

UNTHREADABILITY WITH SMALL CONDITIONS

MAXWELL LEVINE

ABSTRACT. We introduce a forcing that adds a $\square(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$ -sequence with countable conditions under CH. Assuming the consistency of a weakly compact cardinal, we can find a forcing extension by our new poset in which both $\square(\aleph_2, < \aleph_0)$ and $\square_{\aleph_1, \aleph_0}$ fail in the forcing extension.

1. INTRODUCTION

The tension between the stationary reflection principles of large cardinals and the fine-structural combinatorics that hold in canonical inner models is a prominent theme in set theory. In particular, variations of Jensen's principle \square_κ , which holds for all cardinals κ in Gödel's Constructible Universe L , have been studied widely. The construction of new models realizing some compatibility between large cardinal properties and square properties can help us develop a more vivid picture of the individual cardinals and their relationships to one another.

The principle \square_κ and its relatives are known as *square principles*. Each such principle asserts that there exists a coherent sequence $\mathcal{C} = \langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ where \mathcal{C}_α is a set of closed unbounded sets in α , and that \mathcal{C} does not have a *thread*, meaning that there is no club $D \subseteq \lambda$ such that $D \cap \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ for all limit points $\alpha \in D$. Square principles of the form $\square_{\mu, \kappa}$ assert the existence of such a \mathcal{C} of length μ^+ (notice the discrepancy in notation) in which the members of the \mathcal{C}_α 's have order-type bounded by μ , which serves as the reason why there cannot be a thread. On the other hand, square principles of the form $\square(\mu^+, \kappa)$ assert the existence of such a \mathcal{C} of length μ^+ where the non-existence of the thread is simply declared outright. The consequences of this distinction are significant for this paper.

We will follow a strain of research having to do with adding square sequences of length μ^+ with forcings consisting of conditions of cardinality $< \mu$. The poset introduced here adds a $\square(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$ -sequence with countable conditions. This is different from the conventional way of forcing $\square(\mu^+, \kappa)$ -sequences, which uses conditions of cardinality μ . This approach was introduced by Jensen and studied thoroughly by Cummings, Foreman, and Magidor. We will refer to this as *Jensen's method* for forcing square sequences, since we will have reason to compare and contrast it with the approach used here, especially regarding the behavior of the complementary threading forcing. Our approach also contrasts with the forcings for adding \square_{\aleph_1} using finite conditions originally used by Dolinar and Džamonja [4] and later streamlined by Neeman [11]; these forcings seem to have no use for a threading forcing. The most natural point of comparison for the forcing is the one introduced by Stanley and Shelah for adding \square_{\aleph_1} with countable conditions [12]. Their forcing needs the bounded order-type requirement to work, so the distinction is still important, and in any case we will show that it is possible to make \square_{\aleph_1} fail in extensions by the new forcing.

The idea of the forcing described in this paper is roughly based on Baumgartner’s forcing to add a club to \aleph_1 with finite sequences, except that we crucially use the presentation due to Abraham and generalize it to \aleph_2 , a possibility that is alluded to by Mitchell [9]. This construction generalizes to higher cardinals to get $\square(\kappa^{++}, \kappa)$ -sequence under the assumption that $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$.

Theorem 1. *If $V \models \text{CH}$ then there is a forcing \mathbb{S} consisting of countable conditions such that $V[\mathbb{S}] \models \square(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$. Moreover, if $W \models “\kappa$ is weakly compact”*, then $W[\text{Col}(\aleph_1, < \kappa)][\mathbb{S}] \models \neg \square(\aleph_2, < \aleph_0) \wedge \neg \square_{\aleph_1, \aleph_0}$.

The assumption of a weakly cardinal is optimal because work of Jensen and Todorćević shows that this is required to make $\square(\kappa, 1)$ fail for regular κ [13].

This paper is organized as follows: The remainder of the introduction will cover background. We will introduce \mathbb{S} in the second section and show that it adds a $\square(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$ -sequence. The third section will introduce the new threading forcing \mathbb{T} and show how it can be used with large cardinals to make stronger square principles fail.

We assume familiarity with the technique of forcing [7]. As for our conventions: Given a set of ordinals X , $\text{Lim}(X)$ is the set of limit ordinals in X , $\text{lim}(X) = \{\alpha \in X : X \cap \alpha \text{ is unbounded}\}$, $\text{lim}^+(X) = \{\alpha < \text{sup}(X) : X \cap \alpha \text{ is unbounded}\}$, and $j[X] = \{j(\alpha) : \alpha \in X\}$ if j is a function. We also let $\text{ot}(X)$ denote the order-type of X , and $X \cap \text{cof}(\tau) = \{\alpha \in X : \text{cf}(\alpha) = \tau\}$. If \mathbb{P} is a forcing poset and $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$, then $p \leq q$ means that p has more information than q . If we say that \mathbb{P} is κ -distributive for a regular κ , we mean that \mathbb{P} does not add new functions $f : \lambda \rightarrow \text{ON}$ for $\lambda < \kappa$, and when we say that \mathbb{P} is κ -closed, we mean that it is closed under $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ -decreasing sequences of length λ for all $\lambda < \kappa$. The notation $V[\mathbb{P}]$ will refer to an extension by an unspecified generic. When depicting an iteration $\mathbb{P}_0 * \dot{\mathbb{P}}_1$, we will often drop the dot and write $\mathbb{P}_0 * \mathbb{P}_1$.

1.1. Definitions of Squares. First we define square principles of the form $\square(\lambda, \kappa)$. These are examples of incompleteness principles, because they imply the non-existence of an object that appears to be approximated, namely a thread.¹

Definition 2. Let κ and λ be regular cardinals such that $\kappa < \lambda$. Then $\langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha : \alpha \in \text{Lim}(\lambda) \rangle$ is a $\square(\lambda, \kappa)$ -sequence if the following hold for all $\alpha \in \text{Lim}(\lambda)$:

- (1) \mathcal{C}_α consists of clubs in α .
- (2) $1 \leq |\mathcal{C}_\alpha| \leq \kappa$.
- (3) For all $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ and all $\beta \in \text{lim}(C)$, $C \cap \beta \in \mathcal{C}_\beta$.
- (4) There is no club $D \subset \lambda$ such that for all $\alpha \in \text{lim}(D)$, $D \cap \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$.

If there is a $\square(\lambda, \kappa)$ -sequence, then we say that $\square(\lambda, \kappa)$ holds. If $V \models “\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ is a $\square(\lambda, \kappa)$ sequence” and $W \supset V$ is a model containing some D such that $D \cap \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \text{lim}(D)$, then we say that D threads $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$.

Definition 3. Let κ and μ be cardinals. Then $\langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha : \alpha \in \text{Lim}(\mu^+) \rangle$ is a $\square_{\mu, \kappa}$ -sequence if it is a $\square(\mu^+, \kappa)$ -sequence, and moreover for all $\alpha \in \text{Lim}(\mu^+)$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$, $\text{ot } C \leq \mu$.

Remark 4. If \mathcal{C} is a $\square_{\mu, \kappa}$ -sequence, then there is no $D \subset \mu^+$ such that for all $\alpha \in \text{lim}(D)$, $D \cap \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$. (Hence point (4) from the definition of $\square(\lambda, \kappa)$ -sequences

¹See a survey of Cummings for background on square principles of the form $\square_{\mu, \kappa}$ and stationary reflection [2].

is implied.) This is because if γ where the $(\kappa + \omega)^{\text{th}}$ point of D , then $D \cap \gamma \in \mathcal{C}_\gamma$ has an order-type larger than κ .

Definition 5. If \mathcal{C} is a $\square(\lambda, \kappa)$ -sequence, we say that a poset \mathbb{P} *threads* \mathcal{C} if \mathbb{P} forces that there is a thread of \mathcal{C} .

1.2. Elementary Submodels and Generic Conditions. In this subsection we will outline the basic arguments we use to preserve \aleph_2 . In this regard, there are a couple of important conventions we will use:

- In the context of discussing a poset \mathbb{P} , we will refer to a regular cardinal as “sufficiently large” when $H(\Theta)$ contains enough information about \mathbb{P} for the argument at hand. In this paper we mean that $H(\Theta)$ contains \mathbb{P} and all of its antichains. More generally, we will refer to a structure $K \models \text{ZFC} - \text{Power set}$ as “sufficiently rich” when it contains \mathbb{P} and its antichains.²
- Given a poset \mathbb{P} and a sufficiently rich structure K , we will refer to an elementary submodel $M \prec K$ as *basic* if $\mathbb{P} \in M$, $|M| = \aleph_1$, $M \cap \aleph_2 \in \aleph_2$, and $M^\omega \subseteq M$, i.e. M is closed under countable sequences. This usage is specific to this paper because we will use it frequently.

Proposition 6. *Suppose CH holds, $|X| = \aleph_1$, and K is a sufficiently rich structure with $X, \aleph_2 \in K$. Then there is a basic model $M \prec K$ such that $X \subset M$.*

Proof. Let $M_0 \prec K$ be an elementary submodel of cardinality \aleph_1 such that $X \subset M_0$. Then take a chain $\langle M_i : i < \aleph_1 \rangle$ of \aleph_1 -sized elementary submodels of K such that for all $i < \aleph_1$, $\text{sup}(M_i \cap \aleph_2) \subseteq M_{i+1}$, $M_i^\omega \subseteq M_{i+1}$ (this is where we use CH), and such that there is continuity in the sense that $M_i = \bigcup_{j < i} M_j$ for all limits $i < \aleph_1$. Then let $M = \bigcup_{i < \aleph_1} M_i$. \square

Definition 7. Let \mathbb{P} be a poset, let K be a sufficiently rich structure, and let $M \prec K$ such that $\mathbb{P} \in M$.

