

AD⁺ IMPLIES THAT ω_1 IS A CLUB Θ -BERKELEY CARDINAL

DOUGLAS BLUE AND GRIGOR SARGSYAN

ABSTRACT. Following [1], given cardinals $\kappa < \lambda$, we say κ is a club λ -Berkeley cardinal if for every transitive set N of size $< \lambda$ such that $\kappa \subseteq N$, there is a club $C \subseteq \kappa$ with the property that for every $\eta \in C$ there is an elementary embedding $j : N \rightarrow N$ with $\text{crit}(j) = \eta$. We say κ is ν -club λ -Berkeley if $C \subseteq \kappa$ as above is a ν -club. We say κ is λ -Berkeley if C is unbounded in κ . We show that under AD⁺, (1) every regular Suslin cardinal is ω -club Θ -Berkeley (see Theorem 7.1), (2) ω_1 is club Θ -Berkeley (see Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 7.1), and (3) the $\delta_{2^n}^1$'s are Θ -Berkeley—in particular, ω_2 is Θ -Berkeley (see Remark 7.5).

Along the way, we represent regular Suslin cardinals in direct limits as cutpoint cardinals (see Theorem 5.1). This topic has been studied in [30] and [2], albeit from a different point of view. We also show that, assuming $V = L(\mathbb{R}) + \text{AD}$, ω_1 is not Θ^+ -Berkeley, so the result stated in the title is optimal (see Theorem 9.14 and Theorem 9.19).

Mathematics Subject Classification: 03E55, 03E57, 03E60 and 03E45.

1. INTRODUCTION

Kunen [8] famously showed that the existence of a nontrivial elementary embedding $j : V_{\lambda+2} \rightarrow V_{\lambda+2}$ is inconsistent with ZFC. The intractability of the question whether ZF refutes the existence of such an embedding led Woodin to define, in his set theory seminar in the 1990s, a large cardinal notion to test whether ZF can prove even one nontrivial inconsistency. A cardinal κ is a *Berkeley cardinal* if for every transitive set M with $\kappa \in M$, and for any ordinal $\eta < \kappa$, there is a nontrivial elementary embedding $j : M \rightarrow M$ with $\eta < \text{crit}(j) < \kappa$. In addition to revealing tension between axioms of infinity and the Axiom of Choice, if Berkeley cardinals are consistent with ZF, then the Ultimate L Conjecture is false [1, Corollary 8.1].

We answer the determinacy version of this consistency question. Solovay showed that assuming AD, every subset of ω_1 is constructible from a real, and hence there is a nontrivial elementary embedding from any ZFC model of height ω_1 to itself with critical point less than ω_1 . Thus ω_1 is “ZFC-Berkeley” for structures of height ω_1 . We generalize this to transitive sets of any size less than Θ which are coded by sets of ordinals. Moreover, we can ensure that for every club in ω_1 and every such set, there is an embedding with critical point in that club, that is, adapting the terminology of [1],

Theorem 1.1. *Assume AD⁺. Then ω_1 is club Θ -Berkeley.*

A cardinal κ is a *HOD-Berkeley cardinal* if for all transitive sets $M \in \text{HOD}$ with $\kappa \in M$, and for every ordinal $\eta < \kappa$, there is a nontrivial elementary embedding $j : M \rightarrow M$ with $\eta < \text{crit}(j) < \kappa$ [1]. In ZFC, the existence of a HOD-Berkeley cardinal implies the failure of the HOD Conjecture (and hence the Ultimate L conjecture) [1, Theorem 8.6]. It is an immediate corollary of Theorem 1.1 that in a ZFC forcing extension, ω_1 is a HOD-Berkeley cardinal for structures which are ordinal definable from a real and belong to H_{ω_3} , see Corollary 8.2.

