The stationary set splitting game*

Paul B. Larson   Saharon Shelah

November 6, 2018

Abstract

The *stationary set splitting game* is a game of perfect information of length ω_1 between two players, *unsplit* and *split*, in which *unsplit* chooses stationarily many countable ordinals and *split* tries to continuously divide them into two stationary pieces. We show that it is possible in ZFC to force a winning strategy for either player, or for neither. This gives a new counterexample to Σ_2^2 maximality with a predicate for the nonstationary ideal on ω_1, and an example of a consistently undetermined game of length ω_1 with payoff definable in the second-order monadic logic of order. We also show that the determinacy of the game is consistent with Martin's Axiom but not Martin's Maximum.

MSC2000: 03E35; 03E60

The *stationary set splitting game* ($\mathcal{SG}$) is a game of perfect information of length ω_1 between two players, *unsplit* and *split*. In each round α, *unsplit* either accepts or rejects α. If *unsplit* accepts α, then *split* puts α into one of two sets A and B. If *unsplit* rejects α then *split* does nothing. After all ω_1 many rounds have been played, *split* wins if *unsplit* has not accepted stationarily often, or if both of A and B are stationary.

In this note we prove that it is possible to force a winning strategy for either player in $\mathcal{SG}$, or for neither, and we also show that the determinacy of $\mathcal{SG}$ is consistent with Martin's Axiom but not Martin's Maximum [4]. We also present two guessing principles, $\mathcal{C}_s$ (*club for split*) and $\mathcal{D}_u$ (*diamond for unsplit*), which imply the existence of winning strategies for *split* and *unsplit*, respectively (and are therefore incompatible; see Theorems 1.5 and 1.8). These principles may be of independent interest.

---

1 Winning strategies

1.1 Strategies for *split*

A collection $\mathcal{X}$ of countable sets is *stationary* if for every function $F\colon [\bigcup \mathcal{X}]^{<\omega} \to \bigcup \mathcal{X}$ there is an element of $\mathcal{X}$ closed under F. A set $\mathcal{X}$ of countable sets is *projective stationary* [2] if for every stationary $S \subset \omega_1$ the set of $X \in \mathcal{X}$ with $X \cap \omega_1 \in S$ is stationary. We note that a partial order P is said to be *proper* if forcing with P preserves the stationarity (in the sense above) of stationary sets from the ground model (see [11]).

The following statement holds in fine structural models such as L. It is a strengthening of the principle $(+)$ used in [8]. Justin Moore has pointed out to us that his Mapping Reflection Principle [9] implies the failure of $(+)$. We note also that in the statement of $(+)$, "projective stationary" can be replaced with "club" without strengthening the statement. We do not know if that is the case for $\mathcal{C}+$.

1.1 Definition. Let $\mathcal{C}+$ be the statement that there exists a projective stationary set $\mathcal{X}$ consisting of countable elementary substructures of $H(\aleph_2)$ such that for all X, Y in $\mathcal{X}$ with $X \cap \omega_1 = Y \cap \omega_1$, either every for every club $C \subset \omega_1$ in X there is a club $D \subset \omega_1$ in Y with $D \cap X \subset C \cap X$, or for every for every club $D \subset \omega_1$ in Y there is a club $C \subset \omega_1$ in X with $C \cap X \subset D \cap X$.

Given a partial run of $\mathcal{SG}$ of length α, we let E_α be the set of $\beta < \alpha$ accepted by *unsplit*, and we let A_α, B_α be the partition of E_α chosen by *split*.

Theorem 1.2. *If $\mathcal{C}+$ holds then* split *has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{SG}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a set of countable elementary submodels of $H(\aleph_2)$ witnessing $\mathcal{C}+$, and for each $\alpha < \omega_1$ let $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$ be the set of $X \in \mathcal{X}$ with $X \cap \omega_1 = \alpha$. Let Z be the set of $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$ is nonempty (since $\mathcal{X}$ is projective stationary, this set contains a club).

Play for *split* as follows. In round $\alpha \in Z$, if *unsplit* accepts α, let $\mathcal{Y}_\alpha$ be the set of all $X \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha$ such that X contains a stationary subset of ω_1, E_X, such that $E_X \cap \alpha = E_\alpha$. If $\mathcal{Y}_\alpha = \emptyset$, put $\alpha \in A_{\alpha+1}$. Otherwise, since every club subset of ω_1 in every member of $\mathcal{Y}_\alpha$ intersects E_α, there cannot be two club subsets of ω_1 in $\bigcup \mathcal{Y}_\alpha$, one disjoint from A_α and one disjoint from B_α, since some club subset of ω_1 in $\bigcup \mathcal{Y}_\alpha$ would be contained in both of these clubs. If any member of $\mathcal{Y}_\alpha$ contains a club subset of ω_1 disjoint from A_α, then put α in $A_{\alpha+1}$, and if any member of $\mathcal{Y}_\alpha$ contains a club subset of ω_1 disjoint from B_α, then put α in $B_{\alpha+1}$. If neither case holds, put $\alpha \in A_{\alpha+1}$.

