PROCEEDINGS OF THE
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Volume 130, Number 4, Pages 1247–1248
S 0002-9939(01)06407-3
Article electronically published on November 9, 2001

GAMES OF LENGTH $\omega \cdot 2$

BENEDIKT LÖWE AND PHILIPP ROHDE

(Communicated by Carl G. Jockusch, Jr.)

Abstract. This note combines an unpublished theorem of Woodin's about AD and Uniformisation with combinatorial arguments of Blass' to get a startling consequence for games on ω of length $\omega \cdot 2$: The determinacy of these games is equivalent to the Axiom of Real Determinacy.

This short note does not contain the proof of an independent new theorem. Instead, it provides a surprising viewpoint on two known theorems by pointing out that they can be used to fill a gap in the theory of determinacy for games of fixed countable length. This remark is particularly puzzling since the conjectures and guesses of the experts about how to fill this gap were anticipating a different solution, and the result seems to defy intuition.

The result of this note has been independently noticed by Richard Ketchersid (Los Angeles).

Throughout this note, we shall work in $\mathsf{ZF}+\mathsf{DC}$. We denote by $\mathsf{AD}[\alpha]$ the Axiom of Determinacy for games of length α with moves in ω, i.e., "for all $A \subseteq \omega^\alpha$ there is either a winning strategy for player I or a winning strategy for player II in the game $G(A)$". Moreover, $\mathsf{AC}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R})$ is the Axiom of Choice for families of sets of reals parametrized by real numbers, and $\mathsf{AD}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the Axiom of Real Determinacy.

The following picture depicts what has been known about the axioms $\mathsf{AD}[\alpha]$:

The axioms $\mathsf{AD}[n]$ for a natural number n are consequences of ZF alone [Zer13], the axioms $\mathsf{AD}[\alpha]$ for $\omega \leq \alpha < \omega \cdot 2$ are equivalent to $\mathsf{ZF}+\mathsf{AD}$ (by a folklore argument mentioned in [Bl75, Remark 7]), the axioms $\mathsf{AD}[\alpha]$ for $\omega^2 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$ are equivalent to $\mathsf{ZF}+\mathsf{AD}_{\mathbb{R}}$ (for $\omega^2 \leq \alpha < \omega^3$ this is the main theorem of [Bl75], for $\omega^3 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$ this has been independently shown by Donald A. Martin and Hugh Woodin [unpublished]), and the axioms AD_α for uncountable α are inconsistent by a theorem of Mycielski [My63] and Blass [Bl75, Remark 8].

This picture leaves a conspicuous gap between $\omega \cdot 2$ and ω^2. Since games of length ω^2 seem to be the natural choice for coding information about games with

Received by the editors April 2, 2001 and, in revised form, May 2, 2001.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03E60, 03E25, 03E35, 03E45.
The authors would like to thank the anonymous referee for encouraging suggestions that led to a considerable improvement in the exposition.

real number moves, several people have thought that the determinacy axioms from the gap below ω^2 should be strictly weaker than $\mathsf{AD}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Using an observation of Blass' and an unpublished theorem of Woodin's, we shall show that these conjectures were wrong:

Fact 1 (Blass)**.** $\mathsf{AD}[\omega \cdot 2]$ *implies* $\mathsf{AC}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R})$ [Bl75, Remark 7].

Fact 1 shows that $\mathsf{AD}[\omega{\cdot}2]$ cannot be equivalent to AD since under the assumption of AD, $\mathsf{AC}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R})$ doesn't hold in $\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{R})$. But much more is true:

Theorem 2 (Woodin)**.** *Then* $\mathsf{AD} + \mathsf{AC}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R})$ *and* $\mathsf{AD}_{\mathbb{R}}$ *are equivalent.*

(For a reference without proof, cf. [Ka94, Theorem 32.23].)

These two results give:

Theorem 3. *Suppose* $\omega \cdot 2 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$. *Then* $\mathsf{AD}[\alpha]$ *is equivalent to* $\mathsf{AD}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Proof. That $\mathsf{AD}_{\mathbb{R}}$ implies $\mathsf{AD}[\alpha]$ has previously been known (by the above-mentioned theorems of Blass, Martin and Woodin). But the other direction follows from the concatenation of Fact 1 and Theorem 2. □

This completes the picture of the axioms $\mathsf{AD}[\alpha]$ in a surprising way as follows:



The question of whether you can eliminate the use of DC from the proof of Theorem 2 is an open problem. Consequently, we do not know how to fill the gap without working in the theory $\mathsf{ZF} + \mathsf{DC}$. To try and do so would be a worthwhile project.

References

[Bl75] Andreas Blass, Equivalence of Two Strong Forms of Determinacy, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 52 (1975), p. 373-376 MR **51:**10103

[Ka94] Akihiro Kanamori, The Higher Infinite, Large Cardinals in Set Theory from Their Beginnings, Berlin 1994 [Perspectives in Mathematical Logic] MR **96k:**03125

[My63] Jan Mycielski, On the Axiom of Determinateness I, Fundamenta Mathematicae 53 (1963), p. 205-224 MR **28:**4991

[Zer13] Ernst Zermelo, Über eine Anwendung der Mengenlehre auf die Theorie des Schachspiels, *in:* E. W. Hobson, A. E. H. Love (*eds.*), Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress of Mathematicians, Cambridge 1912, Volume 2, Cambridge 1913, p. 501–504

Mathematisches Institut, Rheinische Friedrich–Wilhelms–Universität Bonn, Beringstrasse 6, 53115 Bonn, Germany

E-mail address: loewe@math.uni-bonn.de

Mathematisches Institut, Rheinische Friedrich–Wilhelms–Universität Bonn, Beringstrasse 6, 53115 Bonn, Germany

E-mail address: rohde@math.uni-bonn.de