Recall that a set of reals A is κ -Suslin if A is the projection of a tree on $\omega \times \kappa$, and κ is a *Suslin cardinal* if there is a κ -Suslin set of reals which is not γ -Suslin for any $\gamma < \kappa$. We show that

The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the NCN Grant WEAVE-UNISONO, Id: 567137.

every regular Suslin cardinal κ is ω -club Θ -Berkeley, i.e. for all ω -clubs $C \subseteq \kappa$ and all transitive sets M with $\kappa \in M$, there is a nontrivial elementary embedding $j : M \rightarrow M$ with $\text{crit}(j) \in C$.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume AD^+ . Then every regular Suslin cardinal is ω -club Θ -Berkeley. Thus, every limit Suslin cardinal is a Θ -Berkeley cardinal.¹*

Of course, ω_1 is a regular Suslin cardinal. What seems to distinguish the arguments for Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 is whether the club or ω -club filter on the cardinal in question is an ultrafilter. For example, we expect that if κ is the largest Suslin cardinal, e.g. δ_1^2 in $L(\mathbb{R})$, then κ is club Θ -Berkeley.

Theorem 1.2 establishes the existence of *limit ω -club Θ -Berkeley cardinals*, limit ω -club Θ -Berkeley cardinals which are a limit of same.

Corollary 1.3. *Assume AD^+ . Then every regular limit Suslin cardinal is a limit ω -club Θ -Berkeley cardinal.*

Recall that for every n , the projective ordinal δ_n^1 is the supremum of the lengths of Δ_n^1 prewellorderings of the reals. The projective ordinals are analogues of ZFC cardinals in the setting of AD. We show that the even projective ordinals are Θ -Berkeley.

Theorem 1.4. *Assume AD^+ . Then for all n , δ_{2n}^1 is Θ -Berkeley.*

In particular, ω_2 is Θ -Berkeley.

A few words are in order about how these AD^+ theorems bear on the questions whether ZF + “there is a Berkeley cardinal” or ZFC + “there is a HOD-Berkeley cardinal” are consistent. Consider the latter question. Historically, large cardinals witnessed by elementary embeddings have been isolated first and subsequently shown to hold, in their measure formulations and assuming AD, at small cardinals. Thus ω_1 is measurable, strongly compact, supercompact, and huge, and ω_2 is measurable and has a significant degree of supercompactness. Presumably, this could have happened in reverse. Then we would need to see whether ZF large cardinal notions like Berkeley cardinals can “survive” the Axiom of Choice. Full Berkeley cardinals cannot. Perhaps HOD-Berkeley cardinals do. This paper opens the door for that eventuality.

1.1. Acknowledgements. The authors thank Gabriel Goldberg for fruitful discussion about choiceless cardinal phenomena under AD and for raising the question Theorem 9.14 addresses.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Inner model theory. The proofs of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 7.1 require inner model theory. We will use the full normalization technique, and [30, Theorem 1.4] in particular will play a crucial role. We will also use the HOD analysis, references for which include [32], [29, Chapter 8], [12] and [31]. We will only need the HOD analysis in models of the form $L^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$, where Ψ is an iteration strategy, and the HOD analysis that we will need is the one that for a given $x \in \mathbb{R}$, represents $\text{HOD}_{\Psi, x} | \Theta^{L^\Psi(\mathbb{R})}$ as a Ψ -premouse over x . In this regard, the HOD analysis we need is essentially the HOD analysis of $L(\mathbb{R})$.

The following notation will be used throughout. Suppose \mathcal{M} is some fine structural premouse (e.g. a hybrid premouse, hod premouse or just a pure premouse). We say that a cardinal κ is a cutpoint of \mathcal{M} if there is no extender $E \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $\text{crit}(E) < \kappa \leq \text{lh}(E)$. By a theorem of Schlutzenberg (see [19]), one can remove the condition that $E \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{M}}$.

When we write “ κ is a measurable cardinal of \mathcal{M} ” or similar expressions, we mean that κ is a measurable cardinal in \mathcal{M} as witnessed by the extender sequence of \mathcal{M} . The aforementioned

¹This follows because if κ is a singular Suslin cardinal that is a limit of Suslin cardinals then it is a limit of regular Suslin cardinals. See [3].

result of Schlutzenberg makes this convention unnecessary, but it is easier to communicate results with it.

Given a premouse (or any model with an extender sequence) \mathcal{M} and an \mathcal{M} -cardinal ν , we let $o^{\mathcal{M}}(\nu) = \sup(\{\text{lh}(E) : E \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{M}} \wedge \text{crit}(E) = \nu\})$. That is, $o^{\mathcal{M}}(\nu)$ is the Mitchell order of ν .

