequence  $\langle P_\alpha^\lambda(\mathbf{q}), \dot{Q}'_\zeta(\mathbf{q}) : \alpha \leq \beta, \zeta < \beta \rangle$ .

Let  $f$  be any function from  $\kappa$  onto  $H(\kappa)$ . We recursively choose our sequences  $\{\mathcal{I}_\lambda : \lambda \in D\}$  and  $\{\dot{Q}'_\gamma : \gamma \in \kappa\}$ . The critical inductive assumptions are, for  $\lambda \in D$ ,

- (1)  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda$  extends  $\mathcal{I}_\mu$  for all  $\mu \in D \cap \lambda$ ,
- (2)  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda$  is acceptable,
- (3)  $\{\dot{Q}'_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda\}$  is  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda$ -suitable.

Now let  $\lambda \in D$  and assume we have constructed, for each  $\mu \in D \cap \lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{I}_\mu$  and  $\{\dot{Q}'_\gamma : \gamma < \mu\}$ . If  $D \cap \lambda$  is cofinal in  $\lambda$ , then we simply let  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda = \bigcup \{\mathcal{I}_\mu : \mu \in D \cap \lambda\}$  and there is nothing more to do. Otherwise, let  $\mu$  be the maximum element of  $D \cap \lambda$ .

Case 1:  $\mu \notin S_1^\kappa$ . First choose any acceptable  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda \supset \mathcal{I}_\mu$ . Choose  $\{\dot{Q}'_\beta : \mu \leq \beta < \lambda\}$  by induction as follows. For  $\mu < \beta \notin \mathbf{E}$ , let  $\mathbf{q}$  denote  $\{\dot{Q}'_\gamma : \gamma < \beta\}$ . Let  $\zeta < \kappa$  be minimal so that  $\dot{Q}'_\beta = f(\zeta)$  is a  $P_{\mu+\beta}^\mu(\mathbf{q})$ -name of a ccc poset that is not in the list  $\{\dot{Q}'_\gamma : \gamma < \beta\}$ . For  $\mu \leq \beta \in \mathbf{E}$ , choose, if possible minimal  $\zeta < \kappa$  so that  $f(\zeta)$  is equal to  $Q(\mathcal{U}, \dot{C}_\beta)$  for some S-space task that is not yet handled and let  $\dot{Q}'_\beta = f(\zeta)$ . Otherwise, let  $\dot{Q}'_\beta = \mathcal{C}_\omega$ .

The verification of the inductive hypotheses in Case 1 is routine. We also note that if the induction continues to  $\kappa$ , then  $P_{\kappa+\kappa}^\kappa(\{\dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \kappa\})$  will force that there are no S-spaces and that Martin's Axiom holds.



Case 2:  $\mu \in S_1^\kappa$ . Let  $\mathbf{q}$  denote  $\{\dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \mu\}$ . Now we decode the element  $h_\mu$  from the  $\diamond$ -sequence. If there is any  $(\alpha, \xi) \in \mu \times \mu$  such that  $f(h_\mu(\alpha, \xi))$  is not a  $P_{\mu+\mu}^\mu(\mathbf{q})$ -name, then proceed as in Case 1. For each  $\alpha \in \mu$ , if  $f(h_\mu(\alpha, 0))$  is not a name of a finite subset of  $\mu$ , then proceed as in Case 1, otherwise let  $\dot{F}_\alpha = f(h_\mu(\alpha, 0))$ . Similarly, if there is an  $\alpha \in \mu$  such that  $f(h_\mu(\alpha, 1))$  is not a name of a positive rational number, then proceed as in Case 1, otherwise let  $\dot{e}_\alpha = f(h_\mu(\alpha, 1))$ . If there is an  $\alpha \in \mu$  and a  $\xi > 1$  such that  $f(h_\mu(\alpha, \xi))$  is not a name of a element of  $[0, 1]$ , then proceed as in Case 1, otherwise let

$$\text{for } (\alpha, \xi) \in \mu \times \mu \quad \dot{y}_\alpha(\xi) = \begin{cases} f(h_\mu(\alpha, \xi + 2)) & \text{if } \xi < \omega \\ f(h_\mu(\alpha, \xi)) & \text{if } \omega \leq \xi < \mu \end{cases}.$$

It now follows that  $\dot{y}_\alpha$  is a name of an element of  $[0, 1]^\mu$  and let the name  $\{x \in [0, 1]^\mu : (\forall \beta \in \dot{F}_\alpha) |x(\beta) - \dot{y}_\alpha(\beta)| < \dot{e}_\alpha\}$  be denoted by  $\dot{U}_\alpha$ . Now we ask if there is a function  $f_\mu : \omega_1 \rightarrow \mu$  as in Theorem 5.8. In particular, if there is an  $I \in [\mu]^{\aleph_1}$  and such a function  $f_\mu : \omega_1 \rightarrow \mu$  such that the sequence  $\mathcal{A} = \{\dot{A}_\eta : \eta \in \omega_1\}$  as defined in the statement of Theorem 5.8 satisfies that  $P_{\mu+\mu}^\mu(\mathbf{q})$  forces that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a Moore-Mrowka task and each  $\dot{A}_\alpha$  is a  $P_{\mu+\mu}^\mu(\mathbf{q})(I) \star \dot{R}_0$ -name in the sense of Lemma 5.5. If all this holds, then choose an appropriate  $I_\mu$  so that  $I \subset I_\mu$  and define  $\dot{Q}'_\mu$  to be  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}, \dot{C}_\mu)$ . For the remaining choices proceed as in Case 1.