- A condition q is (M, \mathbb{P}) -*generic* if for every maximal antichain $A \in M$ (such that $A \subseteq \mathbb{P}$), for all $q' \leq q$, there is some $q'' \leq q'$ such that $q'' \leq p$ for some $p \in A \cap M$. Equivalently, q is (M, \mathbb{P}) -generic if $q \Vdash \dot{G} \cap M$ is $\mathbb{P} \cap M$ -generic over M [7].
- A condition q is *strongly* (M, \mathbb{P}) -*generic* if for all $q' \leq q$, there is some $p \in \mathbb{P} \cap M$ such that for every $p' \leq p$ with $p' \in \mathbb{P} \cap M$, there is some $q'' \leq q'$ such that $q'' \leq p'$. Equivalently, q is strongly (M, \mathbb{P}) -generic if $q \Vdash \dot{G} \cap M$ is $\mathbb{P} \cap M$ -generic over the ground model V [10].

It is clear that all strongly (M, \mathbb{P}) -generic conditions are (M, \mathbb{P}) -generic for sufficiently rich structures. We distinguish between these two types of generic conditions for the sake of some remarks that we will make below.

Proposition 8. *Suppose \mathbb{P} is a poset, K is a sufficiently rich structure, and $M \prec K$ with $\mathbb{P} \in M$. Suppose q is (M, \mathbb{P}) -generic and G is \mathbb{P} -generic over V with $q \in G$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) $M[G] \prec K[G]$.
- (2) $V \cap M[G] = M$.
- (3) If $\dot{f} \in M$ is such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{f} : \dot{\kappa}_1 \rightarrow \dot{\kappa}_2$ where $\kappa_1 \subset M$ and $\kappa_2 \in M$, then $\text{range}(\dot{f}[G]) \subset M$.

²See Eisworth’s chapter in the Handbook for many examples of these kinds of arguments [5].

Proof. These are standard arguments,³ so we will prove only (3) since (1) and (2) use the same trick. Work in V and let $\alpha \in \kappa_1$. Let $A \in M$ be a maximal antichain consisting of conditions deciding $\dot{f}(\check{\alpha})$. By elementarity there is such an $A \in M$. Given some $q' \leq q$, let $q'' \leq q'$ be below some $p \in A \cap M$ using the fact that q is an (M, \mathbb{P}) -generic condition. By elementarity, $p \Vdash \dot{f}(\check{\alpha}) = \check{\beta}$ for some $\beta \in M$, so the same information is forced by q'' . \square

Definition 9. Suppose $\mathbb{P} \in M \prec K$ for K sufficiently rich. We say that M has *generic conditions for \mathbb{P}* (resp. *strongly generic conditions*) if for all $p \in \mathbb{P} \cap M$, there is some $q \leq p$ such that q is (M, \mathbb{P}) -generic (resp. strongly (M, \mathbb{P}) -generic).

Proposition 10. *Let $M \prec K$ be a basic elementary submodel of a sufficiently rich structure such that M has generic conditions for \mathbb{P} . Then \mathbb{P} preserves \aleph_2 .*

Proof. Working in V , we have $\aleph_2 \in M$ by elementarity and $\aleph_1 \subset M$ by $M^\omega \subset M$. M would contain a \mathbb{P} -name \dot{f} for a supposed collapsing function $f : \aleph_1^V \rightarrow \aleph_2^V$ by elementarity. Apply Proposition 8. \square

2. DEFINING THE MAIN POSET

The goal of this section is to introduce our poset for adding a $\square(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$ -sequence with countable conditions.

Definition 11. Let \mathfrak{S} be the set of $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma])$ such that $\alpha < \aleph_2$ is a limit ordinal, $x \in \omega$, and $[\beta, \gamma]$ is a closed interval of ordinals such that $-1 \leq \beta \leq \gamma < \alpha$.⁴ We let $s \in \mathfrak{S}$ if $s \subset \mathfrak{S}$ and the following hold:

- (1) The set s is countable.
- (2) If $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]), (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$, then either $\beta = \beta'$ or $[\beta, \gamma] \cap [\beta', \gamma'] = \emptyset$.
- (3) If $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$, then for all $x, y \in \omega$ and $\beta, \gamma < \alpha$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$ if and only if $(\langle \alpha, y \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$.
- (4) If $\{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta_i, \gamma_i]) : i < \omega\} \subseteq s$ and $\beta^* = \sup_{i < \omega} (\beta_i + 1) < \alpha$, then it follows that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta^*, \gamma^*]) \in s$ for some γ^* .
- (5) If $\{(\langle \alpha, x_i \rangle, [\beta_i, \gamma_i]) : i < \omega\} \subset s$ and $\alpha^* = \sup_{i < \omega} (\alpha_i + 1)$, then it follows that $(\langle \alpha^*, y \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$ for some y, β, γ .
- (6) If $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\bar{\beta}, \bar{\gamma}]) \in s$ and $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$, then $\{\beta < \alpha : \exists \gamma, (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s\}$ is unbounded in α .
- (7) If $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$ and there are $\alpha' < \alpha$ and some $x' \in \omega$ such that $(\langle \alpha', x' \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$, then there are $\beta'' \leq \alpha'$ and $\gamma'' \geq \alpha'$ such that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta'', \gamma'']) \in s$.
- (8) If $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$, then one of the following holds:
 - (a) $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$.
 - (b) $\beta = \beta' + 1$ and there is some $\bar{\beta} \leq \beta'$ such that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\bar{\beta}, \beta']) \in s$.
 - (c) $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega$ and there exists a sequence of ordinals $\langle \beta_i : i < \omega \rangle$ converging to β such that $\forall i < \omega, \exists \gamma_i, (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta_i, \gamma_i]) \in s$.
 - (d) $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega$ and there is some $\bar{\beta} < \beta$ and some sequence of ordinals $\langle \gamma_i : i < \omega \rangle$ converging to β such that $\forall i < \omega, (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\bar{\beta}, \gamma_i]) \in s$.

³See the chapter on proper forcing in Jech [7].

⁴We are abusing the term “ordinal” in the case that $\beta = -1$.

- (9) Suppose that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$ and either $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$ or else $\{\beta' < \beta : \exists \gamma', (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s\}$ is unbounded in β . Then there is some $y \in \omega$ such that for all $\beta' \leq \gamma' < \beta$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$.

The ordering is defined so that $s' \leq_{\mathbb{S}} s$ if and only if the following hold:

- (1) $s' \supseteq s$.
- (2) Suppose there are $\alpha \in \text{Lim}(\aleph_2)$ and $x \in \omega$ with $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$ for some β', γ' . Suppose also that there are $\beta < \alpha$ and $y \in \omega$ such that for all $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$. Then it is also the case that for all $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s'$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s'$.

We will also use the following conventions:

- An element of \mathfrak{S} is called a *bit*.
- If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, the set $\{\alpha < \aleph_2 : \exists x, \beta, \gamma, (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s\}$ is called the *domain* of s and is abbreviated $\text{dom}(s)$.
- If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then $\text{dom}(s)$ has a maximal element γ , which will be denoted $\text{max}(s)$.
- For $\langle \alpha, x \rangle \in \text{Lim}(\aleph_2) \times \omega$, we let $\dot{C}_\alpha^x := \{(\check{\beta}, s) : \exists \gamma, (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s \in \mathbb{S}\}$.
- Suppose $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and there are $\alpha, \beta \in \text{dom}(s)$ and $x, y \in \omega$ such that for all $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$ $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$. Then we say that s forces that \dot{C}_α^x *coheres at* β , and more specifically that y *witnesses coherence of* \dot{C}_α^x *at* β . We sometimes use this terminology before we have verified that some $s \in \mathfrak{S}$ is in fact a condition in \mathbb{S} . The second point of the definition of $\leq_{\mathbb{S}}$ states that $s' \leq_{\mathbb{S}} s$ means that if s forces that y witnesses coherence of \dot{C}_α^x at β , then so does s' .
- It will be clear below that there are densely many $s \in \mathbb{S}$ such that for all $\alpha \in \text{dom } s$, $x \in \omega$, there is some $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$. In other words, the \dot{C}_α^x 's will be defined for all $x \in \omega$. We will just use this as an implicit assumption going forward, since it does not affect the arguments.
- If $\delta \in (\aleph_2 \cap \text{cof}(\omega_1)) \cup \{\aleph_2\}$, we write $s \upharpoonright \delta := \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s : \alpha < \delta\}$, noting that $s \upharpoonright \delta \in \mathbb{S}$.
- For $s \in \mathbb{S}$, $\text{out } s = \{\beta \geq 0 : \exists \alpha, x, \gamma, (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s, s \Vdash \text{“ot}(\dot{C}_\alpha^x) = \omega\}$.

We can describe an intuition for Definition 11 here. If $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\beta \geq 0$, then this indicates that s forces β to be a point in \dot{C}_α^x and also forces “ $\dot{C}_\alpha^x \cap (\beta, \gamma] = \emptyset$ ”. Note that x is just a placeholder label here. Clause 1 and Clause 2 should be thought of in association with Abraham’s presentation of Baumgartner’s forcing for adding a club in \aleph_1 with finite conditions [1], but generalized to \aleph_2 . Clause 3 asserts that if $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$, then the set of \dot{C}_α^x for $x \in \omega$ is in fact a singleton. Clause 4 ensures that the clubs in the $\square(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$ -sequence are closed. Clause 5 ensures that we will be able to extend any condition. Clause 6 ensures that the clubs in ordinals α of countable cofinality are unbounded. Clause 7 is crucial for the argument that \mathbb{S} is countably closed: it ensures that if β^* is a new limit of β 's, then we can freely define a lower bound at β^* in a way that guarantees Clause 9. Clause 8 in part ensures that the question of whether β is a limit point of its club is determined by the condition, so that in closure arguments we only need to deal with freshly added limits of β 's. Finally, Clause 9 ensures that the generic object added by \mathbb{S} is a coherent sequence.