Let E be the play by *unsplit* in a run of $\mathcal{SG}$ where *split* has played by this strategy, and let A and B be the corresponding play by *split*. Let C be a club subset of ω_1 and supposing that E is stationary, fix $X \in \mathcal{X}$ containing E, A, B and C with $X \cap \omega_1 \in E \cap C$. Then if $A \cap C \cap X \cap \omega_1 = \emptyset$, then $X \cap \omega_1 \in A \cap C$, and if $B \cap C \cap X \cap \omega_1 = \emptyset$, then $X \cap \omega_1 \in B \cap C$, which shows that C does not witness that *unsplit* won this run of the game. $\square$

The following fact, in conjunction with Theorem 1.2, shows that Martin's Axiom is consistent with the existence of a winning strategy for *split*.

Theorem 1.3. *The statement $\mathcal{C}+$ is preserved by forcing with c.c.c. partial orders.*

Proof. Let P be a c.c.c. forcing and let $\mathcal{X}$ witness $\mathcal{C}+$. Let γ be a regular cardinal greater than $\aleph_2$ and $2^{|P|}$. Let $G \subset P$ be a V-generic filter, and let

$$\mathcal{X}[G] = \{X[G] \cap H(\aleph_2)^{V[G]} : X \prec H(\gamma)^V, X \cap H(\aleph_2)^V \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

Since every club subset of ω_1 in $V[G]$ contains one in V, in order to show that $\mathcal{X}[G]$ witnesses $\mathcal{C}+$ in $V[G]$, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{X}[G]$ is projective stationary there. Fix a P-name ρ for a function from $[H(\aleph_2)^{V[G]}]^{<\omega}$ to $H(\aleph_2)^{V[G]}$. For any countable $X \prec H(\gamma)$ with $X \cap H(\aleph_2) \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\rho \in X$, $X[G] \cap H(\aleph_2)^{V[G]}$ is in $\mathcal{X}[G]$ and closed under the realization of ρ. Fix a P-name τ for a stationary subset of ω_1 and a condition $p \in P$. Let S be the set of countable ordinals forced to be in τ by some condition below p. Then exist a countable $X \prec H(\gamma)$ with $X \cap H(\aleph_2) \in \mathcal{X}$, $X \cap \omega_1 \in S$ and $\rho \in X$ and a condition q below p forcing that $X[\dot{G}] \cap \omega_1$ (where $\dot{G}$ is the name for the generic filter) is in the realization of τ. By genericity, then, $\mathcal{X}[G]$ is projective stationary. $\qquad\square$

We do not know how to force $\mathcal{C}+$, however, and use a different principle to force the existence of a winning strategy for *split*.

1.4 Definition. Let $\mathcal{C}_s$ be the statement that there exist c_α ($\alpha < \omega_1$ limit) such that each c_α is a sequence $\langle a_\beta^\alpha : \beta < \gamma_\alpha \rangle$ (for some countable γ_α) of cofinal subsets of α of orderype ω and

- for all limit $\alpha < \omega_1$ and all $\beta < \beta' < \gamma_\alpha$, $a_{\beta'}^\alpha \setminus a_\beta^\alpha$ is finite;

- for every club $C \subset \omega_1$ and every stationary $E \subset \omega_1$ there exists an a_β^α with $\alpha \in E$ such that $a_\beta^\alpha \setminus C$ is finite and $a_\beta^\alpha \cap E$ is infinite.

The principle $\mathcal{C}_s$ also holds in fine structural models such as L. The winning strategy for *split* given by $\mathcal{C}_s$ is very similar to the one given by $\mathcal{C}+$.

Theorem 1.5. *If $\mathcal{C}_s$ holds then* split *has a winning strategy in* $\mathcal{SG}$.