The construction of  $P_{\kappa+\kappa} = P_{\kappa+\kappa}^\kappa(\mathbf{q})$  where  $\mathbf{q} = \{\dot{Q}'_\beta : \beta < \kappa\}$  is complete. As explained at the beginning of the proof, it follows from Lemma 5.6 and Theorem 5.8, and that the fact that  $D$  is a cub, that separable Moore-Mrowka spaces in this model have cardinality at most  $\mathfrak{c}$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Uri Abraham, Matatyahu Rubin, and Saharon Shelah, *On the consistency of some partition theorems for continuous colorings, and the structure of  $\aleph_1$ -dense real order types*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **29** (1985), no. 2, 123–206, DOI 10.1016/0168-0072(84)90024-1. MR801036
- [2] Uri Avraham and Saharon Shelah, *Martin's axiom does not imply that every two  $\aleph_1$ -dense sets of reals are isomorphic*, Israel J. Math. **38** (1981), no. 1-2, 161–176, DOI 10.1007/BF02761858. MR599485
- [3] A. V. Arhangel'skiĭ, *The structure and classification of topological spaces and cardinal invariants*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **33** (1978), no. 6(204), 29–84, 272 (Russian). MR526012
- [4] Zoltán T. Balogh, *On compact Hausdorff spaces of countable tightness*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **105** (1989), no. 3, 755–764, DOI 10.2307/2046929. MR930252

- [5] Alan Dow and Todd Eisworth, *CH and the Moore-Mrowka problem*, Topology Appl. **195** (2015), 226–238, DOI 10.1016/j.topol.2015.09.025. MR3414886
- [6] Alan Dow, *Compact spaces of countable tightness in the Cohen model*, Set theory and its applications (Toronto, ON, 1987), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1401, Springer, Berlin, 1989, pp. 55–67, DOI 10.1007/BFb0097331. MR1031765
- [7] A. Dow, *Compact  $C$ -closed spaces need not be sequential*, Acta Math. Hungar. **153** (2017), no. 1, 1–15, DOI 10.1007/s10474-017-0739-x. MR3713559
- [8] V. V. Fedorčuk, *Completely closed mappings, and the compatibility of certain general topology theorems with the axioms of set theory*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **99** (141) (1976), no. 1, 3–33, 135 (Russian). MR0410631
- [9] A. Hajnal and I. Juhász, *On hereditarily  $\alpha$ -Lindelöf and  $\alpha$ -separable spaces. II*, Fund. Math. **81** (1973/74), no. 2, 147–158, DOI 10.4064/fm-81-2-147-158. MR336705
- [10] Mohammad Ismail and Peter Nyikos, *On spaces in which countably compact sets are closed, and hereditary properties*, Topology Appl. **11** (1980), no. 3, 281–292, DOI 10.1016/0166-8641(80)90027-9. MR585273
- [11] Thomas Jech, *Set theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded. MR1940513 (2004g:03071)
- [12] I. Juhász, *A survey of  $S$ - and  $L$ -spaces*, Topology, Vol. II (Proc. Fourth Colloq., Budapest, 1978), Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, vol. 23, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1980, pp. 675–688. MR588816
- [13] William Mitchell, *Aronszajn trees and the independence of the transfer property*, Ann. Math. Logic **5** (1972/73), 21–46, DOI 10.1016/0003-4843(72)90017-4. MR313057
- [14] A. J. Ostaszewski, *On countably compact, perfectly normal spaces*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **14** (1976), no. 3, 505–516, DOI 10.1112/jlms/s2-14.3.505. MR438292
- [15] Mary Ellen Rudin, *A normal hereditarily separable non-Lindelöf space*, Illinois J. Math. **16** (1972), 621–626. MR309062
- [16] Saharon Shelah, *Proper forcing*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 940, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1982. MR675955
- [17] Stevo Todorčević, *Forcing positive partition relations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **280** (1983), no. 2, 703–720, DOI 10.2307/1999642. MR716846

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE, CHARLOTTE, NC 28223  
 Email address: adow@uncc.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, HILL CENTER, PISCATAWAY, NEW JERSEY, U.S.A. 08854-8019

Current address: Institute of Mathematics, Hebrew University, Givat Ram, Jerusalem 91904, Israel

Email address: shelah@math.rutgers.edu