We state an easy fact that we will use without comment for the remainder of the paper:

Proposition 12. *Given $s \in \mathbb{S}$, $\alpha \in \text{dom } s$, and $x \in \omega$, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $s \Vdash \text{“}\beta \in \lim \dot{C}_\alpha^x\text{”}$.
- (2) *Either:*
 - (a) $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$ and $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$ for some γ , or else
 - (b) there are sequences $\langle \beta_i : i < \omega \rangle$ and $\langle \gamma_i : i < \omega \rangle$ converging to β such that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta_i, \gamma_i]) \in s$ for all $i < \omega$.

Proof. (2) \implies (1): This clear if (b) holds, so assume that (a) holds. Suppose $s' \leq s$ and $\bar{\beta} < \beta$, where we want to show that there is some $s'' \leq s'$ such that $s'' \Vdash \text{“}[\bar{\beta}, \beta] \cap \dot{C}_\alpha^x \neq \emptyset\text{”}$. Let

$$\beta^* = \sup\{\beta' + 1 : \beta' < \beta : \exists \gamma', (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s'\},$$

so $\beta^* < \beta$ by the fact that s is countable and $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$. If $\bar{\beta} \leq \beta^*$ then we are done. Otherwise, let

$$s'' = s' \cup \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta^*, \bar{\beta}])\} \cup \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\bar{\beta}, \bar{\beta}])\}$$

if $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$, or let

$$s'' = s' \cup \{(\langle \alpha, y \rangle, [\beta^*, \bar{\beta}]) : y \in \omega\} \cup \{(\langle \alpha, y \rangle, [\bar{\beta}, \bar{\beta}]) : y \in \omega\}$$

if $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$.

(1) \implies (2): Assume that β is a limit ordinal and that (2) does not hold. Let $\beta^* = \sup\{\beta' + 1 : \beta' < \beta : \exists \gamma', (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s'\}$ if this set is not empty, otherwise $\beta^* = 0$. Then $\beta^* < \beta$, either by Clause 4 or by $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$. If there is no γ such that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$, then let $s' = s \cup \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta^*, \beta])\}$ if $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$, so we see that $s' \Vdash \text{“}\beta \notin \lim \dot{C}_\alpha^x\text{”}$; and if $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$ we define a similar s' that satisfies Clause 3. If there is some γ such that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$, then $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega$, so let $\langle \gamma_i : i < \omega \rangle$ be a sequence above β^* converging to β and let $s' = s \cup \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta^*, \gamma_i]) : i < \omega\}$ if $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$; s' can be defined similarly if $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$. \square

The proof that \mathbb{S} is countably closed is similar to the analogous proof for Jensen’s method of forcing square sequences in the sense that ω -sequences can vacuously top off lower bounds of countable sequences. However, it is different in the sense that new limit points of the \dot{C}_α^x ’s are added. Because of this complication, we introduce some additional terminology.

Definition 13. Let $\vec{s} = \langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$ be an $\leq_{\mathbb{S}}$ -decreasing sequence of conditions.

- Let $\text{ed}(\vec{s}) = \bigcup_{i < \omega} \text{dom}(s_i)$ be the *existing domain*.
- Let $\text{fd}(\vec{s}) = \lim^+(\text{ed}(\vec{s})) \setminus \text{ed}(\vec{s})$ be the *fresh domain*.
- Let the *existing points* $\text{ep}(\vec{s})$ consist of $\beta \in \aleph_2$ such that for some $\alpha \in \text{ed}$, $x \in \omega$, and $\gamma < \aleph_2$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in \bigcup_{i < \omega} s_i$.
- Suppose $\beta \in \lim(\aleph_2)$ and $\alpha \in \text{ed}(\vec{s})$ as witnessed by $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma'])$. Suppose that $\beta \notin \text{ep}(\vec{s})$ and $\beta < \alpha$, but there are sequences $\langle \beta_n : n < \omega \rangle$ and $\langle \gamma_n : n < \omega \rangle$ with supremum β such that $\forall n < \omega$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta_n, \gamma_n]) \in \bigcup_{i < \omega} s_i$. Then we let $\beta \in \text{fp}(\vec{s})$, the set of *fresh points*, and we say that $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ *witnesses* $\beta \in \text{fp}(\vec{s})$.

If \bar{s} is a lower bound of \vec{s} , then we say that \bar{s} is *parsimonious* if:

- $\text{dom}(\bar{s}) = \text{ed}(\vec{s}) \cup \text{fd}(\vec{s}) \cup \text{fp}(\vec{s})$;

- for all $\alpha \in \text{Lim}(\aleph_2)$ and $x \in \omega$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in \bar{s}$ implies either $\beta \in \text{ep}(\bar{s}) \cup \text{fp}(\bar{s})$ or $\bar{s} \Vdash \text{“ot}(\dot{C}_\alpha^x) = \omega\text{”}$.

We drop the notation for \vec{s} when the context is clear.

Lemma 14. \mathbb{S} is countably closed. Moreover, every $\leq_{\mathbb{S}}$ -decreasing sequence $\langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$ has a parsimonious lower bound.

Before proving the lemma, we establish the basic relationships between the sets of points described above.

Proposition 15. Let $\vec{s} = \langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$ be an $\leq_{\mathbb{S}}$ -decreasing sequence of conditions in \mathbb{S} .

- (1) $\text{fd}(\vec{s}), \text{fp}(\vec{s}) \subset \aleph_2 \cap \text{cof}(\omega)$.
- (2) $\text{fp}(\vec{s}) \cap \text{ed}(\vec{s}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. (1) is immediate, so we prove (2). This can be argued as follows: If $\beta \in \text{fp}(\vec{s})$, then there are no y, β', γ' such that $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \bigcup_{i < \omega} s_i$. Suppose for contradiction that this is the case, and that $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ witnesses that $\beta \in \text{fp}(\vec{s})$. This means that $\alpha > \beta$ and that $\alpha \in \text{dom } s_i$ for some $i < \omega$. Assume that i is also large enough that $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s_i$. Then by Clause 7, there are $\beta'' \leq \beta$ and $\gamma'' \geq \beta$ such that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta'', \gamma'']) \in s_i$. This however is a contradiction, because then there cannot be such a sequence of β_n 's as in the definition of $\text{fp}(\vec{s})$. \square

Proof of Lemma 14. Let $\langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$ be an $\leq_{\mathbb{S}}$ -decreasing sequence of conditions in \mathbb{S} and fix ed , fd , ep , and fp as in Definition 13. Let $S_0 := \bigcup_{i < \omega} s_i$. For each $\beta \in \text{fp}$, let X_β be the set of pairs $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ witnessing that $\beta \in \text{fp}$. We let

$$S_1 := \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \beta]) : \alpha \in \text{ed}, \beta \in \text{fp}, \langle \alpha, x \rangle \in X_\beta\}.$$

For each $\beta \in \text{fp}$, let $f_\beta : \omega \rightarrow X_\beta$ be a surjection. Let

$$S_2 := \{(\langle \beta, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) : \beta \in \text{fp}, f(x) = \langle \alpha, y \rangle \in X_\beta, (\langle \alpha, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_0, \gamma' < \beta\}.$$

Also let

$$S_3 := \{(\langle \beta, x \rangle, [\beta', \beta']) : \beta' < \beta, \text{fp} \ni \beta, \beta', f(x) = \langle \alpha, y \rangle \in X_\beta \cap X_{\beta'}\}.$$

For each $\alpha \in \text{fd} \setminus \text{fp}$, choose a sequence $\langle \delta_n^\alpha : n < \omega \rangle$ of ordinals converging to α where $\delta_0^\alpha = 0$ and δ_n^α is a successor ordinal for all $n > 0$. Let

$$S_4 := \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\delta_n^\alpha, \delta_{n+1}^\alpha - 1]) : \alpha \in \text{fd} \setminus \text{fp}, x \in \omega, n < \omega\}$$

Let $\tilde{S} = S_0 \cup S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3 \cup S_4$, define $B_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle} = \{\beta : \exists \gamma, (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in \tilde{S}\}$ where appropriate, and let

$$S_5 = \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) : \alpha \in \text{ed} \cup \text{fd} \cup \text{fp}, x \in \omega, \beta \in B_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle} \cup \{-1\}, \\ \gamma \in [\beta, \min\{B_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle} \setminus (\beta + 1)\}) \cap (\text{ed} \cup \text{fd} \cup \text{fp})\}$$

The lower bound we seek is $\bar{s} := \tilde{S} \cup S_5$. It is clear that \bar{s} is parsimonious as long as it is a lower bound. It remains to argue that \bar{s} is a condition and that $\bar{s} \leq_{\mathbb{S}} s_i$ for all $i < \omega$.

Assuming that \bar{s} is in fact a condition, it is relatively straightforward to argue that it is a lower bound: Since we have $\bar{s} \supseteq s_i$ for all $i < \omega$, the first point in the definition of $\leq_{\mathbb{S}}$ holds. For the second point, suppose it is the case that we have some $\alpha \in \text{dom } s_i$ and that there are $\beta < \alpha, y \in \omega$ such that for all $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s_i$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s_i$. Then $\alpha, \beta \in \text{ed}$. We do

not need to worry about bits from S_0 and only need to consider bits from S_1 and S_5 . Observe that if $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \beta']) \in S_1$, i.e. $\beta' \in \mathbf{fp} \cap \beta$ and $\langle \alpha, x \rangle \in X_{\beta'}$, then $\langle \beta, y \rangle \in X_{\beta'}$ as well, so $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \beta']) \in S_1$; the reverse reasoning also holds. It is clear that bits from S_5 will also satisfy this requirement.

