The Journal of Symbolic Logic
Volume 91, Number 2, June 2026

# ON INDESTRUCTIBLE STRONGLY GUESSING MODELS

RAHMAN MOHAMMADPOUR AND BOBAN VELIČKOVIĆ

**Abstract.** In [15] we defined and proved the consistency of the principle $\mathrm{GM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ which implies that many consequences of strong forcing axioms hold simultaneously at $\omega_2$ and $\omega_3$. In this paper we formulate a strengthening of $\mathrm{GM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ that we call $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$. We also prove, modulo the consistency of two supercompact cardinals, that $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ is consistent with ZFC. In addition to all the consequences of $\mathrm{GM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$, the principle $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$, together with some mild cardinal arithmetic assumptions that hold in our model, implies that any forcing that adds a new subset of $\omega_2$ either adds a real or collapses some cardinal. This gives a partial answer to a question of Abraham [1] and extends a previous result of Todorčević [16] in this direction.

**§1. Introduction.** One of the driving themes of research in set theory in recent years has been the search for higher forcing axioms. Since most applications of strong forcing axioms such as the proper forcing axiom (PFA) and Martin's maximum (MM) can be factored through some simple, but powerful combinatorial principles, it is natural to look for higher cardinal versions of such principles. One such principle is $\mathrm{ISP}(\omega_2)$ which was formulated by Viale and Weiß [19]. They derived it from PFA and showed that it has a number of structural consequences on the set-theoretic universe. For instance, it implies the tree property at $\omega_2$, and the failure of $\square(\lambda)$, for regular $\lambda \geq \omega_2$. Moreover, Krueger [10] showed that it implies the singular cardinal hypothesis (SCH). A strengthening of $\mathrm{ISP}(\omega_2)$ was studied by Cox and Krueger [6]. They showed that this strengthening, which we refer to as $\mathrm{SGM}(\omega_2, \omega_1)$, is consistent with $2^{\aleph_0} > \aleph_2$. It is therefore a natural candidate for a generalization to higher cardinals. In [15] we introduced one such generalization, $\mathrm{GM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$, and showed that if there are two supercompact cardinals then there is a generic extension $V[G]$ of the universe in which $\mathrm{GM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ holds. In addition to $\mathrm{ISP}(\omega_2)$, the principle $\mathrm{GM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ implies that the tree property also holds at $\omega_3$, and that the approachability ideal $I[\omega_2]$ restricted to ordinals of cofinality $\omega_1$ is the non stationary ideal restricted to this set. The consistency of the latter was previously shown by Mitchell [14] starting from a model with a greatly Mahlo cardinal. In the current paper we further strengthen the principle $\mathrm{GM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ in the spirit of Cox and Krueger [6]. We call this new principle $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$. We show its consistency by a modification of the forcing notion from [15], again starting from two supercompact cardinals. As a new application we show that $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$,

Received October 24, 2023.
2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03E35, 03E55, 03E57, 03E65.
*Key words and phrases.* guessing model, indestructible guessing model, Magidor model, virtual model, side conditions.

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Association for Symbolic Logic.
0022-4812/26/9102-0018
DOI:10.1017/jsl.2025.1



https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

together with some mild cardinal arithmetic assumptions that hold in our model, implies that any forcing that adds a new subset of $\omega_2$ either adds a real or collapses some cardinal. This gives a partial answer to a question of Abraham [1] and extends a previous result of Todorčević [16] in this direction.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some preliminaries and background facts. In Section 3 we state the main theorem and derive the application of $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ to the problem of Abraham mentioned above. In Section 4 we review the definitions on virtual models from [15]. In Section 5 we describe the main forcing and prove the relevant facts about it. The pieces are then put together in Section 6 to derive the main theorem of this paper. We warn the reader that the current paper relies heavily on the concepts and results from [15], hence having access to that paper is necessary for the full understanding of our results.

## §2. Preliminaries.

**2.1. Special trees.** Let $T = (T, \leq_T)$ be a tree of height $\omega_1$. Recall that $T$ is called *special* if there is a function $f : T \to \omega$, such that for every $s <_T t$ in $T$, we have $f(s) \neq f(t)$. If $T$ is a tree of height $\omega_1$, the standard forcing $\mathbb{S}(T)$ to generically specialize $T$ consists of finite partial specializing functions, ordering by reverse inclusion. If $T$ has no cofinal branches then $\mathbb{S}(T)$ has the countable chain condition, see [2]. We say that $T$ is *weakly special* if there is a function $f : T \to \omega$ such that whenever $s, t, u \in T$ and $f(s) = f(t) = f(u)$, if $s <_T t$ and $s <_T u$ then $t$ and $u$ are comparable. Baumgartner [3, Theorem 7.3] proved that for a tree $T$ of height $\omega_1$ which has no branches of length $\omega_1$, $T$ is special iff $T$ is weakly special. He also showed [3, Theorem 7.5] that if every tree of height and size $\omega_1$ that has no branches of length $\omega_1$ is special, then every tree of height and size $\omega_1$ that has at most $\omega_1$ branches is weakly special. We recall the following well-known fact, see [6, Proposition 4.3] for a proof.

PROPOSITION 2.1. *If $V \subseteq W$ are models of set theory with $\omega_1^V = \omega_1^W$, $T \in V$ is a tree of height $\omega_1$ which is weakly special in $V$, then every branch of $T$ in $W$ of length $\omega_1$ is in $V$.*

**2.2. Guessing models.** Throughout this paper by a model $M$, we mean a set or a class such that $(M, \in)$ satisfies a sufficient fragment of ZFC. For a set or class $M$, we say that a set $x \subseteq M$ is *bounded in* $M$ if there is $y \in M$ such that $x \subseteq y$. Let us call a transitive model $R$ *powerful* if it includes every set bounded in $R$. We say that $x$ is *guessed* in $M$ if there is $x^* \in M$ with $x^* \cap M = x \cap M$. Suppose that $\gamma$ is an $M$-regular cardinal. We say $x$ is *$\gamma$-approximated* in $M$ if for every $a \in M$ with $|a|^M < \gamma$, we have $a \cap x \in M$. We say that $M$ is *$\gamma$-guessing in a model $N$* if for every $x \in N$ bounded in $M$, if $x$ is $\gamma$-approximated in $M$, then $x$ is guessed in $M$.

DEFINITION 2.2 [18]. Let $\gamma$ be a regular cardinal. A set $M$ is said to be *$\gamma$-guessing* if $M$ is $\gamma$-guessing in $V$.

Recall from [9] that a pair $(M, N)$ of transitive models with $\gamma \in M \subseteq N$ has the *$\gamma$-approximation property*, if $M$ is $\gamma$-guessing in $N$.

THEOREM 2.3 (Krueger [10]). *Let $M_0 \subseteq M_1 \subseteq M_2$ be transitive models. If $(M_0, M_1)$ and $(M_1, M_2)$ have the $\omega_1$-approximation property, then so does $(M_0, M_2)$.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THEOREM 2.4 (Cox–Krueger [5]). *Suppose that $R$ is a powerful model and $M \prec R$. Let also $\gamma$ be a regular cardinal in $M$ with $\gamma \subseteq M$. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) *$M$ is a $\gamma$-guessing model.*
(2) *The pair $(\overline{M}, V)$ has the $\gamma$-approximation property.*

**2.3. Indestructible and special guessing models.** The notion of an indestructible guessing model was introduced by Cox and Krueger [6].

DEFINITION 2.5. An $\omega_1$-guessing model $M$ of size $\omega_1$ is *indestructible* if $M$ remains $\omega_1$-guessing in any outer universe with the same $\omega_1$.

Let us first recall that a set $X$ of size $\omega_1$ is *internally unbounded* if $X \cap \mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}(X)$ is cofinal in $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}(X)$, and is *internally club* if $X \cap \mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}(X)$ contains a closed unbounded subset of $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}(X)$. It is easily seen that if $M$ is an $\omega_1$-sized elementary submodel of a powerful model $R$, then $M$ is internally unbounded (I.U.) if and only if there is an I.U. sequence for $M$, i.e., a $\subseteq$-increasing and $\in$-sequence $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ of countable sets with union $M$, and that $M$ is internally club (I.C.) if and only if there is an I.C. sequence for $M$, i.e., a $\subseteq$-continuous I.U. sequence for $M$.

It was shown by Krueger [10] that if $R$ is a powerful model and $M \prec R$ with $\omega_1 \subseteq M$ is an $\omega_1$-guessing model of size $\omega_1$, then $M$ is internally unbounded.

Let us fix an I.U. sequence $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ for an I.U. $\omega_1$-guessing model $M$ of size $\omega_1$. For every $\alpha < \omega_1$, let

$$T_\alpha(M) \coloneqq \{(z, f) \in M : f : z \cap M_\alpha \to 2\}.$$

Let also

$$T(M) = \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} T_\alpha(M).$$

We order $T(M)$ by $(z, f) \leq (z', f')$ if and only if $z = z'$ and $f \subseteq f'$.

Notice that $T(M) \subseteq M$, and hence $|T(M)| \leq \omega_1$. Clearly $T(M)$ is a tree of height $\omega_1$. Assume that $b$ is an uncountable branch through $T(M)$. Then there is $z \in M$ such that for all $(z', f') \in b$, we have $z' = z$. Let

$$F = \bigcup \{f : (z, f) \in b\}.$$

Then $F : z \cap M \mapsto 2$ is a function which is $\omega_1$-approximated in $M$. Since $M$ is an $\omega_1$-guessing model, there is $F^* \in M$ with $F \restriction (z \cap M) = F^* \restriction (z \cap M)$. Given $F^*$, we can recover the branch $b$, so $T(M)$ has at most $\omega_1$ branches. By Proposition 2.1 we now have the following [6, Proposition 4.4].

PROPOSITION 2.6 (Cox–Krueger [6]). *Suppose $M$ is an I.U. $\omega_1$-guessing model of cardinality $\omega_1$. Then there is a tree $T$ of size and height $\omega_1$ with $\omega_1$ cofinal branches such that $T$ being weakly special implies that $M$ is an indestructible $\omega_1$-guessing.*

**2.4. Strong properness.**

DEFINITION 2.7 (Mitchell [13]). Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a forcing notion and $A$ a set. We say that $p \in \mathbb{P}$ is $(A, \mathbb{P})$-*strongly generic* if for every $q \leq p$ there is a condition $q \restriction A \in A$ such that any $r \in A$ with $r \leq q \restriction A$ is compatible with $q$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

DEFINITION 2.8. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a forcing notion, and $\mathcal{S}$ be a collection of sets. We say that $\mathbb{P}$ is *strongly proper* for $\mathcal{S}$ if for every $A \in \mathcal{S}$ and $p \in A \cap \mathbb{P}$, there exists an $(A, \mathbb{P})$-strongly generic condition $q \leq p$.

A forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ is called strongly proper, if for every sufficiently large regular cardinal $\theta$ there is a club $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}(H_\theta)$ such that $\mathbb{P}$ is strongly proper for $\mathcal{C}$.

DEFINITION 2.9. A forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ has the $\gamma$-approximation property if for every $V$-generic filter $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, the pair $(V, V[G])$ has the $\gamma$-approximation property.

The following are standard.

LEMMA 2.10. *Every strongly proper forcing has the $\omega_1$-approximation property.*

LEMMA 2.11. *Suppose $R$ is a powerful model, $M \prec R$ is an $\omega_1$-guessing model, and that $\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing with the $\omega_1$-approximation property. Then $M$ remains $\omega_1$-guessing in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$.*

PROOF. It follows easily from Theorems 2.3 and 2.4. ⊣

**2.5. Magidor models.** The following definition is motivated by Magidor's reformulation of a supercompact cardinal, see [12].

DEFINITION 2.12 (Magidor model, [15]). We say that a model $M$ is a *$\kappa$-Magidor model* if, letting $\overline{M}$ be the transitive collapse of $M$ and $\pi$ the collapsing map, $\overline{M} = V_{\bar{\gamma}}$, for some $\bar{\gamma} < \kappa$ with $\operatorname{cof}(\bar{\gamma}) \geq \pi(\kappa)$, and $V_{\pi(\kappa)} \subseteq M$. If $\kappa$ is clear from the context, we omit it.

PROPOSITION 2.13. *Suppose $\kappa$ is supercompact and $\mu > \kappa$ with $\operatorname{cof}(\mu) \geq \kappa$. Then the set of $\kappa$-Magidor models is stationary in $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(V_\mu)$.*

PROOF. See [15, Proposition 3.21]. ⊣

**2.6. Some lemmata.**

LEMMA 2.14 (Neeman [7]). *Suppose that $M$ is a 0-guessing model which is sufficiently elementary in some transitive model $A$. Suppose that $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is a forcing. Then every $(M, \mathbb{P})$-generic condition is $(M, \mathbb{P})$-strongly generic.*

We need the following.

