

Examples concerning iterated forcing II

Piotr Koszmider, piotr.koszmider@gmail.com

- 1 On Suslin-free forcings, finishing the consistency of $MA + \neg CH +$
There is no Kurepa tree

- 1 On Suslin-free forcings, finishing the consistency of $\text{MA} + \neg\text{CH} +$
There is no Kurepa tree
- 2 The question of forcing chains of functions $f_\xi : \omega_1 \rightarrow \omega_1$ increasing
modulo finite sets

Motivation: We will sketch the proof of the relative consistency
(assuming the existence of a strongly inaccessible cardinal) of $MA + \neg CH +$
 \neg There is no Kurepa tree

Motivation: We will sketch the proof of the relative consistency
(assuming the existence of a strongly inaccessible cardinal) of $MA + \neg CH +$
 \neg There is no Kurepa tree

Proof.

Preparatory stage

Motivation: We will sketch the proof of the relative consistency
(assuming the existence of a strongly inaccessible cardinal) of $MA + \neg CH +$
 $\neg CH +$ There is no Kurepa tree

Proof.

Preparatory stage

- 1 First (using an inaccessible cardinal) obtain the consistency of $CH +$
 $\neg CH +$ There is no Kurepa tree



Motivation: We will sketch the proof of the relative consistency (assuming the existence of a strongly inaccessible cardinal) of $MA + \neg CH +$ There is no Kurepa tree

Proof.

Preparatory stage

- 1 First (using an inaccessible cardinal) obtain the consistency of $CH +$ There is no Kurepa tree
- 2 And moreover for any c.c.c. forcing P of cardinality ω_1 $P \Vdash$ There is no Kurepa tree.



Motivation: We will sketch the proof of the relative consistency (assuming the existence of a strongly inaccessible cardinal) of $MA + \neg CH +$ There is no Kurepa tree

Proof.

Preparatory stage

- 1 First (using an inaccessible cardinal) obtain the consistency of $CH +$ There is no Kurepa tree
- 2 And moreover for any c.c.c. forcing P of cardinality ω_1 $P \Vdash$ There is no Kurepa tree.
- 3 Assume: no c.c.c. forcing P of cardinality ω_1 forces that there is Kurepa tree



Proof.

Main stage

Proof.

Main stage

- 1 Iterate all c.c.c forcings of cardinality ω_1 which do not add uncountable branches through ω_1 -trees



Proof.

Main stage

- 1 Iterate all c.c.c forcings of cardinality ω_1 which do not add uncountable branches through ω_1 -trees
- 2 Prove that if P is c.c.c. and adds an uncountable branch through an ω_1 -tree, then there is Q which is c.c.c., does not add uncountable branches through ω_1 -trees and

$Q \Vdash \check{P}$ is not c.c.c.



Proof.

Main stage

- 1 Iterate all c.c.c forcings of cardinality ω_1 which do not add uncountable branches through ω_1 -trees
- 2 Prove that if P is c.c.c. and adds an uncountable branch through an ω_1 -tree, then there is Q which is c.c.c., does not add uncountable branches through ω_1 -trees and

$Q \Vdash \check{P}$ is not c.c.c.

- 3 Prove that if for each $\beta < \alpha$ we have $P_\beta \Vdash \dot{Q}_\beta$ does not add an uncountable branches through ω_1 -trees, then P_α has this property as well as for each $\beta < \alpha$ we have that P_β forces that $P_{[\beta, \alpha]}$ has this property.



Theorem

Suppose that A is a complete c.c.c. Boolean algebra and let T be a tree of height ω_1 . If A^ adds a new branch through T , then A^* contains a reversed Souslin tree. In particular P^2 is not c.c.c.*

Theorem

Suppose that A is a complete c.c.c. Boolean algebra and let T be a tree of height ω_1 . If A^ adds a new branch through T , then A^* contains a reversed Souslin tree. In particular P^2 is not c.c.c.*

Proof.

Theorem

Suppose that A is a complete c.c.c. Boolean algebra and let T be a tree of height ω_1 . If A^* adds a new branch through T , then A^* contains a reversed Souslin tree. In particular P^2 is not c.c.c.

