A SACKS REAL OUT OF NOWHERE

JAKOB KELLNER† AND SAHARON SHELAH‡

Abstract. There is a proper countable support iteration of length $\omega$ adding no new reals at finite stages and adding a Sacks real in the limit.

1. Introduction

Preservation theorems are a central tool in forcing theory:

Let $(P_\alpha, Q_\alpha)_{\alpha<\epsilon}$ be a forcing iteration. Assume that $Q_\alpha$ is (forced to be) nice for all $\alpha < \epsilon$. Then $P_\epsilon$ is nice.

A niceness (or preservation) property usually implies that the forcing does not change the universe too much. Among the most important preservation theorems are:

The finite support iteration of ccc forcings is ccc. [8]

and

The countable support iteration of proper forcings is proper. [6]

In this paper we investigate proper countable support iterations, so the limits are always proper. Many additional preservation properties are preserved as well, for example $\omega^\omega$-bounding (i.e., not adding an unbounded real). This is a special instance of a general preservation theorem by the second author (“Case A” of [7, XVIII §3]) which is also known as “first preservation theorem” [1, Section 6.1.B] or “tools-preservation” [4, Section 5], see also [5, Theorem 2.4]. Many additional preservation theorems for proper countable support iterations can be found in [7], or, from the point of view of large cardinals, in [9].

We investigate iterations where all iterands are NNR, which means that they do not add new reals. So the iterands (and therefore the limit as well) satisfy all instances of tools-preservation. However, it turns out that the limit can add a new real $r$. The first example was given by Jensen [3], and the phenomenon was further investigated in [7, V]. So what do we know about the real $r$? We know that it has to be bounded by an old real (i.e., a real in the ground model), corresponding to the iterable preservation property “$\omega^\omega$-bounding”. $r$ will even satisfy the stronger Sacks property. In particular $r$ cannot be, e.g., a Cohen, random, Laver or Mathias real.

In the previously known examples, the proof that a new real $r$ is added is rather indirect and does not give much “positive” information about $r$. So it is natural to ask which kind of reals can appear in proper NNR limits. Todd Eisworth asked this question for the simplest and best understood real that satisfies the Sacks property, the Sacks real. In this paper, we show that Sacks reals indeed can appear in this way:
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Often preservation theorems also have the (weaker) form “If $\epsilon$ is a limit, and all $P_\alpha$ are nice for $\alpha < \epsilon$, then $P_\epsilon$ is nice.”
Theorem 1. There is an iteration \((P_n, Q_n)_{n<\omega}\) such that each \(Q_n\) is forced to be proper and NNR and such that the countable support limit \(P_\omega\) adds a Sacks real. Moreover, \(P_\omega\) is equivalent to \(S \ast P'\), where \(S\) is Sacks forcing and \(P'\) is NNR\(^2\).

The Theorem can be interpreted in two ways:

On the one hand, it indicates limitations of possible preservation theorems: “Not adding a Sacks real” is obviously not iterable (even with rather strong additional assumptions).

On the other hand, it shows that Sacks forcing is exceptionally “harmless”: It satisfies every usual iterable preservation property\(^3\). So the Sacks model (the model constructed by starting with CH and iterating \(\omega_2\) Sacks forcings in a countable support iteration) has all the corresponding properties as well\(^4\).

In a continuation of this work we will say more about the kind of reals that can be added in limits of NNR iterations (e.g. generics for other finite splitting lim sup tree forcings). It turns out that many of these reals can appear at limit stages, but some of them not at stage \(\omega\), but only at later stages, e.g. \(\omega_2\).

We thank a referee for suggesting several improvements in the presentation.

2. Sacks conditions as squares of terms

In this section, we introduce the forcing notion \(Q_*\), which is forcing equivalent to Sacks forcing. We will later work with \(Q_*\) in the proof of Theorem 1.

A Sacks condition (or Sacks tree) is a perfect tree \(T \subseteq 2^{<\omega}\). Given \(T\), we call a node \(t\) a splitting node if \(t\) has two immediate successors in \(T\).

Let \(F_n\) be the set of the \(n\)-th splitting nodes, cf. Figure 1. So \(t \in F_n\) means that \(t\) is a splitting node and that there are \(n\) splitting nodes below \(t\). Since \(T\) is perfect, \(F_n\) is a front, which means that every branch through \(T\) meets \(F_n\) exactly once. Being a front is stronger than just being a maximal antichain, and due to König’s Lemma every front is finite.

A branch \(b\) through \(T\) is an element of \(2^\omega\) and therefore a sequence \((b_0, b_1, \ldots)\) for some \(b_n \in \{0, 1\}\). Intuitively speaking, we can describe “the arbitrary branch” \(b\) of \(T\) by interpreting each \(b_n\) to be a term \(t_n(x_0, \ldots, x_n)\), where the value of \(t_n\) (0 or 1) depends on \(x_l\) for \(l \leq n\), and \(x_l\) is a variable with values in \(\{0, 1\}\) that tells us whether we choose the left (0) or right (1) path at the front \(F_l\).

A more formal description of terms can be found in Definition 2.4, but a simple example is much more instructive: In the tree \(T\) of Figure 1, the sequence of terms

\[^2\]We do not claim that \(P'\) is proper.

\[^3\]More exactly: Sacks forcing satisfies every property \(X\) such that: Every proper NNR forcing satisfies \(X\), \(X\) is preserved under proper countable support iterations, and if \(P\) does not satisfy \(X\), then \(P \ast Q\) does not satisfy \(X\) either for any NNR \(Q\).

\[^4\]Of course this is already known for many of the popular properties, cf. [2] or [3], which shows that in some respect Sacks forcing is the “most tame” forcing possible. This corresponds to the fact that all of the usual cardinal characteristics (apart from the continuum) are \(\aleph_1\) in the Sacks model.
It is easy to check that, e.g., 
\[ \psi \circ \phi \text{ after applying the substitution } \]
when we apply 
\[ a, b \text{ when we apply } \]
\[ (a, b) \in \{0, 1\} \]
\[ \text{If } \psi \circ \phi \text{ is indeed the same as } \]
\[ t_2 \circ \phi = \begin{cases} x_2 & \text{if } x_0 = 0 \text{ and } x_1 = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } x_0 = 0 \text{ and } x_1 = 1, \\ x_1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \]
\[ \begin{cases} x_0 & \text{if } 1 = 0 \text{ and } x_0 = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } 1 = 0 \text{ and } x_0 = 1, \\ x_0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} = x_0', \]
\[ \left( x_0', x_1', x_2' \right) = \left( x_0, x_1, x_0 \right). \]
\[ \text{Let } \psi \text{ be a perfect subtree, and call the canonical term sequence } (t_0', t_1', \ldots), \text{ written as terms in the variables } x_0', x_1', \ldots. \]
\[ \text{In the example of Figure 1, we get: } \]
\[ t_0' = 1, \quad t_1' = 1, \quad t_2' = x_0'. \]
\[ \text{The fronts } F_{n'} \text{ “refine” } F_n. \text{ If } t \in F_{n'}, \text{ then } t \supseteq s \text{ for a unique } s \in F_n. \]
\[ \text{So the variables } (x_0', \ldots, x_l') \text{ give at least as much information (about the branch) as } (x_0, \ldots, x_l). \]
\[ \text{In other words, we can calculate the value of } x_n \text{ given the values } (x_0', \ldots, x_l'), \text{ and we write this dependence as a term } \phi_n(x_0', \ldots, x_l'). \]
\[ \text{This defines a function (or: term sequence) } \phi \text{ that assigns to each variable } x_n \text{ a term } \phi_n(x_0', \ldots, x_l'). \]
\[ \text{We will use the following notation: } \]
\[ (2.1) \quad \text{Given a Sacks tree } T, \text{ the sequence } \bar{t} \text{ of terms defined as above is } \]
\[ \text{called the canonical term sequence for } T. \]
\[ \text{Let } a \text{ be an assignment, that is a map that assigns each variable a value in } \{0, 1\}. \]
\[ \text{Then } a \text{ can be extended to evaluate terms } t \text{ to } \bar{t} \circ a \in \{0, 1\}, \text{ so we can evaluate the term sequence } \bar{t} = (t_0, t_1, \ldots) \text{ to } \]
\[ \bar{t} \circ a := (t_0 \circ a, t_1 \circ a, \ldots) \in 2^\omega. \]
\[ \text{If } \bar{t} \text{ is the canonical term sequence for } T \text{ and } a \text{ an assignment, then } \bar{t} \circ a \text{ is a branch through } T. \]
\[ \text{Moreover, every branch can be obtained this way: } \]
\[ (2.2) \quad T = \{ \bar{t} \circ a \mid n : n \in \omega, \text{ a an assignment} \}. \]
\[ \text{The following property is trivial, but important: Fix } n. \text{ Then there is a finite set } I \text{ such that we can determine the value that is assigned to } x_n \text{ by an assignment } a \text{ provided we know the values } (t_i \circ a)_{i \in I}. \]
\[ \text{We denote this by the following: For a canonical term sequence } \bar{t}, \]
\[ (2.3) \quad \text{each } x_n \text{ is determined by finitely many } t_i. \]
\[ \text{(Proof: Let } \bar{t} \text{ be the maximum of the heights of the nodes in } F_n. \text{ Set } I = \{0, \ldots, l\}. \)
\[ \text{In the example above, } x_0 \text{ is determined by } t_0, \text{ and } x_1 \text{ by } (t_0, t_1, t_2), \text{ but not by } (t_0, t_1). \]
\[ \text{Let } T' \subseteq T \text{ be a perfect subtree, and call the canonical term sequence } (t_0', t_1', \ldots), \]
\[ \text{written as terms in the variables } x_0', x_1', \ldots. \]
\[ \text{In the example of Figure 1, we get: } \]
\[ t_0' = 1, \quad t_1' = 1, \quad t_2' = x_0'. \]
So far, we used different variable symbols \((x_i, x'_i)\) for variables used in \(l\) and \(l'\) (in the hope to make the concept of substitution a bit clearer). Of course this is not necessary, and we will only use \(x_i\) in the following. We will see that the following partial order \(S^*\) is equivalent to Sacks forcing: \(S^*\) consists of sequences of terms \((t_i)_{i \in \omega}\) using the variables \(x_j\) \((j \in \omega)\) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
(i) & \ t_i \text{ depends only on } x_j \text{ with } j \leq i, \text{ and} \\
(ii) & \text{ each } x_j \text{ is determined by finitely many } t_i.
\end{align*}
\]

The order is defined as follows: \(l'\) is stronger than \(l\), if there is a substitution \(\phi\) such that \(l' = l \circ \phi\) and

\[
\begin{align*}
(i) & \ \phi_i \text{ only depends on } x_j \text{ with } j \leq i, \text{ and} \\
(ii) & \text{ each } x_j \text{ is determined by finitely many } \phi_i.
\end{align*}
\]

It is easy to check that \(\leq\) is reflexive and transitive; and that \(\circ\) is associative: The identity substitution witnesses \(l \leq l\); and if \(l' = l \circ \phi'\) and \(l'' = l' \circ \phi''\) then \(l'' = (l \circ \phi') \circ \phi'' = l \circ (\phi \circ \phi'').\)

We could omit (2.5)(ii): If \(\phi\) is any substitution, and if \(l'\) and \(l \circ \phi\) both are in \(S^*\), then \(\phi\) satisfies (ii) anyway.

Substitutions (as defined in (2.5)) are obviously exactly the same as conditions in \(S^*\) (as defined in (2.4)). This fact is not deep or of any real importance, but it will simplify our notation. So let us describe this effect once more:

Assume that \(\hat{s}\) and \(\hat{l}\) both are conditions in \(S^*\). We can interpret \(\hat{l}\) as a substitution \(\phi\) such that \(\phi_n = t_n\). (I.e., \(t_n(x'_0, \ldots, x'_n)\) calculates the value of \(x_n\).) Then \(\hat{s} \circ \hat{l}\) is again element of \(S^*\) (and stronger than \(\hat{s}\)). On the other hand, if \(l'\) is stronger than \(\hat{s}\), then this is witnessed by a substitution \(\phi\), which we can in turn interpret as element of \(S^*\).

We can interpret a \(\hat{l} \in S^*\) as continuous function from \(2^{\omega}\) to \(2^{\omega}\), and map \(\hat{l}\) to its image, or to the associated tree:

**Lemma 2.1.** Let \(\Psi\) map \(l \in S^*\) to \(\{(l \circ a) | n : n \in \omega, a \text{ an assignment}\}\). Then \(\Psi\) is a surjective complete embedding (in particular order preserving) from \(S^*\) into Sacks forcing.