LEMMA 2.15. *Let $\mathbb{P} \in H_\theta$ be a forcing with the $\omega_1$-approximation property. Assume that $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}) \in H_\theta$. Suppose $M \prec H_\theta$ is countable and $\mathbb{P} \in M$. Let $Z \in M$ and let $f : M \cap Z \to 2$ be a function that is not guessed in $M$. If $p \in \mathbb{P}$ is $(M, \mathbb{P})$-generic, then*

$$p \Vdash \text{“}\check{f} \text{ is not guessed in } M[\dot{G}]\text{.”}$$

PROOF. Pick a $V$-generic filter $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ containing $p$. Assume toward a contradiction that for some function $g : Z \to 2$ in $M[G]$, $g \restriction M \cap Z = f$. Suppose $x \in [Z]^\omega \cap M$. Then $x \subseteq M$ and hence $g \restriction x = f \restriction x \in V$ as $M[G] \cap V = M$. We have that $g \restriction x \in M$. Now by the elementarity of $M[G]$ in $H_\theta[G]$ and the definability of $V$ in $V[G]$ (see [11, 20],) we have $g$ is countably approximated in $V$. Since $\mathbb{P}$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property, it follows that $g \in V$ and hence $g \in M$. Therefore $f$ is guessed in $M$, which is a contradiction. ⊣

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LEMMA 2.16. *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a forcing. Assume $\dot{f} : Z \to 2$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-name for a function and $M$ is a model with $\dot{f}, Z \in M$. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$ be an $(M, \mathbb{P})$-generic condition that forces $\dot{f} \restriction M \cap Z = \check{g}$, for some function $g$. If $g$ is guessed in $M$, then $p$ decides $\dot{f}$.*

PROOF. Suppose that $h \in M$ is a function so that $h \restriction M \cap Z = g$, we will show that $p \Vdash$ "$\dot{f} = \check{h}$". Fix $q \leq p$. We claim that there is a condition below $q$ that forces $\dot{f} = \check{h}$. If not, the set

$$D = \{r \in \mathbb{P} : \exists \zeta \in Z \text{ such that } r \Vdash \check{h}(\zeta) \neq \dot{f}(\zeta)\}$$

that belongs to $M$ is pre-dense below $q$. Since $q$ is $(M, \mathbb{P})$-generic, there is $r \in D \cap M$ compatible with $q$. So there exists $\zeta \in M \cap Z$ such that $r \Vdash$ "$\dot{f}(\zeta) \neq \check{h}(\zeta) = \check{g}(\zeta)$". This is a contradiction, since $r$ is compatible with $q$ and $q$ forces $\dot{f}(\zeta) = \check{g}(\zeta)$. ⊣

LEMMA 2.17. *Assume $M \prec H_\theta$ is countable and $Z \in M$. Suppose that $z \mapsto f_z$ is a function on $[Z]^\omega$ in $M$ so that $f_z$ is a function with $z \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(f_z)$. Let $f : M \cap Z \to 2$ be a function that is not guessed in $M$. Let $B \in M$ be a cofinal subset of $[Z]^\omega$. Then there is $B^* \in M$ which is a cofinal subset of $B$ such that for every $z \in B^*$, $f_z \nsubseteq f$.*

PROOF. For every $\zeta \in Z$, let

$$A^\varepsilon_\zeta = \{z \in B : f_z(\zeta) = \varepsilon\}, \text{ where } \varepsilon = 0, 1.$$

Note that the sequence

$$\langle A^\varepsilon_\zeta : \zeta \in Z, \varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}\rangle$$

belongs to $M$. We are done if there is some $\zeta \in Z$ such that both $A^0_\zeta$ and $A^1_\zeta$ are cofinal in $B$, as then one can find by elementarity such $\zeta \in M \cap Z$ and let $B^* = A^{1-f(\zeta)}_\zeta$. Therefore, let us assume that for every $\zeta \in Z$, there is a unique $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $A^\varepsilon_\zeta$ is cofinal in $B$. Now define $h$ on $Z$ by letting $h(\zeta)$ be $\varepsilon$ if and only if $A^\varepsilon_\zeta$ is cofinal in $[Z]^\omega$. Obviously $h$ belongs to $M$. But $h \restriction M \cap Z \neq f$, since $f$ is not guessed in $M$. So there must exist $\zeta \in M \cap Z$ such that $h(\zeta) \neq f(\zeta)$, which in turn implies that $A^{1-f(\zeta)}_\zeta$ is a cofinal subset of $B$ and belongs to $M$. Let $B^*$ be $A^{1-f(\zeta)}_\zeta$. ⊣

DEFINITION 2.18. Let $T$ be a tree of height $\omega_1$. We say that $p \in \mathbb{S}(T)$ if $p$ is a partial function, $\mathrm{dom}(p)$ is a finite subset of $T$, $p : \mathrm{dom}(p) \to \omega$, and if $x, y \in \mathrm{dom}(p)$ are distinct and $p(x) = p(y)$, then $x$ and $y$ are incomparable in $T$. The order on $\mathbb{S}(T)$ is the reverse inclusion.

It is well-known that if $T$ has no uncountable branches, then $\mathbb{S}(T)$ has the ccc. We also need the following fact which was shown by Chodounský–Zapletal [4]. We provide a proof for completeness.

PROPOSITION 2.19 (Chodounský–Zapletal [4]). *Suppose $T$ is a tree of height $\omega_1$ without uncountable branches. Then $\mathbb{S}(T)$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property.*

PROOF. Suppose $\mu$ is a cardinal and $\dot{f}$ is an $\mathbb{S}(T)$-name for a function from $\mu$ to 2 which is countably approximated in $V$. It suffices to show that some condition in $\mathbb{S}(T)$ decides $\dot{f}$. Fix a sufficiently large regular cardinal $\theta$ and a countable $M \prec H_\theta$ containing all the relevant objects. Since $\dot{f}$ is forced to be countably approximated in $V$ we can pick a condition $p \in \mathbb{S}(T)$ and a function $g : M \cap \mu \to 2$ such that $p$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

forces that $\dot{f} \restriction (M \cap \mu) = \check{g}$. Since $\mathbb{S}(T)$ is ccc, $p$ is $(M, \mathbb{S}(T))$-generic. Therefore, by Lemma 2.16 we may assume that $g$ is not guessed in $M$. Let $d = \mathrm{dom}(p)$, let $d_0 = d \cap M$, and $p_0 = p \restriction d_0$. Let $n = |d \setminus d_0|$. Let $C$ be the collection of $x \in [T \cup \mu]^\omega$ such that $d_0 \subseteq x$ and $T \cap x$ is an initial segment of $T$ under $\leq_T$. If $x \in C \cap M$, then there is a condition $p_x \leq p_0$, and a function $g_x : \mu \cap x \to 2$ such that $p_x \restriction x = p_0$, $|p_x \setminus p_0| = n$, and $p_x$ forces that $\dot{f} \restriction (x \cap \mu)$ equals $g_x$. This is witnessed by the condition $p$. By the elementarity of $M$ such a pair $(p_x, g_x)$ exists, for all $x \in C$. Moreover, we can pick the assignment $x \mapsto (p_x, g_x)$ in $M$. Let $d_x = \mathrm{dom}(p_x)$. By Lemma 2.17 we can find $C^* \in M$, a cofinal subset of $C$ under inclusion such that $g_x \not\subseteq g$, for all $x \in C^*$. This implies that $p_x$ and $p$ are incompatible, for all $x \in C^* \cap M$. Let us fix an enumeration $d \setminus d_0 = \{t(0), \ldots, t(n-1)\}$, and, for each $x \in C^*$, an enumeration $d_x \setminus d_0 = \{t_x(0), \ldots, t_x(n-1)\}$.

Claim 2.20. *Let $B \in M$ be a cofinal subset of $C^*$, and $i, j < n$. Then there is $B^* \in M$, a cofinal subset of $B$, such that for every $x \in B^* \cap M$, $t(i)$ and $t_x(j)$ are incomparable.*

Proof. For $t \in T$, let $\mathrm{pred}_T(t)$ be the set of predecessors of $t$ in $T$, and let $h_t$ be the characteristic function of $\mathrm{pred}_T(t)$ as a subset of $T$. Let $h = h_{t(i)} \restriction (T \cap M)$. For $x \in B$ let $h_x = h_{t_x(j)} \restriction (T \cap x)$. Suppose first that $h$ is not guessed in $M$. Then by Lemma 2.17 we can find $B^* \in M$, a cofinal subset of $B$, such that $h_x \not\subseteq h$, for all $x \in B^*$. This implies that if $x \in B^* \cap M$ then $t(i)$ and $t_x(j)$ do not have the same predecessors in $T \cap x$ and hence are incomparable, as desired. Suppose now that $h$ is guessed in $M$ and let $k \in M$ be a function such that $k \restriction (T \cap M) = h$. Since $h^{-1}(1)$ is a chain and is closed downwards in $T$, the same is true for $k^{-1}(1)$. $T$ has no uncountable chains, so $k^{-1}(1)$ is countable and hence we must have $k^{-1}(1) \subseteq M$. Moreover, $k^{-1}(1) = \mathrm{pred}_T(t(i)) \cap M$. By the elementarity of $M$ there is $s \in M$ such that $k^{-1}(1) = \mathrm{pred}_T(s)$. Now, let $B^*$ be the set of $x \in B$ such that $s \in x$. Then $B^* \in M$ is a cofinal subset of $B$. If $x \in B^* \cap M$, then since $t_x(j) \notin x$, it follows that $t_x(j) \notin \mathrm{pred}_T(s)$. It follows that $t_x(j)$ is not below $t(i)$. Also, $t_x(j)$ cannot be above $t(i)$ in $T$, since then $t_x(j)$ and all its predecessors in $T$ are in $M$ and $t(i)$ is not in $M$. It follows that $B^*$ is as required. ⊣

Now, applying the above claim repeatedly for all pairs $i, j < n$ we can find a cofinal subset $B$ of $C^*$ such that, for all $x \in B \cap M$, every element of $d_x \setminus d_0$ is incomparable with every element of $d \setminus d_0$. It follows that if $x \in B \cap M$ then $p_x \cup p \in \mathbb{S}(T)$, which is a contradiction.

**§3. The main theorems.** We recall the guessing model principle introduced by Viale and Weiß [19]. We let $\mathrm{GM}(\kappa, \gamma)$ be the statement that $\mathrm{GM}(\kappa, \gamma, H_\theta)$ holds, for all sufficiently large regular $\theta$, where $\mathrm{GM}(\kappa, \gamma, H_\theta)$ states that

$$\mathfrak{G}_{\kappa,\gamma}(H_\theta) = \{M \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(H_\theta) : M \prec H_\theta \text{ and } M \text{ is } \gamma\text{-guessing}\}$$

is stationary in $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(H_\theta)$.

Definition 3.1 (Cox–Krueger [6]). $\mathrm{SGM}(\omega_2, \omega_1)$ states that for every sufficiently large regular cardinal $\theta$ the following set is stationary in $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_2}(H_\theta)$.

$$\mathfrak{G}_{\omega_2,\omega_1}(H_\theta) = \{M \in \mathcal{P}_{\omega_2}(H_\theta) : M \prec H_\theta \text{ and } M \text{ is indestructibly } \omega_1\text{-guessing}\}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Notice that it was proved in [6] that Suslin's hypothesis follows from $\mathrm{SGM}(\omega_2, \omega_1)$, but not from $\mathrm{GM}(\omega_2, \omega_1)$.

Let us now recall the notion of a strongly $\gamma$-guessing model introduced and studied by the authors in [15].

DEFINITION 3.2. Let $\gamma \leq \kappa$ be regular uncountable cardinals. A model $M$ of cardinality $\kappa^+$ is called *strongly $\gamma$-guessing* if it is the union of an $\in$-increasing chain $\langle M_\xi : \xi < \kappa^+ \rangle$ of $\gamma$-guessing models of cardinality $\kappa$ such that $M_\xi = \bigcup \{M_\eta : \eta < \xi\}$, for every $\xi$ of cofinality $\kappa$.

It was proved in Remark 2.14 of [15] that every strongly $\gamma$-guessing model is $\gamma$-guessing.

DEFINITION 3.3. $\mathrm{GM}^+(\kappa^{++}, \gamma)$ is the statement that $\mathrm{GM}^+(\kappa^{++}, \gamma, H_\theta)$ holds, for all sufficiently large regular $\theta$, where $\mathrm{GM}^+(\kappa^{++}, \gamma, H_\theta)$ states that

$$\mathfrak{G}^+_{\kappa^{++},\gamma}(H_\theta) = \{M \in \mathcal{P}_{\kappa^{++}}(H_\theta) : M \prec H_\theta \text{ and } M \text{ is strongly } \gamma\text{-guessing}\}.$$

is stationary in $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa^{++}}(H_\theta)$.

DEFINITION 3.4. A model $M$ of cardinality $\omega_2$ is *indestructibly strongly $\omega_1$-guessing* if it is the union of an increasing chain $\langle M_\xi : \xi < \omega_2 \rangle$ of indestructibly $\omega_1$-guessing models of cardinality $\omega_1$ such that $M_\xi = \bigcup \{M_\eta : \eta < \xi\}$, for every $\xi$ of cofinality $\omega_1$.

DEFINITION 3.5. The principle $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ states that $\mathfrak{S}^+_{\omega_3,\omega_1}(H_\theta)$ is stationary, for all large enough $\theta$, where

$$\mathfrak{S}^+_{\omega_3,\omega_1}(H_\theta) \coloneqq \{M \in \mathcal{P}_{\omega_3}(H_\theta) : M \prec H_\theta \text{ is indestructibly and strongly } \omega_1\text{-guessing}\}.$$

DEFINITION 3.6. For a regular cardinal $\kappa$, we let $\mathrm{MP}(\kappa^+)$ denote the statement that every forcing that adds a new subset of $\kappa^+$ whose initial segments are in the ground model collapses some cardinal $\leq 2^\kappa$.

Todorčević [16] showed that if every tree of size and height $\omega_1$ with at most $\omega_1$ cofinal branches is weakly special and $2^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_{\omega_1}$ then $\mathrm{MP}(\omega_1)$ holds. The principle was also studied by Golshani and Shelah in [8], where they showed that $\mathrm{MP}(\kappa^+)$ is consistent, for every regular cardinal $\kappa$.

PROPOSITION 3.7 (Cox–Krueger [6]). *If* $\mathrm{SGM}(\omega_2, \omega_1)$ *and* $2^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_{\omega_1}$ *then* $\mathrm{MP}(\omega_1)$ *holds.*

We shall prove that $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ implies $\mathrm{MP}(\omega_2)$, and since $\mathrm{SGM}(\omega_2, \omega_1)$ follows from $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$, we get the simultaneous consistency of $\mathrm{MP}(\omega_1)$ and $\mathrm{MP}(\omega_2)$.