For proving that \bar{s} is a condition, we verify each clause from Definition 11 in turn. The various cases we need to consider are informed by Proposition 15.

Clause 1: This follows because the S_k 's are each defined from countably many parameters.

Clause 2: Fix $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$, $[\beta, \gamma]$, and $[\beta', \gamma']$. We prove this clause for \tilde{S} since the added bits from S_5 cannot violate it. We consider the possible cases:

$\alpha \in \mathbf{ed}$, $\beta, \beta' \in \mathbf{ep}$: If i is large enough that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma])$ and $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma'])$ are in s_i , then this follows from the fact s_i is a condition.

$\alpha \in \mathbf{ed}$, $\beta \in \mathbf{ep}$, $\beta' \in \mathbf{fp}$: Then $\gamma' = \beta'$, so we can assume $\beta < \beta'$ and we want to show that $\gamma < \beta$. If this were not the case, then because of the fact that we have some $i < \omega$ with $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s_i$, and because $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ would witness $\beta' \in \mathbf{fp}$ in this case, it follows that $\beta \leq \gamma$ would imply that $\beta' \notin \mathbf{fp}$, a contradiction.

$\alpha \in \mathbf{ed}$, $\beta', \beta \in \mathbf{fp}$: Then $\gamma' = \beta'$ and $\gamma = \beta$, so there is nothing to deal with.

$\alpha \in \mathbf{fd} \setminus \mathbf{fp}$: Then the clause follows from the fact that the intervals $[\delta_n^\alpha, \delta_{n+1}^\alpha - 1]$ are disjoint.

$\alpha \in \mathbf{fp}$, $\beta, \beta' \in \mathbf{ep}$: Then there is some $\tilde{x} \in \omega$ and $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathbf{ep}$ such that $f_\alpha(x) = \langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$. Then $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]), (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_2$, and so the fact that we have $(\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]), (\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s_i$ for large enough i gives us the clause for this case.

$\alpha \in \mathbf{fp}$, $\beta \in \mathbf{ep}$, $\beta' \in \mathbf{fp}$: We can assume $\beta < \beta'$. It must be the case that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \beta']) \in S_3$ as witnessed by some $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$ with $f_\alpha(x) = \langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$ and moreover that $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle \in X_{\beta'}$. Then $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in S_2$, so there is some $i < \omega$ such that $(\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s_i$. Then if it were the case that $\beta' \leq \gamma$, it would not be the case that $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle \in X_{\beta'}$.

$\alpha \in \mathbf{fp}$, $\beta, \beta' \in \mathbf{fp}$: This is analogous to the case $\alpha \in \mathbf{ed}$, $\beta, \beta' \in \mathbf{fp}$ in the sense that we only need to consider whether or not $\beta = \beta'$.

Clause 3: If $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$ and $\alpha \in \text{dom}(\bar{s})$, then $\alpha \in \mathbf{ed}$. Then \bar{s} inherits Clause 3 from the fact that the s_i 's have Clause 3.

Clause 4: If $\alpha \in \mathbf{fd} \setminus \mathbf{fp}$, then the clause is satisfied vacuously. For the other cases, let the β_n 's and β^* be as in Definition 11. If $\alpha \in \mathbf{ed}$, then either $\beta^* \in \mathbf{ep}$, in which case the item is witnessed by a bit from S_0 , or else $\beta \in \mathbf{fp}$, in which case the clause is witnessed by a bit in S_1 . If $\alpha \in \mathbf{fp}$ and $\beta^* \in \mathbf{ep}$ the clause is witnessed by a bit from S_2 . If $\alpha \in \mathbf{fp}$ and $\beta^* \in \mathbf{fp}$, then the clause is witnessed by a bit from S_3 .

Clause 5: Let α^* be as in Definition 11. If $\alpha^* \in \mathbf{ed}$, then the clause is witnessed by a bit from S_0 . If $\alpha^* \in \mathbf{fd} \setminus \mathbf{fp}$ it is witnessed by a bit from S_4 . If $\alpha^* \in \mathbf{fp}$, it is witnessed by a bit from S_2 .

Clause 6: This is clear by inspection.

Clause 7: If $\alpha \in \mathbf{fd} \setminus \mathbf{fp}$, then this follows from the fact that the intervals $[\delta_n^\alpha, \delta_{n+1}^\alpha - 1]$ cover α . The other cases are witnessed by bits from S_5 .

Clause 8: The only cases where there is something to check are the ones in which $\beta \in \mathbf{fp}$, in which case option (c) holds.

Clause 9: As with Clause 2, we break Clause 9 into subcases that we prove for \tilde{S} . This implies that Clause 9 follows for \bar{s} . Referring to the statement in

Definition 11, fix $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ and β such that the hypothesis holds for $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in \tilde{S}$ for some γ .

$\alpha \in \text{fd} \setminus \text{fp}$: Then coherence holds vacuously because there are no limit points to consider.

$\alpha \in \text{ed}, \beta \in \text{ep}$: Then there is some $i < \omega$ such that $s_i \Vdash \text{“}\beta \in \lim \dot{C}_\alpha^x\text{”}$, where we are using Clause 8 (because β does not “turn into” a limit point of \dot{C}_α^x). Therefore there is some y such that for all $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s_i$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s_i$. This also holds for $i' \geq i$ by the definition of \leq_S . This means that if $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$ for $\gamma' < \beta$, then there are two possibilities: The first is that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s_i$ for some $i < \omega$, in which case $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s_i \subseteq \tilde{S}$. The second is that $\beta' \in \text{fp}$, $X_{\beta'}$ contains both $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ and $\langle \beta, y \rangle$, and $\beta' = \gamma'$, in which case $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \beta']) \in S_1$ and $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \beta']) \in S_1$ as well. The reverse reasoning applies if we start with the premise that $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$.

$\alpha \in \text{ed}, \beta \in \text{fp}$: Then $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ witnesses $\beta \in \text{fp}$, so let y be such that $f_\beta(y) = \langle \alpha, x \rangle$. Then we can argue that for all $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$. If $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$ and $\beta' \in \text{ep}$, then $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_0$, and hence $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_2$. If $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$ and $\beta' \in \text{fp}$, then $\gamma' = \beta'$ and $\langle \alpha, x \rangle \in X_{\beta'}$, so $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_3$. The other inclusion follows the same reasoning.

$\alpha \in \text{fp}, \beta \in \text{ep}$: Then there is some $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$ witnessing $\alpha \in \text{fp}$ with $f_\alpha(x) = \langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$. All bits $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in \tilde{S}$ such that $\beta \in \text{ep}$ are in S_2 and witnessed by $(\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in S_0$. Therefore there is some $i < \omega$ with $s_i \Vdash \text{“}\beta \in \lim \dot{C}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{\tilde{x}}\text{”}$. Let y be such that if $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$, then $(\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_0$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_0$. We can then argue that if $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$, then $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$. Suppose that $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$ and $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$ with $\beta' \in \text{ep}$. Then $(\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_0$, so $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_0$. If instead $\beta' \in \text{fp}$, then $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \beta']) \in S_3$ and $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle \in X_{\beta'}$, which implies $\langle \beta, y \rangle \in X_{\beta'}$, so $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \beta']) \in S_3$. Again, the reverse reasoning applies if we start with the premise that $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$.

$\alpha \in \text{fp}, \beta \in \text{fp}$: Then $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \beta]) \in S_3$, so there is some $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle \in X_\alpha \cap X_\beta$ such that $f_\alpha(x) = \langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$. Let y be such that $f_\beta(y) = \langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$. We argue that for all $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$. Suppose $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in \tilde{S}$. If $\beta' \in \text{ep}$, then $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_2$, so $(\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_0$, so $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_2$. If $\beta' \in \text{fp}$, then $\beta' = \gamma'$ and $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \beta']) \in S_3$, implying $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle \in X_{\beta'} \cap X_\alpha$, i.e. $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle \in X_{\beta'} \cap X_\beta \cap X_\alpha$, implying $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \beta']) \in S_3$ also. Once more, we can reverse the reasoning.

This finishes the proof of Lemma 14. \square

Remark 16. The role S_5 played in this proof will be repeated frequently. When we add bits to some $s \in \mathfrak{S}$ to ensure Clause 7, we will say that we are “sealing off” s .

The next task is to prove that \mathbb{S} preserves \aleph_2 .

Lemma 17. *If $s \in \mathbb{S}$ and $M \prec K$ is a basic model with $s, \mathbb{S} \in M$, then s is strongly (M, \mathbb{S}) -generic.*

Therefore Proposition 6 implies:

Corollary 18. *Under CH, \mathbb{S} preserves \aleph_2 .*

Proof of Lemma 17. Let $\delta = M \cap \aleph_2$. Suppose $s' \leq s$ and let s^* consist of all $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s'$ such that $\alpha, \beta, \gamma < \delta$. Then $s^* \in M$ by the countable closure of M . Let $s^{**} \leq s^*$ where $s^{**} \in M$. We will construct s'' such that $s'' \leq s', s^{**}$.

For each $\alpha \in \text{dom}(s') \setminus \delta$, $x \in \omega$, let $X_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle}$ be the set of $\langle \beta, y \rangle$ such that $s' \Vdash \beta \in \lim \dot{C}_\alpha^x \cap \delta$, and such that y witnesses coherence, i.e. Clause 9. Let

$$S_0 = \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) : \alpha \in \text{dom}(s') \setminus \delta, \exists \langle \beta, y \rangle \in X_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle}, (\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s^{**}\}$$

Let $B_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle} = \{\beta : \exists \gamma, (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s^{**} \cup s' \cup S_0\}$ and let

$$S_1 = \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) : \alpha \in \text{dom}(s^{**}) \cup \text{dom}(s'), x \in \omega, \beta \in B_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle} \cup \{0\}, \\ \gamma \in [\beta, \min\{B_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle} \setminus (\beta + 1)\} \cap (\text{dom } s^{**} \cup \text{dom } s')]\}$$

We then argue that $s'' := s^{**} \cup s' \cup S_0 \cup S_1$ is a condition by verifying the nontrivial clauses from Definition 11.