Proof.

- 1 Consider a downward closed subtree $T' \subseteq T$ of elements $t \in T$ such that there is $p \in A^*$ such that $p \Vdash \check{t} \in \dot{b}$



Theorem

Suppose that A is a complete c.c.c. Boolean algebra and let T be a tree of height ω_1 . If A^* adds a new branch through T , then A^* contains a reversed Souslin tree. In particular P^2 is not c.c.c.

Proof.

- 1 Consider a downward closed subtree $T' \subseteq T$ of elements $t \in T$ such that there is $p \in A^*$ such that $p \Vdash \check{t} \in \dot{b}$
- 2 There is an order reversing injection $f : T' \rightarrow A^*$ defined by $f(t) = [\check{t} \in \dot{b}]$ such that incomparable elements in T' are sent to incompatible conditions in A^*



Theorem

Suppose that A is a complete c.c.c. Boolean algebra and let T be a tree of height ω_1 . If A^* adds a new branch through T , then A^* contains a reversed Souslin tree. In particular P^2 is not c.c.c.

Proof.

- 1 Consider a downward closed subtree $T' \subseteq T$ of elements $t \in T$ such that there is $p \in A^*$ such that $p \Vdash \check{t} \in \dot{b}$
- 2 There is an order reversing injection $f : T' \rightarrow A^*$ defined by $f(t) = [\check{t} \in \dot{b}]$ such that incomparable elements in T' are sent to incompatible conditions in A^*
- 3 Since A^* is c.c.c. the image $f[T']$ is a c.c.c. reversed tree.



Theorem

Suppose that A is a complete c.c.c. Boolean algebra and let T be a tree of height ω_1 . If A^* adds a new branch through T , then A^* contains a reversed Souslin tree. In particular P^2 is not c.c.c.

Proof.

- 1 Consider a downward closed subtree $T' \subseteq T$ of elements $t \in T$ such that there is $p \in A^*$ such that $p \Vdash \check{t} \in \dot{b}$
- 2 There is an order reversing injection $f : T' \rightarrow A^*$ defined by $f(t) = [\check{t} \in \dot{b}]$ such that incomparable elements in T' are sent to incompatible conditions in A^*
- 3 Since A^* is c.c.c. the image $f[T']$ is a c.c.c reversed tree.
- 4 As $P \Vdash \dot{b} \neq \check{c}$ for any branch c of T , we conclude that $f[T']$ has height ω_1 and so is a Suslin tree.



Definition

Suppose T is a tree. Then P_T consists of finite functions $f : \text{dom}(f) \rightarrow N$ such that $\text{dom}(f) \in [T]^{<\omega}$ and $f^{-1}\{n\}$ are antichains.

Definition

Suppose T is a tree. Then P_T consists of finite functions $f : \text{dom}(f) \rightarrow N$ such that $\text{dom}(f) \in [T]^{<\omega}$ and $f^{-1}\{n\}$ are antichains.

Theorem

If T has no uncountable branches then P_T^n is c.c.c. for each $n \in N$. In particular, P_T does not add new uncountable branches.

Definition

Suppose T is a tree. Then P_T consists of finite functions $f : \text{dom}(f) \rightarrow N$ such that $\text{dom}(f) \in [T]^{<\omega}$ and $f^{-1}\{n\}$ are antichains.

Theorem

If T has no uncountable branches then P_T^n is c.c.c. for each $n \in N$. In particular, P_T does not add new uncountable branches.

Proof.

- Let $(f_1^\alpha, \dots, f_n^\alpha)$ be elements of P^n which form an antichain for $\alpha < \omega_1$



Definition

Suppose T is a tree. Then P_T consists of finite functions $f : \text{dom}(f) \rightarrow N$ such that $\text{dom}(f) \in [T]^{<\omega}$ and $f^{-1}\{n\}$ are antichains.

Theorem

If T has no uncountable branches then P_T^n is c.c.c. for each $n \in N$. In particular, P_T does not add new uncountable branches.

Proof.