THEOREM 3.8. *Suppose that $V \subseteq W$ are transitive models of* ZFC. *Assume that* $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ *and* $2^{\omega_1} < \aleph_{\omega_2}$ *hold in $V$. Suppose that $W$ has a subset of $\omega_2^V$ that does not belong to $V$. Then either $\mathcal{P}^V(\omega_1) \neq \mathcal{P}^W(\omega_1)$ or some $V$-cardinal $\leq 2^{\omega_1}$ is no longer a cardinal in $W$.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROOF. Let $x \in W \setminus V$ be a subset of $\omega_2^V$, and suppose that $\mathcal{P}^V(\omega_1) = \mathcal{P}^W(\omega_1)$. We will show that some cardinal $\leq 2^{\omega_1}$ is no longer a cardinal in $W$. By $\mathcal{P}^V(\omega_1) = \mathcal{P}^W(\omega_1)$, every initial segment of $x$ belongs to $V$. Let

$$\mathfrak{X} = \{x \cap \gamma : \gamma < \omega_2\}.$$

Note that $\mathfrak{X}$ is bounded in $V$. Assume toward a contradiction that every $V$-cardinal $\leq 2^{\omega_1}$ remains a cardinal in $W$. Working in $W$, let $\mu \geq \omega_2$ be the least cardinal so that there is a set $M$ in $V$ of cardinality $\mu$ such that $M \cap \mathfrak{X}$ is of size $\omega_2$. Thus $\mu \leq 2^{\omega_1}$.

CLAIM 3.9. $\mu = \omega_2$.

PROOF. Assume toward a contradiction that $\mu > \omega_2$ and $M$ is a witness to it, then one can work in $V$ and write $M$ as the union of an increasing sequence $\langle M_\xi : \xi < \mathrm{cof}^{\mathrm{V}}(\mu)\rangle$ of subsets of $M$ in $V$ whose size are less than $\mu$. Since $\mu \leq 2^{\omega_1} < \aleph_{\omega_2}$ and every cardinal $\leq 2^{\omega_1}$ is a cardinal in $W$, we have $\mathrm{cof}^W(\mu) = \mathrm{cof}^V(\mu) \neq \omega_2$. Thus either $\mu$ is of cofinality at most $\omega_1$, and then by the pigeonhole principle, there is $\xi < \mathrm{cof}(\mu)$ such that $|M_\xi \cap \mathfrak{X}| = \omega_2$, or $\mu$ is regular, and then there is some $\xi < \mu = \mathrm{cof}(\mu)$ such that $M \cap \mathfrak{X} \subseteq M_\xi$. In either case, we get a contradiction since $|M_\xi| < \mu$. ⊣

By the above claim, $\mu = \omega_2$. Let $M$ be a witness for $\mu = \omega_2$, and let $\mathfrak{X}' = M \cap \mathfrak{X}$. Notice that $V \models |M| = \omega_2$. Since $M$ is in $V$ and $V$ satisfies $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$, one can cover $M$ by an indestructibly strongly $\omega_1$-guessing model $N$ of size $\omega_2$. Working in $W$, $x$ is countably approximated in $N$, since if $\gamma \in N \cap \omega_2$, then there is $\gamma' > \gamma$ in $N$ such that $x \cap \gamma' \in \mathfrak{X}' \subseteq N$, and hence $x \cap \gamma \in N$. On the other hand, $N$ is a guessing model in $W$ by $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ in $V$ and both $\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$ are cardinals in $W$. Thus $x$ is guessed in $N$, but then $x$ must be in $N$ since $\omega_2 \subseteq N$. Therefore, $x$ is in $V$, which is a contradiction!

The following corollaries are immediate.

COROLLARY 3.10. *Suppose that $V \subseteq W$ are transitive models of* ZFC. *Assume that* $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$, $2^{\omega_0} < \aleph_{\omega_1}$ *and* $2^{\omega_1} < \aleph_{\omega_2}$ *hold in $V$. Suppose that $W$ has a new subset of $\omega_2^V$. Then either $W$ contains a real which is not in $V$ or some cardinal $\leq 2^{\omega_1}$ in $V$ is collapsed in $W$.*

COROLLARY 3.11. *Assume* $2^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_{\omega_1}$ *and* $2^{\aleph_1} < \aleph_{\omega_2}$ *hold. Then* $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ *implies both* $\mathrm{MP}(\omega_1)$ *and* $\mathrm{MP}(\omega_2)$.

Our main theorem reads as follows.

THEOREM 3.12 (Main theorem). *Assume there are two supercompact cardinals. There is a generic extension $V[G]$ of $V$ in which* $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ *and* $2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1} = 2^{\aleph_2} = \aleph_3$ *hold.*

**§4. An overview of virtual models.** We review the theory of virtual models from the authors' paper [15].

**4.1. The general setting.** We consider the language $\mathcal{L}$ obtained by adding a single constant symbol $c$ and a predicate $U$ to the standard language of set theory. Let us say

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that an $\mathcal{L}$-structure $\mathcal{A} = (A, \in, \kappa, U)$ is *suitable* if $A$ is a transitive set and $\mathcal{A} \models$ "ZFC" in the expanded language, where $\kappa = c^{\mathcal{A}}$ is an uncountable regular in $\mathcal{A}$. For a suitable structure $\mathcal{A}$ and an ordinal $\alpha \in A \setminus \kappa$, let $\mathcal{A}_\alpha = (A \cap V_\alpha, \in, \kappa, U \cap V_\alpha)$. Finally, we let

$$E_{\mathcal{A}} = \{\alpha \in \mathrm{ORD}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A}_\alpha \prec \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Note that $E_A$ is a closed subset of $\mathrm{ORD}^{\mathcal{A}}$. It is not definable in $\mathcal{A}$, but $E_{\mathcal{A}} \cap \alpha$ is uniformly definable in $\mathcal{A}$ with parameter $\alpha$, for each $\alpha \in E_{\mathcal{A}}$. For $\alpha \in E_{\mathcal{A}}$, we let $\mathrm{next}_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha)$ be the least ordinal in $E_{\mathcal{A}}$ above $\alpha$, if such an ordinal exists. Otherwise, we leave $\mathrm{next}_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha)$ undefined. We shall often abuse notation and refer to the structure $\mathcal{A}$ by $A$.

LEMMA 4.1. *Suppose $M$ is an elementary submodel of a suitable structure $A$, and that $\alpha \in E_A$. If $(M \cap \mathrm{ORD}^A) \setminus \alpha \neq \varnothing$, then* $\min(M \cap \mathrm{ORD}^A \setminus \alpha) \in E_A$.

PROOF. See [17, Lemma 1.1] or [15, Lemma 3.1]. ⊣

If $M$ is a submodel of a suitable structure $A$ and $X$ is a subset of $A$, let the operation Hull be defined by

$$\mathrm{Hull}(M, X) = \{f(\bar{x}) : f \in M, \bar{x} \in X^{<\omega}, f \text{ is a function, and } \bar{x} \in \mathrm{dom}(f)\}.$$

For $\alpha \in E_A$, we let $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ denote the set of all transitive $\mathcal{L}$-structures $\mathcal{H} \in A$ which are elementary extensions of $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ and have the same cardinality as $A_\alpha$. Note that if $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}$, then $E_{\mathcal{H}} \cap \alpha = E_A \cap \alpha$. For $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$, we will refer to $A_\alpha$ as the *standard part* of $\mathcal{H}$. Note that if $\mathcal{H}$ has nonstandard elements, then $\alpha \in E_{\mathcal{H}}$.

LEMMA 4.2. *Suppose $M$ is an elementary submodel of a suitable structure $A$, and that $X \subseteq A$. Let $\delta = \sup(M \cap \mathrm{ORD}^A)$, and suppose that $X \cap A_\delta$ is nonempty. Then* $\mathrm{Hull}(M, X)$ *is the least elementary submodel of $A$ containing $M$ and $X \cap A_\delta$ as subsets.*

PROOF. See [17, Lemma 1.2] or [15, Lemma 3.3]. ⊣

**4.2. Virtual models in $V_\lambda$.** Assume that $\kappa < \lambda$ are supercompact and inaccessible cardinals, respectively. Consider the $\mathcal{L}$-structure

$$V_\lambda := (V_\lambda, \in, \kappa, U).$$

Let $E = E_{V_\lambda}$ and $\mathrm{next}(\alpha) = \mathrm{next}_{V_\lambda}(\alpha)$.

DEFINITION 4.3. Suppose $\alpha \in E$. We let $\mathcal{V}_\alpha$ denote the collection of all substructures $M$ of $V_\lambda$ of size less than $\kappa$ so that if we let $A = \mathrm{Hull}(M, V_\alpha)$, then $A \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ and $M$ is an elementary submodel of $A$. The members of $\mathcal{V}_\alpha$ are called *$\alpha$-models*.

We write $\mathcal{V}_{<\alpha}$ for $\bigcup\{\mathcal{V}_\gamma : \gamma \in E \cap \alpha\}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ for $\mathcal{V}_{<\lambda}$. The collections $\mathcal{V}_{\leq\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\geq\alpha}$ are defined in the obvious way. For $M \in \mathcal{V}$, $\eta(M)$ denotes the unique ordinal $\alpha$ such that $M \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha$. Note that if $M \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha$, then $\sup(M \cap \mathrm{ORD}) \geq \alpha$. In general, $M$ is not elementary in $V_\lambda$, in fact, this only happens if $M \subseteq V_\alpha$. In this case, we will say that $M$ is a *standard $\alpha$-model*. We refer to the members of $\mathcal{V}$ as *virtual models*. We also refer to members of $\mathcal{V}^A$, for some suitable structure $A$ with $A \subseteq V_\lambda$, as *general virtual models*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Suppose $M, N \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\alpha \in E$. We say that an isomorphism $\sigma : M \to N$ is an *$\alpha$-isomorphism* if it has an extension to an isomorphism $\bar{\sigma} : \mathrm{Hull}(M, V_\alpha) \to \mathrm{Hull}(N, V_\alpha)$. We say that $M$ and $N$ are *$\alpha$-isomorphic* and write $M \cong_\alpha N$ if there is an $\alpha$-isomorphism between them. Note that $\sigma$ and $\bar{\sigma}$, if they exist, are unique.

It is clear that $\cong_\alpha$ is an equivalence relation, for every $\alpha \in E$. If $\alpha < \beta$ are in $E$, then for every $\beta$-model $M$ there is a canonical representative of the $\cong_\alpha$-equivalence class of $M$ which is an $\alpha$-model.

DEFINITION 4.4. Suppose $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are members of $E$ and $M$ is a $\beta$-model. Let $\overline{\mathrm{Hull}(M, V_\alpha)}$ be the transitive collapse of $\mathrm{Hull}(M, V_\alpha)$, and let $\pi$ be the collapsing map. We define $M \restriction \alpha$ to be $\pi[M]$, i.e., the image of $M$ under the collapsing map of $\mathrm{Hull}(M, V_\alpha)$.

Note that if $A \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ then $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^A \subseteq \mathcal{V}_\alpha$. Therefore, if $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$, $M \in \mathcal{V}^A$, and $N \in \mathcal{V}^B$, we can still write $M \cong_\alpha N$ if $M \restriction \alpha = N \restriction \alpha$. It is straightforward to check that if $\alpha \leq \beta$ are in $E$, and $M \in \mathcal{V}$. Then $(M \restriction \beta) \restriction \alpha = M \restriction \alpha$. For each $\alpha \in E$, the virtual version of the membership relation is defined as follows.

Suppose $M, N \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\alpha \in E$. We write $M \in_\alpha N$ if there is $M' \in N$ with $M' \in \mathcal{V}^N$ such that $M' \cong_\alpha M$. If this is the case, we say that $M$ is $\alpha$-in $N$.

LEMMA 4.5. *Let $\alpha \leq \beta$ be in $E$. Suppose $M, N \in \mathcal{V}_{\geq\beta}$ and $M \in_\beta N$. Then $M \restriction \alpha \in_\alpha N \restriction \alpha$.*

PROOF. See [15, Proposition 3.15]. ⊣

DEFINITION 4.6. For $\alpha \in E$, we let $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$ denote the collection of countable models in $\mathcal{V}_\alpha$, and we let $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ be the collection of all $M \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha$ that are $\kappa$-Magidor models.

The collections $\mathcal{C}_{<\alpha}$, $\mathcal{C}_{\leq\alpha}$, $\mathcal{C}_{\geq\alpha}$, $\mathcal{U}_{<\alpha}$, $\mathcal{U}_{\leq\alpha}$, and $\mathcal{U}_{\geq\alpha}$ are defined similarly. We write $\mathcal{C}$ for $\mathcal{C}_{<\lambda}$, and $\mathcal{U}$ for $\mathcal{U}_{<\lambda}$, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}$ for the collection of standard models in $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{st}}$ for the standard models in $\mathcal{U}$. Note that both classes $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ are closed under projections.

LEMMA 4.7. *$\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}$ contains a club in $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}(V_\lambda)$, and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{st}}$ is stationary in $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(V_\lambda)$.*

PROOF. See [15, Propositions 3.19 and 3.24]. ⊣

DEFINITION 4.8. Let $M \in \mathcal{V}$. We say that $M$ is *active* at $\alpha \in E$ if $\eta(M) \geq \alpha$ and $\mathrm{Hull}(M, V_{\kappa_M}) \cap E \cap \alpha$ is unbounded in $E \cap \alpha$, where $\kappa_M = \sup(M \cap \kappa)$. We say that $M$ is *strongly active* at $\alpha$ if $\eta(M) \geq \alpha$ and $M \cap E \cap \alpha$ is unbounded in $E \cap \alpha$.

One can easily see that a Magidor model is active at $\alpha$ if and only if it is strongly active at $\alpha$.