**Proof.** \(\Psi(\hat{l})\) is a perfect tree: Pick any \(s = (l \circ a) | n \in \Psi(\hat{l})\). Note that \(t_0, \ldots, t_{n-1}\) use a finite set \(A\) of variables. Pick \(x_j \notin A\). Then \(x_j\) is determined by \(t_0, \ldots, t_{l-1}\) for some \(l\). Pick assignments \(b, c\) extending \(a[A]\) such that \(x_j \circ b \neq x_j \circ c\). Then \((l \circ b)|l \neq (l \circ c)|l\) (otherwise they would determine the same value for \(x_j\)), so we get two incomparable nodes in \(\Psi(\hat{l})\) both extending \(s\).

We see from that \(\Psi\) is surjective. It is clear that \(\Psi\) preserves \(\leq\).

\(\Psi\) preserves \(\perp\): Assume that \(\Psi(\hat{l})\) and \(\Psi(\hat{s})\) both contain the perfect tree \(T\). By thinning out \(T\), we can assume the following: If \(l\) is the length of a node in \(F_s\), then \(t_1(x), \ldots, t_l(x)\) determine \(x_n\), and the same holds for \(s\). Let \(r(x') \in S^*\) be the canonical sequence of \(T\). So \(x'_0, \ldots, x'_{l-1}\) determine a node in \(F_s\), and therefore sufficiently many \(t_1, \ldots, t_{l-1}\) to determine \(x_n\). This defines a substitution \(\phi\) witnessing that \(r\) is stronger than \(l\). The same applies to \(s\). \(\square\)

Of course \(\Psi\) is not injective. For example, if we simply interchange \(x_0\) and \(x_1\) in a suitable sequence \(l\), then we can still get a valid term sequence (different from the original one), but the image under \(\Psi\) will be the same.

In \(S^*\), the index set of the term sequence is \(\omega\). We will later need \(\omega \times \omega\)-sequences; so we will just identify \(\omega\) with \(\omega \times \omega\), using a canonical order. See Figure 2

\[
\tau : \omega \times \omega \to \omega \text{ is defined by } \tau(n, m) = n + \frac{1}{2}(n + m)(n + m + 1).
\]
The bijection $\tau$ defines a linear order of $\omega \times \omega$ of order type $\omega$:

$$\tau(i, j) \leq \tau(n, m) \iff (i, j) \preceq (n, m)$$

We will later use the following trivial fact:

$$i + j < n \text{ and } (i', j') \preceq (i, j) \text{ then } i' + j' < n.$$  

We now rewrite $S^*$ in the form of $\omega \times \omega$-sequences:

**Definition 2.2.** $Q_*$ consists of squares of terms $(t_{n,m})_{n,m \in \omega}$ using the variables $x_{i,j}$ such that

(i) $t_{n,m}$ depends only on $x_{i,j}$ with $(i,j) \preceq (n,m)$, and

(ii) each $x_{i,j}$ is determined by finitely many $t_{n,m}$.

The order is defined as follows: $\bar{t}$ is stronger than $\bar{s}$, if there is a condition $\phi \in Q_*$ such that $\bar{t} = \bar{s} \circ \phi$.

Since $Q_*$ is isomorphic to $S^*$, Lemma 2.1 gives us:

**Corollary 2.3.** $Q_*$ is forcing equivalent to Sacks forcing.

We now add the a formal definition of term, assignment and substitution:

**Definition 2.4.**

- Let $X$ be a set. We will call an element $v \in X$ a variable (or: variable symbol). We will interpret $v$ as a “binary variable”, i.e., the value of $v$ is 0 or 1. In this paper, we will use $X = \{x_i : i \in \omega\}$ and $X = \{x_{i,j} : i, j \in \omega\}$.

- An $X$-term $t$ consists of a sequence $(v_0, \ldots, v_{l-1})$ for some $0 \leq l \leq \omega$ and $v_i \in X$, together with a function $f: 2^l \to 2$. (So for $l = 0$, the sequence of variables is empty and the term is a constant.) We usually write terms as $t(v_0, \ldots, v_{l-1})$. Abusing notation, we identify the variable $v$ with the “identity term” corresponding to $(v)$, $\text{Id}$.

- An assignment $a$ is a function $X \to 2$. Assignments extend to all $X$-terms in the natural way. In other words, given an assignment $a$, we can apply $a$ to a term $t$ to get an element of 2. We denote the result of applying $a$ to a term (or variable) $t$ by $t \circ a \in 2$.

- Similarly, a substitution $\phi$ maps $X$ to $X$-terms. Equivalently, a substitution is a sequence $(\phi_v)_{v \in X}$ of $X$-terms indexed by $X$. Again, we can extend a substitution to act on all $X$-terms, and we write $t \circ \phi$ for the result. We can also apply substitutions to sequences $t = (t_v)_{v \in X}$ of terms (indexed by $X$), the result $t \circ \phi$ is another sequences of terms indexed by $X$. The application of substitutions is associative: For term sequences $\bar{r}$, $\bar{s}$ and $\bar{t}$, all indexed by $X$, we get $\bar{r} \circ (\bar{s} \circ \bar{t}) = (\bar{r} \circ \bar{s}) \circ \bar{t}$.

---

5Formally we could let $t$ be a triple $(X, (v_0, \ldots, v_{l-1}), f)$, to guarantee that $X$ is disjoint to the terms built from it.
• The variable (or term) $s$ “is determined by the terms $t_0, \ldots, t_n$” means that $(t_0 \circ a, \ldots, t_n \circ a) = (t_0 \circ b, \ldots, t_n \circ b)$ implies $s \circ a = s \circ b$ for all assignments $a$ and $b$. In other words, if we know the value of $t_0, \ldots, t_n$, we can infer the value of $s$.

• According to our formal definition, two terms that depend on different variables are distinct (even if these variables are not relevant). However, we will only be interested in terms “as functions”, i.e., modulo the following equivalence relation: $t =^* s$ means that $t \circ a = s \circ a$ for all assignments $a$.

In particular, the last $=$ sign in Definition 2.2 really means $=^*$ etc.

3. A SIMPLE CASE

In the rest of the paper, $\delta$ always denotes a countable limit ordinal.

In this section, we construct a proper, NNR countable support iteration and argue that the limit adds a real that it is similar to a Sacks real (i.e., it adds a generic object for a forcing that looks in some way similar to the $Q_*$ defined in the previous section). In the rest of the paper, we deal with an analog (but notationally more complicated) construction that actually adds a Sacks real.

So the purpose of this section is to give some idea of the constructions we use to prove Theorem 1 using a somewhat simplified notation. The reader who does not feel the need of such an introduction can safely continue with the next section.

We do not give any proofs in this section, but refer to the proofs of the more general statements. Caution: We use the same symbols for the simpler objects in this section and for the analog constructions in the rest of the paper.

The forcing iteration will start with a preparatory forcing $\bar{P}$, followed by $Q_0, Q_1, \ldots$. $\bar{P} * P_n$ stands for $\bar{P} * Q_0 \star \cdots \star Q_{n-1}$. We will also use the countable support limit of $\bar{P} * P_n$. Since all forcings are proper, this countable support limit is the same as $\bar{P} * P_\omega$, where $P_\omega$ is the $P$-name for the countable support limit of the $P_n$.

The preparatory forcing adds cofinal subsets $\nu_{\delta,n,m} \subseteq \delta$ of of order type $\omega$ for every limit ordinal $\delta < \omega_1$ and $n, m \in \omega$. In more detail:

**Definition 3.1.** A condition $\bar{p}$ in $\bar{P}$ consists of a limit ordinal $ht(\bar{p}) \in \omega_1$ and a sequence $(\nu_{\delta,n,m})_{0 < \delta < \omega_1, n,m \in \omega}$, such that $\nu_{\delta,n,m} \subseteq \delta$ is cofinal and has order type $\omega$, and $\nu_{\delta,n,m_1}$ and $\nu_{\delta,n,m_2}$ are disjoint for $m_1 \neq m_2$. $\bar{P}$ is ordered by extension.

So $\bar{p}$ is $\sigma$-closed.

**Definition 3.2.** $Q_0$ is (the $\bar{P}$-name) for $2^{<\omega_1}$, ordered by extension.

So $Q_0$ is $\sigma$-closed as well, and adds the generic sequence $\eta_0 \in 2^{\omega_1}$.

Given $\bar{P} * P_n = \bar{P} * Q_0 \star \cdots \star Q_{n-1}$ such that $Q_{n-1}$ adds the generic sequence $\eta_{n-1} \in 2^{\omega_1}$, we define the $P * P_n$-name $Q_n$ (see also Figure 3(a)):

**Definition 3.3.** Let $q$ be a partial function from $\omega_1$ to $2$, $\delta \subseteq dom(q)$, $q$ and $\eta_{n-1}$ cohere at $\delta + m$, if $\eta_{n-1}(\delta + m) = q(\alpha)$ for all but finitely many $\alpha \in \nu_{\delta,n-1,m}$. Abusing notation, we just say $q$ coheres with $\eta_{n-1}(\delta + m)$.

We set $q \in Q_n$, if $q \in 2^{<\omega_1}$ and $q$ coheres with $\eta_{n-1}(\delta + m)$ for all $\delta \leq dom(q)$, $m \in \omega$.

**Lemma 3.4.** The following is forced by $P_n$:

(i) If $q \in Q_n$, $q' \in 2^{dom(q)}$, and $q'(\alpha) = q(\alpha)$ for all but finitely many $\alpha \in dom(q)$, then $q' \in Q_n$.

(ii) $Q_n$ is separative and adds a generic sequence $\eta_n \in 2^{\omega_1}$ defined by $\bigcup_{q \in \mathcal{G}(n)} q$.

(iii) If $n > 0$, then $Q_n$ is not $\sigma$-closed.

---

6That is, for every $p \in Q$ there are $q_1, q_2 \leq p$ such that $q_1 \perp q_2$. 
Lemma 3.7. For a proof, see Lemma 5.8. The proof is again a bit cumbersome, and uses similar arguments (chains of countable elementary submodels) as the proof of 3.4(iv).

Figure 3. (a) $q$ coheres with $\eta_{n-1}(\delta + m)$. The gray area indicates $\nu_{5, n-1, m}$. (b) An element of $R$: $p_{n, \delta + m} = x_{n, m}$. The term $p_{n, \alpha}$ only depends on $x_{i, j}$ with $i < n$. (c) Filling in the term $x_{4, 2}$ at various positions: In the bottom row, $I_{4, 2}$ contains 6 and 8; the $1 \times \omega$-blocks where the terms $x_{4, 2}$ are added (indicated by the gray area) propagates up-left.

(iv) $Q_n$ is proper and NNR, i.e., $Q_n$ adds no new real.

For a proof, see Lemmas 4.7, 4.9 and 4.11. Note that (i)–(iii) are very easy, and (iv) is straightforward (but a bit cumbersome).

Lemma 3.5. $\dot{P} \ast P_\omega$ adds a new real. In particular, the $\dot{P}$-generic element $\check{\nu}$ together with $(\eta_n(m))_{n, m \in \omega}$ determines the generic filter.

Proof. If we know $\nu_{\omega, n-1, m}$ and $\eta_n(l)$ for all $l \in \omega$, then we can determine $\eta_{n-1}(\omega + m)$. So if we know all $\nu_{\delta, n, m}$ and all $\eta_n(m)$ for $\delta < \omega_1, n, m \in \omega$, then we can by induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$ calculate all $\eta_\alpha(n)$ for $n \in \omega$.

We now define a dense subforcing $R$ of $\dot{P} \ast P_\omega$. See Figure 3(b). We use the notion of variable, term, assignment and substitution, as in Definition 2.4, for the set of variables $X = \{x_{i, j} : i, j \in \omega\}$.

Definition 3.6. $R = \bigcup_{\delta \leq \omega_1} R_{\delta + \omega}$. A condition $p$ in $R_{\delta + \omega}$ consists of $\check{p}$ and $\check{p}$ such that

- $\check{p} \in \dot{P}$, $\text{ht}(\check{p}) = \delta + \omega$.
- $p = (p_{n, \alpha})_{n, \alpha \in \delta + \omega}$.
- $p_{n, \delta + m}$ is the term $x_{n, m}$.
- For $\alpha < \delta$, $p_{n, \alpha}$ is a term using only variables $x_{i, j}$ with $i < n$.
- For $\alpha \leq \delta$ and $n, m \in \omega$, $p_{n, \alpha + m} = p_{n + 1, \zeta}$ for all but finitely many $\zeta \in \nu_{\alpha, n, m}$.