Proof. Let a_β^α ($\alpha < \omega_1$ limit, $\beta < \gamma_\alpha$) witness $\mathcal{C}_s$. Play for *split* as follows. In round α, α a limit, if *unsplit* has accepted α and if some a_β^α intersects A_α infinitely and B_α finitely, then put α in $B_{\alpha+1}$. If some a_β^α intersects B_α infinitely and A_α finitely, then put α in $A_{\alpha+1}$. Since the a_β^α's ($\beta < \gamma_\alpha$) are $\subset$-decreasing mod finite, both cases cannot occur. If neither case occurs, put α in $A_{\alpha+1}$.

Let E be the play by *unsplit* in a run of $\mathcal{SG}$ where *split* has played by this strategy, and let A and B be the corresponding play by *split*. Let C be a club subset of ω_1 and supposing that E is stationary, fix a_β^α with $\alpha \in E$ such that $a_\beta^\alpha \setminus C$ is finite and $a_\beta^\alpha \cap E$ is infinite. Then if $A \cap a_\beta^\alpha$ is finite, then $\alpha \in A \cap C$, and if $B \cap a_\beta^\alpha$ is finite, then $\alpha \in B \cap C$, which shows that C does not witness that *unsplit* won this run of the game. $\qquad\square$

A partial order P is said to be *strategically ω-closed* if there exists a function $f\colon P^{<\omega} \to \mathcal{P}(P)$ such that whenever $\langle p_i : i \le n \rangle$ is a finite descending sequence in P, $f(\langle p_i : i \le n \rangle)$ is a dense subset below p_n and, whenever $\langle p_i : i < \omega \rangle$ is a descending sequence in P such that for each n there exists a j with

$$p_j \in f(\langle p_i : i \le n \rangle),$$

the sequence has a lower bound in P. It is easy to see that strategic ω-closure is equal to the property that for every countable $X \prec H((2^{|P|})^+)$ and every (X, P)-generic filter g contained in X there is a condition in P extending g.

Let us say that a set a *captures* a pair E, C if $a \setminus C$ is finite and $a \cap E$ is infinite. Given $A \subset \omega_1$, let $\mathbb{C}(A)$ be the partial order which adds a club subset of A by initial segments. We force $\mathcal{C}_s$ by first adding a potential $\mathcal{C}_s$-sequence by initial segments, and then iterating to kill off every counterexample.

We refer the reader to [11] for background on countable support iterations of proper forcing.

Theorem 1.6. *Suppose that CH and $2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_2$ hold. Let $\bar{P} = \langle P_\eta, Q_\eta : \eta < \omega_2 \rangle$ be a countable support iteration such that P_0 is the partial order consisting of sequences $\langle c_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \text{ limit} \rangle$, for some countable ordinal δ, such that each c_α is a sequence $\langle a^\alpha_\beta : \beta < \gamma_\alpha \rangle$ (for some countable ordinal γ_α) of cofinal subsets of α of ordertype ω, deceasing by mod-finite inclusion (and P_0 is ordered by extension). Suppose that the remainder of $\bar{P}$ satisfies the following conditions.*

- *For each nonzero $\eta < \omega_2$ there is a P_η-name τ_η for a subset of ω_1 such that if $(\tau_\eta)_{G_\eta}$ (where G_η is the restriction of the generic filter to P_η) is stationary in the P_η extension and there exists a club $C \subset \omega_1$ in this extension such that no a^α_β with $\alpha \in \tau_{G_\eta}$ captures the pair τ_{G_η}, C, then $\underset{\sim}{Q_\eta}$ is $\mathbb{C}(\omega_1 \setminus (\tau_\eta)_{G_\eta})$ (and otherwise, $\underset{\sim}{Q_\eta}$ is $\mathbb{C}(\omega_1)$).*

- *For every pair E, C of subsets of ω_1 in any P_η-extension ($\eta < \omega_2$), if E is stationary in this extension and C is club and no a^α_β with $\alpha \in E$ captures E, C, then there is a $\rho \in [\eta, \omega_2)$ such that if E is stationary in the P_ρ extension, then $\underset{\sim}{Q_\rho}$ is $\mathbb{C}(\omega_1 \setminus E)$.*

Then $\bar{P}$ is strategically ω-closed, and $\mathcal{C}_s$ holds in the $\bar{P}$-extension. Furthermore, in the $\bar{P}$ extension, $\Diamond(S)$ holds for every stationary $S \subset \omega_1$.