NOTATION 4.9. *For a model $M \in \mathcal{V}$, let $a(M) = \{\alpha \in E : M \text{ is active at } \alpha\}$ and $\alpha(M) = \max(a(M))$.*

Note that $a(M)$ is a closed subset of $E$ of size at most $|\mathrm{Hull}(M, V_{\kappa_M})|$. We now recall the definition of a *meet* from [15] which is the virtual version of intersection defined only for two models of different types. Suppose $N \in \mathcal{U}$ and $M \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\overline{N}$ be the transitive collapse of $N$, and let $\pi$ be the collapsing map. Note that if $\overline{N} \in M$, then $\overline{N} \cap M$ is a countable elementary submodel of $\overline{N}$. Then $\overline{N} \cap M \in \overline{N}$ since $\overline{N}$ is closed under countable sequence. Note that $\pi^{-1}(\overline{N} \cap M) = \pi^{-1}[\overline{N} \cap M]$, and this model is elementary in $N$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

DEFINITION 4.10. Suppose $N \in \mathcal{U}$ and $M \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\alpha = \max(a(N) \cap a(M))$. We will define $N \wedge M$ if $N \in_\alpha M$. Let $\overline{N}$ be the transitive collapse of $N$, and let $\pi$ be the collapsing map. Set

$$\eta = \sup(\sup(\pi^{-1}[\overline{N} \cap M] \cap \mathrm{ORD}) \cap E \cap (\alpha + 1)).$$

We define the meet of $N$ and $M$ to be $N \wedge M = \pi^{-1}[\overline{N} \cap M] \restriction \eta$.

REMARK 4.11. It was proved in [15] that $N \wedge M \in \mathcal{C}_\eta$ is an $\eta$-model, and, furthermore, if $N \wedge M$ is active at $\gamma$, then $(N \wedge M) \restriction \gamma = N \restriction \gamma \wedge M \restriction \gamma$. More intersection-like properties of $\wedge$ are found on [15, pp. 14–16].

NOTATION 4.12. *Let $\alpha \in E$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a set of virtual models. We let*

$$\mathcal{M} \restriction \alpha = \{M \restriction \alpha : M \in \mathcal{M}\} \text{ and } \mathcal{M}^\alpha = \{M \restriction \alpha : M \in \mathcal{M} \text{ is active at } \alpha\}.$$

DEFINITION 4.13. Let $\alpha \in E$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{C}$. We say $\mathcal{M}$ is an *$\alpha$-chain* if for all distinct $M, N \in \mathcal{M}$, either $M \in_\alpha N$ or $N \in_\alpha M$, or there is a $P \in \mathcal{M}$ such that either $M \in_\alpha P \in_\alpha N$ or $N \in_\alpha P \in_\alpha M$.

LEMMA 4.14. *Suppose $\alpha \in E$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is a finite subset of $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{C}$. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is an $\alpha$-chain if and only if there is an enumeration $\{M_i : i < n\}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $M_0 \in_\alpha \ldots \in_\alpha M_{n-1}$.*

PROOF. See [15, Proposition 3.41]. ⊣

**§5. Virtual models as side conditions.** We recall the definition of our pure side conditions forcing with decorations introduced in [15]. We give its basic properties and refer the reader to the above paper for the proofs. Recall that $\kappa < \lambda$ are supercompact and inaccessible, respectively.

DEFINITION 5.1 (pure side conditions). Suppose $\alpha \in E$. We say that $p = \mathcal{M}_p$ belongs to $\mathbb{M}^\kappa_\alpha$ if:

(1) $\mathcal{M}_p \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq\alpha} \cup \mathcal{U}_{\leq\alpha}$ is finite and closed under meets, and
(2) $\mathcal{M}_p^\delta$ is a $\delta$-chain, for all $\delta \in E \cap (\alpha + 1)$.

We let $\mathcal{M}_q \leq \mathcal{M}_p$ if for all $M \in \mathcal{M}_p$ there is $N \in \mathcal{M}_q$ such that $N \restriction \eta(M) = M$. Finally, let $\mathbb{M}^\kappa_\lambda = \bigcup\{\mathbb{M}^\kappa_\alpha : \alpha \in E\}$ with the same order.

Suppose $\mathcal{M}_p \in \mathbb{M}^\kappa_\lambda$. Let

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p) = \{M \restriction \alpha : M \in \mathcal{M}_p \text{ and } \alpha \in a(M)\}.$$

We say that $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ is *$\mathcal{M}_p$-free* if every $N \in \mathcal{M}_p$ with $M \in_{\eta(M)} N$ is strongly active at $\eta(M)$. Let $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ denote the set of all $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ that are $\mathcal{M}_p$-free. Note that a model $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ that is not $\mathcal{M}_p$-free is not $\mathcal{M}_q$-free, for any $\mathcal{M}_q \leq \mathcal{M}_p$.

DEFINITION 5.2 (side conditions with decorations). Suppose $\alpha \in E \cup \{\lambda\}$. We say that a pair $p = (\mathcal{M}_p, d_p)$ belongs to $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$ if $\mathcal{M}_p \in \mathbb{M}^\kappa_\alpha$, $d_p$ is a finite partial function from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ to $\mathcal{P}_\omega(V_\kappa)$ such that

($\divideontimes$) if $M \in \mathrm{dom}(d_p)$, $N \in \mathcal{M}_p$, and $M \in_{\eta(M)} N$, then $d_p(M) \in N$.

We say that $q \leq p$ if $\mathcal{M}_q \leq \mathcal{M}_p$ in $\mathbb{M}^\kappa_\alpha$, and, for every $M \in \mathrm{dom}(d_p)$, there exists some $\gamma \in E \cap (\eta(M) + 1)$ with $M \restriction \gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(d_q)$ such that $d_p(M) \subseteq d_q(M \restriction \gamma)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We call $d_p$ the decoration of $p$. The order on $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$ is transitive. We will say that $q$ is *stronger* than $p$ if $q$ forces that $p$ belongs to the generic filter, in other words, any $r \leq q$ is compatible with $p$. We write $p \sim q$ if each of $p$ and $q$ is stronger than the other. We identify equivalent conditions, often without saying so. Our forcing does not have the greatest lower bound property, but if $p$ and $q$ have a greatest lower bound, we will denote it by $p \wedge q$. To be precise, we should refer to $p \wedge q$ as the $\sim$-equivalence class of a greatest lower bound, but we ignore this point as it should not cause any confusion. Note that if $p \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$ and $M \in \mathcal{M}_p$ is a $\delta$-model that is not active at $\delta$, we may replace $M$ with $M \restriction \alpha(M)$ and get an equivalent condition. Thus, if $\alpha \in E$ and $\mathrm{cof}(\alpha) \geq \kappa$, then $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$ is forcing equivalent to $\bigcup\{\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\gamma : \gamma \in E \cap \alpha\}$. Suppose $\alpha, \beta \in E$ and $\alpha \leq \beta$. For every $p \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\beta$, we let $\mathcal{M}_{p\restriction\alpha} = \mathcal{M}_p \restriction \alpha$ and $d_{p\restriction\alpha} = d_p \restriction \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}_p \restriction \alpha)$. It is easy to see that $p \restriction \alpha = (\mathcal{M}_{p\restriction\alpha}, d_{p\restriction\alpha}) \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$. The following is straightforward.

LEMMA 5.3. *Suppose that $\alpha, \beta \in E$ with $\alpha \leq \beta$. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\beta$ and let $q \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$ be such that $q \leq p \restriction \alpha$. Then there exists $r \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\beta$ such that $r \leq p, q$.*

PROOF. We let $\mathcal{M}_r = \mathcal{M}_p \cup \mathcal{M}_q$. Note that $\mathcal{M}_r$ is closed under meets. We define $d_r$ by letting $d_r(M) = d_q(M)$ if $M \in \mathrm{dom}(d_q)$, and $d_r(M) = d_p(M)$ if $M \in \mathrm{dom}(d_p)$ with $\eta(M) > \alpha$. It is straightforward that $r$ is as required. ⊣

REMARK 5.4. The condition $r$ from the previous lemma is the greatest lower bound of $p$ and $q$, so we will let $r := p \wedge q$.

DEFINITION 5.5. Assume $p \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$, and that $M \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{U}$ be such that $p \in M$. Let $\mathcal{M}_{pM}$ be the closure of $\mathcal{M}_p \cup \{M\}$ under meets, and let $d_{pM}$ be defined on

$$\mathrm{dom}(d_{pM}) = \{N \restriction \delta : N \in \mathrm{dom}(d_p) \text{ and } \delta = \sup(M \cap \eta(N))\},$$

by letting $d_{pM}(N \restriction \delta) = d_p(N)$.

LEMMA 5.6. *$p^M$ is the weakest condition extending $p$ with $M \in \mathcal{M}_{pM}$.*

PROOF. [15, Lemma 4.11]. ⊣

NOTATION 5.7. *For virtual models $N, M$, we set $\alpha(N, M) = \max(a(N) \cap a(M))$.*

We are now about to give the restriction of a condition to a given model. We start with Magidor models.

DEFINITION 5.8. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$. Assume that $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ is a Magidor model. For $N \in \mathcal{M}_p$, we let $N \restriction M = N \restriction \alpha(N, M)$ if $\kappa_N < \kappa_M$, otherwise $N \restriction M$ is undefined. Let $p \restriction M$ be defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_{p\restriction M} = \{N \restriction M : N \in \mathcal{M}_p\} \text{ and } d_{p\restriction M} = d_p \restriction (\mathrm{dom}(d_p) \cap M).$$

PROPOSITION 5.9. *Suppose $p \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$ and $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ is a Magidor model. Then $p \restriction M \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda \cap M$ and $p \leq p \restriction M$. Moreover, if $q \in M \cap \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$ extends $p \restriction M$. Then $q$ is compatible with $p$ and the meet $p \wedge q$ exists.*

PROOF. See [15, Lemmata 4.13 and 4.14]. ⊣

As a corollary, we have that the forcing $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$ is strongly proper for $\mathcal{U}$. We now define an analogue of $p \restriction M$ for countable models $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p)$. Now suppose $p \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$ and $M \in \mathcal{M}_p$ is either a standard countable model or a countable model with $\alpha \in M$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Suppose $N \in \mathcal{M}_p$ and $N \in_\gamma M$, where $\gamma = \max(a(M) \cap a(N))$. If $\gamma \in M$, then $N \restriction \gamma \in M$, but it may be that $\gamma \notin M$, but then, if we let $\gamma^* = \min(M \cap \lambda \setminus \gamma)$, we have that $\gamma^* \in E \cap M$ by Lemma 4.1. Thus there is a $\gamma^*$-model $N^* \in M$ which is $\gamma$-isomorphic to $N \restriction \gamma$. Moreover, such $N^*$ is unique[1].

DEFINITION 5.10. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$. Assume that $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ is a countable model that is either standard or contains $\alpha$. Suppose that $N \in \mathcal{M}_p$, and let $\gamma = \alpha(M, N)$. If $N \in_\gamma M$, we let $\gamma^* = \min(M \cap \lambda \setminus \gamma)$. We define $N \restriction M$ to be the unique $\gamma^*$-model $N^* \in M$ such that $N^* \cong_\gamma N$. Otherwise, $N \restriction M$ is undefined. Let

$$\mathcal{M}_{p\restriction M} = \{N \restriction M : N \in \mathcal{M}_p\} \text{ and}$$

$$\operatorname{dom}(d_{p\restriction M}) = \{N \restriction M : N \in \operatorname{dom}(d_p) \text{ and } N \in_{\eta(N)} M\}.$$

If $N \in \operatorname{dom}(d_p)$ and $N \in_{\eta(N)} M$, we then let $d_{p\restriction M}(N \restriction M) = d_p(N)$. Let also

$$p \restriction M \coloneqq (\mathcal{M}_{p\restriction M}, d_{p\restriction M}).$$

REMARK 5.11. Suppose $N \in \operatorname{dom}(d_p)$ and let $\eta = \eta(N)$. If $N \in_\eta M$ then $M$ is strongly active at $\eta$ since $N$ is $\mathcal{M}_p$-free. If $\eta \in M$ then we put $N$ in $\operatorname{dom}(d_{p\restriction M})$ and keep the same decoration at $N$. If $\eta \notin M$ we lift $N$ to the least level $\eta^*$ of $M$ above $\eta$, we put the resulting model $N^*$ in $\operatorname{dom}(d_{p\restriction M})$ and copy the decoration of $N$ to $N^*$. If $P \in \mathcal{M}_p$ is such that $P \restriction \eta = N$ then $(P \restriction M) \restriction \eta^* = N^*$. Moreover, we can recover $N$ from $N^*$ as $N^* \restriction \sup(\eta^* \cap M)$. Thus, the function $d_{p\restriction M}$ is well-defined. Note also that $p \restriction M \in M$.

PROPOSITION 5.12. *Let $p \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$ and let $M \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\alpha \in M$ and $M \restriction \alpha \in \mathcal{M}_p$. Then $p \restriction M \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$, and for any $q \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha \cap M$ with $q \leq p \restriction M$, $p$ and $q$ are compatible, and the meet $p \wedge q$ exists.*

PROOF. See [15, Lemma 4.26]. ⊣

Note that if $p, q \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$ are such that $q \leq p$ and $M \in \mathcal{M}_p$ then $q \restriction M \leq p \restriction M$. It follows from Lemma 5.6 and Proposition 5.12 that $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$ is strongly proper for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}$, and that $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$ is strongly proper for the collection of all models $M \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\alpha \in M$.

For a filter $F$ in $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$, we set $\mathcal{M}_F \coloneqq \bigcup\{\mathcal{M}_p : p \in F\}$, and for a $V$-generic filter $G$ in $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$, we let $G_\alpha = G \cap \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$, for all $\alpha \in E$. The following is easy.

LEMMA 5.13. *For every $\delta \in E$ with $\operatorname{cof}(\delta) < \kappa$, $\mathcal{M}^\delta_G$ is a $\delta$-chain.*

PROPOSITION 5.14. *Let $\delta \in E$ with $\operatorname{cof}(\delta) < \kappa$. Suppose $M \in \mathcal{M}^\delta_G$ is a Magidor model that is not the least model in $\mathcal{M}^\delta_G$. Then*

$$M \cap V_\delta = \bigcup\{Q \cap V_\delta : Q \in_\delta M \text{ and } Q \in \mathcal{M}^\delta_G\}.$$

PROOF. See [15, Proposition 4.32]. ⊣

PROPOSITION 5.15. *The forcing $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$ collapses all uncountable cardinals below $\kappa$ to $\omega_1$ and those between $\kappa$ and $\lambda$ to $\kappa$.*

PROOF. See [15, Theorems 4.33 and 4.34]. ⊣

[1] See the paragraph above [15]

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Notice $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$ is $\lambda$-c.c., see Proposition 5.32.