We identify two conditions $p$ and $q$ if $\check{p} = \check{q}$ and $p_{n, \alpha} = q_{n, \alpha}$ for all $n \in \omega$, $\alpha < \delta$.

We can interpret $p \in R$ as a condition $(\check{p}, p(0), p(1), \ldots)$ in $\dot{P} \ast P_\omega$: After forcing with $\dot{P} \ast P_n$, we have the generic sequences $(\eta_i)_{i < n}$. This defines a canonical assignment of $x_{i, j}$ for $i < n$, namely $x_{i, j} := \eta_i(\delta + j)$. This assignment evaluates $(p_{n, \alpha})_{\alpha < \delta}$ to a condition in $Q_n$ (assuming that $\check{p}$ is element of the $\dot{P}$-generic filter), and we define $p(n)$ to be that condition. Using this identification, we get:

Lemma 3.7. $R$ is a dense subset of $\dot{P} \ast P_\omega$.

For a proof, see Lemma 5.8. The proof is again a bit cumbersome, and uses similar arguments (chains of countable elementary submodels) as the proof of 3.4(iv).
Note the following simple properties for $p \in R_{\delta+\omega}$:

- If $\delta = \omega$, we get $(\forall n,m)(\exists^\infty k)p_{n+1,k} = x_{n,m}$.
- If $\delta = \omega + \omega$, we get $(\forall n,m)(\exists^\infty k)p_{n+2,k} = x_{n,m}$.
- If $\delta = \omega \cdot \omega$, then we get $(\forall n,m)(\exists^{\infty n'}(\exists^\infty m')r_{n',m'} = x_{n,m}$.

Actually, the last item holds for all $\delta > \omega \cdot \omega$, which can easily be seen by induction; and we get some kind of converse as well:

**Lemma 3.8.** Assume that $(r_{i,j})_{i,j \in \omega}$ is a matrix of terms such that

(i) $r_{i,j}$ depends only on $x_{n,m}$ with $n < i$,

(ii) $(\forall n,m)(\exists\infty n')(\exists\infty m')r_{n',m'} = x_{n,m}$

(iii) $(\forall n)(\exists\infty k)r_{n,k} = 0$.

Then there is a $p \in R_{\omega \cdot \omega + \omega}$ such that $r_{i,j} = p_{i,j}$ for all $i, j \in \omega$.

**Proof (sketch).** We have to define a suitable $\tilde{p}$ (i.e., the sequence $(\nu_{\alpha,n,m})_{\alpha \leq \omega,n,m \in \omega}$) as well as $p_{\alpha,n}$ for $i \in \omega$ and $\omega \leq \alpha < \omega \cdot \omega$.

We deal with one variable after another, see Figure 3(c). Assume we are dealing with $x_{n,m}$. Set

$I_{n,m} = \{n' \geq n + 2 : (\exists\infty k)r_{n',k} = x_{n,m}\}$.

According to (ii), $I_{n,m}$ is infinite. We define $\nu_{\omega \cdot \omega,n,m} \subseteq [\omega, \omega \cdot \omega]$ such that $\nu_{\omega \cdot \omega,n,m} \cap [i \cdot \omega, (i + 1) \cdot \omega)$ contains a single element (not used so far) if $i + m + 1 \in I_{n,m}$ and is empty otherwise.

We set $r_{n+1,\alpha} = x_{n,m}$ for all $\alpha \in \nu_{\omega \cdot \omega,n,m}$; and propagate the $x_{n,m}$ diagonally down.

We repeat the same construction for all the other $x_{n,m}$, and then set all the remaining terms $r_{n,\alpha} = 0$. To get coherence for these points as well, we just define the remaining $\nu'$s in a way so that they only point to $r$'s that are 0. At height $\omega$, we use (iii) to do this, at other heights we just have to make sure to leave enough space when choosing the elements of $\nu_{\delta,n,m}$.

We now describe how to “stack” a condition on top of another one to get a stronger condition. See Figure 5(b) for a graphical illustration.

- If we “cut away the bottom part” of a condition $q \in R_{\delta + \delta' + \omega}$ at height $\delta$, then we get a condition $q' \in R_{\delta' + \omega}$. Formally we can define $q'$ as follows:
  
  $\beta \in \tilde{q}_{\alpha,n,m}$ iff $\beta + \delta \in \tilde{q}_{\delta + \alpha,n,m}$.

  $q'_{\alpha,n} = q_{\delta + \alpha}$.

  We denote this $q'$ by $q[\delta, \delta + \delta' + \omega]$.

- We can stack any condition $q' \in R_{\delta' + \omega}$ on top of some condition $p \in R_{\delta + \omega}$, resulting in some $q \in R_{\delta + \delta' + \omega}$ such that $q[\delta, \delta + \delta' + \omega] = q'$. Formally, $q$ is defined as follows:

  $\tilde{q}[\delta] = \tilde{p}$.

  For $\alpha < \delta'$, we set $\delta + \beta \in \tilde{q}_{\alpha+\delta',n,m}$ iff $\beta \in \tilde{q}_{\alpha,n,m}$.

  For $\alpha < \delta$, we set $q_{\delta + \alpha} = q_{\alpha,n}$.

  We define the substitution $\phi$ by $\phi_{n,m} = q'_{n,m}$, and set $q_{\alpha,n} = p_{\alpha,n} \circ \phi$ for all $\alpha \leq \delta$.

  We denote this $q$ by $p \upharpoonright q'$.

It is clear that $p \upharpoonright q' \leq p$ (interpreted as element of $\tilde{P} \ast P_\omega$). The converse is true as well:

\begin{equation}
(3.1) \text{ If } q \leq p, \text{ then either } q = p \text{ or } q = p \upharpoonright q', \text{ where } q' = q[\text{lht}(p), \text{lht}(q)].
\end{equation}

The proof of (3.1) uses the following simple fact: For every $p \in R$,

\begin{equation}
(3.2) \text{ every partial assignment of every finite } A \subseteq \{x_{i,j} : i,j \in \omega\} \text{ is compatible with } p.
\end{equation}
In other words, if $f : \omega \times \omega \to 2$ is a finite partial function, then it is compatible with $p$ (interpreted as element of $\bar{P} + P_\omega$) that $\eta_p(\delta + m) = f(n, m)$ for all $(n, m) \in \text{dom}(f)$.

Given a $p \in R_\delta$ (we assume $\delta \geq \omega \cdot \omega$), we can map $p$ to the square of terms $\sigma(p) = (p_{n,m})_{n,m \in \omega}$. Then $\sigma$ maps $R$ to $Q_{**}$ in an order preserving way, where $Q_{**}$ is defined as follows:

**Definition 3.9.** $Q_{**}$ is the set of all sequences $\bar{t} = (t_{i,j})_{i,j \in \omega}$ of terms such that

(i) $t_{n,m}$ depends only on $x_{i,j}$ with $i < n$,
(ii) $(\forall n,m)(\exists n')(\exists m')t_{n',m'} = x_{n,m},$

$\bar{t} \leq \bar{s}$, if there is a substitution $\phi$ such that:

(iii) $t_{i,j} = s_{i,j} \circ \phi$ for all $i, j \in \omega$.
(iv) $\phi_{n,m}$ only depends on $x_{i,j}$ with $i \leq n$.

**Lemma 3.10.** $R$ (or equivalently: $\bar{P} + \bar{P}_\omega$) adds a generic filter for $Q_{**}$.

Note that $Q_{**}$ looks somewhat similar to the $Q_*$ defined in the previous section. For $Q_*$ instead of $Q_{**}$, the Theorem is the main part of Theorem 1. In the rest of the paper, we will modify the constructions so that we actually end up with $Q_*$ instead of $Q_{**}$.

**Proof (sketch).** We already mentioned that $\sigma : R \to Q_{**}$ preserves $\leq$. Assume that $G$ is $R$-generic over $V$, and define

$$G_{**} = \{ \bar{t} \in Q_{**} : (\exists p \in G) \sigma(p) \leq \bar{t} \}.$$ 

It is enough to show the following:

\[(3.3) \quad \text{For } p \in R \text{ there is a } \bar{s} \leq Q_{**} \sigma(p) \text{ such that for all } \bar{t} \leq \bar{s} \text{ then there is an } q \leq_R p \text{ such that } \sigma(q) \leq \bar{t}. \]

Then the Lemma follows: First note that $G_{**}$ does not contain incompatible elements, since $\sigma$ is order preserving. Now assume that $D \subseteq Q_{**}$ is dense, and (towards a contradiction) that $p$ forces that $G_{**}$ does not meet $D$. Then pick some $\bar{t} \leq \bar{s}$ in $D$ and some $q$ as above, contradiction.

To show \[(3.3),\] we define $\bar{s} \in Q_{**}$ via the substitution $\phi$ witnessing $\bar{s} \leq \sigma(p)$, defined as follows: For each $n$, let $(\phi_{n,m})_{m \in \omega}$ enumerate (with infinite repetitions) the constant term 0 and all variables $x_{i,j}$ with $i < n$. So $\phi$ maps $x_{n,m}$ to the term $\phi_{n,m}$.

Now pick any $\bar{t}$ that is stronger than $\bar{s}$, witnessed by some substitution $\psi$. Note that $\phi \circ \psi$ satisfies the requirements of Lemma \[\text{(3.3)}\] So there is a $q' \in R$ such that $\sigma(q') = \phi \circ \psi$. Then $p \upharpoonright q'$ is as required. \qed

In the rest of the paper, we will modify the constructions of this section in such a way that we end up with $Q_*$ instead of $Q_{**}$. It turns out that this does not require any new concepts, just a more awkward notation.

4. The NNR Iteration

In the rest of the paper, $\delta$ always denotes a countable limit ordinal.

First we define a $\sigma$-closed preparatory forcing $\bar{P}$, which gives us for every limit $\alpha \in \omega_1$ a subset of $\alpha$ of order type $\omega$ and some simple coding sequences.

**Definition 4.1.** $\bar{P} \in \bar{P}$ if for some $\text{ht}(\bar{P}) < \omega_1$, $\bar{P}$ consists of sequences $\nu_{\delta,n,m}$, $f_{\delta,n,m}$, and $f_{\delta,n,m,k}$ for $\delta < \text{ht}(\bar{P})$, $m,n,k \in \omega$, such that

- each $\nu_{\delta,n,m}$ is a cofinal, unbounded subset of $\delta$ of order type $\omega$.
- $m_1 \neq m_2$ implies that $\nu_{\delta,n,m_1}$ and $\nu_{\delta,n,m_2}$ are disjoint.
\[ \delta + m \]

\[ \eta_n \] coheres with \( \eta_{n-1}(\delta+m) \) above \( k_0 = 2 \). \( \nu_{\delta,n-1,m} \) is indicated by the gray area, \( j_{\delta,n-1,m} \) corresponds to the partition of this area. \( f_{\delta,n-1,m,k} \) calculates \( g_{\delta,n-1,m,k} \). (b) There are conditions which determine the gray values, but these conditions are not dense. (c) No condition can determine all gray values. (d) A typical condition in \( \tilde{P} \ast P_3 \): The gray area indicates the domain, all the values are \textquotedblleft constants\textquotedblright. 

- \( j_{\delta,n,m} \) is an increasing function from \( \omega \) to \( \omega \).
- \( f_{\delta,n,m,k} \) is a surjective function from \( 2^{j_{\delta,n,m}(k)} \cdot j_{\delta,n,m}(k+1) \) to \( 2 \).

\[ \tilde{P} \] is ordered by extension.

**Lemma 4.2.** \( \tilde{P} \) is \( \sigma \)-closed, and forces that \( 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1 \).

**Proof.** In the \( \tilde{P} \)-extension \( V' \) define \( A_\delta \) by \( l \in A_\delta \) iff \( \delta + 2l \in \nu_{\delta+\omega,0,0} \). By a simple density argument, \( \{ A_\delta : \delta < \omega_1 \} \) contains all old reals and therefore all reals. \( \square \)

Fix \( \delta, n, m, k \). Given \( \nu_{\delta,n-1,m}, j_{\delta,n-1,m} \) and \( f_{\delta,n-1,m,k} \), we define the function \( g_{\delta,n-1,m,k} : 2^\omega \rightarrow \{ 0, 1 \} \) the following way, cf. Figure 4(a):

Fix \( \eta_n \in 2^\omega \). For \( i \in \omega \), let \( \zeta_i \) be the \( i \)-th element of \( \nu_{\delta,n-1,m} \). Set \( b_i = \eta_n(\zeta_i) \). So \( b = (b_i)_{i \in \omega} \in 2^{\omega} \). Look at \( b[j_{\delta,n-1,m}(k), j_{\delta,n-1,m}(k+1) - 1] \). This is a 0-1-sequence of appropriate length, so we can apply \( f_{\delta,n-1,m,k} \). We call the result \( g_{\delta,n-1,m,k}(\eta_n) \).