Proof. Let X be a countable elementary submodel of $H((2^{|\bar{P}|})^+)$ with $\bar{P} \in X$, let g be an X-generic filter contained in $\bar{P} \cap X$. Let $\gamma_{X \cap \omega_1}$ be the ordertype of $X \cap \omega_2$, and for each $\beta < \gamma_{X \cap \omega_1}$, let η_β be the βth member of $X \cap \omega_2$. For each $\beta < \gamma_{X \cap \omega_1}$, let $a^{X \cap \omega_1}_\beta$ be a cofinal subset of $X \cap \omega_1$ of ordertype ω such that, letting g_η denote the restriction of g to P_η,

- *for all $\beta' < \beta < \gamma_{X \cap \omega_1}$, $a^{X \cap \omega_1}_\beta \setminus a^{X \cap \omega_1}_{\beta'}$ is finite;*

- a^α_β is eventually contained in every club subset of ω_1 in $X[g_{\eta_\beta}]$ and intersects infinitely every stationary subset of ω_1 in every $X[g_{\eta_{\beta'}}]$, $\beta' \in [\beta, \gamma_{X \cap \omega_1})$.

It remains to see that we can extend g to a condition whose first coordinate is given by adding $c_{X \cap \omega_1} = \langle a_\beta^\alpha : \beta < \gamma_{X \cap \omega_1} \rangle$ to the union of the first coordinates of the elements of g, and whose ηth coordinate, for each nonzero $\eta \in X \cap \omega_2$ is the condition given by the union of $\{X \cap \omega_1\}$ and the set of realizations of the ηth coordinates of the members of g. We do this by induction on η, letting g'_η be our extended condition in P_η.

For each $\eta \in \omega_2 \cap X$, there is a P_η-name $\sigma \in X$ for a club subset of ω_1 such that if, in the P_η-extension $(\tau_\eta)_{G_\eta}$ is stationary and there exists a club C such that τ_{G_η}, C is not captured by any a_β^α with $\alpha \in (\tau_\eta)_{G_\eta}$, then σ_{G_η} is such a C. However, the realizations of τ_η and σ by g are captured by $a_{o.t.(\eta \cap \omega_2)}^{X \cap \omega_1}$, so g'_η forces that $\tau_{G_\eta}, \sigma_{G_\eta}$ is captured by $a_{o.t.(\eta \cap \omega_2)}^{X \cap \omega_1}$. It follows that g'_η forces that either Q_η is $\mathbb{C}(\omega_1)$, or $X \cap \omega_1$ is not in τ_{G_η}. In either case, the union of the members of $g \cap \underset{\sim}{Q}_\eta$ be can extended to a condition in Q_η by adding $\{X \cap \omega_1\}$.

To see that $\underset{\sim}{\diamondsuit}(S)$ holds for every stationary $S \subset \underset{\sim}{\omega}_1$ in the $\bar{P}$ extension, fix such an S in the P_α extension for some $\alpha < \omega_2$. Since $\bar{P}$ is (ω, ∞) distributive, there exists in this extension a set $\langle e_\beta^\delta : \delta, \beta < \omega_1 \rangle$ such that for every $\delta < \omega_1$ and every $x \subset \delta$ there are uncountably many β such that $e_\beta^\delta = x$. Then, letting $T \in \mathcal{P}(\omega_1)^{V[G_\alpha]}$ be the set such that the realization of $\underset{\sim}{Q}_\alpha$ is $\mathbb{C}(T)$, Q_α adds a $\diamondsuit$ sequence $\langle b_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ defined by letting b_δ be e_β^δ, where the βth element of T above β is the first element of the generic club for Q_α above δ. To see that this is a $\diamondsuit$ sequence, note that since S is stationary in the $\bar{P}$ extension, there are stationarily many elementary submodels X of any sufficiently large $H(\theta)^{V[G]}$ in this extension with $X \cap \omega_1 \in S$. Then $X \cap (G/G_\alpha)$ is a $(X \cap V[G_\alpha], \bar{P}/P_\alpha)$-generic filter which can be extended to a condition in $\bar{P}/P_\alpha$ by adding $X \cap \omega_1$ to each coordinate, and extended again to make any element of $T \setminus ((X \cap \omega_1) + 1)$ the least element of the generic club for Q_α above $X \cap \omega_1$. That $\langle b_\beta : \beta \in S \rangle$ is a $\underset{\sim}{\diamondsuit}$ sequence then follows by genericity. $\square$

Section 2 shows that proper forcing does not always preserve the existence of a winning strategy for *split*.

1.2 A strategy for *unsplit*

In this section we show that it is consistent for *unsplit* to have a winning strategy in $\mathcal{SG}$. We do this via the following guessing principle.