Clause 2: It is clear that if this clause is satisfied by $s^{**} \cup s' \cup S_0$, then it is satisfied by s'' . Fix $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma])$ and $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma'])$ for which we will prove the clause. The clause follows from the fact that s^{**} and s' are conditions in \mathbb{S} if $\alpha < \delta$ or if both bits are in s' . Suppose that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s'$ and $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in S_0 \setminus s'$ as witnessed by $\langle \bar{\beta}, y \rangle \in X_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle}$. Since $\gamma' < \bar{\beta}$, we can assume without loss of generality that $\beta < \bar{\beta}$, from which it follows that $\gamma < \bar{\beta}$ since $s' \Vdash \beta \in \lim \dot{C}_\alpha^x$. Then $(\langle \bar{\beta}, y \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s^*$ and $(\langle \bar{\beta}, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s^{**}$, meaning that both bits are in s^{**} . Hence it must be that either $\beta = \beta'$ or $[\beta, \gamma] \cap [\beta', \gamma'] = \emptyset$. The remaining case, in which both $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma])$ and $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma'])$ are both in $S_0 \setminus s'$, is similar.

Clause 7: This is witnessed by bits in S_1 , which seal off $s^{**} \cup s' \cup S_0$.

Clause 9: It is sufficient to prove this clause for $s^{**} \cup s' \cup S_0$. Fix $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ and β as in the statement of Clause 9 in Definition 11. If $\alpha < \delta$, then if $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s^{**} \cup s' \cup S_0$ for some x, β, γ , then $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s^{**}$, so we have what we need because $s^{**} \in \mathbb{S}$ and satisfies Clause 9. If $\alpha \in \aleph_2 \setminus \delta$ and $\beta \geq \delta$, then we have what we need because $s' \in \mathbb{S}$. Observe that if $\beta < \delta$, $\alpha \in \aleph_2 \setminus \delta$, and $s' \Vdash \beta \in \lim \dot{C}_\alpha^x$, then we have $\beta \in \text{dom}(s^{**})$, so clause holds for the remaining case due to bits in S_0 . \square

Lemma 19. \mathbb{S} adds a $\square(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$ -sequence.

Proof. Suppose G is \mathbb{S} -generic over V . We know from Lemma 14 and Corollary 18 that \mathbb{S} preserves cardinals and cofinalities up to and including \aleph_2 . In $V[G]$ we let $\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha : \alpha \in \text{Lim}(\aleph_2) \rangle$ be defined so that $\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \{C_\alpha^x : x \in \omega\}$ and $C_\alpha^x = \dot{C}_\alpha^x[G]$.

First we show that for all $\alpha \in \text{Lim}(\aleph_2)$, for all $x \in \omega$, C_α^x is non-empty. We do this by working in V and arguing that $D_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle} = \{s \in \mathbb{S} : \exists x, \beta, \gamma, (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s\}$ is dense in \mathbb{S} . Suppose $s \notin D_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle}$ for all $x \in X$. Then there is no $\alpha' \in \text{dom } s, x \in \omega$ with $s \Vdash \alpha \in \lim \dot{C}_{\alpha'}^x$. For the case where $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$, choose a sequence $\langle \delta_i : i < \omega \rangle$ converging to α where $\delta_0 = 0$ and δ_i is a successor ordinal for $i > 0$. Then $s \cup \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\delta_i, \delta_{i+1} - 1]) : x \in X, i < \omega\} \in D_{\langle \alpha, x \rangle}$ (note that this is a condition). For the case where $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$, let $\bar{\alpha} = \sup(\text{dom}(s \upharpoonright \alpha) \cup (\text{out}(s) \cap \alpha)) + 1$. Then let $s' \supseteq s \cup \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [0, \bar{\alpha}]) : x \in X\} \cup \{(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\bar{\alpha} + 1, \bar{\alpha} + 1]) : x \in X\}$.

Next we show that \dot{C}_α^x is forced to be unbounded and closed in α for all $\alpha \in \text{Lim}(\aleph_2)$ and $x \in \omega$. Unboundedness follows automatically from Clause 6 of Definition 11 if $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$. If $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$, the argument for unboundedness is similar to the one used for showing that \dot{C}_α^x is defined; the supremum of $\text{dom}(s \upharpoonright \alpha) \cup (\text{out}(s) \cap \alpha)$ for any given condition $s \in \mathbb{S}$ will be bounded below α . For all $\alpha \in \text{Lim}(\aleph_2)$, closure

for countable sequences follows from Clause 4. Furthermore, for $\alpha \in \text{Lim}(\aleph_2)$ and $\beta < \alpha$ such that $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$, we have from Proposition 12 that if $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$ for some γ , then $s \Vdash \beta$ is a limit point of \dot{C}_α^x .

Now we show that \vec{C} is coherent. Suppose that $s \in \mathbb{S}$ forces that β is a limit point of \dot{C}_α^x , and suppose for contradiction that there is no $y \in \omega$ and no $s' \leq s$ forcing that “ $\dot{C}_\alpha^x \cap \beta = \dot{C}_\beta^y$ ”. Then we find an $\leq_{\mathbb{S}}$ -decreasing sequence $\langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$ such that $s_i \Vdash \dot{C}_\alpha^x \cap \beta \neq \dot{C}_\beta^{i_i}$, and we find a lower bound \bar{s} of this sequence using the countable closure of \mathbb{S} . Then \bar{s} violates Clause 9.

Finally, we show that \vec{C} does not have a thread in $V[\mathbb{S}]$, using the usual genericity argument. Suppose s forces that \dot{D} is a closed unbounded subset of \aleph_2 . Let $\bar{\alpha}$ and $s' \leq s$ be such that s' forces $\bar{\alpha}$ to be the ω^{th} point of \dot{D} . Build an \mathbb{S} -decreasing sequence of conditions $\langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$ below s' and an increasing sequence of ordinals $\langle \alpha_i : i < \omega \rangle$ above $\bar{\alpha}$ as follows: Let $\alpha_0 = \bar{\alpha}$ and $s_0 = s'$. Given s_i and α_i , $s_{i+1} \leq s_i$ and α_{i+1} will be chosen such that $s_{i+1} \Vdash \alpha_{i+1} \in \text{lim } \dot{D}$ and such that $\alpha_{i+1} > \max s_i$ and $\max s_{i+1} > \alpha_i$. Then let α^* be the supremum of the α_i 's and let s^* be a lower bound of the s_i 's forcing that \dot{C}_{α^*} consists only of ω -sequences—this is specifically possible from the argument in Lemma 14, where α^* would be in $\text{fd} \setminus (\text{ed} \cup \text{fp})$ in that argument. Therefore $s^* \Vdash \dot{D} \cap \alpha^* \notin \dot{C}_{\alpha^*}$. \square

3. THREADS

Next we introduce the threading forcing \mathbb{T} . Of course, a $\square(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$ -sequence is defined as such because it has no thread, but our ability to force a thread allows us to make use of large cardinals from the ground model. This is also how the threading forcing for Jensen's method works. The goal of this section is to show that we can use our own \mathbb{T} to lift weakly compact embeddings of the form $j : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$.

Definition 20. Let $G_{\mathbb{S}}$ be \mathbb{S} -generic over V and work in $V[G_{\mathbb{S}}]$. For all $\alpha \in \text{Lim}(\aleph_2)$ and $x \in \omega$, let $C_\alpha^x = \dot{C}_\alpha^x[G_{\mathbb{S}}]$.

Define \mathfrak{T} to be the set of closed intervals $[\beta, \gamma]$ such that $-1 \leq \beta \leq \gamma < \aleph_2$. Then we define a poset of \mathbb{T} of conditions $t \subset \mathfrak{T}$ such that the following holds:

- (1) The set t is countable.
- (2) If $[\beta, \gamma], [\beta', \gamma'] \in t$, then either $\beta = \beta'$ or $[\beta, \gamma] \cap [\beta', \gamma'] = \emptyset$.
- (3) If $\{[\beta_i, \gamma_i] : i < \omega\} \subseteq t$ and $\beta^* = \sup_{i < \omega} (\beta_i + 1)$, then it follows that $[\beta^*, \gamma^*] \in t$ for some γ^* .
- (4) If $[\beta, \gamma] \in t$, then one of the following holds:
 - (a) $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$.
 - (b) $\beta = \beta' + 1$ and there is some $\bar{\beta} \leq \beta'$ such that $[\bar{\beta}, \beta'] \in t$.
 - (c) $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega$ and there exists a sequence of ordinals $\langle \beta_i : i < \omega \rangle$ converging to β such that $\forall i < \omega, \exists \gamma_i, [\beta_i, \gamma_i] \in t$.
 - (d) $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega$ and there is some $\bar{\beta} < \beta$ and some sequence of ordinals $\langle \gamma_i : i < \omega \rangle$ converging to β such that $\forall i < \omega, [\bar{\beta}, \gamma_i] \in t$.
- (5) There is some $\alpha < \aleph_2$ such that $[\alpha, \alpha] \in t$ and such that for all $\beta > \alpha$, there is no γ such that $[\beta, \gamma] \in t$. Either $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$ or there is some $\langle \beta_n : n < \omega \rangle$ cofinal in α such that for all $n < \omega$, $[\beta_n, \gamma] \in t$ for some γ .
- (6) Suppose that $[\beta, \gamma] \in t$ and either $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$ or else $\{\beta' < \beta : \exists \gamma', [\beta', \gamma'] \in t\}$ is unbounded in β . Then there some $x \in \omega$ such that for all $\beta' \leq \gamma' < \beta$, $[\beta', \gamma'] \in t$ implies both $\beta' \in C_\beta^x$ and $C_\beta^x \cap (\beta', \gamma') = \emptyset$.