To summarize: Let \( \zeta_i \) be the \( i \)-th element of \( \nu_{\delta,n-1,m} \). Then we define

\[ g_{\delta,n-1,m,k}(\eta) = f_{\delta,n-1,m,k}(\eta(\zeta_i))[j_{\delta,n-1,m}(k) \leq i < j_{\delta,n-1,m}(k+1)]. \]

We will be interested in sequences \( (\eta_n)_{n \in \omega} \) that cohere with respect to \( g_{\delta,n,m,k} \). We again refer to Figure 4(a):

**Definition 4.3.** Let \( \eta_{n-1} \) and \( \eta_n \) be partial functions from \( \omega_1 \) to \( 2 \), \( \delta + m \in \text{dom}(\eta_{n-1}) \), \( \delta \subseteq \text{dom}(\eta_n) \), \( k_0 \in \omega \). We say that \( \eta_{n-1} \) and \( \eta_n \) cohere at \( \delta + m \) above \( k_0 \), if \( \eta_{n-1}(\delta + m) = g_{\delta,n-1,m,k}(\eta_n) \) for all \( k \geq k_0 \). We say that \( \eta_{n-1} \) and \( \eta_n \) cohere at \( \delta + m \), if they cohere above some \( k_0 \). Abusing notation, we also say that \( \eta_n \) coheres with \( \eta_{n-1}(\delta + m) \).

Let \( \tilde{G} \) be \( \tilde{P} \)-generic over \( V \), and define in \( V[\tilde{G}] \) the forcing notion \( Q_0 \):

**Definition 4.4.** \( p \in Q_0 \) iff \( p \in 2^{\text{ht}(p)} \) for some \( \text{ht}(p) < \omega_1 \). \( Q_0 \) is ordered by extension.

So \( Q_0 \) is \( \sigma \)-closed and adds the generic \( \eta_0 \in 2^{\omega_1} \). Assume that \( n \geq 1 \), \( \tilde{P} \ast P_n = \tilde{P} \ast Q_0 \ast \cdots \ast Q_{n-1} \), and \( Q_{n-1} \) adds the generic sequence \( \eta_{n-1} \in 2^{\omega_1} \). Let \( \tilde{G} \ast G_n \) be \( \tilde{P} \ast P_n \)-generic over \( V \). In \( V[\tilde{G} \ast G_n] \), we define \( Q_n \) the following way:
Definition 4.5. \( p \in Q_n \) iff \( p \in 2^{ht(p)} \) for some limit ordinal \( ht(p) < \omega_1 \) and \( \eta_{n-1} \) and \( p \) cohere everywhere, i.e. at all \( \delta + m < ht(p) + \omega \). \( Q_n \) is ordered by extension.

Notation 4.6. We denote the \( \mathcal{P} \)-generic filter by \( \mathcal{G} \), we set \( \mathcal{P} \ast P_0 = \mathcal{P} \ast Q_0 \ast \cdots \ast Q_{n-1} \), with generic filter \( \mathcal{G} \ast G_n \). Since \( \mathcal{P} \) is proper, the countable support limit of \( \mathcal{P} \ast P_n \) is the same as \( \mathcal{P} \ast P_\omega \), where \( P_\omega \) is the \( \mathcal{P} \)-name for the countable support limit of the \( P_n \). The generic filter of \( \mathcal{P} \ast P_\omega \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{G} \ast G_\omega \); and \( G(n) \) is the \( Q_n \)-generic filter (a \( \mathcal{P} \ast P_{n+1} \)-name, or equivalently a \( \mathcal{P} \ast P_n \)-name for a \( Q_n \)-name).

Lemma 4.7. The following is forced by \( \mathcal{P} \ast P_n \):

(i) Conditions can be finitely modified: If \( q \in Q_n \), \( q' \in 2^{\text{dom}(q)} \) and \( q'(\alpha) = q(\alpha) \) for all but finitely many \( \alpha \in \text{dom}(q) \), then \( q' \in Q_n \).

(ii) If \( p \in Q_n \) and \( \beta > ht(p) \) is a limit ordinal, then there is a \( q \leq p \) with \( ht(q) = \beta \). In particular, \( Q_n \) adds the generic object \( \eta_n = \bigcup G(n) \in 2^{\omega_1} \) (which in turn determines the generic filter \( G(n) \)).

(iii) \( Q_n \) is separative (and in particular nontrivial), and not \( \sigma \)-closed for \( n \geq 1 \).

Proof. (i) is trivial.

(ii) Let \( (\delta_i, m_i)_{i \in \omega} \) enumerate all pairs \( (\delta, m) \) such that \( ht(p) < \delta \leq \beta \) and \( m \in \omega \). Define an increasing sequence \( p_i \) of partial functions from \( \beta \) to \( \{0, 1\} \):

Set \( p_0 = p \). For \( i > 0 \), assume that \( \text{dom}(p_{i-1}) = ht(p) \cup \bigcup_{j < i} \nu_{\delta_j, n-1, m_j} \). Then \( \nu_{\delta_i, n-1, m_i} \cap \text{dom}(p_{i-1}) \) is finite:

- If \( j < i \) and \( \delta_j = \delta_i \), then \( m_j \neq m_i \) and \( \nu_{\delta_j, n-1, m_j} \) are disjoint.
- If \( j < i \) and \( \delta_j \neq \delta_i \), then \( \nu_{\delta_j, n-1, m_j} \cap \nu_{\delta_i, n-1, m_i} \) are finite (since \( \nu_{\delta_j, n-1, m_j} \) is a cofinal subset of \( \delta \) of order type \( \omega \)).
- For the same reason, \( \nu_{\delta_i, n-1, m_i} \cap \text{ht}(p) \) is finite.

Therefore we can extend \( p_{i-1} \) to some \( p_i \) by adding values at \( \nu_{\delta_i, n, m_i} \setminus \text{dom}(p_i) \) that cohere with \( \eta_{n-1}(\delta_i + m_i) \). (Recall that \( f_{\delta_i, n-1, m_i} \) is onto.) Set \( p_\omega = \bigcup P_n \), and fill in arbitrary values (e.g., 0) at \( \beta \setminus \text{dom}(p_\omega) \). This gives a \( q \leq p \) with \( ht(q) = \beta \).

(iii) follows from (i) and (ii).

Remark 4.8. For this proof, as well as for most of the following, the preparatory forcing \( \mathcal{P} \) is not necessary: The definition of \( Q_n \) works for any reasonably defined sequences \( \nu, j, f \). Only in Section 6 we need that these sequences are generic. (Guessing with, e.g., a \( \Delta \)-sequence is not enough, as discussed in Section 7.)

Lemma 4.9. \((\eta_n)_{n \in \omega}\) is determined by \( \mathcal{G} \) and \( (\eta_n(m))_{n, m \in \omega} \). In particular, \( \mathcal{P} \ast P_\omega \) adds a new real.

Of course, we do not use any particular property of the countable support limit here. More generally, we get:

Assume \( V' \) is an extension of \( V \) that contains some \( \mathcal{G} \) and a sequence \( (G(n))_{n \in \omega} \) such that \( \mathcal{G} \) is \( \mathcal{P} \)-generic over \( V \) and \( G(n) \) is \( Q_n \)-generic over \( V[G \ast G_n] \). Fix \( \delta < \omega_1 \), \( n_0 \in \omega \) and \( f : \omega \to \omega \) and set

\[ x = (\eta_n(\alpha))_{n \geq n_0, \delta + f(n) < \alpha < \delta + \omega}. \]

Then \( (G_n)_{n \in \omega} \) is in \( V[\mathcal{G}, x] \).

See Figure 4(c).

Proof. By induction on \( 1 \leq h \leq n_0 \), each \( \eta_n(\alpha) \) is determined for \( n \geq n_0 - h, \delta + \omega \cdot h \leq \alpha < \delta + \omega \cdot (h + 1) \). By induction on limit ordinals \( \delta + \omega \cdot n_0 < \delta' < \omega_1 \), each \( \eta_n(\alpha) \) is determined for \( \delta + \omega \cdot n_0 < \alpha < \delta' \). \( \square \)
Remark 4.10. For all $n_0 \in \omega$ and $f : \omega \to \omega$, there are conditions in $\dot{P} \ast P_\omega$ that determine all $\eta_n(m)$ for $n < n_0$ or $m < f(n)$, cf. Figure 4(b). (The reason is that $\dot{P} \ast P_{n_0}$ does not add new reals, as we will see in the next lemma, and that each $Q_n$-condition can be modified at finitely many places.) However, these conditions are not dense. (For exactly the same reason: There is a condition $p_0$ stating that $(\eta_n(0))_{n \in \omega}$ codes $(\eta_n(\omega))_{n \in \omega}$, via a simple injection from $\omega \times \omega$ to $\omega$. Then according to the last Lemma, no $p' \leq p_0$ can determine all $\eta_n(0)$.)

Lemma 4.11. $\dot{P} \ast P_n$ forces that $Q_n$ is proper and does not add a new $\omega$-sequence of ordinals.

Proof. Work in $V' = V[\dot{G} * G_n]$ and fix some large regular cardinal $\chi^*$. Let $N^* \prec H^{V'}(\chi^*)$ be a countable elementary submodel containing $\dot{G}, \eta_{n-1}$ and $p_0 \in Q_n$. Set $\delta^* = N^* \cap \omega_1$. Let $(D_i)_{i \in \omega}$ list all dense subsets of $Q_n$, that are in $N^*$, and assume $D_0 = Q_n$. It is enough to show the following:

$$\tag{4.1} \text{There is a } q \leq p_0 \text{ with } \text{ht}(q) = \delta^* \text{ such that } q \text{ is stronger than some } p_i \in D_i \cap N^* \text{ for every } i \in \omega.$$ 

Then $q$ is in particular $N^*$-generic, which shows that $Q_n$ is proper. And if $f \in N^*$ is a name for a function from $\omega$ to the ordinals, then the value of $f(n)$ is determined in the dense set $D_{i(n)}$ for some $i(n) \in \omega$ an therefore by $q$. This shows that no new $f$ is added by $Q_n$.

So let us prove (4.1). Pick (in $V'$) a sequence $(N_i)_{i \in \omega}$ and a large, regular $\chi \in N^*$ such that:

- $N_i \in N^*$.
- $N_i \prec H(\chi)$ is countable.
- $N_0$ contains $\eta_{n-1}$ and $p_0$, $N_{i+1}$ contains $N_i$ and $D_{i+1}$.

Set $\beta_i = N_i \cap \omega_1$. So $\text{sup}_{i \in \omega}(\beta_i) = \delta^*$.

Fix (in $V'$) any $\eta^* \in Q_n$ of height $\delta^*$. In particular $\eta^*$ coheres with $\eta_{n-1}(\delta^* + m)$ for all $m$. Set

$$u_i = \{ \alpha \in \nu^*_{\delta^*+n-1,m} : m < i, \beta_i \leq \alpha < \beta_{i+1} \}.$$ 

Each $u_i$ is finite. We will construct $q$ such that $q \supseteq \eta^*|u_i$ for all $i \geq 1$. This guarantees that $q$ coheres with $\eta_{n-1}(\delta^* + m)$ for all $m \in \omega$.

Assume that $p_i \in N_i \cap D_i$ is already defined. We extend it to $p_{i+1} \in N_{i+1} \cap D_{i+1}$:

- The finite sequence $\eta^*|u_{i+1}$ is in $N_{i+1}$, so we can (in $N_{i+1}$) extend $p_i$ first to some $p' \supseteq \eta^*|u_{i+1}$ in $Q_n$. Then extend $p'$ to $p_{i+1} \in D_{i+1} \cap N_{i+1}$.

Set $q = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} p_i$. Then $q$ is in $Q_n$: We already know that $q$ coheres with $\eta_{n-1}(\delta^* + m)$. For $\delta < \delta^*$, let $i$ be such that $\alpha < \beta_i$. Then $q$ extends $p_{i+1}$ which coheres with $\eta_{n-1}(\alpha + m)$.