1.7 Definition. Let $\mathcal{D}_u$ be the statement that there exists a diamond sequence $\langle \sigma_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ such that for every $E \subset \omega_1$ there is a club $C \subset \omega_1$ such that either

$$\forall \alpha \in C((E \cap \alpha = \sigma_\alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha \in E)$$

or

$$\forall \alpha \in C((E \cap \alpha = \sigma_\alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha \notin E).$$

Theorem 1.8. *If $\mathcal{D}_u$ holds then* unsplit *has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{SG}$.*

Proof. Let $\langle \sigma_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ witness $\mathcal{D}_u$. Play for *unsplit* by accepting α if and only if $\sigma_\alpha = A_\alpha$. At the end of the game, the set of α such that $\sigma_\alpha = A_\alpha$ is stationary, and there is a club C such that either for all α in C, if $\sigma_\alpha = A_\alpha$, then α is in A, or for all α in C, if $\sigma_\alpha = A_\alpha$, then α is in B. In either case, *split* has lost. $\qquad\square$

Our iteration to force $\mathcal{D}_u$ employs the same strategy as the iteration for $\mathcal{C}_s$. We first force to add a $\diamondsuit$-sequence $\langle \sigma_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ by initial segments, and we then iterate to make this sequence witness $\mathcal{D}_u$, iteratively forcing a club through the set of $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that $\sigma_\alpha \neq E \cap \alpha$ or $\alpha \in E$ for each $E \subset \omega_1$ such that the sets $\{\alpha \in E \mid \sigma_\alpha = E \cap \alpha\}$ and $\{\alpha \in \omega_1 \setminus E \mid \sigma_\alpha = E \cap \alpha\}$ are both stationary.

More specifically, we have the following. Given a sequence $\Sigma = \langle \sigma_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ such that each σ_α is a subset of α, and given $E \subset \omega_1$, let $A(\Sigma, E)$ be the set of $\alpha \in E$ such that $\sigma_\alpha = E \cap \alpha$, and let $B(\Sigma, E)$ be the set of $\alpha \in \omega_1 \setminus E$ such that $\sigma_\alpha = E \cap \alpha$.

Theorem 1.9. *Suppose that $CH + 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_2$ holds, and let $\bar{P}$ be a countable support iteration $\langle P_\alpha, Q_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2 \rangle$ such that P_0 is the partial order consisting of sequences $\langle \sigma_\beta : \beta < \gamma \rangle$, for some countable ordinal γ, such that each σ_β is a subset of β, ordered by extension. Let Σ be the sequence added by P_0 and suppose that the remainder of $\bar{P}$ satisfies the following conditions.*

- *Each $\underset{\sim}{Q}_\alpha$ is either $\mathbb{C}(\omega_1)$ or $\mathbb{C}(\omega_1 \setminus B(\Sigma, E))$ for some $E \subset \omega_1$ such that $A(\Sigma, E)$ and $B(\Sigma, E)$ are both stationary.*

- *For every $E \subset \omega_1$ in any P_α-extension ($\alpha < \omega_2$) there is a $\gamma \in [\alpha, \omega_2)$ such that if $A(\Sigma, E)$ and $B(\Sigma, E)$ are both stationary in the P_γ extension, then $\underset{\sim}{Q}_\gamma$ is $\mathbb{C}(\omega_1 \setminus B(\Sigma, E))$.*

Then $\bar{P}$ is strategically ω-closed, and in the $\bar{P}$-extension, $\mathcal{D}_u$ holds. Furthermore, in the $\bar{P}$ extension, $\diamondsuit(S)$ holds for every stationary $S \subset \omega_1$.

Proof. The iteration $\bar{P}$ is clearly strategically ω-closed, since for any countable $X \prec H((2^{|\bar{P}|})^+)$ and any $(X, \bar{P})$-generic filter g contained in X, one can extend g to a condition by making $\sigma_{X \cap \omega_1}$ unequal to the realization by g of any name in X for a subset of ω_1, and adding $X \cap \omega_1$ to all the clubs being added by the $\underset{\sim}{Q}_\alpha$'s, $\alpha \in X \cap \omega_2$. It is clear also that in the $\bar{P}$-extension there is no $E \subset \omega_1$ such that $A(\Sigma, E)$ and $B(\Sigma, E)$ are both stationary.

To see that at least one of $A(\Sigma, E)$ and $B(\Sigma, E)$ is stationary for each $E \subset \omega_1$, we first note the following.