DEFINITION 5.16. Suppose that $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$ is $V$-generic, and that $\alpha \in E$ is of cofinality less than $\kappa$. We let $C_\alpha(G) = \{\kappa_M : M \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha_G\}$.

PROPOSITION 5.17. *Let $G$ be a $V$-generic filter over $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$. Then $C_\alpha(G)$ is a club in $\kappa$, for all $\alpha \in E$ of cofinality $<\kappa$. Moreover, if $\alpha < \beta$ then $C_\beta(G) \setminus C_\alpha(G)$ is bounded in $\kappa$.*

PROOF. See [15, Lemma 4.37]. ⊣

**5.1. The iteration.** For a condition $\mathcal{M}_p \in \mathbb{M}^\kappa_\lambda$ and an ordinal $\gamma \in E$, we let

$$\mathcal{M}_p(\gamma) \coloneqq \{M \in \mathcal{M}_p^{\mathrm{next}(\gamma)} : \gamma \in M\}.$$

In other words, $\mathcal{M}_p(\gamma)$ consists of those models in $\mathcal{M}_p \restriction \mathrm{next}(\gamma)$ that are strongly active at $\mathrm{next}(\gamma)$.

Let $E^+ = E \cup \{\alpha + 1 : \alpha \in E\}$. We will define by induction the poset $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$, for $\alpha \in E^+ \cup \{\lambda\}$. Let $\mathrm{Fn}(\omega_1, \omega)$ denote the poset of finite partial functions from $\omega_1$ to $\omega$, ordered under reverse inclusion. Conditions in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ will be triples of the form $p = (\mathcal{M}_p, d_p, w_p)$, where $(\mathcal{M}_p, d_p) \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$, and $w_p$ is a finite function with $\mathrm{dom}(w_p) \subseteq E \cap \alpha$, such that $w_p(\gamma) \in \mathrm{Fn}(\omega_1, \omega)$, for all $\gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(w_p)$. If $p$ is such a triple and $\gamma < \alpha$ is in $E$, we let $p \restriction \gamma$ denote the triple $(\mathcal{M}_p \restriction \gamma, d_p \restriction \gamma, w_p \restriction \gamma)$, where $(\mathcal{M}_p \restriction \gamma, d_p \restriction \gamma)$ is defined as in $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$ and $w_p \restriction \gamma$ is the restriction of $w_p$ to $\mathrm{dom}(w_p) \cap \gamma$.

Let us recall that we are working with a suitable structure $(V_\lambda, \in, \kappa, U)$. To be precise, $U : \lambda \to V_\lambda$ is a (bookkeeping) function that we regard it as a binary predicate. Thus let us assume that $U$ is onto and for every $x \in V_\lambda$, the set $\{\alpha < \lambda : U(\alpha) = x\}$ is unbounded.

DEFINITION 5.18. For $\alpha \in E$, we let $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ consist of triples $p = (\mathcal{M}_p, d_p, w_p)$, where

(1) $(\mathcal{M}_p, d_p) \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$.
(2) $w_p$ is a finite function with $\mathrm{dom}(w_p) \subseteq E \cap \alpha$ such that, if $\gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(w_p)$, then $U(\gamma)$ is a $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\gamma$-term for a relation on $\omega_1$ such that $\dot{T}_\gamma = (\check{\omega}_1, U(\gamma))$ is forced to be a tree of height $\omega_1$ without uncountable branches, $w_p(\gamma) \in \mathrm{Fn}(\omega_1, \omega)$, and

$$p \restriction \gamma \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\gamma} \check{w}_p(\gamma) \in \dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\gamma).$$

For conditions $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$, we say $p$ is stronger than $q$ and write $p \leq q$, if and only if,

(1) $(\mathcal{M}_p, d_p) \leq (\mathcal{M}_q, d_q)$ in $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$,
(2) $\mathrm{dom}(w_p) \supseteq \mathrm{dom}(w_q)$, and $w_q(\gamma) \subseteq w_p(\gamma)$, for every $\gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(w_q)$.

We let $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha+1}$ denote the set of triples $p$ as above, but with $\mathrm{dom}(w_p) \subseteq \alpha + 1$. Let $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda = \bigcup_{\alpha \in E} \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ with the same order.

Note that if $\alpha = \min(E)$ then $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha = \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$. Also, for $\alpha \in E$, $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha+1}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha * \dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$, if $U(\alpha)$ has the right form, otherwise $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha+1} \cong \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$. For $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$ and $\alpha \in E$, we let

$$p \restriction (\alpha + 1) = (\mathcal{M}_p \restriction \alpha, d_p \restriction \alpha, w_p \restriction (\alpha + 1)).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The order is transitive and whenever $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$ and $\alpha \in E^+$, then $p \restriction \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$. Moreover, if $p \leq q$ then $p \restriction \alpha \leq q \restriction \alpha$.

PROPOSITION 5.19. *Suppose $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta$, and that $\alpha \leq \beta$ are in $E^+$. If $q$ is a condition in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ that extends $p \restriction \alpha$, then $p$ is compatible with $q$ in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta$.*

PROOF. Let $(\mathcal{M}_r, d_r)$ be $(\mathcal{M}_p, d_p) \wedge (\mathcal{M}_q, d_q)$ as defined in Lemma 5.3. Let also $w_r$ be defined on $\mathrm{dom}(w_p) \cup \mathrm{dom}(w_q)$ by

$$w_r(\gamma) = \begin{cases} w_q(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma < \alpha, \\ w_p(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma \geq \alpha. \end{cases}$$

It is evident that $r$ is a condition which extends $p$ and $q$. ⊣

REMARK 5.20. The condition $r$ from the previous lemma is the greatest lower bound of $p$ and $q$, so we will denote it by $r := p \wedge q$.

The following corollary is immediate.

COROLLARY 5.21. *For every $\alpha \leq \beta$ in $E^+ \cup \{\lambda\}$, $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ is a complete suborder of $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta$.*

PROPOSITION 5.22. *Let $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$ and let $M \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{U}$ be such that $p \in M$. Then there is a condition $p^M \leq p$ with $M \in \mathcal{M}_{p^M}$.*

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{M}_{p^M}$ and $d_{p^M}$ be defined as in Definition 5.5. We let $p^M = (\mathcal{M}_{p^M}, d_{p^M}, w_p)$. It is clear that $p^M$ is the required condition. ⊣

We need the following lemma in several proofs.

LEMMA 5.23. *Let $\alpha \in E$. Suppose $M \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{U}$ with $\eta(M) > \alpha$ and $\alpha \in M$. Let $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ be a condition with $M \restriction \alpha \in \mathcal{M}_p$. Let $\beta = \max(\mathrm{dom}(w_p) \cap M)$. Let $G_{\beta+1}$ be a $V$-generic filter on $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\beta+1}$ with $p \restriction \beta + 1 \in G_{\beta+1}$. Assume that $q \in M \cap \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ is a condition such that*:

- $(\mathcal{M}_q, d_q) \leq (\mathcal{M}_p, d_p) \restriction M$,
- $M \cap \mathrm{dom}(w_p) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(w_q)$, *and*
- $q \restriction \beta + 1 \in G_{\beta+1}$.

*Then $p$ and $q$ are compatible in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$.*

PROOF. First, by Proposition 5.12, we have that $(\mathcal{M}_q, d_q)$ and $(\mathcal{M}_p, d_p)$ are compatible in $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$ and the meet $(\mathcal{M}_q, d_q) \wedge (\mathcal{M}_p, d_r)$ exists. Let us denote this meet by $(\mathcal{M}, d)$. Let us also fix $r \in G_{\beta+1}$ extending $p \restriction \beta + 1$ and $q \restriction \beta + 1$. Let $(\mathcal{M}_s, d_s)$ be the meet $(\mathcal{M}, d) \wedge (\mathcal{M}_r, d_r)$ as defined in Lemma 5.3. We now define $w_s$ on $\mathrm{dom}(w_r) \cup \mathrm{dom}(w_p) \cup \mathrm{dom}(w_q)$ by letting:

$$w_s(\gamma) = \begin{cases} w_r(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(w_r) \\ w_q(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(w_q) \setminus \mathrm{dom}(w_r), \\ w_p(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(w_p) \setminus (\mathrm{dom}(w_r) \cup \mathrm{dom}(w_q)). \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $s = (\mathcal{M}_s, d_s, w_s)$ is a condition in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ extending $p$ and $q$. ⊣

PROPOSITION 5.24. *Let $\alpha \in E$. Suppose $M \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{U}$ with $\eta(M) > \alpha$ and $\alpha \in M$. Let $p$ be a condition with $M \restriction \alpha \in \mathcal{M}_p$. Then*

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1) *if* $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$, *then* $p$ *is* $(M, \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha)$*-generic,*
(2) *if* $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha+1}$, *then* $p$ *is* $(M, \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha+1})$*-generic.*

PROOF. First note that under our assumptions both $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ and $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha+1}$ belong to $M$. $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha+1}$ is either equal to $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ or is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha * \dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$. Since $\dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$ is forced to be ccc, (2) follows from (1). If $\alpha = \min(E)$ then $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\alpha$, and by Proposition 5.12, it is then strongly proper for all models $M \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{U}$ with $\eta(M) > \alpha$.

Suppose now that $\alpha$ is not the least element of $E$ and (2) holds for all $\beta < \alpha$. Let $D \in M$ be a dense subset of $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$. We may assume without loss of generality that $p \in D$. Let $\beta = \max(\mathrm{dom}(w_p) \cap M)$. Pick a $V$-generic filter $G_{\beta+1}$ on $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\beta+1}$ such that $p \restriction \beta + 1 \in G_{\beta+1}$. By elementarity of $M[G_{\beta+1}]$ in $\mathrm{Hull}(M, V_{\eta(M)})[G_{\beta+1}]$, there is a condition $q \in D \cap M[G_{\beta+1}]$ satisfying the following.

(1) $(\mathcal{M}_q, d_q) \leq (\mathcal{M}_p, d_p) \restriction M$,
(2) $M \cap \mathrm{dom}(w_p) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(w_q)$, and
(3) $q \restriction \beta + 1 \in G_{\beta+1}$.

By the inductive assumption, $p \restriction \beta + 1$ is $(M, \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\beta+1})$-generic, and hence $M[G_{\beta+1}] \cap V = M$. Therefore, we can find such $q$ in $M$. By Lemma 5.23, $p$ and $q$ are compatible. ⊣

PROPOSITION 5.25. *Suppose that* $\lambda^* > \lambda$ *is a sufficiently large regular cardinal. Let* $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$. *Suppose that* $M^* \prec H_{\lambda^*}$ *with* $\kappa, \lambda \in M^*$ *is such that* $M := M^* \cap V_\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_p$. *Then* $p$ *is* $(M^*, \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda)$*-generic.*

PROOF. Observe that $\eta = \sup(M^* \cap \lambda)$ is in $E$, and that $M$ is an $\eta$-model. The rest is as in the proof of Proposition 5.24. ⊣

COROLLARY 5.26. *For every* $\alpha \in E^+ \cup \{\lambda\}$, $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ *is proper.*

COROLLARY 5.27. *For every* $\alpha \in E^+ \cup \{\lambda\}$, $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ *is strongly proper for* $\mathcal{U}$.

PROOF. This follows from Proposition 5.24 and Lemma 2.14. ⊣

DEFINITION 5.28. Let $\alpha \in E$ and let $G_\alpha$ be $V$-generic over $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$. In the model $V[G_\alpha]$, let $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}[G_\alpha]$ denote the set of all $M \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}$ such that $\eta(M) > \alpha$, $\alpha \in M$ and $M \restriction \alpha \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha_{G_\alpha}$.

As in [15, Lemma 5.2] we have the following.

PROPOSITION 5.29. $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}[G_\alpha]$ *is a stationary subset of* $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}(V_\lambda)$ *in the model* $V[G_\alpha]$.

Let $\alpha \in E^+$. Assume that $G_\alpha$ is a $V$-generic filter on $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$. One can form the quotient forcing $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda / G_\alpha$. Suppose that also $M \in \mathcal{C}_{>\alpha}$, $M \restriction \alpha \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha_{G_\alpha}$, and $p \in M \cap \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda / G_\alpha$. It is then easily seen that $p^M$ belongs to $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda / G_\alpha$. By an argument, as in Proposition 5.24, we have the following.

PROPOSITION 5.30. *Let* $\lambda^* > \lambda$ *be a sufficiently large regular cardinal. Suppose that* $\alpha \in E$, *and* $G_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ *is a* $V$*-generic filter. Let* $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda / G_\alpha$. *Suppose* $M^* \prec H_{\lambda^*}$ *contains all the relevant objects, and* $M = M^* \cap V_\lambda$ *belongs to* $\mathcal{M}_p$. *Then* $p$ *is* $(M^*[G_\alpha], \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda / G_\alpha)$*-generic.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Suppose $\alpha \in E^+$ and let $G_\alpha$ be $V$-generic over $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$. In $V[G_\alpha]$ fix a large regular cardinal $\lambda^*$ and let $\mathcal{S}$ be the collection of all countable models of the form $M[G_\alpha]$, where $M \prec H^V_{\lambda^*}$ contains the relevant objects, and $M \cap V_\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}[G_\alpha]$. Now, by Propositions 5.29 and 5.30 we have the following.