As an immediate consequence we get the following fact, illustrated in Figure 4(d):

Corollary 4.12. The conditions $(\tilde{p}, p_0, \ldots, p_{n-1})$ of the following form are dense in $\dot{P} \ast P_n$: $\text{ht}(\tilde{p}) = \delta + \omega \cdot (n - 1)$ for some $\delta$, and in $V$ there is a sequence $(p'_0, \ldots, p'_{n-1})$ such that $p'_{i} \in 2^{\delta+\omega \cdot (n-1-i)}$ and $p_i$ is the standard name for $p'_i$.

5. A dense subset

We will now use the notions of variable, term and substitution as defined in Definition 2.

We use $\{ x_{n,m} : n, m \in \omega \}$.

Assume that $\tilde{p}$ is a sequence of terms $(p_{n,\alpha})_{n \in \omega, \alpha < \delta}$. In $V[G]$, $\tilde{p}$ can be interpreted as a promise that the generic sequence $(\eta_n)_{n \in \omega}$ is compatible with $\tilde{p}$, i.e., that there

\footnote{by using (4)(i, ii)}

\footnote{With "standard name for $x^*$ (x in the ground model) we mean the (canonical) name $\dot{x}$ that evaluates to $x$ for all generic filters.}
is an assignment $a$ such that $p_{n,a} \circ a = \eta_n(\alpha)$ for all $n \in \omega, \alpha < \delta$. Of course such a promise can be inconsistent, for example if $\delta = \omega$ and each $p_{n,m}$ is (the constant term) 0.

**Definition 5.1.** $R = \bigcup_{\delta \in \omega_1} R_{\delta+\omega}$. A condition $p$ in $R_{\delta+\omega}$ consists of $\tilde{p}$ and $\hat{p}$ such that:

- $\tilde{p} \in \hat{p}$, $\text{ht}(\tilde{p}) = \delta + 1$ (or equivalently $\delta + \omega$).
- $\tilde{p} = (p_{n,a})_{n \in \omega, \alpha < \delta+\omega}$.
- $p_{n,\delta+m}$ is the term $x_{n,m}$.
- If $\alpha < \delta$, then $p_{n,a}$ is a term that only depends on $x_{l,k}$ with $l < n$.
- For every $m, n \in \omega$ and $\alpha \leq \delta$ limit there is a $k_0 < \omega$ such that for all assignments $a$, we get that $(p_{n+1,\zeta} \circ a)_{\zeta < \alpha}$ coheres with $p_{n,a+m} \circ a$ above $k_0$.

We interpret terms as functions, not syntactical objects, so we identify two elements $p, q$ of $R_{\delta+\omega}$ if they satisfy $\tilde{p} = \hat{q}$ and $p_{n,a} = q_{n,a}$ for all $n, \alpha$; see Definition 2.4.

Elements of $R$ can be interpreted as statements about the generic sequence:

**Definition 5.2.** The canonical assignment $a^c_\delta$ assigns the value $\eta_n(\delta + m)$ to the variable $x_{n,m}$. (So $a^c_\delta$ is a $\hat{p} \ast P_\omega$-name.) We also use $a^c_{\delta+n}$ as a $\hat{p} \ast P_n$-name for the partial assignment that maps $\eta(\delta + m)$ to the variable $x_{l,m}$ for all $l < n$.

**Definition 5.3.** Let $i : R \rightarrow \hat{p} \ast P_\omega$ map $p \in R_{\delta+\omega}$ to $(\tilde{p}, q(0), q(1), \ldots)$ defined as follows: For each $n, q(n)$ is the $\hat{p} \ast P_n$-name for the sequence $(p_{n,a} \circ a_\delta^c)_{\zeta < \delta}$.

**Lemma 5.4.** (i) $i(p)$ actually is a condition in $\hat{p} \ast P_\omega$.

(ii) $i(p)$ is the truth value (in $\text{to}(\hat{p} \ast P_\omega)$) of the following statement: $\tilde{p} \in \hat{G}$, and $\tilde{p}$ is compatible with the generic sequence $\tilde{\eta}$.

(iii) In particular, this truth value remains positive if we additionally assign specific values for finitely many of the variables $x_{n,m}$.

Here, “$\tilde{p}$ is compatible with the generic sequence $\tilde{\eta}$” means: There is some assignment $a$ such that $p_{n,a} \circ a = \eta_n(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha < \delta + \omega$. Since $p_{n,\delta+m} = x_{n,m}$, the only assignment that can ever witness compatibility is the canonical assignment $a^c_\delta$.

More formally, and slightly stronger, we can formulate the last item as: Given $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ and $(b_{n,i})_{n \epsilon \omega, i < f(n)}$ with $b_{n,i} \in \{0, 1\}$, the truth value of the following statement is non-zero:

- $\tilde{p} \in \hat{G}$,
- $p_{n,a} \circ a^c_\delta = \eta_n(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha < \delta + \omega$,
- and additionally $\eta_n(\delta + i)$ (or equivalently $x_{n,i} \circ a^c_\delta$) is $b_{n,i}$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $i < f(n)$.

**Proof.** (i) it follows from the definition of $R$ that each $q(n)$ is a valid condition in $Q_n$. (ii) The canonical assignment is the only assignment that can possibly witness compatibility. (iii) Given $f$ and $b_{n,i}$ as above, we can just extend $q(n)$ to be the name of some condition $q'$ in $Q_n$ of height $\delta + \omega$ (instead of just $\delta$) such that $q'(\delta + i) = b_{n,i}$ for all $i < f(n)$. For this we need, as usual, just Lemma 4.7(i,ii). □

**Remark 5.5.**

- It is easy to see (similarly to 4.7) that $R_{\delta+\omega}$ is nonempty for all $\delta$. We will only prove this (implicitly) for “stationary many” $\delta$, in Lemma 5.8 $\sigma^\delta R$ is dense in $\hat{p} \ast P_\omega$.
- In view of this Lemma, the proof of (iii) can be compared to Remark 4.1. (b)

While we cannot densely determine the gray area of Figure 3(b), we can densely determine such an area shifted up to some $\delta$. 


If \( \alpha < \delta \), then \( p_{n,\alpha} \) can be calculated from finitely many \( p_{l,\beta + m} \) with \( l < n \) (since \( p_{n,\alpha} \) is a term using variables \( x_{l,m} \), \( l < m \), and \( p_{l,\beta + m} = x_{l,m} \)). We can also calculate values in the other direction:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Lemma 5.8.} & \quad \text{Fix} \ n, \alpha \in P_n. \end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Proof.} & \quad \frac{\text{Assume}}{\text{that}} \ \frac{\text{for all}}{\text{assignments}} \ a, b \ \text{with} \ \eta \ \text{will may just write} \ p, \text{then it can be split accordingly.}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Lemma 5.6.} & \quad (i) \ p_{n,\alpha} \text{ is determined by finitely many } x_{l,k} \text{ with } l < n. \\
& \quad (ii) \ x_{n,m} \text{ can be determined by finitely many } p_{l,k} \text{ with } l > n, k \in \omega.
\end{align*} \]

More generally, we get (cf. Figure 5(a)): If \( p \in R_{\delta + \omega} \) and \( \beta < \delta \) (not necessary a limit), then every \( p_{n,\alpha} \) with \( \beta + \omega \leq \alpha < \delta + \omega \) can be determined by finitely many \( p_{l,\zeta} \) with \( l > n, \beta < \zeta < \beta + \omega \). More precisely: There is a \( k \in \omega \) and a sequence \((l_i, \xi_i)_{i<k}\) such that \( l_i > n, \beta < \xi_i < \beta + \omega \) and for all assignments \( a, b \) the following holds: If \( p_{n,\alpha} \circ a \neq p_{n,\alpha} \circ b \), then \((p_{l_i,\xi_i} \circ a)_{i<k} \neq (p_{l_i,\xi_i} \circ b)_{i<k}\).

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Proof.} & \quad \frac{\text{By induction on } \alpha}{\text{Assume } \alpha = \beta + \omega + m}. \ (p_{n+1,\zeta} \circ a, \xi) \text{ coheres with } p_{n,\alpha} \text{ above some } k_0, \text{ so we can use } f_{\beta + \omega,n,m} \text{ to get } p_{n,\alpha}. \ \text{Now assume that the statement is true for all } \alpha < \nu, \nu \text{ limit. If } \alpha = \nu + m, \text{ then } p_{n,\alpha} \text{ again is determined by the values of certain } p_{l,\zeta} \text{ with } l > n, \beta < \zeta < \nu, \text{ each of which in turn is determined (by induction) by finitely many } p_{l',\zeta'} \text{ with } \beta < \zeta' < \beta + \omega. \ \square
\end{align*} \]

We can identify \( R \) with a subset of \( P \ast P_\omega \):

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Lemma 5.7.} & \quad i : R \rightarrow \tilde{P} \ast P_\omega \text{ is injective.}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Proof.} & \quad \frac{\text{Fix } p \in R_{\delta + \omega}, q \in R_{\delta'+\omega}, p \neq q. \ \text{If } \tilde{p} \neq \tilde{q}, \text{ then } i(q) \neq i(p). \ \text{So assume that } \tilde{p} = \tilde{q} \text{ (in particular } \delta' = \delta). \ \text{Since } p \neq q, \text{ there is an } (n, \alpha) \text{ and a (finite, partial) assignment } a \text{ such that } q_{n,\alpha} \circ a \neq p_{n,\alpha} \circ a. \ \text{According to 5.6(iii), } i(q) \text{ is compatible with } a. \ \text{Let } r \leq i(q) \text{ force that the generic sequences are compatible with } a. \ \text{Then } r \text{ forces that } i(p) \text{ is not in the generic filter, since it determines a different value for } \eta_n(a) \text{ than } i(q). \ \square
\end{align*} \]

So we can interpret \( R \) as a subset of \( P \ast P_\omega \); and we usually do so, that is, we will may just write \( p \) instead of \( i(p) \) and \( R \) instead of \( i''R \), as in the following:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Lemma 5.8.} & \quad R \subseteq P \ast P_\omega \text{ is dense.}
\end{align*} \]

The proof is a bit cumbersome, but really just a modification of the proof of Lemma 4.11.
Proof. Fix \((\tilde{p}, p(0), p(1), \ldots) \in \hat{P} \ast P_n\), and a countable \(N^* \prec H(\chi^*)\) containing \((\tilde{p}, p(0), p(1), \ldots)\). Set \(\delta^* = N^* \cap \omega_1\). It is enough to show:

\[(5.1) \quad \text{There is a } q \in R_{\delta^* + \omega} \text{ such that } i(q) \leq (\tilde{p}, p(0), p(1), \ldots).\]

The \(\hat{P} \ast P_n\)-condition \((\tilde{p}, p(0), \ldots, p(n))\) will be denoted by \(p|n\). For \(q \in R\) and \(n \in \omega\), we set

\[q(n) = (q_{n, \alpha})_{\alpha < \delta^* + \omega} \quad \text{and} \quad q|n := (\tilde{q}, q(0), q(1), \ldots, q(n-1))\]

Just as \(q\) can be interpreted as a condition in \(\hat{P} \ast P_{\omega}\) in a canonical way (cf. 5.4), we can interpret \(q|n\) as a condition in \(\hat{P} \ast P_n\). In particular, “\(q|n\) forces \(\varphi\)” means the following:

- If \(\hat{G} \ast G_n\) is \(\hat{P} \ast P_n\)-generic over \(V\), if \(\hat{G}\) contains \(\tilde{q}\) and if \(\eta_0, \ldots, \eta_{n-1}\) are compatible with \((q_{n, \alpha})_{\alpha < n, \alpha < \delta^* + \omega}\), then \(\varphi\) holds in \(V[\hat{G} \ast G_n]\).

Let us call an antichain \(E\) in \(\hat{P} \ast P_n\) nice, if every condition \(e\) in \(E\) has the form of Corollary 4.12. These conditions are dense, so we get:

\[\text{For all } n \in \omega, X \in V \text{ and all } \tau \text{ such that } \hat{P} \ast P_n \text{ forces that } \tau \in \tilde{X}\]

there is a nice maximal antichain \(B\) deciding \(\tau\). I.e., for each \(b \in B\) there is an \(x^b \in X\) such that \(b\) forces \(\tau = x^b\).