Following [29, Definition 2.2], for a premouse \mathcal{M} and $E \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\kappa = \text{crit}(E)$, we let $\nu(E) = \sup((\kappa^+)^{\mathcal{M}} \cup \{\xi + 1 : \xi \text{ is a generator of } E\})$. We also let $\pi_E^{\mathcal{M}}$ be the ultrapower embedding given by E . We will often omit \mathcal{M} .

If \mathcal{M} is a non-tame premouse such that $\mathcal{M} \models$ “there are no Woodin cardinals,” then \mathcal{M} has at most one $\omega_1 + 1$ -iteration strategy, and under AD, because ω_1 is a measurable cardinal, \mathcal{M} has at most one ω_1 -iteration strategy. For more details see [29].

Suppose \mathcal{M} is a premouse and Σ is an iteration strategy for \mathcal{M} . If \mathcal{N} is a normal Σ -iterate of \mathcal{M} , then we let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}}^{\Sigma}$ be the normal \mathcal{M} -to- \mathcal{N} tree that is according to Σ , and if the main branch of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}}^{\Sigma}$ does not drop, then we let $\pi_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}}^{\Sigma} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be the iteration embedding given by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}}^{\Sigma}$. If \mathcal{N} is a Σ -iterate of \mathcal{M} , then $\Sigma_{\mathcal{N}}$ is the iteration strategy for \mathcal{N} given by $\Sigma_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{U}) = \Sigma((\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}}^{\Sigma}) \frown \mathcal{U})$.

In the above situation, we say \mathcal{N} is a complete Σ -iterate of \mathcal{M} if $\pi_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}}$ is defined. When discussing direct limit constructions, we will use $\mathcal{M}_{\infty}(\mathcal{M}, \Sigma)$ for the direct limit of all complete Σ -iterates of \mathcal{M} and $\pi_{\mathcal{M}, \infty}^{\Sigma} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\infty}(\mathcal{M}, \Sigma)$ will be the direct limit embedding. If \mathcal{N} is a complete Σ -iterate of \mathcal{M} then $\pi_{\mathcal{N}, \infty}^{\Sigma} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\infty}(\mathcal{M}, \Sigma)$ is the iteration embedding.

We will often omit Σ from the superscripts in the notation introduced above.

2.2. Woodin’s Derived Model Theorem. Assume ZFC – Powerset + “ λ is a limit of Woodin cardinals” + “ λ^+ exists,” and suppose $g \subseteq \text{Coll}(\omega, < \lambda)$ is a generic. For $\alpha < \lambda$, let $g_{\alpha} = g \cap \text{Coll}(\omega, \alpha)$. Set $\mathbb{R}^* = \cup_{\alpha < \lambda} \mathbb{R}^{V[g_{\alpha}]}$ and, working in $V(\mathbb{R}^*)$, let Γ^* be the set of those $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^*$ such that for some $\alpha < \lambda$ and for some $(T, S) \in V[g_{\alpha}]$, $V[g_{\alpha}] \models$ “ (T, S) are $< \lambda$ -absolutely complementing” and $A = \cup_{\beta \in [\alpha, \lambda)} (p[T])^{V[g_{\beta}]}$.

Theorem 2.1 (Woodin’s Derived Model Theorem, [25, 28]). *Assume ZFC – Powerset + “ λ is a limit of Woodin cardinals” + “ λ^+ exists”. Suppose $g \subseteq \text{Coll}(\omega, < \lambda)$ is a generic. Then $L(\Gamma^*, \mathbb{R}^*) \models \text{AD}^+$.*

The model $L(\Gamma^*, \mathbb{R}^*)$ is the derived model of V at λ induced by g . We denote it by $D(V, \lambda, g)$. While $D(V, \lambda, g)$ is not in V , its theory is, and in V , we can refer to $D(V, \lambda, g)$ via the forcing language.