- 1 Let $(f_1^\alpha, \dots, f_n^\alpha)$ be elements of P^n which form an antichain for $\alpha < \omega_1$
- 2 Let $a_\alpha = \text{dom}(f_1^\alpha) \cup \dots \cup \text{dom}(f_n^\alpha)$, assume they form a Δ -system



Definition

Suppose T is a tree. Then P_T consists of finite functions $f : \text{dom}(f) \rightarrow N$ such that $\text{dom}(f) \in [T]^{<\omega}$ and $f^{-1}\{n\}$ are antichains.

Theorem

If T has no uncountable branches then P_T^n is c.c.c. for each $n \in N$. In particular, P_T does not add new uncountable branches.

Proof.

- 1 Let $(f_1^\alpha, \dots, f_n^\alpha)$ be elements of P^n which form an antichain for $\alpha < \omega_1$
- 2 Let $a_\alpha = \text{dom}(f_1^\alpha) \cup \dots \cup \text{dom}(f_n^\alpha)$, assume they form a Δ -system
- 3 May w.l.o.g. assume that there are isomorphisms $\pi_{\alpha,\beta} : a_\alpha \rightarrow a_\beta$ which lifts up to isomorphisms of $(f_1^\alpha, \dots, f_n^\alpha)$ and $(f_1^\beta, \dots, f_n^\beta)$



- 1 Let $(f_1^\alpha, \dots, f_n^\alpha)$ be a “model” of such conditions with domain a and isomorphisms $\pi_\alpha : a \rightarrow a_\alpha$

- 1 Let $(f_1^\alpha, \dots, f_n^\alpha)$ be a “model” of such conditions with domain a and isomorphisms $\pi_\alpha : a \rightarrow a_\alpha$
- 2 Fix an ultrafilter u on ω_1 which does not contain any countable set

- 1 Let $(f_1^\alpha, \dots, f_n^\alpha)$ be a “model” of such conditions with domain a and isomorphisms $\pi_\alpha : a \rightarrow a_\alpha$
- 2 Fix an ultrafilter u on ω_1 which does not contain any countable set
- 3 There is $Y \in u$ such that for $\alpha \in Y$ there are $t, s \in a$ such that

$$X_\alpha = \{\beta \in \omega_1 : \pi_\alpha(t) \leq \pi_\beta(s)\} \in u$$

- 1 Let $(f_1^\alpha, \dots, f_n^\alpha)$ be a “model” of such conditions with domain a and isomorphisms $\pi_\alpha : a \rightarrow a_\alpha$
- 2 Fix an ultrafilter u on ω_1 which does not contain any countable set
- 3 There is $Y \in u$ such that for $\alpha \in Y$ there are $t, s \in a$ such that

$$X_\alpha = \{\beta \in \omega_1 : \pi_\alpha(t) \leq \pi_\beta(s)\} \in u$$

- 4 If $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in Y$ and $\beta \in X_{\alpha_1} \cap X_{\alpha_2}$, then $\pi_{\alpha_1}(t), \pi_{\alpha_2}(t) \leq \pi_\beta(s)$ and so $\pi_{\alpha_1}(t), \pi_{\alpha_2}(t)$ are compatible, hence we get an uncountable branch through T , a contradiction.

Theorem

If P is c.c.c and adds a new branch through an ω_1 -tree, then there is a c.c.c forcing Q that does not add a new branch through any ω_1 -tree and

$Q \Vdash \check{P}$ *is not c.c.c..*

Theorem

If P is c.c.c and adds a new branch through an ω_1 -tree, then there is a c.c.c forcing Q that does not add a new branch through any ω_1 -tree and

$$Q \Vdash \check{P} \text{ is not c.c.c..}$$

It is possible to add Martin's axiom without adding new branches through ω_1 -trees which appear in intermediate models.

Theorem

If P is c.c.c and adds a new branch through an ω_1 -tree, then there is a c.c.c forcing Q that does not add a new branch through any ω_1 -tree and

$$Q \Vdash \check{P} \text{ is not c.c.c..}$$

It is possible to add Martin's axiom without adding new branches through ω_1 -trees which appear in intermediate models.

Theorem

(Devlin) It is consistent that there is no Kurepa tree and $MA_+ \neg CH$ holds.