The induction hypothesis. We will construct \(\tilde{q}\) in \(\hat{Q}\) of height \(\delta^* + \omega\) and, by induction on \(n \geq 0\), the condition \(q(n)\) — i.e., the terms \((q_{n, \alpha})_{\alpha < \delta^*}\) depending on variables \(x_{i,j}\) with \(i < n\) — such that the following holds:

(i) \(q(n+1)\) satisfies the conditions on elements of \(R_{\delta^* + \omega}\).

(ii) \(q(n+1)\) is \(\hat{P} \ast P_{n+1}\)-generic over \(N^*\).

(iii) \(q(n+1)\) is stronger than \((\tilde{p}, p(0), \ldots, p(n))\).

(iv) \(q(n+1)\) decides every nice maximal antichain \(E\) of \(\hat{P} \ast P_{n+1}\) in \(N^*\) by finite case distinction.

More formally: Item (i) means

(i) for all \(m \in \omega\) and \(\alpha \leq \delta^*\) limit there is a \(k_0 < \omega\) such that for all assignments \(a\), we have that \((q_{n, \xi} \circ a)_{\xi < \alpha}\) coheres with \(q_{n-1, \alpha+m} \circ a\) above \(k_0\).

And item (iv) means: For every nice maximal antichain \(E\) of \(\hat{P} \ast P_{n+1}\) in \(N^*\) there is an \(l^E \in \omega\), a sequence \((e^E_0, \ldots, e^E_{n-1})\) of elements of \(E \cap N^*\) and a sequence \((t^E_0, \ldots, t^E_{n-1})\) of terms using only variables \(x_{i,j}\) with \(i < n+1\) such that \(q|(n+1)\) forces the following:

(iv) There is exactly one \(k < l^E\) such that \(t^E_k \circ a^E_{n+1} = 1\) (cf. 5.2), and \(e^E_k \in \tilde{G} \ast G_n\) for this \(k\).

This implies the following (where we apply Lemma 5.3.3):

(v) For all partial assignments \(b\) of the (finitely many) variables used in any of the \(t^E_k\) there is exactly one \(k < l^E\) such that \(t^E_k \circ b = 1\).

Note that (iii) (for all \(n\)) implies \([5.1]\).

Step 1: Finding \(\tilde{q}\). First extend \(\tilde{p}\) to \(\tilde{p}'\) such that \(ht(\tilde{p}') = \delta^*\) and such that for every dense subset \(D\) of \(\tilde{P}\) in \(N^*\) there is an \(d \in D \cap N^*\) weaker that \(\tilde{p}'\) (this is possible since \(\tilde{P}\) is \(\sigma\)-closed). In particular, \(\tilde{p}'\) is \(\tilde{P}\)-generic over \(N^*\), and if \(E \subseteq \tilde{P}\) is a maximal antichain in \(N^*\), then \(\tilde{p}'\) decides the \(e \in E\) that will be in the generic antichain (and \(e \in N^*\)).
We further extend $\vec{p}$ to $\vec{q}$ by adding some arbitrary value at $\delta^*$. So $\text{ht}(\vec{q}) = \delta^* + 1$ (or equivalently $\delta^* + \omega$).

**Step 2: Finding $q(0)$**. This case, $n = 1$, is simple since $Q_0$ is $\sigma$-closed.

We have to define the (constant) terms $(q_0, \alpha)_{\alpha < \delta^*}$. Let $(D_i)_{\alpha \in \omega}$ enumerate all $\vec{P}$-names in $N^*$ for open dense subsets of $Q_0$, such that $D_0 = Q_0$.

We now define $r_n$ and $s_n$ for $n \in \omega$ such that:

(a) $r_n$ is a $\vec{P}$-name in $N^*$, forced by $\vec{p}$ to be a $Q_0$ condition and element of $D_n$.

(b) $s_n$ is a 0-1-sequence in $N^*$, forced by $\vec{q}$ to be $r_n$.

(c) $r_{n+1}$ is forced to extend $s_n$.

Set $r_0 = p(0)$. This satisfies (a). Given an $r_n$ satisfying (a), note that $\vec{P}$ does not add new countable sequences of ordinals. So every condition in $Q_0[\vec{G}]$, in particular $r_n$, already exists in the ground model $N^*$. So $r_n$ is decided by a maximal antichain, and therefore by $\vec{q}$, to be some sequence $s_n \in N^*$; satisfying (b). Also, since $s_n \in 2^{<\omega} \cap N^*$, we can find in $N^*$ a $\vec{P}$-name $r_{n+1}$ for an element of $D_{n+1}$ extending $s_n$.

Fix $\alpha < \delta^*$, and set $q_{0,\alpha}$ to be the term with constant value $s_n(\alpha)$ (for sufficiently large $n$). This defines $q(0)$. So $\vec{q}$ forces that $q(0)$ is $Q_0$-generic over $N^*[\vec{G}]$, i.e., $(\vec{q}, q(0))$ is $\vec{P} \ast P_1$-generic over $N^*$ and forces that $(\vec{p}, p(0)) \in \vec{G} \ast G_1$. So (i)–(iii) are satisfied. Now fix some nice, maximal antichain $E \subseteq \vec{P} \ast P_1$ such that $E \in N^*$. Every $e \in E$ is of the form $(\vec{e}, e(0))$ for a 0-1-sequence $e(0)$ in $V$. If $e \in N^*$, then $\vec{e}$ and $e(0)$ have height less than $\delta^*$. In particular, every $e \in E \cap N^*$ is either extended by $(\vec{q}, q(0))$ or is incompatible with it. Since $E \in N^*$ is a maximal antichain, and since $(\vec{q}, q(0))$ is $\vec{P} \ast P_1$-generic over $N^*$, we know that there has to be exactly one $e^* \in E$ compatible with $(\vec{q}, q(0))$, and $e^* \in N^*$. In other words, $(\vec{q}, q(0))$ decides the element $e^* \in E \cap N^*$ that is going to be in $\vec{G} \ast G_1$. So to satisfy (iv)', we can set $l_E^E = 1$, $t_0^E = 1$, $c_0^E = e^*$.

**Step 3: The successor step**. Now things get a bit more complicated, since $Q_n$ is not $\sigma$-closed any more. We assume that the induction hypothesis (i)–(iv) holds for $n - 1$. So we already have $q|n$ want to find $q_{n, \alpha}$ for $0 \leq \alpha < \delta^*$. As previously, we let $(D_i)_{i \in \omega}$ enumerate all $\vec{P} \ast P_n$-names in $N^*$ for open dense subsets of $Q_n$ (and we set $D_0 = Q_n$).

First we fix (in $V$) a term-sequence $(t^*_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \bigcup_{m \in \omega} \nu_m \cap \nu_{\delta^*+m}}$ such that:

- If $\alpha \in \nu_{\delta^*+m}$, then $t^*_\alpha$ only depends on $x_{\delta^*+m}$.
- For all $m \in \omega$, the sequence $l^*_\alpha$ coheres with $q_{\delta^*+m}$ (which is just $x_{\delta^*+m}$) above some $k_0$.
- For every $\beta < \delta^*$, the partial sequence $l^*_\alpha \upharpoonright \beta$ uses only finitely many variables.

We can find such a sequence since the $f_{\delta^*+m,k}$ defined by $\vec{q}$ are surjective and the $\nu_m \cap \nu_{\delta^*+m}$ are disjoint (for different $m$) cofinal subsets of $\delta^*$ of order type $\omega$.

We will construct in $V$ by induction on $i \in \omega$:

- a finite set $v_i$ of variables $x_{l,j}$ with $l < n$,
- for every assignment $a$ of $v_i$ a $\vec{P} \ast P_n$-name $r^a_i$ in $N^*$,
- a finite set $w_i$ of variables $x_{l,j}$ with $l < n$,
- for every assignment $b$ of $w_i$ a 0-1-sequence $s^b_i$ in $N^*$,
- an ordinal $\beta_i < \delta^*$,

such that the following holds:

(a) $v_{i+1} \supseteq w_i \supseteq v_i$.

$\sigma$-complete, and we will not be able to decide everything with the generic condition $q(n)$; but we will still be able to decide “modulo finite case distinction”.
(b) If a is an assignment of $v_i$, then $r^a_i$ is a name (in $N^*$) for an element of $D_i$.
(c) If $b$ is an assignment of $w_i$ and $a$ its restriction to $v_i$, then $(q|n)\& b$ forces
\[ s^b_i = r^a_i. \]

Set $w_0 = \emptyset$. So there is only one assignment, the empty one, of $w_0$. We set
\[ r^0_i = p(n)[13] \]
Assume that for some $i \geq 0$ we already have $w_i$, and $r^a_i$ for all assignments $a$ of $w_i$. Fix $a$. Note that $\hat{P} \ast P_n$ does not add any new countable sequences of ordinals, so according to [5.2] $r^a_i$ is decided by a nice maximal antichain $E$ of $\hat{P} \ast P_n$ in $N^*$. Using item (iv) of the induction hypothesis, we choose the sequences $(e^E_0, \ldots, e^E_n)$ of and $(t^E_0, \ldots, t^E_n)$. Let $v'$ be the (finite) set of variables used in any of the $t^E_k$. Set $v^a_i = w_i \cup v'$. Let $b$ be an assignment of $v^a_i$ extending $a$. According to (v), there is a unique $k \leq l^E$ such that $t^E_k \& b = 1$. We call this element $k(b)$. The element $e^E_{k(b)}$ determines $r^a_i$ to be a specific 0-1-sequence of $V$, and we call this sequence $s^b_i$. Note that $s^b_i \in N^*$. We can do this for all assignments $a$ of $w_i$, and set $v_i = \bigcup v^a_i$.

We still have to construct $\beta_i$, $w_{i+1}$ and $r^b_{i+1}$. We pick in $N^*$ a $\hat{P} \ast P_n$-name $N$ for a countable elementary submodel of $H^V[G \ast G_n](\chi)$ containing $D_{i+1}$ and all the (finitely many) $s^b_i$. Since $N \cap \omega_1$ is an $\hat{P} \ast P_n$-name for an ordinal, there are only finitely many possibilities modulo $q|n$, and we can choose $\beta_i \in N^* \cap \omega_1$ larger than every possibility for $N \cap \omega_1$.

The terms $t^E_k$ for $\alpha < \delta_i$ use only a finite set $w'$ of variables (of the form $x_{n-1,m}$). Set $w_{i+1} = v_i \cup w'$. Fix an assignment $a$ of $w_{i+1}$ and let $b$ be the restriction to $v_i$. Fix the index set
\[ I = \{ \alpha < \beta_i : (\exists j \leq i) \alpha \in \nu_{\beta_i,n-1,j} \}. \]
The finite set $I$ is in $N^*$. Set
\[ x = (\hat{P} \circ b)[I]. \]
This is a finite partial function in $N^*$ from $I$ to $\{0, 1\}$. We define the $\hat{P} \ast P_n$-name $r^b_{i+1}$ in $N^*$ by the following construction in $N^*[\hat{G} \ast G_n]$:

Let $d$ be some fixed element of $D_{i+1}$.

- Assume that $\beta' = N \cap \omega_1 < \beta_i$. (Otherwise set $r^a_{i+1} = d$.)
- Assume that $s^b_i$ is a $Q_n$-condition. (Otherwise set $r^a_{i+1} = d$.)
- In $N$, extend $s^b_i$ to some $Q_n$-condition containing $x[\langle \beta' \rangle \downarrow (s^b_i)]$. (As usual, use $\leq \beta_i$ inside $N$.)
- Again in $N$, pick some condition $r^a_{i+1}$ in $D_{i+1}$ extending $s^b_i$. In particular, $r_{i+1}$ has height less than $\beta_i$.

This ends the construction. We can summarize all the possibilities of $s^b_i(\alpha)$ into the term $q_\alpha(n)$ (depending on the variables in $v_i$). This defines $q(n)$.

It remains to be shown that $q|n+1$ satisfies the induction hypothesis.

For (i)' first assume $\alpha < \delta^*$. Let $D_i$ be the set of conditions of length $\geq \alpha$. Let $q_{n-1,\alpha+m}$ be determined by the finite set $v$ of variables, and set $v' = v \cup v_i$. Fix an assignment $b$ of $v'$. In particular $b$ determines $q_{n-1,\alpha+m}$ as well as $q(n)|\alpha$, since $q(n)$ “extends” $s^b_i \in D_i$ (where $b'$ is the restriction of $b$ to $v_i$). Since $q|n$ is compatible with the finite assignment $b$, we know that $q(n) \circ b|\alpha$ coheres with

---

10 For $x \in \hat{P} \ast P_n$, $x \& b$ is the truth value (in $ro(\hat{P} \ast P_n)$) of the following statement: $x \in \hat{G} \ast G_n$, and $b$ is compatible with $q_0, \ldots, q_{n-1}, \ldots$, i.e., for every $x_{i,k} \in v_i$, we have $q_{j,n-1,k} = x_{i,k} \circ b$. For this notation we can use $x = p|n$, and also $x = q|n$, since we can canonically interpret $q|n$ as element of $\hat{P} \ast P_n$.