Claim 1. *Suppose that $E \subset \omega_1$ is a member of the P_α extension, for some $\alpha < \omega_2$, and $A(\Sigma, E)$ is stationary in this extension. Then $A(\Sigma, E)$ remains stationary in the $\bar{P}$ extension.*

Note that $A(\Sigma, E)$ has countable intersection with $B(\Sigma, F)$, for every $F \subset \omega_1$. Fix $X \prec H(((2^{|\bar{P}|})^+)^V)^{V[G_\alpha]}$ (where G_α is the restriction of the generic

filter G to P_α) with $X \cap \omega_1 \in A(\Sigma, E)$ and $A(\Sigma, E) \in X$. Then any $(X, \bar{P}/P_\alpha)$-generic filter contained in X can be extended to a condition by adding $X \cap \omega_1$ to the clubs being added at every stage of $\bar{P}$ after the first.

Similar reasoning shows the following two facts, which complete the proof that Σ witnesses $\mathcal{D}_u$ in the $\bar{P}$ extension.

Claim 2. *Suppose that $E \subset \omega_1$ is a member of the P_α extension, for some $\alpha < \omega_2$, and not a member of the P_γ extension, for any $\gamma < \alpha$. Then $A(\Sigma, E) \cup B(\Sigma, E)$ is stationary in the P_α extension.*

To see Claim 2, let τ be a P_α-name for a subset of ω_1 which is forced to be unequal to any such subset in any P_γ extension, for any $\gamma < \alpha$. Fix $X \prec H(((2^{|\bar{P}|})^+))^V$ with $\tau \in X$. Let g be an (X, P_α)-generic filter, and note that the realization of $\tau{\restriction}(X \cap \omega_1)$ by g is different from the realizations of $\rho{\restriction}(X \cap \omega_1)$ by g for any P_γ-name $\rho \in X$ for a subset of ω_1, for any $\gamma \in X \cap \alpha$. It follows that adding the realization of $\tau{\restriction}(X \cap \omega_1)$ by g to the union of the first coordinate projection of g gives a condition in P_0 forcing that $X \cap \omega_1$ is not in any $\Sigma(B, \rho_{G_\gamma})$, for any for any P_γ-name $\rho \in X$ for a subset of ω_1, for any $\gamma \in X \cap \alpha$. Therefore, we can add $X \cap \omega_1$ to the clubs being added in every other stage of $\bar{P}$ in $X \cap \alpha$, and get a condition extending every condition in g.

Claim 3. *Suppose that $E \subset \omega_1$ is a member of the P_α extension, for some $\alpha < \omega_2$, and $A(\Sigma, E)$ is nonstationary in this extension. Then $B(\Sigma, E)$ remains stationary in the $\bar{P}$ extension.*

This is similar to the previous claims, noting that every subsequent stage of $\bar{P}$ forces a club though the complement of a set with countable intersection with $B(\Sigma, E)$.

The proof that $\diamondsuit(S)$ holds for every stationary $S \subset \omega_1$ in the $\bar{P}$ extension is (literally) the same as in the proof of Theorem 1.6. □

Note that that the iterations $\bar{P}$ in Theorems 1.6 and 1.9 are strategically ω-closed.

1.3 Σ_2^2 maximality

The statements that *split* and *unsplit* have winning strategies in $\mathcal{SG}$ are each Σ_2^2 in a predicate for NS_{ω_1}, and they are obviously not consistent with each other. Woodin (see [6]) has shown that if there is a proper class of measurable Woodin cardinals, then there exists in a forcing extension a transitive class model of ZFC satisfying all Σ_2^2 sentences ϕ such that $\phi + \mathrm{CH}$ can be forced over the ground model. The results here show that this result cannot be extended to include a predicate for NS_{ω_1}. This was known already, in that $\diamondsuit^*$ (in the sense of [7]) and "the restriction of NS_{ω_1} to some stationary set is $\aleph_1$ dense" were both known to be consistent with $\diamondsuit$ (the second of these is due to Woodin, uses large cardinals and is unpublished, though a related proof, also due to Woodin, appears in [3]). Our example is simpler and doesn't use large cardinals; it also gives (we believe, for the first time) a counterexample consisting of two sentences each consistent with "$\diamondsuit(S)$ holds for every stationary set $S \subset \omega_1$."

1.4 A determined variation

There are many natural variations of $\mathcal{SG}$. We show that one such variation is determined.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the following game of length ω_1. In round α, player I puts α into one of two sets E_0 and E_1, and player II puts α into one of two sets A_0 and A_1. After all ω_1 rounds have been played, II wins if one of the following pairs of set are both stationary.*

- *$E_0 \cap A_0$ and $E_0 \cap A_1$*

- *$E_1 \cap A_0$ and $E_1 \cap A_1$*

Then II has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}$.