We have $t' \leq_{\mathbb{T}} t$ if and only if:

- (1) $t' \supseteq t$;
- (2) If $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ is such that for $\beta, \gamma < \alpha$, $[\beta, \gamma] \in t$ implies $\beta \in C_\alpha^x$ and $C_\alpha^x \cap (\beta, \gamma] = \emptyset$, then for $\beta, \gamma < \alpha$, $[\beta, \gamma] \in t'$ implies $\beta \in C_\alpha^x$ and $C_\alpha^x \cap (\beta, \gamma] = \emptyset$.

We use the following conventions for $t \in \mathbb{T}$:

- $\text{pos}(t) = \{\beta \geq 0 : \exists \gamma, [\beta, \gamma] \in t\}$.
- $\max(t)$ is the largest element of $\text{pos}(t)$.

Definition 21. If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, let

$$\text{thr}(s) = \{(\{[\alpha, \alpha]\} \cup \{[\beta, \gamma] : (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s\}) : \alpha \in \text{dom}(s), x \in \omega\}.$$

We say that $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ *witnesses* that $t \in \text{thr}(s)$ if $[\alpha, \alpha] \in t$ and for $\beta, \gamma < \alpha$, $[\beta, \gamma] \in t$ if and only if $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$.

Now we can connect the notion of $\text{thr}(s)$ for $s \in \mathbb{S}$ with \mathbb{T} if we are working in V .

Proposition 22. *The following are true given $s \in \mathbb{S}$:*

- (1) If $t \in \text{thr}(s)$ is witnessed by $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ then $s \Vdash "t \in \check{\mathbb{T}}"$.
- (2) If $s \Vdash "i \in \check{\mathbb{T}}"$, then there is some $s' \leq s$ and some $t' \in \text{thr}(s')$ such that $s' \Vdash "t' \leq \check{i}"$.

Proof. (1) is clear, with the appropriate $\alpha \in \text{dom } s$ and $x \in \omega$ witnessing Clause 6 from Definition 20. (2) works as follows: Let $s^* \leq s$, α , and $x \in \omega$ be such that $s^* \Vdash "\alpha = \max(\check{i})"$ and $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$ witnesses Clause 6 of Definition 20". Then use the countable closure of \mathbb{S} to find $s' \leq s^*$ such that $s' \Vdash "i = t^+ \in V"$ and such that for all $[\beta, \gamma] \in t^+$, either $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s'$ or else there is some $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s'$ such that $\beta \neq \beta'$ and $[\beta, \gamma] \cap [\beta', \gamma'] \neq \emptyset$. Then it must be the case that if $[\beta, \gamma] \in t^+$ then $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s'$ because otherwise the definition of $\leq_{\check{\mathbb{T}}}$ would be violated. Then let t' be such that $[\alpha, \alpha] \in t'$ and such that for all $\beta, \gamma < \alpha$, $[\beta, \gamma] \in t'$ if and only if $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s'$. Then s' and t' witness (2). \square

The next step is to introduce our version of the two-step iterations that appear in Jensen's method of forcing squares.

Definition 23. We let $D(\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T})$ refer to the set of pairs $(s, \check{t}) \in \mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}$ such that:

- (1) $s \Vdash "i = \check{t}"$ for some $t \in \text{thr}(s)$.
- (2) $s \Vdash "\max(\check{t}) = \max(s) \geq \text{sup}(\text{out}(s))"$.

If $(s, \check{t}) \in D(\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T})$, we will most often write (s, \check{t}) as (s, t) .

Lemma 24. *The set $D(\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T})$ is dense in $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}$ and countably closed. Moreover, if a sequence $\langle (s_i, t_i) : i < \omega \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}}$ -decreasing, then it has a lower bound (\bar{s}, \bar{t}) such that \bar{s} is a parsimonious lower bound of $\langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$.*

Proof. We will prove each claim separately. The "moreover" part of the statement will be clear from the proof.

Claim 25. *$D(\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T})$ is dense in $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}$.*

Suppose $(s, \check{t}) \in \mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}$. Let s' and t' witness Proposition 22 with respect to (s, \check{t}) . Then choose $s'' \leq s'$, $t'' \in \text{thr}(s'')$, and a large enough α^* such that $(s'', \check{t}'') \leq (s', \check{t}')$ and such that $\alpha^* = \max(t'') = \max(s'') \geq \text{sup}(\text{out}(s''))$ as follows: Let $\beta^* = \text{sup}\{\gamma + 1 : \exists \beta, [\beta, \gamma] \in t'\}$ and choose α^* such that $\max(s') \cup \text{sup}(\text{out}(s')) < \alpha^*$.

Let $\langle \alpha_n : n < \omega \rangle$ be a sequence with supremum α^* such that $\alpha_0 = \beta^*$ and α_n is a successor ordinal for $n > 0$. Let

$$s^+ = s' \cup \{(\langle \alpha^*, x \rangle, [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1} - 1]) : x, n \in \omega\} \cup \{(\langle \alpha^*, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) : [\beta, \gamma] \in t', x \in \omega\}.$$

Then let s'' be the sealed off version of s^+ , and let t'' be such that $[\alpha^*, \alpha^*] \in t''$ and such that for all $\beta, \gamma < \alpha^*$, $[\beta, \gamma] \in t''$ if and only if $(\langle \alpha^*, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s''$ for all $x \in \omega$.

Claim 26. $D(\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T})$ is countably closed.

Let $\langle (s_i, t_i) : i < \omega \rangle$ be $\leq_{\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}}$ -decreasing in $D(\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T})$. Let s^* be a parsimonious lower bound of $\vec{s} = \langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$. We use some definitions with the goal of eventually constructing \vec{t} :

- $T_0 = \bigcup_{i < \omega} t_i$,
- $\text{ep}(t) = \{\beta : \exists \gamma, [\beta, \gamma] \in T_0\}$,
- $\text{fp}(t) = \lim^+(\text{ep}(t)) \setminus \text{ep}(t)$,
- $t^* = T_0 \cup \{[\beta, \beta] : \beta \in \text{fp}(t)\}$.

We will define (\vec{s}, \vec{t}) based on (s^*, t^*) and argue that $(\vec{s}, \vec{t}) \in D(\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T})$. Now let $\bar{\alpha}$ be the supremum of $\text{ep}(t) \cup \text{fp}(t)$. If there is some i such that $\bar{\alpha} \in \text{dom}(s_i)$, in other words $\bar{\alpha} \in \text{ep}(t)$, then it will be the case that $\text{pos}(t^*) = \text{pos}(\vec{t})$ for some $\vec{t} \in \text{thr}(\vec{s})$. Then we can let $\vec{s} = s^*$ and let \vec{t} be \vec{t} . Let us therefore assume for the rest of the proof that for all $i < \omega$, $\bar{\alpha} \notin \text{dom } s_i$.

We will define \vec{s} by first defining s^+ . Let s^+ be defined as follows:

- If $\alpha \neq \bar{\alpha}$, then $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s^+$ if and only if $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s^*$.
- $(\langle \bar{\alpha}, x + 1 \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s^+$ if and only if $(\langle \bar{\alpha}, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s^*$.
- $(\langle \bar{\alpha}, 0 \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s^+$ if $[\beta, \gamma] \in t^*$ and $\gamma < \bar{\alpha}$.

Then we let \vec{s} be the sealed off version of s^+ . We need to argue that $\vec{s} \in \mathbb{S}$. It suffices to show that Clause 9, i.e. coherence, from Definition 11 holds for bits of the form $(\langle \bar{\alpha}, 0 \rangle, [\beta', \gamma'])$. Let β be as in the statement of Clause 9. Observe that there is some $\beta^* \in (\beta, \alpha)$ such that $\beta^* \in \text{ep}(t)$ and either Case (a) or Case (c) of Clause 4 of Definition 20 holds for β^* . Let x be such that $\langle \beta^*, x \rangle$ witnesses Clause 6 of Definition 20. Then $\beta^* \in \text{dom } s^*$ and $s^* \Vdash \text{“}\beta \in \lim \dot{C}_{\beta^*}^x\text{”}$, so let y witness coherence of $\dot{C}_{\beta^*}^x$ at β . Then y witnesses coherence of $\dot{C}_{\bar{\alpha}}^0$ at β .

We let \vec{t} be defined so that $[\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}] \in \vec{t}$ and so that for all $\beta, \gamma < \bar{\alpha}$, $[\beta, \gamma] \in \vec{t}$ if and only if $(\langle \bar{\alpha}, 0 \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in \vec{s}$. We claim that $(\vec{s}, \vec{t}) \in D(\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T})$. It can be checked that \vec{s} is a lower bound of $\langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$: Observe that $\bar{\alpha} = \max(\vec{s}) = \max(s^*)$ because s^* was chosen to be parsimonious and because Clause 2 and Clause 1 from Definition 23 hold for (s_i, t_i) for all $i < \omega$. In particular, the fact that $\text{sup}(\text{out}(s_i)) \leq \max(s_i)$ for all $i < \omega$ implies that $\text{fp}(\vec{s}) \subseteq \max(s^*)$. We only needed to guarantee that we would have $\vec{t} \in \text{thr}(\vec{s})$. \square

We therefore see that \mathbb{T} preserves \aleph_1 over $V[\mathbb{S}]$ since it is a factor of a countably distributive iteration. Moreover, we can expand the proof from Lemma 17 to see:

Proposition 27. $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}$ preserves \aleph_2 over V .