Notation 2.2. *Suppose λ is as above, $X \in V_{\lambda}$, A is a $< \lambda$ -uB set and ϕ is a formula. We write $V \models \phi^{D(\lambda)}[X, A]$ if whenever $g \subseteq \text{Coll}(\omega, < \lambda)$ is generic, $D(V, \lambda, g) \models \phi[X, A_g]$, where A_g is the interpretation of A in $V[g]$.*

Suppose (\mathcal{P}, Σ) is a mouse pair of some kind and \mathcal{P} has infinitely many Woodin cardinals. Let λ be a limit of Woodin cardinals of \mathcal{P} . Then M is a derived model of (\mathcal{P}, Σ) at λ if there is some genericity iteration² of \mathcal{P} via Σ with last model \mathcal{P}_{ω} such that if $\pi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\omega}$ is the iteration embedding, then $\pi(\lambda) = \omega_1$ and M is the derived model of \mathcal{P}_{ω} at ω_1^V as computed by some $g \subseteq \text{Coll}(\omega, < \omega_1^V)$ which is \mathcal{P}_{ω} -generic and $(\mathbb{R}^*)^{\mathcal{P}_{\omega}[g]} = \mathbb{R}$.

3. ω_1 IS CLUB Θ -BERKELEY

Before the proof of the main theorem, we present a proof of a special but representative case. This proof has the advantage of being more accessible while featuring most of the main ideas.

The main ideas. We present the main idea behind the proofs of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 7.1 assuming that $\mathcal{M}_{\omega}^{\#}$ exists. Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\omega}^{\#}$ and let δ be the least Woodin cardinal of \mathcal{M} .

²For more on genericity iterations, see [29, Chapter 7].

Let $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{M}[(\delta^+)^{\mathcal{M}}]$, and let Σ be the $\omega_1 + 1$ -iteration strategy of \mathcal{P} . It is a theorem of Woodin that if \mathcal{N} is the direct limit of all countable iterates of \mathcal{P} via Σ , then $\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{N}}(\delta) = \Theta^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ and the universe of $\mathcal{N}|\Theta^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ is just $(\text{HOD}|\Theta)^{L(\mathbb{R})}$. Our goal now is to generate a non-trivial embedding

$$j : (\text{HOD}|\Theta)^{L(\mathbb{R})} \rightarrow (\text{HOD}|\Theta)^{L(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Theorem 9.14 shows that such an embedding cannot exist in $L(\mathbb{R})$, but we can hope to find such an embedding j with the additional property that if $\gamma < \Theta^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ then $j \upharpoonright (\text{HOD}|\gamma)^{L(\mathbb{R})} \in L(\mathbb{R})$. We obtain such an embedding as follows. Let E be the total Mitchell order 0 extender on the extender sequence of \mathcal{P} with the property that $\text{crit}(E)$ is the least measurable cardinal of \mathcal{P} . Set $\tau = \text{crit}(E)$, $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{P}|\tau^{++}$, $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \pi_E(\mathcal{P}_0)$ and $\mathcal{Q} = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}, E)$. Let Λ be the fragment of Σ that acts on iteration trees that are above $\text{Ord} \cap \mathcal{P}_0$, and similarly, let Φ be the fragment of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}}$ that acts on iterations that are above $\text{Ord} \cap \mathcal{Q}_0$. Let \mathcal{R} be the direct limit of all countable Λ -iterates of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S} be the direct limit of all countable Φ -iterates of \mathcal{Q} . Then π_E generates an embedding $j^+ : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ such that $j \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}_0 = \pi_E \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}_0$. Moreover, setting $j = j^+ \upharpoonright (\text{HOD}|\gamma)^{L(\mathbb{R})}$, j is as desired.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume $\text{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$. Then ω_1 is a club Θ -Berkeley cardinal.*

Proof. Towards a contradiction, assume not. Fix a transitive N' such that

$$(1.1) \quad |N'| < \Theta,$$

$$(1.2) \quad \omega_1 \subseteq N' \text{ and}$$

(1.3) the set of $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that there is no elementary embedding $j : N' \rightarrow N'$ with the property that $\text{crit}(j) = \alpha$ is stationary in ω_1 .

Let $\phi(u)$ be the formula expressing (1.1)-(1.3). Thus $\phi[N']$ holds.

Fix a real x_0 such that N' is ordinal definable from x_0 . By minimizing the ordinal parameter, we can find N such that N is the OD_{x_0} -least³ M such that $\phi[M]$ holds.