Proof. Let B_{00}, B_{01}, B_{10} and B_{11} be pairwise disjoint stationary subsets of ω_1. In round α, if α is in B_{ij}, let II put α in A_i if I put α in E_0 and in A_j otherwise. Then after all ω_1 many rounds have been played, suppose that $A_i \cap E_0$ is nonstationary. Then B_{i0} and B_{i1} are both contained in E_1 modulo NS_{ω_1}, which means that $E_1 \cap A_0$ and $E_1 \cap A_1$ are both stationary. Similarly, if $A_i \cap E_1$ is nonstationary then B_{0i} and B_{1i} are both contained in E_0 modulo NS_{ω_1}, which means that $E_0 \cap A_0$ and $E_0 \cap A_1$ are both stationary. $\square$

2 Indeterminacy from forcing axioms

The axiom PFA^{+2} says that whenever P is a proper partial order, D_α ($\alpha < \omega_1$) are dense subsets of P and σ_1, σ_2 are P-names for stationary subsets of ω_1, there is a filter $G \subset P$ such that $G \cap D_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ for each $\alpha < \omega_1$, and such that $\{\alpha < \omega_1 \mid \exists p \in G \; p \Vdash \check{\alpha} \in \sigma_i\}$ is stationary for each $i \in \{1,2\}$. Theorems 1.6 and 1.9 together show that PFA^{+2} implies the indeterminacy of $\mathcal{SG}$. Furthermore, a straightforward argument shows that the following statement implies the nonexistence of a winning strategy for *unsplit* in $\mathcal{SG}$, where $Add(1,\omega_1)$ is the partial order that adds a subset of ω_1 by initial segments : for any pair σ_1,σ_2 of $Add(1,\omega_1)$-names for stationary subsets of ω_1, there is a filter $G \subset Add(1,\omega_1)$ realizing both σ_1 and σ_2 as stationary sets. This statement is trivially subsumed by PFA^{+2}, but also holds in the collapse of a sufficiently large cardinal to be ω_2, and thus is consistent with CH.

The axiom Martin's Maximum [4] says that whenever P is a partial order such that forcing with P preserves stationary subsets of ω_1 and D_α ($\alpha < \omega_1$) are dense subsets of P, there is a filter $G \subset P$ such that $G \cap D_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ for each $\alpha < \omega_1$.

Theorem 2.1. *Martin's Maximum implies that $\mathcal{SG}$ is undetermined.*

Proof. Fix a strategy Σ for *unsplit* in $\mathcal{SG}$, and let E, A, and B be the result of a generic run of $\mathcal{SG}$ where *unsplit* plays by Σ (the partial order consists of countable partial plays where *unsplit* plays by Σ, ordered by extension). If the

complement of E has stationary intersection with every stationary subset of ω_1 in the ground model, one can force to kill the stationarity of E in such a way that the induced two step forcing preserves stationary subsets of ω_1 and produces a run of $\mathcal{SG}$ where *unsplit* plays by Σ and loses. If the complement of E does not have stationary intersection with some stationary $F \subset \omega_1$ in the ground model, then there is a partial run of the game p and a name τ for a club such that p forces that E will contain $F \cap \tau_G$. Then there exists in the ground model a run of $\mathcal{SG}$ extending p in which *unsplit* plays by Σ and loses: *split* picks a pair of disjoint stationary subsets F_0, F_1 of F, and plays so that

- for every $\alpha < \omega_1$, some initial segment of the play forces some ordinal greater than α to be in τ,

- whenever *unsplit* accepts $\alpha \in F$, *split* puts α in A if $\alpha \in F_0$ and puts $\alpha \in B$ if $\alpha \in F_1$.

Now fix a strategy Σ for *split* in $\mathcal{SG}$, and generically add a regressive function f on ω_1 by initial segments. Let $E^\alpha = f^{-1}(\alpha)$ and let A^α, B^α be the responses given by Σ to a play of E^α by *unsplit*. Note that each E^α will be stationary.