11 More formally, we should set
\[ r^0_i = \begin{cases} p(n) & \text{if } p(n) \in Q_n \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \]
since $p(n)$ is forced to be in $Q_n$ by $p|n$, not by the empty condition.
According to the construction, all assignments for all assignments \( b \) of \( v' \).

Let \( D \) be the \( \vec{P} \cdot P_n \)-name for the following open dense subset of \( Q_n \)
\[
D = \{ q \leq e(n) : e \in E, e[n] \in \vec{G} \cdot G_n \}.
\]
We know that \( D \) appears as some \( D_i \) in the list of dense sets in \( N^* \). Fixing an assignment \( a \) of \( v_i \), we get \( s_i^n \) in \( N^* \) such that \( s_i^n \in D_i[\vec{G} \cdot G_n] \). We set
\[
A^n = \{ e[n] : e \in E, e(n) \subseteq s_i^n \}
\]
This is a nice \( \vec{P} \cdot P_n \)-antichain and maximal under \( (q|n) & a \). We can extend it to a nice maximal antichain \( B^a \). By induction hypothesis, we can determine modulo \( q|n \) the element \( b \) of \( B^a \) chosen by \( \vec{G} \cdot G_n \) filter by finite case distinction. Then \( b^* s_i^n \) is the element of \( E \) chosen by \( \vec{G} \cdot G_{n+1} \). Combining the finite case distinction for the \( s_i^n \) with the finite case distinctions for the according \( B^a \) gives the desired result.

Since \( R \) is a subset of \( \vec{P} \cdot P_n \), it is also a partial order (and since it is dense, it is forcing equivalent to \( \vec{P} \cdot P_n \)). We now show that we can interpret the order on \( R \) in a different way, using substitutions of terms:

**Definition 5.9.** Let \( p \in R_{\delta+\omega} \) and \( q \in R_{\delta'+\omega} \). We call \( q \) term-stronger than \( p \), if either \( p = q \) or if the following holds: \( \bar{q} \leq \bar{p} \) (in particular \( \delta' \geq \delta \)), and \( p_{n,\alpha} \circ \phi = q_{n,\alpha} \) for all \( \alpha < \delta \) and for the substitution \( \phi \) defined by \( \phi_{n,m} = q_{n,\delta+m} \).

(Again, recall that we interpret terms as functions, so we use \( =^* \) as defined in \([2,3]\).)

**Lemma 5.10.** The condition \( q \in R \) is term-stronger than \( p \in R \) iff \( i(q) \leq i(p) \).

**Proof.** Assume that \( q \) is not term-stronger than \( p \). If \( \bar{q} \) is not stronger than \( \bar{p} \) in \( \vec{P} \), then \( i(q) \) cannot be stronger than \( i(p) \). So assume \( \bar{q} \leq \bar{p} \). According to the definition of term-stronger, \( q_{l,\alpha} =^* p_{l,\alpha} \circ \phi \) fails for some \( l, \alpha \). These terms depend on finitely many variables \( x_{n,m} \), and there is a partial assignment \( a \) of these variables such that \( q_{l,\alpha} \circ a \neq p_{l,\alpha} \circ \phi \circ a \). According to Lemma \([5,4]\ iii)\), we can force the generic sequence to be compatible with \( q \) and \( a \). Then \( i(q) \) is in the generic filter, but \( i(p) \) is not, contradicting \( i(q) \leq i(p) \). \( \square \)

If \( q' \) is a condition, then \( (q'_{n,m})_{n,m \in \omega} \) can be interpreted as substitution: For \( p \in R_{\delta+\omega} \) and \( q' \in R_{\delta'+\omega} \), we can stack \( q' \) on top of \( p \) — overlapping at \( [\delta, \delta + \omega] \) — to get a condition \( q \in R_{\delta+\delta'+\omega} \) stronger than \( p \), cf. Figure 5(b). We write \( q = p \upharpoonright q' \).

More precisely:

**Definition 5.11.** For \( p \in R_{\delta+\omega} \) and \( q' \in R_{\delta'+\omega} \), we define the condition \( q = p \upharpoonright q' \) in \( R_{\delta+\delta'+\omega} \) as follows:
\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{q} & (\omega + 1) = \bar{p}. \\
\bar{q}(\alpha) & \text{ for } \alpha \geq \delta + \omega \text{ is defined the following way:} \\
\nu_{\delta+\omega, n,m}^q & = \{ \delta + \beta : \beta \in \nu_{\omega, n,m}^p \}, \\
\bar{q}_{\delta+\omega, n,m} & = \bar{q}_{\delta+\omega, n,m}, \\
f_{\delta+\omega, n,m,k}^q & = f_{\delta+\omega, n,m,k}, \\
q_{n,\delta+\omega} & = q_{n,\delta+\omega}.
\end{align*}
\]
Figure 6. (a) If $q$ is stronger than $p_1$ and $p_2$, then $q_{2,m}$ is constant for all $m$. (The gray area indicates constant terms; the $\hat{P}$ parts are not displayed.) (b) If $p_1, p_2$ are compatible (i.e., weaker than some $q$), they do not have to be comparable.

- If $\alpha < \delta$, then $q_{n,\alpha} = p_{n,\alpha} \circ \phi$ for the substitution $\phi$ defined by $\phi_{n,m} = q'_{n,m}$.

Fact 5.12.  
(i) If $p_1 \in R_{\delta+\omega}^\rho$ and $q' \in R_{\delta'+\omega}^\rho$, then $p_1 \upharpoonright q'$ is stronger than $p_1$.
(ii) If $q' \in R_{\delta'+\omega}^\rho$ is stronger than $p_1 \in R_{\delta+\omega}^\rho$, then we can “split” $q'$ into $p_1 \in R_{\delta+\omega}^\rho$ and $q' \in R_{\delta'+\omega}^\rho$ such that $q = p_1 \upharpoonright q'$.

Remarks 5.13.  
- Of course we generally cannot split a condition at every level: If $q \in R_{\delta'+\omega}^\rho$ and $\delta' < \delta''$, then we generally do not get $q = p_1 \upharpoonright q''$ for some $p_1 \in R_{\delta+\omega}^\rho$.
- The Fact shows that for all $q \in R$ there are only finitely many $p \geq q$, see Figure 6(a).
- Note that two compatible conditions generally are not comparable, see Figure 6(b). (Otherwise, according to the previous item, $R$ would be isomorphic to a tree of height $\omega$ and therefore collapse the continuum.)
- The situation is similar to $Q_*$ defined in Section 2. The conditions that are stronger than some $p \in R$ are exactly those with another condition $q' \in R$ stacked on top.

6. Sacks reals as squares of terms again

We will now investigate the relation of $R$ and $Q_*$. Given a $p \in R$, we can restrict $p$ to an $\omega \times \omega$-matrix of terms:

**Definition 6.1.** For $p \in R$, set $\sigma(p) = (p_{n,m})_{n,m \in \omega}$.

Note that

(6.1) \[ \sigma(p \upharpoonright q') = \sigma(p) \circ \sigma(q'). \]

So stacking $q'$ on top of $p$ translates to applying $\sigma(q')$ (as substitution) to $\sigma(p)$.

Generally $\sigma(p)$ will not be element of $Q_*$, and for a $\tilde{t} \in Q_*$ there generally is no $p \in R$ such that $\sigma(p) = \tilde{t}$. The reason is that some obvious conditions on the term-matrix are incomparable: In $Q_*$, we require

$t_{i,j}$ only depends on $x_{n,m}$ such that $(n,m) \preceq (i,j)$,

whereas every $\sigma(p)$ obviously satisfies

$p_{i,j}$ only depends on $x_{n,m}$ such that $n < i$. 

We will now define a dense subset $R' \subseteq R$ such that $\sigma^n R' \subseteq Q_*$, and such that
$R'$ adds a $Q_*$-generic object. This proves the first part of Theorem [1] since $Q_*$ is
forcing equivalent to Sacks forcing and $R'$ is (as a dense subset) equivalent to $R$,
which in turn is dense in $P * P_\omega$. So $P * P_\omega$ adds a Sacks real.

Lemma 6.2.  
(i) There is an $r^\Delta \in R_{\omega^\omega+\omega}$ such that $\sigma(r^\Delta) \in Q_*$ and $\sigma(p \upharpoonright r^\Delta) \in Q_*$ for all $p \in R$.
(ii) There is an $r^{\text{mult}} \in R_{\omega^\omega+\omega}$ such that for all $\phi \in Q_*$ there is an $r \in R_{\omega^\omega+\omega}$
with $\sigma(r^{\text{mult}}) \circ \phi = \sigma(r)$.

We postpone the proof to the end of the section. We set

$$R' = \{ p \upharpoonright r^\Delta : p \in R \}.$$ 

This is a dense subset of $R$, since $p \upharpoonright r^\Delta \leq p$ for all $p$. As a consequence of the
previous Lemma, we get:

Corollary 6.3.  
(a) If $l \in R'$ and $p \leq_R l$, then $\sigma(p \upharpoonright r^\Delta) \leq Q_*, \sigma(l)$.
(b) If $p \in R'$ then there is an $\tilde{s} \leq p$ such that for all $l \leq \tilde{s}$ then there is an
$q \leq p$ in $R'$ such that $\sigma(q) \leq l$.
(c) The forcing notion $R'$ adds a generic for $Q_*$. So $\tilde{P} * P_\omega$ adds a Sacks real.

Proof of the Corollary. (a) Assume that $p = l \upharpoonright q'$. Then $\sigma(p \upharpoonright r^\Delta) = \sigma(l) \circ \sigma(q' \upharpoonright r^\Delta)$;
and $\sigma(q' \upharpoonright r^\Delta)$ is an element of $Q_*$ and therefore witnesses that $\sigma(p \upharpoonright r^\Delta)$ is
stronger than $\sigma(l)$.
(b) Set $\bar{s} = \sigma(p \upharpoonright r^{\text{mult}} \upharpoonright r^\Delta)$, and let $\phi$ witnesses $\bar{t} \leq \bar{s}$, i.e., $\phi \in Q_*$ and

$$\sigma(r^\Delta) \circ \phi \in Q_*,$$

so by Lemma 6.2(ii), there is an $r \in R$ such that

$$\sigma(r) = \sigma(r^{\text{mult}}) \circ \sigma(r^\Delta) \circ \phi,$$

$$\sigma(p \upharpoonright r) = \sigma(p) \circ \sigma(r) = \bar{s} \circ \phi = \bar{t}.$$ 

Set $q = p \upharpoonright r \upharpoonright r^\Delta$. Then $q \in R'$ and $q \leq p$. Furthermore,

$$\sigma(q) = \sigma(p \upharpoonright r) \circ \sigma(r^\Delta) = \bar{t} \circ \sigma(r^\Delta) \leq \bar{t}.$$ 

(c) Let $G'$ be $R'$-generic over $V$. We show that the following set is $Q_*$-generic filter
over $V$:

$$(6.2) \quad G_* = \{ \bar{r} \in Q_* : (\exists q \in G') \sigma(q) \leq \bar{r} \}.$$ 

First note that $G_*$ does not contain incompatible elements: Assume that $\bar{r}_1$ and $\bar{r}_2$
are in $G_*$. Then there are $l_1, l_2 \in G'$ such that $\sigma(l_1) \leq r_1$. Since $G'$ is a filter, there
is some $p \leq l_1, l_2$ in $G'$. The set

$$\{ p' \upharpoonright r^\Delta : p' \leq p \}$$

is dense below $p$, so there is some $q = p' \upharpoonright r^\Delta$ in $G'$. According to (a), the $q$ satisfies
$\sigma(q) \leq \sigma(l_1), \sigma(l_2)$.