Proof. Specifically, suppose that $s \in \mathbb{S}$, $t \in \mathbb{T}$, and $M \prec K$ is a basic model with $s, \mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T} \in M$, and $\delta = M \cap \aleph_2$. Then it can be argued that $(s, t \cup [\delta, \delta])$ is strongly $(M, \mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T})$ -generic. Then apply Proposition 6. \square

Although \mathbb{T} preserves cardinals, it does not preserve the canonical $\square(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$ -sequence added by \mathbb{S} . This is the primary function of \mathbb{T} in some sense, despite its usefulness for lifting embeddings (which will be established shortly).

Proposition 28. *If $G_{\mathbb{S}} * G_{\mathbb{T}}$ is $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}$ -generic over V , and $\mathcal{D} = \{\beta < \aleph_2 : \exists \gamma, [\beta, \gamma] \in G_{\mathbb{T}}\}$, then \mathcal{D} is a thread of the $\square(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$ -sequence \mathcal{C} derived from $G_{\mathbb{S}}$.*

The following lemma shows how we will use a weakly compact cardinal together with \mathbb{S} by lifting embeddings, using \mathbb{T} in a crucial way. In the context of Jensen's method for forcing squares, we would use a generic condition argument for $j(\mathbb{S})$. However, when we have lifted $j : \mathcal{M}[\text{Col}(\aleph_1, < \kappa)] \rightarrow \mathcal{N}[\text{Col}(\aleph_1, < j(\kappa))]$ and are working in $V[\text{Col}(\aleph_1, < j(\kappa))]$, we have $|\mathbb{S}| = \aleph_1$, yet the conditions in both \mathbb{S} and $j(\mathbb{S})$ are countable. Therefore we use a factorization argument instead.

Lemma 29. *Suppose the following:*

- $\mathcal{C} = \text{Col}(\aleph_1, < \kappa)$ is the Lévy collapse and $G_{\mathcal{C}}$ is \mathcal{C} -generic over \bar{V} .
- $j : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is a weakly compact embedding with critical point κ .
- $j : \mathcal{M}[G_{\mathcal{C}}] \rightarrow \mathcal{N}[j(G_{\mathcal{C}})]$ is the usual lifted embedding given by $\dot{x}_{G_{\mathcal{C}}} \mapsto j(\dot{x})_{j(G_{\mathcal{C}})}$.
- $V[j(G_{\mathcal{C}})]$ contains generics $G_{\mathbb{S}}$ and $G_{\mathbb{T}}$ for \mathbb{S} and \mathbb{T} respectively.

Then in $\bar{V}[j(G_{\mathcal{C}})]$, $j(\mathbb{S})$ is forcing equivalent to $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T} * \mathbb{S}'$ where \mathbb{S}' is a countably closed forcing over $\bar{V}[j(G_{\mathcal{C}})]$.

Observe that the fourth premise can be fulfilled using the Absorption Lemma.

Proof. First we describe \mathbb{S}' and some relevant dense subsets of \mathbb{S} and $j(\mathbb{S})$. Working in $V[G_{j(\mathcal{C})}]$, $j(\mathfrak{S})$ (where \mathfrak{S} is from Definition 11) is of course equal to the set of bits $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma])$ such that $\alpha < j(\kappa)$, $x \in \omega$, $\beta \leq \gamma < j(\kappa)$. Let $C_{\alpha}^x = \dot{C}_{\alpha}^x[G_{\mathbb{S}}]$ for all $\langle \alpha, x \rangle \in \text{Lim}(\aleph_2) \times \omega$ and let $\mathcal{D} = \{\beta < \aleph_2 : \exists \gamma, [\beta, \gamma] \in G_{\mathbb{T}}\}$.

Now let \mathbb{S}' consist of $s \subseteq j(\mathfrak{S}) \setminus \mathfrak{S}$ such that Clause 1 through Clause 8 from Definition 11 hold, such that its ordering is defined like $\leq_{\mathbb{S}}$, and moreover two additional clauses hold, the first of which is a modification of Clause 9 from Definition 11:

- (10) Suppose that $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) \in s$ and either $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$ or else $\{\beta' < \beta : \exists \gamma', (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s\}$ is unbounded in β . Then:
 - (a) If $\beta > \kappa$, then there is some $y \in \omega$ such that for all $\beta' \leq \gamma' < \beta$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$ if and only if $(\langle \beta, y \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$.
 - (b) If $\beta < \kappa$, then there is some $y \in \omega$ such that for all $\beta' \leq \gamma' < \beta$, if $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$ then $\beta' \in C_{\beta}^y$ and $C_{\beta}^y \cap (\beta', \gamma') = \emptyset$.
 - (c) If $\beta = \kappa$, then for all $\beta', \gamma' < \beta$, if $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta', \gamma']) \in s$, then $\beta' \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D} \cap (\beta', \gamma') = \emptyset$.
- (11) For all limit ordinals α and all $x \in \omega$ such that $\exists \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}, (\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}]) \in s$, one of the following holds:
 - (a) $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\kappa, \gamma]) \in s$ for some γ .
 - (b) There exists a non-empty finite sequence $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \dots < \beta_k$ such that the following hold:
 - (i) For all $\ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta_{\ell}, \gamma]) \in s$ for some γ ;
 - (ii) Either $\text{cf}(\beta_0) = \omega_1$ or there are sequences $\langle \beta_n : n < \omega \rangle$, $\langle \gamma_n : n < \omega \rangle$ with $\sup_{n < \omega} \beta_n = \beta_0$ and $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta_n, \gamma_n]) \in s$ for all $n < \omega$;
 - (iii) For all β_{ℓ} with $\ell > 0$, either $\beta_{\ell} = \beta_{\ell-1} + 1$, or $\beta_{\ell} = \beta + 1$ and $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta_{\ell-1}, \beta]) \in s$, or there is a sequence $\langle \gamma_n : n < \omega \rangle$ with $\sup_{n < \omega} \gamma_n = \beta_{\ell}$ and $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta_{\ell-1}, \gamma_n]) \in s$ for all $n < \omega$.

(iv) $(\langle \alpha, x \rangle, [\beta_\ell, \gamma]) \in s$ for some $\gamma \geq \kappa$.

Let $D(j(\mathbb{S}))$ be the dense subset of $s \in j(\mathbb{S})$ such that Clause 11 holds for s . Now we give the isomorphism $\Psi : \{(s, t, s') : s \in \mathbb{S}, (s, t) \in D(\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}), s' \in \mathbb{S}'\} \rightarrow D(j(\mathbb{S}))$. Specifically,

$$\Psi(s, t, s') = s \cup s' \cup \{(\langle \kappa, x \rangle, [\beta, \gamma]) : x \in \omega, [\beta, \gamma] \in t\}.$$

Observe that the definition of Ψ is where we use Clause 3 from Definition 11. We are also using the fact that $V[G_{j(\mathbb{C})}] \models \text{“}\kappa \in j(\kappa) \cap \text{cof}(\omega_1)\text{”}$. It is immediate that Ψ is order-preserving. Moreover, Ψ is a bijection because it has a natural inverse.

Now we will show that \mathbb{S}' is countably closed in $V[G_{j(\mathbb{C})}]$. Suppose $\vec{s} = \langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$ is a descending sequence in \mathbb{S}' . Define ed , fd , ep , fp as in Definition 13, and let \bar{s} be a parsimonious lower bound of \vec{s} defined exactly as in Lemma 14. So $\bar{s} \in j(\mathbb{S})$. We know that \bar{s} satisfies Clause 1 through Clause 8 from Definition 11. We will prove Clause 10 after Clause 11, since the former depends on the proof of the latter.

Clause 11: The case where $\alpha \in \text{fd} \setminus (\text{ep} \cup \text{fp})$ is trivial. Given $\alpha \in \text{ed}$, $x \in \omega$, there is some i such that $\alpha \in \text{dom}(s_i)$. Then the fact that s_i satisfies Clause 11 is enough to imply that \bar{s} satisfies Clause 11. If $\alpha \in \text{fp}$, then there is some $\langle \alpha', x' \rangle$ witnessing $\alpha \in \text{fp}$, and we get Clause 11 from the s_i for i large enough that $\alpha' \in \text{dom}(s_i)$.

Clause 10: For the purpose of verifying this clause, when we say that y witnesses coherence of \dot{C}_α^x at β for $\beta \leq \kappa$, we are referring to the y mentioned in Case (b) or Case (c) of the clause.

Now fix $\alpha \in \text{Lim}(j(\kappa) \setminus (\kappa + 1))$ and $x \in \omega$ as in the statement of Clause 10. We have already handled the case where $\beta > \kappa$ in Lemma 14. Therefore we can assume that $\beta < \kappa$ for the rest of the proof. We break the proof into cases.

$\alpha \in \text{ep}, \beta \in \text{ep}$, for large i Case (a) of Clause 11 holds for s_i w.r.t. $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$: We have that $\beta \in \lim \mathcal{D}$, so there is some $y \in \omega$ such that $\mathcal{D} \cap \beta = C_\beta^y$. Then y witnesses coherence of \dot{C}_x^α at β .

$\alpha \in \text{ep}, \beta \in \text{fp}$, for large i Case (a) of Clause 11 holds for s_i w.r.t. $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$: Observe that since $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}$ has a countably closed dense subset, it follows that \mathbb{T} is countably distributive, so $G_{\mathbb{T}}$ is countably closed, hence $\beta \in \lim \mathcal{D}$. This then follows the reasoning of the previous case.

