Large cardinals and resurrection axioms

Konstantinos Tsaprounis

Addendum

Some final remarks are in order. First of all, we would like to thank Joel David Hamkins, Ralf Schindler, and Jouko Väänänen, for all their help, questions, and valuable suggestions with regard to this dissertation. Special thanks go to Joel David Hamkins for his extended list of detailed comments.

In what follows, and for the reader's orientation, we shall be giving the number of the relevant page, sometimes followed by the number of the line in the text. Negative line numbers are understood by starting the counting from the bottom of the page. Thus, for example, "p. 14, +3" points to the third line of page 14.

p. x. In the third paragraph, we mention Woodin's considerations of the phenomenon of resurrection for Σ_2 - statements. It is worth pointing out that Hamkins and, independently, Väänänen have considered the *Maximality Principle* which is another example of resurrection for set – theoretic formulas.

For more details on this principle, the reader is referred to citation [44] of the text (by Stavi and Väänänen) and to:

Hamkins, J.D., *A simple maximality principle.* In Journal of Symbolic Logic, Vol. 68(2), pp. 527 – 550, 2003.

p. 14, +3 and +4. The word "weaker" should be dropped.

p. 23. In the conclusion of Proposition 2.6, the term "$[\kappa^+, j(\kappa))$ - club" means β - club, for every (regular) β in the interval $[\kappa^+, j(\kappa))$. Likewise for all subsequent appearences of "I - club", with I being an ordinal interval.

p. 26. In Question 2.8 there is no need for any mention to λ. What we are really asking is what is the consistency strength of the existence of a tallness embedding j for κ which, in addition, is such that $j(\kappa)$ is regular/inaccessible.

p. 40. In the second paragraph, we point out the use of the seed $j''\lambda$ in the substructures which we define throughout the Section 2.5. Brent Cody has considered similar constructions in order to study the strength of the failure of the GCH at a degree of supercompactness. The interested reader is referred to:

Cody, B., *The failure of the GCH at a degree of supercompactness.* In Mathematical Logic Quarterly, Vol. 58 (1 – 2), pp. 83 – 94, 2012.

p. 82. In the final paragraph before the beginning of Section 5.1, we say that the resurrection axiom for the class of posets which preserve the stationary subsets of ω_1 is not dealt with in [29]. This is the case for the cited notes by Johnstone, which are the ones to which we had access during the development of the material appearing in Chapter 5.

Shortly before the defense of this dissertation, the actual preprint by Hamkins and Johnstone was brought to our attention. We thus adjust the relevant bibliographic entry of the text as follows:

[29] Hamkins, J.D., Johnstone, T., *Uplifting cardinals and the resurrection axioms.* Preprint (2012).

Hence, for instance, see Theorem 24 in [29] regarding Theorem 1.6 (p. 4). For another example, the phrase "by results in [29]" appearing in the proof of Corollary 5.18 (p. 97) refers to Theorems 4 and 8 in [29].

In the light of the newly cited [29], we shall point out below some results of the current dissertation which have overlap with the independently obtained results by Hamkins and Johnstone.

p. 83, Theorem 5.5. See Theorem 29 in [29].

p. 87, Proposition 5.6. See Theorem 7 in [29].

p. 95, Lemma 5.15. See Theorem 10 in [29].