COROLLARY 5.31. *$\mathcal{S}$ is stationary in $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}([H_{\lambda^*}[G_\alpha])$ and $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda/G_\alpha$ is $\mathcal{S}$-proper in $V[G_\lambda]$.*

PROPOSITION 5.32. *$\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$ satisfies the $\lambda$-c.c.*

PROOF. Assume that $A \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$ is of size $\lambda$. For every $p \in \mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$, let $a(p) = \bigcup\{a(M) : M \in \mathcal{M}_p\}$, which is a closed subset of $E$ of size $<\kappa$. By a standard $\Delta$-system argument, we can find a subset $B$ of $A$ of size $\lambda$ so that there are $a$ and $d$ subsets of $E$ such that $a(p) \cap a(q) = a$ and $\mathrm{dom}(w_p) \cap \mathrm{dom}(w_q) = d$, for all distinct $p, q \in B$. Note that $a$ is closed, and if we let $\gamma = \max(a)$, then $\gamma \in E$. Since $B$ has size $\lambda$, by a simple counting argument, we can assume there is $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{M}^\kappa_\gamma$ such that $\mathcal{M}_p \restriction \gamma = \mathcal{M}$ and that $w_p \restriction d = w_q \restriction d$, for all $p \in B$. Now, pick distinct $p, q \in B$, and define $\mathcal{M}_r = \mathcal{M}_p \cup \mathcal{M}_q$, $d_r = d_p \cup d_q$, and also $w_r = w_p \cup w_q$. Let $r = (\mathcal{M}_r, d_r, w_r)$. It is straightforward to check that $r \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$ and $r \leq p, q$. ⊣

Putting everything together, we have the following.

COROLLARY 5.33. *$\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$ preserves $\omega_1$, $\kappa$ and $\lambda$, and forces that $\kappa = \omega_2^{V[G_\lambda]}$ and $\lambda = \omega_3^{V[G_\lambda]}$.*

PROOF. The preservation of $\omega_1$ and $\kappa$ is guaranteed by Corollaries 5.26 and 5.27, respectively. It is easily seen that $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\lambda$ is a complete suborder of $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$, and hence Propositions 5.15 and 5.32 imply that in generic extensions by $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$, $\kappa = \omega_2$ and $\lambda = \omega_3$. ⊣

PROPOSITION 5.34. *For every $\alpha \in E^+ \cup \{\lambda\}$, $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property.*

PROOF. We proceed by induction. Suppose $\alpha \in E$ and we have established that $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property. Recall that $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha+1}$ is either $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ or is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha * \dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$, for some $\dot{T}_\alpha$ which is a name for a tree of size and height $\omega_1$ without uncountable branches. Then by Proposition 2.19 $\dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$ is forced to have the $\omega_1$-approximation property over $V[G_\alpha]$, where $G_\alpha$ is a generic over $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$. By Theorem 2.3 we conclude that $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha+1}$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property. Recall also that $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\min(E)}$ is strongly proper for $\mathcal{C}$, by Proposition 5.12, and hence has the $\omega_1$-approximation property by Lemma 2.10.

Suppose now that $\alpha$ is not the least element of $E$ and that the conclusion holds for every ordinal in $E^+ \cap \alpha$. Let $\dot{f}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$-name for a function $\mu \to 2$ which is forced by a condition $p$ to be countably approximated in $V$. We may assume that $\mu$ is a cardinal in $V$. Suppose $\lambda^* > \mu, \lambda$ is a sufficiently large regular cardinal. Pick a countable $M^* \prec H_{\lambda^*}$ containing the relevant objects. Thus $M = M^* \cap V_\lambda$ is a standard virtual model. Let $q \leq p^M$ be a condition which decides $\dot{f} \restriction M^* \cap \mu$ and forces it to be equal to some function $g : M^* \cap \mu \to 2$ which is in $V$. By Proposition 5.25 $q$ is $(M^*, \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha)$-generic. By Lemma 2.16, it suffices to show that $g$ is guessed in $M^*$. Assume toward a contradiction that $g$ is not guessed in $M^*$. Let $\gamma = \max(\mathrm{dom}(w_q) \cap M)$, and

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pick some $V$-generic filter $G_{\gamma+1}$ on $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\gamma+1}$ such that $(q \restriction \gamma, w_q(\gamma)) \in G_{\gamma+1}$. Working in $V[G_{\gamma+1}]$, we show that in $M^*[G_{\gamma+1}]$ there is an assignment $x \mapsto (q_x, g_x)$ on $[\mu]^\omega \cap V$ with the following properties.

(1) $q_x \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$,
(2) $(\mathcal{M}_{q_x}, d_{q_x}) \leq (\mathcal{M}_q, d_q) \restriction M$,
(3) $q_x \restriction \gamma + 1 \in G_{\gamma+1}$,
(4) $g_x : x \to 2$, $g_x \in V$,
(5) $q_x \Vdash \dot{f} \restriction x = \check{g}_x$.

If $x \in [\mu]^\omega \cap M^*$ then $x \mapsto (q, g \restriction x)$ satisfies all the above properties. By elementarity of $M^*[G_{\gamma+1}]$ in $H_{\lambda^*}[G_{\gamma+1}]$, such an assignment exists for all $x \in [\mu]^\omega \cap V$. Moreover, by elementarity again there is such an assignment in $M^*[G_{\gamma+1}]$. Now, by the inductive assumption and Lemma 2.15, $g$ is not guessed in $M^*[G_{\gamma+1}]$. Since $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ is proper, $[\mu]^\omega \cap V$ is a cofinal in $[\mu]^\omega$. By Lemma 2.17 there is $B \in M^*[G_{\gamma+1}]$, a cofinal subset of $[\mu]^\omega \cap V$, such that for every $x \in B \cap M^*[G_{\gamma+1}]$, $g_x \not\subseteq g$, and hence $q_x$ is incompatible with $q$. On the other hand, conditions (1)–(3) above enable us to use Lemma 5.23 to make sure that $q_x$ and $q$ are compatible. Thus, for every such $x \in B \cap M^*[G_{\gamma+1}]$, $q_x$ and $q$ are compatible, and hence we get a contradiction. ⊣

One can use Proposition 5.30 and the proof of Proposition 5.34 to prove the following.

PROPOSITION 5.35. *Suppose $\alpha, \beta \in E^+ \cup \{\lambda\}$ and $\alpha < \beta$. Suppose that $G_\alpha$ is a $V$-generic filter over $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$. Then $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta / G_\alpha$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property over $V[G_\alpha]$.*

The following corollary is immediate.

COROLLARY 5.36. *Suppose $\alpha, \beta \in E^+ \cup \{\lambda\}$ and $\alpha < \beta$. Let $G_\beta$ be a $V$-generic filter over $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta$, and let $G_\alpha = G_\beta \cap \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$. Then the pairs $(V, V[G_\alpha])$ and $(V[G_\alpha], V[G_\beta])$ have the $\omega_1$-approximation property.*

**5.2. Quotients by Magidor models.** The first lemma of this subsection states that $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$ is strongly proper for $\mathcal{U}$ in a canonical way.

DEFINITION 5.37. Let $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$. Assume $N \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ is a Magidor model. We let

$$p \restriction N = (\mathcal{M}_{p \restriction N}, d_{p \restriction N}, w_p \restriction N).$$

LEMMA 5.38. *Let $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$, and let $N \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ be a Magidor model. Assume that $\alpha \leq \eta(N)$ is in $E$. Then $p \restriction \alpha \restriction N = (p \restriction N) \restriction \alpha$.*

PROOF. It is enough to show that if $M \in \mathcal{M}_p$, then $(M \restriction N) \restriction \alpha = M \restriction \alpha \restriction N$. This is of course clear from the definition of $M \restriction N$. ⊣

LEMMA 5.39. *Let $p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$, and assume that $N \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_p)$ is a Magidor model. Then*

(1) $p \restriction N \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \cap N$.
(2) *Every condition $q \in N$ extending $p \restriction N$ is compatible with $p$.*

PROOF. We prove both items simultaneously by induction on $\alpha$. Note that both are true for the minimum of $E$. Thus let us assume that $\alpha > \min(E)$. Note that

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$p \restriction N$ belongs to $N$. So all we have to show is that $p \restriction N$ is a condition in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$ that satisfies the second item.

One needs first to show that for every $\gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(p) \cap N$, $(p \restriction N) \restriction \gamma$, which is a condition by the inductive hypothesis and Lemma 5.38, forces in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\gamma$ that "$\check{w}_p(\gamma) \in \dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\gamma)$". Assume towards a contradiction that this is not the case, so there is $q \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\gamma$ with $q \leq (p \restriction N) \restriction \gamma$ which forces $\check{w}_p(\gamma)$ is not in $\dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\gamma)$". Since both $p \restriction N \restriction \gamma$ and $w_p(\gamma)$ belong to $N$, we can find such $q$ in $N$ by elementarity. Therefore, $q$ is not compatible with $p \restriction \gamma$. This contradicts the second item above applied to $p \restriction \gamma, N \restriction \gamma$, and $q$. Hence the first item follows.

To see the second item, we will define a common extension of $p, q$, say $r$ by letting $(\mathcal{M}_r, d_r) = (\mathcal{M}_p, d_p) \wedge (\mathcal{M}_q, d_q)$, $\mathrm{dom}(w_r) = \mathrm{dom}(w_p) \cup \mathrm{dom}(w_q)$, and that

$$w_r(\gamma) = \begin{cases} w_q(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma \in N, \\ w_p(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma \notin N. \end{cases}$$

It follows from Proposition 5.9 that $r$ is a common extension of $p$ and $q$. ⊣

Remark 5.40. As before, we let the above $r$ be the meet of $p$ and $q$, which we denote by $p \wedge q$.

Suppose that $N \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\alpha \in E$. We set

$$\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \restriction N := \{p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha : N \restriction \alpha \in \mathcal{M}_p\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha,N} := \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \cap N.$$

By Lemma 5.39, the condition $\mathbf{1}_N := (\{N \restriction \alpha\}, \varnothing, \varnothing)$ is $(N, \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha)$-strongly generic, and therefore the mapping

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha,N} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \restriction N \\ p &\longmapsto p^{N \restriction \alpha} \end{aligned}$$

is a complete embedding. Moreover, if $p$ is a condition in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \restriction N$, then $p \restriction N \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha,N}$ is such that if $q \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\alpha,N}$ extends $p \restriction N$, then $p$ and $q$ are compatible, and indeed the meet $p \wedge q$ exists.

For a $V$-generic filter $G_{\alpha,N} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \cap N$ we can form the following quotient forcing

$$\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha := \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \restriction N / G_{\alpha,N}.$$

Definition 5.41. Let $G_{\alpha,N}$ be a $V$-generic filter over $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \cap N$. Let $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}[G_{\alpha,N}]$ denote the set of all models $M \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}$ such that $\alpha, N \in M$ and $(N \wedge M) \restriction \alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{G_{\alpha,N}}$.

Note that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}[G_{\alpha,N}]$ is stationary in $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_1}(V_\lambda)$ in the model $V[G_{\alpha,N}]$, but we do not need this and therefore avoid a proof.

Lemma 5.42 (Factorization lemma). *Suppose $N \in \mathcal{U}$, and that $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \eta(N)$ are in $E$. Let $G_{\alpha,N} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \cap N$ be a $V$-generic filter. The mapping*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho : \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N / G_{\alpha,N} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N_\alpha \times (\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \cap N)/G_{\alpha,N} \\ p &\longmapsto (p \restriction \alpha, p \restriction N) \end{aligned}$$

*is a projection in $V[G_{\alpha,N}]$.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROOF. It is easy to observe that $\rho$ is a well-defined, order-preserving mapping that respects the maximal conditions. Assume that the arbitrary elements

$$p \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N/G_{\alpha,N} \text{ and } (r,s) \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \restriction N/G_{\alpha,N} \times (\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \cap N)/G_{\alpha,N} \text{ with}$$

$$(r,s) \leq (p \restriction \alpha, p \restriction N)$$

are given. Our goal is to find a condition $q \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N/G_{\alpha,N}$ with $q \leq p$ such that $\rho(q) \leq (r,s)$.

Since $r \restriction N, s \restriction \alpha \in G_{\alpha,N}$, we can fix a common extension $\bar{q} \in G_{\alpha,N}$ of them. Now by applying Lemma 5.39 to $\bar{q}, N, r$, we have

$$\bar{q} \wedge r \leq \bar{q} \leq s \restriction \alpha,$$

and by applying Proposition 5.19 to $\bar{q}, s, \alpha$, we have

$$\bar{q} \wedge s \leq \bar{q} \leq r \restriction N.$$

By reverse applications of Lemma 5.39 and Proposition 5.19 to the above inequalities, the meets $(\bar{q} \wedge r) \wedge s$ and $(\bar{q} \wedge s) \wedge r$ exist. A simple calculation shows that these conditions are equal, so let us call them $q^*$. The canonicity of our projections guarantees that

$$q^* \restriction \alpha = (\bar{q} \wedge r) \leq r \quad \text{and} \quad q^* \restriction N = (\bar{q} \wedge s) \leq s.$$

Moreover,

$$q^* \restriction \alpha \restriction N = (q^* \restriction N) \restriction \alpha = \bar{q} \in G_{\alpha,N}.$$

Consequently,

$$q^* \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta/G_{\alpha,N} \quad \text{and} \quad (q^* \restriction \alpha, q^* \restriction N) \leq (r,s).$$

It suffices to show that $p$ and $q^*$ are compatible, since the mappings $\bullet \mapsto \bullet \restriction \alpha$ and $\bullet \mapsto \bullet \restriction N$ are order-preserving. We define a common extension of them, say $q$. Let $\mathcal{M}_q = \mathcal{M}_p \cup \mathcal{M}_{q^*}$. For every $\delta \in E$,

$$\mathcal{M}^\delta_q = \begin{cases} \mathcal{M}^\delta_{q^*} & \text{if } \delta \leq \alpha, \quad (\text{since } \mathcal{M}^\delta_p \subseteq \mathcal{M}^\delta_r \subseteq \mathcal{M}^\delta_{q^*}) \\ \mathcal{M}^\delta_p & \text{if } \delta > \alpha. \quad (\text{since } \mathcal{M}^\delta_{q^*} \subseteq \mathcal{M}^\delta_s \subseteq \mathcal{M}^\delta_p). \end{cases}$$

In either case, $\mathcal{M}^\delta_q$ is an $\delta$-chain. Thus $\mathcal{M}_q$ is a condition in $\mathbb{M}^\kappa_\alpha$. We now define $d_q$ on $\operatorname{dom}(d_p) \cup \operatorname{dom}(d_{q^*})$ by letting

$$d_q(P) = \begin{cases} d_p(P) & \text{if } \eta(P) > \alpha \text{ and } P \notin N, \\ d_{q^*}(P) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The function is well-defined as $\rho(q^*) \leq \rho(p)$. A proof similar to [15, Lemma 4.14] would show that every model in $\operatorname{dom}(d_q)$ is $\mathcal{M}_q$-free. We sketch the proof. Thus we assume that $P \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_q)$, $Q \in \mathcal{M}_q$, and that $P \in_{\eta(P)} Q$. We have to show that $Q$ is strongly active at $\eta(P)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

- **Case 1.** $\eta(N) > \alpha$ and $P \notin N$: Then $P$ does not belong to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_{q^*})$, hence $Q \notin \mathcal{M}_{q^*}$, in which case, since $p$ is a condition, $Q$ must be strongly active at $\eta(P)$.
- **Case 2.** $\eta(N) > \alpha$ and $P \in N$: Then $P$ is in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_{q^*})$. We may assume that $Q \notin \mathcal{M}_{q^*}$. In particular, $Q \in \mathcal{M}_p$. Now both $N$ and $Q$ are active at $\eta(P)$. Therefore, we must have $P \in N \in_{\eta(P)} Q$. We can also assume that $Q$ is countable, as otherwise, it is strongly active at $\eta(P)$. Now, we have $P \in_{\eta(P)} (N \wedge Q) \restriction N$, where the latter model belongs to $\mathcal{M}_{q^*}$. Thus $(N \wedge Q) \restriction N$ is strongly active at $\eta(P)$, and hence $Q$.
- **Case 3.** $\eta(P) \leq \alpha$: In this case $P$ is in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_{q^* \restriction \alpha})$, then $Q \restriction \alpha \in \mathcal{M}_{q^* \restriction \alpha}$. Now $Q \restriction \alpha$, and consequently $Q$ is strongly active at $\eta(P)$.