Theorem

(U. Abraham; S. Todorcevic) "There is a first countable S-space" is consistent with $MA_{\aleph_1} + \neg CH$

Theorem

(U. Abraham; S. Todorcevic) "There is a first countable S-space" is consistent with $MA_{+\neg}CH$

Theorem

(P.K.) "There is a countably tight compact space with no point of countable character" is consistent with $MA_{+\neg}CH$.

Theorem

(U. Abraham; S. Todorcevic) "There is a first countable S-space" is consistent with $MA_{+\neg}CH$

Theorem

(P.K.) "There is a countably tight compact space with no point of countable character" is consistent with $MA_{+\neg}CH$.

It is consistent that there are compact spaces K, L and continuous onto map $f : K \rightarrow L$ such that K is first countable and L has no point of countable character.

Definition

Let $f, g : \omega_1 \rightarrow \omega_1$

$$“ =_{f,g} ” = \{ \xi : f(\xi) = g(\xi) \}$$

$$“ >_{f,g} ” = \{ \xi : f(\xi) > g(\xi) \}$$

We say that $f \leq^* g$ if and only if $>_{f,g}$ is finite and $=_{f,g}$ is co-uncountable. A \leq^* -chain is called strong chain.

Definition

Let $f, g : \omega_1 \rightarrow \omega_1$

$$“ =_{f,g} ” = \{ \xi : f(\xi) = g(\xi) \}$$

$$“ >_{f,g} ” = \{ \xi : f(\xi) > g(\xi) \}$$

We say that $f \leq^* g$ if and only if $>_{f,g}$ is finite and $=_{f,g}$ is co-uncountable. A \leq^* -chain is called strong chain.

Definition

We say that $(X_\alpha : \alpha < \beta)$ is a strong chain of subsets of ω_1 iff for each $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \beta$ we have

$$|X_{\alpha_1} \setminus X_{\alpha_2}| < \omega \quad \& \quad |X_{\alpha_2} \setminus X_{\alpha_1}| > \omega.$$

Definition

Let $f, g : \omega_1 \rightarrow \omega_1$

$$“ =_{f,g} ” = \{ \xi : f(\xi) = g(\xi) \}$$

$$“ >_{f,g} ” = \{ \xi : f(\xi) > g(\xi) \}$$

We say that $f \leq^* g$ if and only if $>_{f,g}$ is finite and $=_{f,g}$ is co-uncountable. A \leq^* -chain is called strong chain.

Definition

We say that $(X_\alpha : \alpha < \beta)$ is a strong chain of subsets of ω_1 iff for each $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \beta$ we have

$$|X_{\alpha_1} \setminus X_{\alpha_2}| < \omega \quad \& \quad |X_{\alpha_2} \setminus X_{\alpha_1}| > \omega.$$

Fact: The existence of a strong chain of functions $\omega_1 \rightarrow \omega_1$ of length κ is equivalent to the existence of a strong chain of subsets of ω_1 of length κ .

Theorem

CH or CC (Chang's Conjecture) imply that there are no strong chains. So there is no ZFC c.c.c. notion of forcing which adds a strong chain.

Theorem

CH or CC (Chang's Conjecture) imply that there are no strong chains. So there is no ZFC c.c.c. notion of forcing which adds a strong chain.

Proof.

Theorem

CH or CC (Chang's Conjecture) imply that there are no strong chains. So there is no ZFC c.c.c. notion of forcing which adds a strong chain.

Proof.

Let $(X_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2)$ be a strong chain of subsets of ω_1 .

① There is $\gamma < \omega_1$ such that $|\{X_\alpha \cap \gamma : \alpha \in \omega_2\}| = \omega_2$



Theorem

CH or CC (Chang's Conjecture) imply that there are no strong chains. So there is no ZFC c.c.c. notion of forcing which adds a strong chain.

Proof.

Let $(X_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2)$ be a strong chain of subsets of ω_1 .