$\alpha \in \text{ep}, \beta \in \text{ep}$, for large i Case (b) of Clause 11 holds for s_i w.r.t. $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$: This means that there is some β^+ such that for large i , $s_i \Vdash \text{“}\beta^+ = \max(\lim \dot{C}_\alpha^x \cap \kappa)\text{”}$, and that $\beta \leq \beta^+$. If $\beta = \beta^+$ and y witnesses coherence of \dot{C}_α^x at β^+ , then we are done with this case. If $\beta < \beta^+$, y witnesses coherence of \dot{C}_α^x at β^+ , and y' is such that $C_{\beta^+}^y \cap \beta = C_\beta^{y'}$ (since $\beta \in \lim C_{\beta^+}^y$), then y' witnesses coherence of \dot{C}_α^x at β .

$\alpha \in \text{ep}, \beta \in \text{fp}$, for large i Case (b) of Clause 11 holds for s_i w.r.t. $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$: This is like the previous case, noting that if $\beta < \beta^+$ as written there, then we would still have $\beta \in \lim C_{\beta^+}^y$.

$\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$ witnesses $\alpha \in \text{fp}, \beta \in \text{ep}$, for lg. i Case (a) of Clause 11 holds for s_i , $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$: We have $\beta \in \lim \mathcal{D}$, so there is some $y \in \omega$ such that $\mathcal{D} \cap \beta = C_\beta^y$. So y witnesses coherence of $\dot{C}_\alpha^{\tilde{x}}$ at β , hence it witnesses coherence of C_α^x at β .

The remaining cases all consider $\alpha \in \text{fp}$ and take $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$ witnessing this. The reasoning depends on whether Case (a) or Case (b) holds for s_i with respect to $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{x} \rangle$ for large i . The arguments are analogous to the cases already discussed. \square

Now we can use \mathbb{T} to show that stronger squares do not hold. Since the bulk of the work was done with Lemma 29, and the remaining lemmas are variations of standard arguments, we will handle the rest with a light amount of detail.

Lemma 30. *If W is a ground model and \mathcal{C} is a $\square(\aleph_2, < \aleph_0)$ -sequence in $W[\mathbb{S}]$, then \mathbb{T} does not thread \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. This lemma has analogs for Jensen-style posets (see [8], Lemma 4.5). Let \dot{D} be a name for a thread for \mathcal{C} added over $W[\mathbb{S}]$ by \mathbb{T} and work in W . Build a descending sequence $\langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$ of conditions in \mathbb{S} , sequences $\langle t_i^j : j < \omega \rangle$ in \mathbb{T} for $i < \omega$, and an increasing sequence of ordinals $\langle \gamma_i : i < \omega \rangle$ such that the following hold:

- $(s_i, t_i^j) \in D(\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T})$ for all $i, j < \omega$.
- $t_i^j = t_0^j$ for all $j < i$.
- For all $i, j < \omega$, $\max t_0^j = \max t_i^j$.
- (s_{i+1}, t_0^{i+1}) and (s_{i+1}, t_{i+1}^{i+1}) decide “ $\gamma_i \in \dot{D}$ ” differently.

Then let \bar{s} be a lower bound of $\langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$ and let \bar{t}_i be a lower bound of $\langle t_i^j : j < \omega \rangle$ for all $i < \omega$, and also let $\bar{\gamma}$ be a lower bound of $\langle \gamma_i : i < \omega \rangle$. Then each (\bar{s}, \bar{t}_i) gives a different possibility for $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar{\gamma}}$, contradicting the fact that \mathcal{C} is a $\square(\aleph_2, < \aleph_0)$ -sequence. \square

Lemma 31. *If \mathcal{C} is a $\square(\lambda, \aleph_0)$ -sequence and \mathbb{P} is countably closed, then \mathbb{P} does not thread \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. Stronger versions of this lemma appear elsewhere ([6]), but we sketch an argument for completeness.

Let \dot{D} be a name for a thread supposedly added by \mathbb{P} . Build a tree $\langle p_x : x \in 2^{<\omega} \rangle$ and a collection of ordinals $\langle \gamma_x : x \in 2^{<\omega} \rangle$ such that:

- $x \sqsubseteq y$ implies $p_y \leq p_x$,
- $p_{x \smallfrown 0}$ and $p_{x \smallfrown 1}$ decide “ $\gamma_x \in \dot{D}$ ” differently for some γ_x above $\sup_{|y| < x} \gamma_y$.

Then for all $X \in 2^\omega$, let p_X be the lower bound of $\langle p_{X \smallfrown n} : n < \omega \rangle$. Let $\gamma = \sup_{x \in 2^\omega} \gamma_x$. Then the p_X 's give 2^ω -many possibilities for $C \in \mathcal{C}_\gamma$, which is a contradiction of the fact that \mathcal{C} is a $\square(\lambda, \aleph_0)$ -sequence. \square

Proposition 32. *If \mathcal{C} is a $\square_{\mu, \kappa}$ -sequence and \mathbb{P} preserves μ^+ , then \mathbb{P} does not thread \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. This is basically a restatement of Remark 4. \square

Corollary 33. *If κ is weakly compact, then $V[\text{Col}(\aleph_1, < \kappa)][\mathbb{S}] \models \neg \square(\aleph_2, < \aleph_0)$.*

Proof. Let M be a κ -sized transitive model containing \mathbb{S} and a supposed $\text{Col}(\aleph_1, < \kappa) * \mathbb{S}$ -name $\dot{\mathcal{C}}$ for a $\square(\aleph_2, < \aleph_0)$ -sequence. Let $j : M \rightarrow N$ be a weakly compact embedding with critical point κ , and let $G_{\mathcal{C}} * G_{\mathbb{S}} * G_{\mathbb{T}}$ be $\text{Col}(\aleph_1, < \kappa) * \mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}$ -generic over V . Since $\mathbb{S} * \mathbb{T}$ is countably closed, the quotient $\mathfrak{R} := \text{Col}(\aleph_1, < j(\kappa)) / G_{\mathcal{C}} * G_{\mathbb{S}} * G_{\mathbb{T}}$, is forcing-equivalent to a countably closed forcing (see the section on absorption in [3]). Let $G_{\mathfrak{R}}$ be generic for \mathfrak{R} and work in $V[G_{\mathcal{C}} * G_{\mathbb{S}} * G_{\mathbb{T}} * G_{\mathfrak{R}}]$ to use Lemma 29 to lift j to $j : M[G_{\mathcal{C}}][G_{\mathbb{S}}] \rightarrow N[j(G_{\mathcal{C}})][j(G_{\mathbb{S}})]$ by forcing with a \mathbb{S}' -generic $G_{\mathbb{S}'}$. Use the lift to define a thread D for $\mathcal{C} := \dot{\mathcal{C}}[G_{\mathcal{C}} * G_{\mathbb{S}}]$ by taking an element from the κ^{th} level of $j(\mathcal{C})$. Lemma 30 shows that \mathbb{T} could not have added D , and Lemma 31 show that neither \mathfrak{R} nor \mathbb{S}' could have added D . Therefore the

thread D already exists in $V[G_{\mathcal{C}} * G_{\mathbb{S}}]$, and so \mathcal{C} is not actually a $\square(\aleph_2, < \aleph_0)$ -sequence. \square

Corollary 34. *If κ is weakly compact then $V[\text{Col}(\aleph_1, < \kappa)][\mathbb{S}] \models \neg \square_{\aleph_1, \aleph_0}$.*

Proof. A Mahlo cardinal would be sufficient (see [8], Theorem 4.4). But assume we have a weakly compact cardinal and define a thread D as in Corollary 33. Then Proposition 32 and Proposition 27 together imply that \mathbb{T} could not have added D . Then Lemma 31 shows that the rest of the extension could not have added D . \square

Hence we have finished proving Theorem 1.

Acknowledgement. I would like to thank Heike Mildenerger for a great deal of support while I was working on this paper. I am especially grateful for her willingness to spend a lot of time looking at rough drafts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Uri Abraham and Saharon Shelah. Forcing closed unbounded sets. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 48(3):643–657, 1983.
- [2] James Cummings. Notes on singular cardinal combinatorics. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 46(3), 2005.
- [3] James Cummings. Iterated forcing and elementary embeddings. In Matthew Foreman and Akihiro Kanamori, editors, *Handbook of Set Theory*, pages 775–883. Springer, 2010.
- [4] Gregor Dolinar and Mirna Džamonja. Forcing \square_{ω_1} with finite conditions. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 164(1):49–64, 2013.
- [5] Todd Eisworth. Successors of singular cardinals. In Matthew Foreman and Akihiro Kanamori, editors, *Handbook of Set Theory*, pages 1229–1350. Springer, 2010.
- [6] Yair Hayut and Chris Lambie-Hanson. Simultaneous stationary reflection and square sequences. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, 17(2):1750010, 2017.
- [7] Thomas Jech. *Set Theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, the third millennium, revised and expanded edition, 2003.
- [8] Menachem Magidor and Chris Lambie-Hanson. On the strengths and weaknesses of weak squares. In *Appalachian set theory 2006–2012*, volume 406 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 301–330. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2013.
- [9] William Mitchell. Adding closed unbounded subsets of ω_2 with finite forcing. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 46(3):357–371, 2005.
- [10] William J. Mitchell. On the Hamkins approximation property. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 144:126–129, 2006.
- [11] Itay Neeman. Two applications of finite side conditions at ω_2 . *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 56(7-8):983–1036, 2017.
- [12] S. Shelah and L. Stanley. S -forcing. I. A “black-box” theorem for morasses, with applications to super-Souslin trees. *Israel J. Math.*, 43(3):185–224, 1982.
- [13] Stevo Todorćević. Partitioning pairs of countable ordinals. *Acta Mathematica*, 159(3-4):261–294, 1987.