Using the above argument, it is easy to show that the decorative function $d_q$ fulfils $(*)$ in Definition 5.2.

It remains to define $w_q$ on $\mathrm{dom}(w_p) \cup \mathrm{dom}(w_{q^*})$. For each $\gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(w_q)$, we let

$$w_q(\gamma) = \begin{cases} w_p(\gamma) & \text{if } \gamma > \alpha \text{ and } \gamma \notin N, \\ w_{q^*}(\gamma) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We observe that $w_q$ is well-defined thanks to the definition of $q^*$. Thus $q$ is a condition in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N$, which is easily shown to be a common extension of $p$ and $q$. By an easy calculation, we have

$$q \restriction \alpha \restriction N = \bar{q} \in G_{\alpha,N},$$

and therefore $q \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N / G_{\alpha,N}$, as required! ⊣

LEMMA 5.43. *Suppose $N \in \mathcal{U}$ and that $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \eta(N)$ are in $E$. Let $G_{\beta,N}$ be a $V$-generic filter over $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_{\beta,N}$. Then in $V[G_{\beta,N}]$, $\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$ is a complete suborder of $\mathbb{R}^N_\beta$.*

PROOF. It is clear that $\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N_\beta$, and furthermore, if $p \in \mathbb{R}^N_\beta$, then $p \restriction \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$. Now fix $p \in \mathbb{R}^N_\beta$ and suppose that $q \in \mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$ extends $p \restriction \alpha$. Let $r = p \wedge q$ as obtained in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta$. Therefore, we have $r \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N$. An easy calculation shows that

$$r \restriction N = p \restriction N \wedge q \restriction N \in G_{\beta,N},$$

where we observe that $p \restriction N \leq (q \restriction N) \restriction \alpha$, and hence the meet $p \restriction N \wedge q \restriction N$ exists by Proposition 5.19. ⊣

LEMMA 5.44. *Assume $N$ is a Magidor model, $M \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{st}}[G_{\alpha,N}]$, and that $p \in \mathbb{R}^N_\alpha \cap M$. Then $p^{M \restriction \alpha}$ is an $(M[G_{\alpha,N}], \mathbb{R}^N_\alpha)$-generic condition.*

PROOF. Let us first show that $p^{M \restriction \alpha}$ is an $\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$-condition. Note that by the proof of [15, Lemma 5.7], we have

$$(\mathcal{M}_p, d_p)^{M \restriction \alpha} \restriction N = \big((\mathcal{M}_p, d_p) \restriction N\big)^{N \wedge M \restriction \alpha}.$$

On the other hand, $N \wedge M \restriction \alpha$ is in $\mathcal{M}_{G_{\alpha,N}}$, which in turn implies that

$$\big((\mathcal{M}_{p \restriction N}, d_{p \restriction N})^{N \wedge M \restriction \alpha}, \varnothing\big) \in G_{\alpha,N}.$$

It follows that

$$p^{M \restriction \alpha} \restriction N = \big((\mathcal{M}_{p \restriction N}, d_{p \restriction N})^{N \wedge M \restriction \alpha}, w_p \restriction N\big) \in G_{\alpha,N}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This shows that $p^{M\restriction\alpha}$ is a condition in $\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$, and that $p^{M\restriction\alpha}$ is $(M, \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \restriction N)$-generic. Therefore, $p^{M\restriction\alpha} \restriction N$ is $(M, \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \cap N)$-generic, and that

$$p^{M\restriction\alpha} \restriction N \Vdash \text{“}\check{p} \text{ is } (M[\dot{G}_{\alpha,N}], \dot{\mathbb{R}}^N_\alpha)\text{-generic”}.$$

Since $p^{M\restriction\alpha} \restriction N$ belongs to $G_{\alpha,N}$, we have, in $V[G_{\alpha,N}]$, $p$ is $(M[G_{\alpha,N}], \mathbb{R}^N_\alpha)$-generic. ⊣

We now state our key lemma.

Lemma 5.45. *Suppose $N \in \mathcal{U}$ and that $\gamma \in a(N)$. Let $G_{\gamma,N}$ be a $V$-generic filter over $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\gamma \cap N$. Then in $V[G_{\gamma,N}]$, $\mathbb{R}^N_\gamma$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property.*

Proof. We will prove by induction on $\beta \leq \gamma$ that $\mathbb{R}^N_\beta$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property over $V[G_{\gamma,N}]$, where in the definition of $\mathbb{R}^N_\beta$, we use $G_{\gamma,N} \cap \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta$ as the generic filter on $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \cap N$. Thus we fix $\beta$ and assume that the lemma holds for every ordinal in $E \cap \beta$.

Suppose that $\dot{f}$ is an $\mathbb{R}^N_\beta$-term forced by a condition $p$ to be a function on an ordinal $\mu$ that is countably approximated in $V[G_{\gamma,N}]$. We look for an extension of $p$ that decides $\dot{f}$. We first choose a countable model $M$ elementary in $V_\delta$ with $\delta > \lambda$ such that $E, \beta, \gamma, N, p, \mu$ and $\dot{f}$ belong to $M$, and that

$$\big(N \wedge (M \cap V_\lambda)\big) \restriction \gamma \in \mathcal{M}_{G_{\gamma,N}}.$$

Let also

$$M_\gamma \coloneqq (M \cap V_\lambda) \restriction \gamma \quad \text{and} \quad M_\beta \coloneqq M_\gamma \restriction \beta.$$

Using Lemma 5.44, we can extend $p$ to a condition $p^{M_\beta}$ in $\mathbb{R}^N_\beta$ so that $M_\beta \in \mathcal{M}_{p^{M_\beta}}$. Since $p$ forces that $\dot{f}$ is $\omega_1$-approximated in $V[G_{\gamma,N}]$, there is a condition $q \in \mathbb{R}^N_\beta$ with $q \leq p^{M_\beta}$ which decides the values of $\dot{f} \restriction M \cap \mu$. Therefore, there exists a function $g : M \cap \mu \to 2$ such that

$$q \Vdash \text{“}\check{g} = \dot{f} \restriction M \cap \mu\text{”}.$$

Lemmas 5.43 and 5.44 ensures that $p^{M_\beta}$ is a$(M_\gamma[G_{\gamma,N}], \mathbb{R}^N_\beta)$-generic condition, and thus $(M[G_{\gamma,N}], \mathbb{R}^N_\beta)$-generic. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.16, we are done if $g$ is guessed in $M[G_{\gamma,N}]$. Therefore, we may assume toward a contradiction that $g$ is not guessed in $M[G_{\gamma,N}]$, and we let

$$\alpha \coloneqq \max(\mathrm{dom}(w_q) \cap M).$$

Assume that $G^N_\alpha$ is a $V[G_{\gamma,N}]$-generic filter on $\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$ containing $q \restriction \alpha$, where again we use

$$G_{\alpha,N} = G_{\gamma,N} \cap \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$$

to form the quotient forcing $\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$. Notice that Lemmas 5.42 and 5.44 imply that $q \restriction \alpha$ is $(M[G_{\gamma,N}], \mathbb{R}^N_\alpha)$-generic, and on the other hand by the inductive hypothesis, $\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property over $V[G_{\gamma,N}]$. Consequently, the function $g$ is not guessed in $M[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha]$ by Lemma 2.17. Since $G^N_\alpha$ is a $V[G_{\gamma,N}]$-generic filter

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on $\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$, the factorization lemma (Lemma 5.42) over $V[G_{\alpha,N}]$ yields the following equality:

$$V[G_{\alpha,N}][G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha] = V[G_{\alpha,N}][G^N_\alpha][G_{\gamma,N}].$$

Note that $G^N_\alpha$ is a $V$-generic filter on $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \restriction N$ and $G_{\gamma,N}$ is a $V$-generic filter on $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\gamma \cap N$, and hence we have

$$V[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha] = V[G^N_\alpha][G_{\gamma,N}].$$

Claim 5.46. *The pair $(V[G^N_\alpha], V[G^N_\alpha][G_{\gamma,N}])$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property.*

Proof. Let $G^N_\gamma$ be a $V[G^N_\alpha][G_{\gamma,N}]$-generic filter on $\mathbb{R}^N_\gamma$. Notice that both $G^N_\alpha$ and $G^N_\gamma$ are also $V$-generic filters on $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\gamma$ and $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha$, respectively. Now, Corollary 5.36 implies that the pair

$$(V[G^N_\alpha], V[G^N_\gamma])$$

has the $\omega_1$-approximation property, and so does the pair $(V[G^N_\alpha], V[G^N_\alpha][G_{\gamma,N}])$. ⊣

Note that if $\alpha \in N$, then $\dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$ is already interpreted by $G_{\alpha,N}$, and hence by $G_{\gamma,N}$ and moreover there is a generic filter on $\mathrm{val}_{G_{\gamma,N}}(\dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\alpha))$ in $V[G_{\gamma,N}]$. Thus in this case, the conditions in $\dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$ cannot prevent us from amalgamating conditions in $\mathbb{R}^N_\beta$ (i.e., if $p'$ and $q'$ are conditions in $\mathbb{R}^N_\beta$ with $\alpha \in \mathrm{dom}(w_{p'}) \cap \mathrm{dom}(w_{q'})$, we do know that $w_{p'}^{G_{\gamma,N}}(\alpha)$ and $w_{q'}^{G_{\gamma,N}}(\alpha)$ are compatible.)

For the sake of simplicity, we make the following convention.

Convention 5.47. *We let $\mathbb{Q}$ be the interpretation of $\dot{\mathbb{S}}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$ under $G^N_\alpha$ if $\alpha$ is not in $N$, and let it be the trivial forcing otherwise. We also let, for every $p' \in \mathbb{R}^N_\beta$, $z_{p'} = w_{p'}^{G^N_\alpha}(\alpha)$ if $\alpha \notin N$, and let it be a canonical $\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$-name in $N$ for the maximal condition of the trivial forcing otherwise.*

Claim 5.48. *The forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property over $V[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha]$, and $z_q$ is $(M[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha], \mathbb{Q})$-generic.*

Proof. We may assume that $\alpha \notin N$ and that $\mathbb{Q}$ is nontrivial; thus $\mathbb{Q}$ is the specializing forcing of a tree $T \in V[G^N_\alpha]$ of size and height $\omega_1$ without any cofinal branches. By Claim 5.46, the tree $T$ is still of height $\omega_1$ and has no cofinal branches in $V[G^N_\alpha][G_{\gamma,N}]$. On the other hand, $V[G^N_\alpha][G_{\gamma,N}] = V[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha]$. Thus in $V[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha]$, $\mathbb{Q}$ is a c.c.c. forcing with the $\omega_1$-approximation property. Therefore, $z_q$ is $(M[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha], \mathbb{Q})$-generic. ⊣

Returning to the main body of the proof, let $H$ be a $V[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha]$-generic filter on $\mathbb{Q}$ containing $z_q$. We now work in the model $V[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha][H]$ for the rest of the proof. By Claim 5.48 and Lemma 2.15 and the fact that we have assumed earlier that $g$ is not guessed in $M[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha]$, we have that $g$ is not guessed in

$$M^* \coloneqq M[G_{\gamma,N}][G^N_\alpha][H].$$

Note that for every $x \in M^* \cap [\mu]^\omega$, $x \mapsto (q, g)$ witnesses the conditions below, and so a mapping $x \mapsto (q_x, g_x)$ on $[\mu]^\omega$ exists in $M^*$ such that:

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1) $q_x \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N$,
(2) $(\mathcal{M}_{q_x}, d_{q_x}) \leq (\mathcal{M}_p, d_p) \restriction M$ in $\mathbb{P}^\kappa_\beta$,
(3) $M \cap \mathrm{dom}(w_q) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(w_{q_x})$,
(4) $q_x \restriction \alpha \in G^N_\alpha$,
(5) $z_{q_x} \in H$
(6) $q_x \restriction N \in G_{\beta,N}$, and
(7) $g_x$ is a function with $x \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(g_x)$ such that $q_x \Vdash$ "$g_x \restriction x = \dot{f} \restriction x$".