- 1 There is $\gamma < \omega_1$ such that $|\{X_\alpha \cap \gamma : \alpha \in \omega_2\}| = \omega_2$
- 2 There is $C \subseteq \omega_2$, $|C| = \omega_2$ and $(\gamma_\xi)_{\xi < \omega_1}$ such that $X_\alpha \cap [\gamma_\xi, \gamma_{\xi+1}) \subset X_\beta \cap [\gamma_\xi, \gamma_{\xi+1})$ for all $\alpha < \beta$, $\alpha, \beta \in C$ and $\xi < \omega_1$



Theorem

CH or CC (Chang's Conjecture) imply that there are no strong chains. So there is no ZFC c.c.c. notion of forcing which adds a strong chain.

Proof.

Let $(X_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2)$ be a strong chain of subsets of ω_1 .

- 1 There is $\gamma < \omega_1$ such that $|\{X_\alpha \cap \gamma : \alpha \in \omega_2\}| = \omega_2$
- 2 There is $C \subseteq \omega_2$, $|C| = \omega_2$ and $(\gamma_\xi)_{\xi < \omega_1}$ such that $X_\alpha \cap [\gamma_\xi, \gamma_{\xi+1}) \subset X_\beta \cap [\gamma_\xi, \gamma_{\xi+1})$ for all $\alpha < \beta$, $\alpha, \beta \in C$ and $\xi < \omega_1$
- 3 **CC implies that for any $c : [\omega_2]^2 \rightarrow \omega_1$ there is an uncountable $A \subseteq \omega_2$ and $\beta \in \omega_1$ such that $c[[A]^2] \subseteq \beta$.**



Forcing for adding strong chain: First add appropriate $c : [\omega_2]^2 \rightarrow \omega_1$ by a σ -closed forcing. Then force with P consisting of $p = (a_p, b_p, f_p)$ where

Forcing for adding strong chain: First add appropriate $c : [\omega_2]^2 \rightarrow \omega_1$ by a σ -closed forcing. Then force with P consisting of $p = (a_p, b_p, f_p)$ where

$$\textcircled{1} \quad a_p \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega}, b_p \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}, F_p = \{f_\alpha^p : \alpha \in a_p\} \text{ and } f_\alpha^p : b_p \rightarrow 2,$$

Forcing for adding strong chain: First add appropriate $c : [\omega_2]^2 \rightarrow \omega_1$ by a σ -closed forcing. Then force with P consisting of $p = (a_p, b_p, f_p)$ where

- 1 $a_p \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega}$, $b_p \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, $F_p = \{f_\alpha^p : \alpha \in a_p\}$ and $f_\alpha^p : b_p \rightarrow 2$,
- 2 $\forall \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_p \quad \text{dom } f_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}^p \cap b_p \subseteq c(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$

Forcing for adding strong chain: First add appropriate $c : [\omega_2]^2 \rightarrow \omega_1$ by a σ -closed forcing. Then force with P consisting of $p = (a_p, b_p, f_p)$ where

$$\textcircled{1} \quad a_p \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega}, b_p \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}, F_p = \{f_\alpha^p : \alpha \in a_p\} \text{ and } f_\alpha^p : b_p \rightarrow 2,$$

$$\textcircled{2} \quad \forall \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_p \quad \dot{\succ}_{f_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}^p} \cap b_p \subseteq c(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$$

$$\textcircled{3} \quad p \leq q \text{ iff } a_p \supseteq a_q, b_p \supseteq b_q, f_\alpha^p \supseteq f_\alpha^q \text{ for } \alpha \in a_q \text{ and} \\ \forall \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_q \quad \dot{\succ}_{f_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}^p} \cap b_p \Rightarrow \dot{\succ}_{f_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}^q} \cap b_q$$

Forcing for adding strong chain: First add appropriate $c : [\omega_2]^2 \rightarrow \omega_1$ by a σ -closed forcing. Then force with P consisting of $p = (a_p, b_p, f_p)$ where

$$\textcircled{1} \quad a_p \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega}, b_p \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}, F_p = \{f_\alpha^p : \alpha \in a_p\} \text{ and } f_\alpha^p : b_p \rightarrow 2,$$

$$\textcircled{2} \quad \forall \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_p \quad \alpha_1 >_{f_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}^p} \alpha_2 \implies b_p \subseteq c(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$$

$$\textcircled{3} \quad p \leq q \text{ iff } a_p \supseteq a_q, b_p \supseteq b_q, f_\alpha^p \supseteq f_\alpha^q \text{ for } \alpha \in a_q \text{ and} \\ \forall \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_q \quad \alpha_1 >_{f_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}^p} \alpha_2 \implies \alpha_1 >_{f_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}^q} \alpha_2$$