Suppose that there exist an $\alpha < \omega_1$ and stationary sets S, T in the ground model such that $(S \cap E^\alpha) \setminus A^\alpha$ and $(T \cap E^\alpha) \setminus B^\alpha$ are both nonstationary. Then there is a condition p in our forcing (i.e., a regressive function on some countable ordinal) such that p forces that $(S \cap E^\alpha) \subset A^\alpha$ and $(T \cap E^\alpha) \subset B^\alpha$, modulo nonstationarity (and so in particular S and T have nonstationary intersection). Let τ be a name for a club disjoint from $(S \cap E^\alpha) \setminus A^\alpha$ and $(T \cap E^\alpha) \setminus B^\alpha$. Extend p to a filter f (identified with the corresponding function) realizing τ as a club subset of ω_1, at successor stages extending to add a new element to the realization of τ, and at limit stages (when for some $\beta < \omega$, $f{\restriction}\beta$ has been decided and $f(\beta)$ has not, and β is forced by $f{\restriction}\beta$ to be a limit member of the realization of τ) extending so that $f(\beta) = \alpha$ if and only if $\beta \in S$. Then the run of $\mathcal{SG}$ corresponding to $f^{-1}(\alpha)$ is winning for *unsplit*, since the corresponding set B^α is nonstationary.

If there exist no such α, S, T, there is a function h on ω_1 such that each $h(\alpha) \in \{A^\alpha, B^\alpha\}$ and the forcing to shoot a club through the set of β such that $f(\beta) = \alpha \Rightarrow \beta \in h(\alpha)$ preserves stationary subsets of the ground model. Then Martin's Maximum applied to the corresponding two step forcing produces a run of $\mathcal{SG}$ (the run for any $f^{-1}(\alpha)$ which is stationary) where *split* plays by Σ and loses. $\qquad\square$

Theorem 2.1 leads to the following question.

2.2 Question. Does the Proper Forcing Axiom imply that $\mathcal{SG}$ is not determined?

The following question is also interesting. The consistency of the $\aleph_1$-density of NS_{ω_1} (relative to the consistency of $\mathrm{AD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$) is shown in [13].

2.3 Question. Does the $\aleph_1$-density of NS_{ω_1} decide the determinacy of $\mathcal{SG}$?

3 MLO games

The second-order Monadic Logic of Order (MLO) is an extension of first-order logic with logical constants $=$, $\in$ and $\subset$ and a binary symbol $<$ as the only non-logical constant, allowing quantification over subsets of the domain. Every ordinal is a model for MLO, interpreting $<$ as $\in$.

Given an ordinal α, an MLO game of length α is determined by an MLO formula ϕ with two free variables for subsets of the domain. In such a game, two players each build a subset of α, and the winner is determined by whether these two sets satisfy the formula in α.

Büchi and Landweber [1] proved the determinacy of all MLO games of length ω. Recently, Shomrat [12] extended this result to games of length less than ω^ω, and Rabinovich [10] extended it further to all MLO games of countable length. The stationary set splitting game is an example of an MLO game of length ω_1 whose determinacy is independent of ZFC.

We thank Assaf Rinot for pointing out to us the connection between $\mathcal{SG}$ and MLO games.

References

[1] J.R. Büchi, L.H. Landweber, *Solving sequential conditions by finite-state strategies*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 138 (Apr. 1969), 295-311

[2] Q. Feng, T. Jech, *Projective stationary sets and a strong reflection principle*, J. London Math. Soc. 58 (1998), 271-283

[3] M. Foreman, *Ideals and generic elementary embeddings*, Handbook of Set Theory, Foreman, Kanamori eds., to appear

[4] M. Foreman, M. Magidor, S. Shelah, *Martin's Maximum. saturated ideals, and non-regular ultrafilters. Part I*, Annals of Mathematics, 127 (1988), 1-47

[5] T. Jech, *Set Theory*, The third millennium edition, revised and expanded. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003

[6] R. Ketchersid, P. Larson, J, Zapletal, Σ_2^2-*maximality, homogeneity and the stationary tower*, preprint

[7] K. Kunen, *Set Theory*, North-Holland, 1980

[8] P. Larson, *The canonical function game*, Archive Math. Logic 44 (2005), # 7, 817-827

[9] J. Moore, *Set Mapping Reflection*, J. Math. Logic 5 (2005), # 1, 87-98

[10] A. Rabinovich, *The Church problem for countable ordinals*, preprint, 2007

[11] S. Shelah, *Proper and improper forcing*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998

[12] A. Shomrat, *Uniformization problems in the monadic theory of countable ordinals*, manuscript, 2006

[13] W.H. Woodin, *The axiom of determinacy, forcing axioms and the nonstationary ideal*, de Gruyter Series in Logic and its Applications 1, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1999

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056, USA; Email: `larsonpb@muohio.edu`

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, Jersalem 91904, Israel

Department of Mathematics, Hill Center - Busch Campus, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019, USA; Email: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`