Since $g$ is not guessed in $M^*$, by Lemma 2.17, there is a set $B \in M^*$ cofinal in $[\mu]^\omega$ such that for every $x \in B \cap M^*$, $g_x \not\subseteq g$. Therefore, the conditions $q_x$ and $q$ are incompatible in $\mathbb{R}^\beta_N$, for every $x \in B \cap M^*$.

We now draw a contradiction using the following claim.

Claim 5.49. *For every $x \in B \cap M^*$, $q_x$ and $q$ are compatible.*

Proof. Fix $x \in B \cap M^*$. Thus $q_x \in M^*$, and hence $q_x \in M$ by Lemmas 5.42 and 5.44 and Claim 5.48. The conditions (1)-(5) above allow us to use Lemma 5.23 to find a common extension of $q_x$ and $q$ in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N$, say $\bar{q}_0$. However, we need to show that $q_x$ and $q$ are compatible in $\mathbb{R}^N_\beta$. Let $r \in G^N_\alpha$ be a common extension of $q_x \restriction \alpha$ and $q \restriction \alpha$, and let also $s \in G_{\beta,N}$ be a common extension of $q_x \restriction N$ and $q \restriction N$. Set

$$d = \{\xi \in \mathrm{dom}(w_{\bar{q}_0}) : \alpha \leq \xi \notin N\},$$

and let

$$\bar{q}_1 := (\mathcal{M}_{\bar{q}_0}, d_{\bar{q}_0}, w_{\bar{q}_0} \restriction d).$$

Notice that $\bar{q}_1 \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N$, and that

$$(r, s) \leq (\bar{q}_1 \restriction \alpha, \bar{q}_1 \restriction N).$$

We now apply Lemma 5.42 to $(r, s)$ and $\bar{q}_1$ to find a condition $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N/G_{\alpha,N}$ with $\bar{q} \leq r, s, \bar{q}_1$ such that $\bar{q} \restriction N \in G_{\beta,N}$. Note that $\bar{q} \leq q_x, q$ in $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\beta \restriction N$ but $\bar{q}$ is in $\mathbb{R}^N_\beta$, and hence $q$ and $q_x$ are compatible in $\mathbb{R}^N_\beta$, as required. ⊣

**§6. The proof of theorem 3.12.** Suppose $\kappa < \lambda$ are supercompact cardinals. Consider the structure $V_\lambda = (V_\lambda, \in, \kappa, U)$, where $U$ is a suitable bookkeeping function enumerating all $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$-terms in $V_\lambda$ which are forced to be trees of size and height $\omega_1$ without cofinal branches. Let $G_\lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$ be a $V$-generic filter. Since $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda$ is $\lambda$-c.c, every tree of size and height $\omega_1$ that has no cofinal branches is special in $V[G_\lambda]$. Recall that by Baumgartner's [3, Theorem 7.5], if every tree of height and size $\omega_1$ that has no branches of length $\omega_1$ is special, then every tree of height and size $\omega_1$ that has at most $\omega_1$ cofinal branches is weakly special. Thus, by Proposition 2.6, to show that $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ holds in $V[G_\lambda]$, it suffices to show that $\mathrm{GM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ holds in $V[G_\lambda]$. Indeed, we show that the $\omega_1$-guessing models of size $\omega_1$ witnessing $\mathrm{GM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ are internally club.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\alpha \in E$. Suppose that $N \in \mathcal{M}_{G_\lambda}$ is a Magidor model with $\alpha \in N$. Then $N[G_\alpha]$ is an $\omega_1$-guessing model in $V[G_\lambda]$.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROOF. Note that the projection $N \mapsto N \restriction \alpha$ is an isomorphism and is the identity on $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \cap N$. Thus, $N[G_\alpha]$ and $(N \restriction \alpha)[G_\alpha]$ are also isomorphic. Therefore, by replacing $N$ with $N \restriction \alpha$ we may assume that it is an $\alpha$-model. Let $\overline{N}$ be the transitive collapse of $N$, and let $\pi$ be the collapse map. For convenience, let us write $\bar{\kappa}$ for $\kappa_N$. Then $\overline{N} = V_{\bar{\gamma}}$, for some $\bar{\gamma}$ with $\mathrm{cof}(\bar{\gamma}) \geq \bar{\kappa}$ and $\pi(\kappa) = \bar{\kappa}$. Let $\bar{\alpha} = \pi(\alpha)$. Since $\alpha \in N$ and $N$ is an $\alpha$-model we have

$$\mathbb{Q}_N = \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\lambda \cap N = \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \cap N.$$

Let $\mathbb{Q}^{\bar{\kappa}}_{\bar{\alpha}} = \pi[\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \cap N]$, and let $p \in G_\alpha$ be such that $N \in \mathcal{M}_p$. By Corollary 5.27 $p$ is $(N, \mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha)$-strongly generic. Consequently, $G_{\alpha,N} = G_\alpha \cap N$ is $V$-generic over $\mathbb{Q}^\kappa_\alpha \cap N$. It follows that

$$G^{\bar{\kappa}}_{\bar{\alpha}} = \pi[G_{\alpha,N}]$$

is $V$-generic over $\mathbb{Q}^{\bar{\kappa}}_{\bar{\alpha}}$. Note that

$$\overline{N[G_{\alpha,N}]} = V_{\bar{\gamma}}[G^{\bar{\kappa}}_{\bar{\alpha}}] = V_{\bar{\gamma}}^{V[G_{\alpha,N}]},$$

which belongs to $V[G_{\alpha,N}]$. It is clear that the pair $(\overline{N[G_{\alpha,N}]}, V[G_{\alpha,N}])$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property. On the other hand, by Lemma 5.45, the quotient forcing $\mathbb{R}^N_\alpha$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property, and thus, by Proposition 5.35, the pair $(V[G_{\alpha,N}], V[G_\lambda])$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property. By Theorem 2.3, the pair

$$(\overline{N[G_{\alpha,N}]}, V[G_\lambda])$$

has the $\omega_1$-approximation property. Now Theorem 2.4 implies that $N[G_{\alpha,N}]$ is an $\omega_1$-guessing model in $V[G_\lambda]$. ⊣

One can show with a similar proof that if $\mu > \lambda$ and $N \prec V_\mu$ is a $\kappa$-Magidor model containing all the relevant parameters. Then $N[G_\lambda]$ is an $\omega_1$-guessing model in $V[G_\lambda]$. We now prove that for all $\mu > \lambda$ the set of strongly $\omega_1$-guessing models is stationary in $\mathcal{P}_{\omega_3}(V_\mu[G_\lambda])$.

LEMMA 6.2. *Suppose that $\mu > \lambda$ and $N \prec V_\mu$ is a $\lambda$-Magidor model containing all the relevant parameters. Then $N[G_\lambda]$ is a strongly $\omega_1$-guessing model.*

PROOF. Since $N$ is a $\lambda$-Magidor model, its transitive collapse $\overline{N}$ equals $V_{\bar{\gamma}}$, for some $\bar{\gamma} < \lambda$. Let $\bar{\lambda} = N \cap \lambda$, which is in $E$. Note that $\mathrm{cof}(\bar{\lambda}) \geq \kappa$, and hence the transitive collapse $\overline{N[G_\lambda]}$ of $N[G_\lambda]$ equals $V_{\bar{\gamma}}[G_{\bar{\lambda}}]$. On the other hand, the pair $(V[G_{\bar{\lambda}}], V[G_\lambda])$ has the $\omega_1$-approximation property by Corollary 5.36. Therefore, $V_{\bar{\gamma}}[G_{\bar{\lambda}}]$ and hence also $N[G_\lambda]$ remains an $\omega_1$-guessing model in $V[G_\lambda]$. To see that $V_{\bar{\gamma}}[G_{\bar{\lambda}}]$ is a strongly $\omega_1$-guessing model, fix some $\delta \in E$ with $\delta > \bar{\gamma}$ and $\mathrm{cof}(\delta) < \kappa$. Note that if $M \in \mathcal{M}^\delta_{G_\lambda}$ is a Magidor model with $\bar{\lambda} \in M$, then by Lemma 6.1 $M[G_{\bar{\lambda}}]$ is an $\omega_1$-guessing model. Moreover, if $M \in \mathcal{M}^\delta_{G_\lambda}$ is a limit of such Magidor models then by Proposition 5.14,

$$M \cap V_\delta = \bigcup \{Q \cap V_\delta : Q \in_\delta M \text{ and } Q \in \mathcal{M}^\delta_{G_\lambda}\}.$$

Hence if we let $\mathcal{G}$ be the collection of the models $(M \cap V_{\bar{\gamma}})[G_{\bar{\lambda}}]$, for Magidor models $M \in \mathcal{M}^\delta_{G_\lambda}$ with $\bar{\lambda} \in M$, then $\mathcal{G}$ is an $\in$-increasing chain of length $\omega_2$ which is continuous at $\omega_1$-limits and whose union is $V_{\bar{\gamma}}[G_{\bar{\lambda}}]$. Note that every model of size

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$\omega_1$ in this chain is a continuous union of an I.C. sequence. Therefore $N[G_\lambda]$ is a strongly $\omega_1$-guessing model in $V[G_\lambda]$, as required. ⊣

The following corollary is immediate and concludes the proof of Theorem 3.12.

COROLLARY 6.3. *The principle* $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ *holds in* $V[G_\lambda]$.

REMARK 6.4. The decoration component in the forcing conditions plays no role in our main theorem. However, without additional effort, one can easily show that the $\omega_1$-guessing models of size $\omega_1$ witnessing the truth of $\mathrm{SGM}^+(\omega_3, \omega_1)$ in the final model are internally club.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors are grateful to the reviewer for his/her comments and suggestions.

## REFERENCES

[1] U. ABRAHAM, ***The isomorphism types of Aronszajn trees and the forcing without the generalized continuum hypothesis***, Ph.D. thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 1979.

[2] J. BAUMGARTNER, J. MALITZ, and W. REINHARDT, *Embedding trees in the rationals*. ***Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America***, vol. 67 (1970), pp. 1748–1753.

[3] J. E. BAUMGARTNER, *Iterated forcing*, ***Surveys in Set Theory*** (A. R. D. Mathias, editor), *volume 87 of London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1983, pp. 1–59.

[4] D. CHODOUNSKÝ and J. ZAPLETAL, *Why Y-c.c*. ***Annals of Pure and Applied Logic***, vol. 166 (2015), no. 11, pp. 1123–1149,.

[5] S. COX and J. KRUEGER, *Quotients of strongly proper forcings and guessing models*. ***The Journal of Symbolic Logic***, vol. 81 2016, no. 1, pp. 264–283.

[6] ———, *Indestructible guessing models and the continuum*. ***Fundamenta Mathematicae***, vol. 239 (2017), no. 3, pp. 221–258.

[7] T. GILTON and I. NEEMAN, *Side conditions and iteration theorems*. ***Appalachian Set Theory***, 2016, https://www.math.ucla.edu/∼ineeman/scit.pdf/.

[8] M. GOLSHANI and S. SHELAH, *Specializing trees and answer to a question of Williams*. ***Journal of Mathematical Logic***, vol. 21 (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 2050023, 20.

[9] J. D. HAMKINS, *Gap forcing*. ***Israel Journal of Mathematics***, vol. 125 (2001), no. 1, pp. 237–252.

[10] J. KRUEGER, *Guessing models imply the singular cardinal hypothesis*. ***Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society***, vol. 147 (2019), no. 12, pp. 5427–5434.

[11] R. LAVER, *Certain very large cardinals are not created in small forcing extensions*. ***Annals of Pure and Applied Logic***, vol. 149 (2007), no. (1-3), pp. 1–6.

[12] M. MAGIDOR, *On the role of supercompact and extendible cardinals in logic*. ***Israel Journal of Mathematics***, vol. 10 (1971), no. 2, pp. 147–157,

[13] W. J. MITCHELL, *Adding closed unbounded subsets of* $\omega_2$ *with finite forcing*. ***Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic***, vol. 46 (2005), no. 3, pp. 357–371, 07.

[14] ———,$I\,[\omega_2]$ *can be the nonstationary ideal on*. ***Transactions of the American Mathematical Society***, vol. 361 (2009), no. 2, pp. 561–601.

[15] R. MOHAMMADPOUR and B. VELICKOVIĆ, *Guessing models and the approachability ideal*. ***Journal of Mathematical Logic***, vol. 21 (2021), no. 2, Paper No. 2150003, 35.

[16] S. TODORČEVIĆ, *Some combinatorial properties of trees*. ***Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society***, vol. 14 (1982), no. 3, pp. 213–217.

[17] B. VELICKOVIC, ***Iteration of Semiproper Forcing Revisited***, 2014, https://arxiv.org/abs/1410.5095.

[18] M. VIALE, *Guessing models and generalized Laver diamond*. ***Annals of Pure and Applied Logic***, vol. 163 (2012), no. 11, pp. 1660–1678.

[19] M. VIALE and C. WEIß, *On the consistency strength of the proper forcing axiom*. ***Advances in Mathematics***, vol. 228 (2011), no. 5, pp. 2672–2687.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[20] W. H. Woodin, *The continuum hypothesis, the generic-multiverse of sets, and the Ω conjecture*, ***Set Theory, Arithmetic, and Foundations of Mathematics: Theorems, Philosophies*** (J. Kennedy and R. Kossak, editors), volume 36 of Lecture Notes in Logic, Association for Symbolic Logic, La Jolla, 2011, pp. 13–42.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF THE POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (GDANSK BRANCH)
ANTONIEGO ABRAHAMA 18, 81-825, SOPOT
POLAND
*E-mail*: rahmanmohammadpour@gmail.com
*URL:* https://sites.google.com/site/rahmanmohammadpour

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU - PARIS RIVE GAUCHE
UNIVERSITÉ PARIS CITÉ 8 PLACE AURÉLIE NEMOURS
75205 PARIS CEDEX 13
FRANCE
*E-mail*: boban@math.univ-paris-diderot.fr
*URL:* http://www.logique.jussieu.fr/∼boban

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press