Forcing for adding strong chain: First add appropriate $c : [\omega_2]^2 \rightarrow \omega_1$ by a σ -closed forcing. Then force with P consisting of $p = (a_p, b_p, f_p)$ where

- 1 $a_p \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega}$, $b_p \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, $F_p = \{f_\alpha^p : \alpha \in a_p\}$ and $f_\alpha^p : b_p \rightarrow 2$,
- 2 $\forall \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_p \quad \bigcap_{f_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}^p} \cap b_p \subseteq c(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$
- 3 $p \leq q$ iff $a_p \supseteq a_q$, $b_p \supseteq b_q$, $f_\alpha^p \supseteq f_\alpha^q$ for $\alpha \in a_q$ and $\forall \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_q \quad \bigcap_{f_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}^p} \cap b_p \Rightarrow \bigcap_{f_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}^q} \cap b_q$

We will put $X_\alpha = \{\beta : f_\alpha^p(\beta) = 1, p \in G\}$ for a P -generic G .

Theorem

(Jensen) Square implies that there is a c.c.c. forcing which adds a Kurepa tree.

Theorem

(Jensen) Square implies that there is a c.c.c. forcing which adds a Kurepa tree.

Theorem

(Baumgartner, Shelah) It is consistent that there is a scattered compact space of Cantor-Bendixon height ω_2 and Cantor-Bendixon width ω .

Theorem

(Jensen) Square implies that there is a c.c.c. forcing which adds a Kurepa tree.

Theorem

(Baumgartner, Shelah) It is consistent that there is a scattered compact space of Cantor-Bendixon height ω_2 and Cantor-Bendixon width ω .

Theorem

(P.K.) It is consistent that there is a strong chain of subsets of ω_1 of length ω_2

Theorem

(Jensen) Square implies that there is a c.c.c. forcing which adds a Kurepa tree.

Theorem

(Baumgartner, Shelah) It is consistent that there is a scattered compact space of Cantor-Bendixon height ω_2 and Cantor-Bendixon width ω .

Theorem

(P.K.) It is consistent that there is a strong chain of subsets of ω_1 of length ω_2

Theorem

(P.K.) It is consistent that there is a WCG Banach spaces where all operators are in the sequential closure of the linear span of projections from a projectional resolution of the identity

Definition

Let $f, g : \omega_1 \rightarrow \omega_1$

$$\geq_{f,g} = \{\xi : f(\xi) \geq g(\xi)\}$$

We say that $f \ll g$ if and only if $\geq_{f,g}$ is finite. A \ll -chain is called very strong chain.

Definition

Let $f, g : \omega_1 \rightarrow \omega_1$

$$\geq_{f,g} = \{\xi : f(\xi) \geq g(\xi)\}$$

We say that $f \ll g$ if and only if $\geq_{f,g}$ is finite. A \ll -chain is called very strong chain.

Theorem

(CH) there is no c.c.c. forcing which adds a very strong chain. So it cannot be added by an iteration of a σ -closed followed by a c.c.c. forcing.

Forcing by conditions $p = (a_p, b_p, F_p, A_p)$, where

- 1 $0 \in a_p \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega}$, $b_p \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, $F_p = \{f_p^\alpha : \alpha \in a_p\}$, $A_p \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\omega}$,
and $f_p^\alpha : b_p \rightarrow \omega_1$, and for each $\beta \in b_p$ we have $f_p^0(\beta) = 0$