Now assume that $D \subseteq Q_*$ is dense, and (towards a contradiction) that $p$ forces
that $G_*$ does not meet $D$. Then pick $\bar{s}$ as in (b), pick $\bar{t} \leq \bar{s}$ in $D$ and pick $q$ again
as in (b). So $q$ forces that $\sigma(p) \leq \bar{t}$ is in $G_*$, a contradiction. So we know that $G_*$
is generic. \qed

It remains to prove Lemma 6.2. All these facts are easy to see, but a bit cumbersome to write down formally. So the reader might be better off drawing
a picture than reading the proof. Fix an injective function from $\omega^{<\omega}$ to $\omega$, $(a_1, \ldots, a_l) \mapsto [\bar{a}_1, \ldots, a_l]$, with coinfinite range.
The construction of $r^\Delta$. All we need is a $r^\Delta \in R_{\omega+\omega}$ satisfying the following:

\[(6.3) \quad r^\Delta_{n,m} \text{ only depends on variables } x_{i,j} \text{ such that } i + j < n.\]

Then, if we stack $r^\Delta$ on top of any $p \in R_{\omega+\omega}$, the resulting $q = p \upharpoonright r^\Delta$ will satisfy (6.3) as well. Also, every element $q$ of $R$ satisfies that each $x_{i,j}$ depends on finitely many $q_{n,m}$ for $n, m \in \omega$, according to Lemma [6.4 (ii)]. Therefore $\sigma(p \upharpoonright r^\Delta)$ will satisfy all requirements for an element of $Q_*$, which proves Lemma (5.2 (i)).

We now construct $r^\Delta$.

- When defining $r^\Delta$, only the $\nu$ part is nontrivial; we set each $j_{\alpha,n,m} : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ and $f_{n,\alpha,m,k} : 2 \rightarrow 2$ to be the identity function for all $\alpha, n, m, k$.
- We deal with one variable at a time. Assume that we deal with $x_{n,\alpha,m}$. 
- Set $\nu_{\omega,\nu,n,m} = \{ \omega \cdot k + \nu n_0, m_0 : k > m_0 \}$.
- For $\alpha \in \nu_{\omega,\nu,n,m}$, we set $r^\Delta_{n,\alpha,0} = x_{n,\alpha,m}$.
- If $n = n_0 + l$ for some $l \geq 1$, if $m = \nu a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_l$ with $a_0 = n_0, a_1 = m_0$, and if $k > m_0 - l$, then set $\nu (\nu (k + 1), n, m) = \{ \omega \cdot k + \nu a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_l, j \}$.
- And for $\alpha \in \nu (\nu (k + 1), n, m)$, we set $r^\Delta_{n,\alpha,0} = x_{n,\alpha,m}$.
- We repeat this for all $x_{i,j}$. (Note that the $\nu_{\alpha,n,m}$ defined for different $m$ will be disjoint).
- So far, whenever we have defined some $\nu_{\beta,n,m}$ to contain $\alpha$, we also warrant that $r^\Delta_{n+1,\alpha} = r^\Delta_{n,\beta,m}$ and $r^\Delta_{n+1,\alpha} = r^\Delta_{n,\beta,m}$ are the same variable.
- We now set all $r^\Delta_{n,\alpha}$ that are undefined so far to be the constant term 0, and define every $\nu_{\beta,n,m}$ that is undefined so far in a way such that every member $\alpha$ of $\nu_{\beta,n,m}$ satisfies $r^\Delta_{n+1,\alpha} = 0$. (Here, we use that the coding function has cofinite range.)

It is easy to see that the object $r^\Delta$ defines this way is element of $R$. Each $r^\Delta_{n,\alpha}$ is either an $x_{n,\alpha,m}$ or 0. If $r^\Delta_{n,m} = x_{n,\alpha,m}$, then $n > m_0 + n_0$. Given $n$, $r^\Delta_{n,m} = 0$ for infinitely many $m$.

The construction of $r^\text{mult}$. We will first show the following:

**Lemma 6.4.** If $(p_{n,m})_{n,m \in \omega}$ satisfies

1. $p_{n,m}$ is a term depending only on $x_{i,j}$ with $i < n$,
2. $(\forall n) (\exists^\infty m) p_{n,m} = 0$,
3. $(\forall i, j) (\exists^\infty n) (\forall M) (\exists m_0, \ldots, m_k > M) x_{i,j}$ is determined by $p_{n_0,m_0}, \ldots, p_{n_k,m_k}$,

then there is an $q \in R_{\omega+\omega}$ such that $\sigma(q) = p$.

**Proof.** The proof is very similar to the preceding construction. The reader might just consult Figure 3 (c).

Assume we have such a sequence $\hat{p}$. We have to define $q \in R_{\omega+\omega}$. We already know that $q_{n,m} = p_{n,m}$ for all $n, m \in \omega$.

We more or less repeat the construction above, to get all $q_{n,m}$ and all $\nu_{\beta,n,m}$, but only for $\beta \geq \omega + \omega$, and we deal with $\nu_{\beta,n,m}$ later. Assume we are dealing with $x_{n,\alpha,m}$. Set

$I_{n,\alpha,m} = \{ n' \geq n_0 + 2 : (\forall M) (\exists m_0', \ldots, m_k' > M) x_{n,\alpha,m} \text{ is determined by } p_{n_0', m_0'}, \ldots, p_{n_k', m_k'} \}$.

According to assumption (3), $I_{n,\alpha,m}$ is infinite.

For all $\alpha > \omega$ limit and all $n, m, k$ we will set $j_{\alpha,n,m}$ and $f_{\alpha,n,m,k}$ to be the identity functions.

We set

$\nu_{\omega,\nu,n,m} = \{ i \cdot \omega + \nu n_0, m_0 : i + m_0 + 1 \in I_{n,\alpha,m} \}$.

(So $\nu_{\omega,\nu,n,m} \cap \{ i \cdot \omega, (i + 1) \cdot \omega \}$ contains a singleton if $i + m_0 + 1 \in I_{n,\alpha}$. and is empty otherwise.) We set $q_{n+1,\alpha} = x_{n,\alpha,m}$ for all $\alpha \in \nu_{\omega,\nu,n,m}$; and

\[\text{This corresponds to the simpler version of } \hat{P} \text{ in Section 3.}\]
“propagate the $x_{n_0,m_0}$ diagonally down”: If $n = n_0 + l$ for some $l \geq 1$, if $i > 0$ and $i + m + l \in I_{n_0,m_0}$, and if $m = (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_l)^\top$ such that $a_0 = n_0, a_1 = m_0$, then set 
\[
\nu_{i(l+1),n,m} = (i \cdot \omega + [a_0, \ldots, a_l, j] : j \in \omega) .
\]

We iterate this for all $x_{n_0,m_0}$, and set all $q_{n,\alpha}$ that have not been defined in this process to be the constant term 0. Also we set the $\nu_{\beta,n,m}$ for $\beta > \omega$ that have not been defined yet to contain only $\alpha > \omega$ such that $q_{n+1,\alpha} = 0$. (Remember that the coding had coinfinite range.)

So we have all $q_{n,\alpha}$ and all $\nu_{\beta,n,m}, j_{\beta,n,m}$ and $f_{\beta,n,m,k}$ for $\beta > \omega$.

We still have to define $\nu_{\omega,n,m}, j_{\omega,n,m}$ and $f_{\omega,n,m,k}$. For this, we use a simple book-keeping: At stage $i$, there are only finitely many pairs $(n, m)$ for which any of these objects are already partially defined. For all of these $(n, m)$, we also have: $\nu_{\omega,n,m}$ is defined up to height $M_{n,m}, j_{\omega,n,m}$ is defined up to some $h_{n,m}$ such that $j_{\omega,n,m}(h_{n,m} - 1) = M_{n,m} - 1$ if $\omega,n,m,k$ is defined for exactly the $k < h_{n,m}$. Let $M$ be the maximum of all $M_{n,m}$ for a given stage.

The book-keeping gives us an $(n_0, m_0)$ and an $(n, m)$ such that $q_{n, \omega + m} = x_{n_0, m_0}$.

By our construction, we know that $x_{n_0,m_0}$ can be determined by finitely many and arbitrary large $q_{n+1,m'}$. Fix $m'_0, \ldots, m'_{l-1}$ bigger than $M$ such that $q_{n+1,m'_0}, \ldots, q_{n+1,m'_{l-1}}$ determines $x_{n_0,m_0}$. Extend $\nu_{\omega,n,m}$ to contain exactly $\{m'_0, \ldots, m'_{l-1}\}$, continue $j_{\omega,n,m'}$ by setting $j_{\omega,n,m'}(h_{n,m}) = M_{n,m} + l - 1$ and define $f_{\omega,n,m',h_{n,m}}$ so that it calculates $x_{n_0,m_0}$.

At the end, again set the $\nu_{\omega,n,m}$ that have not been defined in this process to contain only $m'$ such that $q_{n+1,m'} = 0$. To be able to do this, we use at height $\omega$ assumption (2).

We can now define $r^{\text{mult}}$: We can take any condition in $R$ satisfying

- $r^{\text{mult}}_{n,m}$ only depends on $x_{i,j}$ with $i + j < n$.
- Every $x_{i,j}$ with $i + j < n$, as well as the constant 0 term, occurs infinitely often in $\{r^{\text{mult}}_{n,m} : m \in \omega\}$.

If we set $\bar{p} = r^{\text{mult}} \circ \phi$ for some $\phi \in Q_\omega$, we get:

- $p_{n,m}$ only depends on $x_{i,j}$ with $i + j < n$. (Due to \[2\].) So we satisfy (1).
- For all $n$, infinitely many $p_{n,m}$ are 0. So we satisfy (2).
- $x_{i,j}$ is determined by $(\psi_{i,i,k_i})_{i \in I}$. Fix any $n$ bigger than $\max(l_i + k_i : i \in I)$.
  
  Then $x_{i,j}$ is determined by finitely many $p_{n,m}$ (where we can pick the $m'$'s arbitrarily large). So we satisfy (3).

So $r^{\text{mult}} \circ \phi$ satisfies all assumptions of the previous Lemma, and we get a $q$ as desired.

7. The Quotient Forcing.

It might look tempting to assume $\diamondsuit$ to construct the coding sequences $\bar{\nu}, \bar{\omega}, \bar{f}$ instead of using the preparatory forcing. (We just have to “guess” correctly sufficiently often for the proofs to work.) However, this is not possible: Otherwise, Sacks forcing would be equivalent to $P_\omega$ (since $P_\omega$ adds a Sacks real $s$ which in turn determines the $P_\omega$-generic filter $G_\omega$). But Sacks reals are minimal, and the $Q_0$ generic $\theta_0 \in 2^{\omega_1}$ is not in the ground model $V$. Therefore $V[s] = V[\theta_0]$, a contradiction to the fact that $V[\theta_0]$ does not add new reals.

In particular, if we look at $P_\omega$ in $V[G]$, then $P_\omega$ does not add a Sacks real (over $V[G]$), just a Sacks real over $V$.

So $\bar{P} \ast P_\omega$ adds a Sacks real $s$ but is not equivalent to Sacks forcing, and $s$ does not determine the $\bar{P}$-generic object $\bar{G}$. However, every new $\omega$-sequence is already added by $s$:
Lemma 7.1. If $\tilde{G} \ast G_\omega$ is $\tilde{P} \ast P_\omega$-generic over $V$, and if $r \in V[\tilde{G} \ast G_\omega]$ is an $\omega$-sequence of ordinals, then $r \in V[s]$. Here we set $s = (\tilde{\eta}_n(m))_{n,m \in \omega}$, the Sacks real over $V$.

Proof. If $\tilde{q} \in \tilde{G}$ has height $\delta$, then $s$ together with $\tilde{q}$ determines $G_n$ up to height $\delta$ for all $n$ (just as in Lemma 4.9). So if $N \prec H(\chi)$ and $\tilde{q} \in \tilde{G}$ has height $N \cap \omega_1$, then $s$ together with $\tilde{q}$ determines whether $r \in \tilde{G} \ast G_\omega$ for any $r \in R \cap N$.

Assume towards a contradiction that $p \in R$ forces that $\tilde{f}$ is an $\omega$-sequence of ordinals not added by $s$. Choose an $N \prec H(\chi)$ containing $p, \tilde{f}$, and an $N$-generic $q \leq p$. Each $\tilde{f}(n)$ is decided by some maximal antichain $A \in N$. But for each $a \in A \cap N$, $s$ together with $\tilde{q}$ determines whether $a$ is in $G$. In particular, $\tilde{f}[G] \in V[s]$.

This proves the second part of Theorem 1. Since $R$ forces that there is some Sacks real over $V$ and since Sacks forcing is homogeneous, $R$ can be factorized as Sacks composed with some $P'$. Since the Sacks real already adds all new $\omega$-sequences, $P'$ is NNR.
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