Forcing by conditions $p = (a_p, b_p, F_p, A_p)$, where

- 1 $0 \in a_p \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega}$, $b_p \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, $F_p = \{f_p^\alpha : \alpha \in a_p\}$, $A_p \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\omega}$,
and $f_p^\alpha : b_p \rightarrow \omega_1$, and for each $\beta \in b_p$ we have $f_p^0(\beta) = 0$
- 2 $\forall \beta \in b_p \forall \alpha \in a_p f_p^\alpha(\beta) < \Phi(\beta)$

Forcing by conditions $p = (a_p, b_p, F_p, A_p)$, where

- 1 $0 \in a_p \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega}$, $b_p \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, $F_p = \{f_p^\alpha : \alpha \in a_p\}$, $A_p \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\omega}$,
and $f_p^\alpha : b_p \rightarrow \omega_1$, and for each $\beta \in b_p$ we have $f_p^0(\beta) = 0$
- 2 $\forall \beta \in b_p \forall \alpha \in a_p f_p^\alpha(\beta) < \Phi(\beta)$
- 3 $\forall \beta \in b_p \forall \alpha_1 < \alpha_2; \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_p$, if $d_{A_p, \beta}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \neq 0$, then

$$f_p^{\alpha_2}(\beta) \geq f_p^{\alpha_1}(\beta) + d_{A_p, \beta}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$$

Forcing by conditions $p = (a_p, b_p, F_p, A_p)$, where

- 1 $0 \in a_p \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega}$, $b_p \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, $F_p = \{f_p^\alpha : \alpha \in a_p\}$, $A_p \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\omega}$,
and $f_p^\alpha : b_p \rightarrow \omega_1$, and for each $\beta \in b_p$ we have $f_p^0(\beta) = 0$
- 2 $\forall \beta \in b_p \forall \alpha \in a_p f_p^\alpha(\beta) < \Phi(\beta)$
- 3 $\forall \beta \in b_p \forall \alpha_1 < \alpha_2; \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_p$, if $d_{A_p, \beta}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \neq 0$, then

$$f_p^{\alpha_2}(\beta) \geq f_p^{\alpha_1}(\beta) + d_{A_p, \beta}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$$

- 4 $p \leq q$ iff $a_p \supseteq a_q$, $b_p \supseteq b_q$, $A_p \supseteq A_q$, $f_p^\alpha \supseteq f_q^\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in a_q$ and

Forcing by conditions $p = (a_p, b_p, F_p, A_p)$, where

- 1 $0 \in a_p \in [\omega_2]^{<\omega}$, $b_p \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, $F_p = \{f_p^\alpha : \alpha \in a_p\}$, $A_p \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\omega}$,
and $f_p^\alpha : b_p \rightarrow \omega_1$, and for each $\beta \in b_p$ we have $f_p^0(\beta) = 0$
- 2 $\forall \beta \in b_p \forall \alpha \in a_p f_p^\alpha(\beta) < \Phi(\beta)$
- 3 $\forall \beta \in b_p \forall \alpha_1 < \alpha_2; \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_p$, if $d_{A_p, \beta}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \neq 0$, then

$$f_p^{\alpha_2}(\beta) \geq f_p^{\alpha_1}(\beta) + d_{A_p, \beta}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$$

- 4 $p \leq q$ iff $a_p \supseteq a_q$, $b_p \supseteq b_q$, $A_p \supseteq A_q$, $f_p^\alpha \supseteq f_q^\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in a_q$ and
- 5 $\forall \beta \in b_p - b_q \forall \alpha_1 < \alpha_2; \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in a_q \quad f_p^{\alpha_2}(\beta) > f_p^{\alpha_1}(\beta)$

Theorem

(P.K.) It is consistent that there is a very strong chain of functions from ω_1 into ω_1 of length ω_2

Theorem

(C. Brech, P.K.) It is consistent that there is a compact hereditarily separable scattered compact space of Cantor-Bendixson height ω_2 and Cantor-Bendixson width ω .

Theorem

(P.K.) It is consistent that there is a very strong chain of functions from ω_1 into ω_1 of length ω_2

Theorem

(C. Brech, P.K.) It is consistent that there is a compact hereditarily separable scattered compact space of Cantor-Bendixson height ω_2 and Cantor-Bendixson width ω . It is consistent that there is a Banach space of density ω_2 with no uncountable biorthogonal system.