We observe that $|N| < \delta_1^2$.⁴ Indeed, because $L_{\delta_1^2}(\mathbb{R}) \prec_1 L(\mathbb{R})$, we have some $\alpha < \delta_1^2$ such that $L_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{ZF} - \text{Powerset}$ and such that for some $K \in L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$, $L_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{“}K \text{ is OD}_{x_0} \text{ and } \phi[K]\text{”}$. Since any function $k : K \rightarrow K$ is essentially a set of ordinals, Moschovakis' Coding Lemma⁵ implies that $L(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{“}K \text{ is OD}_{x_0} \text{ and } \phi[K]\text{”}$. Since N was the OD_{x_0} -least, it follows that $N \in L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$.

Now let $\alpha < \delta_1^2$ be such that

$$(2.1) \quad L_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{ZF} - \text{Replacement} + \text{“}N \text{ is the OD}_{x_0}\text{-least } K \text{ such that } \phi[K]\text{”} + \text{“}|N| < \delta_1^2\text{”}$$

$$(2.2) \quad L_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \text{ is the derived model of some pair } (\mathcal{P}, \Sigma)^6 \text{ such that } \mathcal{P} \text{ is an } x_0\text{-mouse and}$$

$$(\text{HOD}_{x_0}|\Theta)^{L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})} = \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma)|\Theta^{L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})}.$$
⁷

(2.3) Letting $(\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^i : i \leq \omega)$ be the Woodin cardinals of \mathcal{P} and their limit, for some \mathcal{P} -successor cutpoint cardinal $\nu < \delta_{\mathcal{P}}^0$, $\text{Ord} \cap N < \pi_{\mathcal{P}, \infty}^\Sigma(\nu)$.

(2.4) For every \mathcal{P} -successor cutpoint cardinal $\nu < \delta_{\mathcal{P}}^0$, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}|\nu} \in L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$.⁸

³With respect to a natural order on sets that are ordinal definable from x_0 . We assume that this order \leq_{OD, x_0} has the following property: For $\alpha < \beta$, $(\leq_{\text{OD}, x_0})^{L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})} = (\leq_{\text{OD}, x_0})^{L_\beta(\mathbb{R})} \cap L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$.

⁴Recall that δ_1^2 is the supremum of \aleph_1^2 prewellorderings of \mathbb{R} . In $L(\mathbb{R})$, δ_1^2 can be characterized as the least κ such that $L_\kappa(\mathbb{R}) \prec_1 L(\mathbb{R})$. See [7].

⁵See [7] or [10].

⁶Thus \mathcal{P} has ω Woodin cardinals.

⁷See Theorem 4.7 and also [16]. By writing such equalities, we mean that the two structures have the same universe.

⁸By a theorem of Steel, δ_1^2 is the least $< \Theta^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ -strong cardinal of $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma)$. See [15, Section 1] for some justifications for this condition.

(2.5) Σ has full normalization.

To obtain (\mathcal{P}, Σ) as above, we first let α be the least satisfying clause (2.1) and then use [16, Lemma 2.5] to build (\mathcal{P}, Σ) . (2.5) follows from the results of [31] and [30, Theorem 1.4]. Now let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma)$. Let τ be the least measurable cardinal of \mathcal{P} and let $E \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{P}}$ be such that

(3.1) $\text{crit}(E) = \tau$ and E is total, and

(3.2) $\text{lh}(E)$ is the least among all extenders of $\vec{E}^{\mathcal{P}}$ that satisfy (3.1).

Set $\mathcal{Q} = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}, E)$. We let $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{P} \upharpoonright (\tau^{++})^{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \pi_E(\mathcal{P}_0)$. Notice that we can view \mathcal{P} as a premouse over \mathcal{P}_0 and \mathcal{Q} as a premouse over \mathcal{Q}_0 . We then let Λ be the fragment of Σ that acts on iteration trees on \mathcal{P} which are above $(\tau^{++})^{\mathcal{P}}$, and let Φ be the fragment of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}}$ that acts on iteration trees on \mathcal{Q} which are above $\pi_E((\tau^{++})^{\mathcal{P}})$. We then have that

$$(4.1) \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Lambda) \upharpoonright \Theta^{L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})} = (\text{HOD}_{\mathcal{P}_0} \upharpoonright \Theta)^{L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})} \text{ and } \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{Q}, \Phi) \upharpoonright \Theta^{L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})} = (\text{HOD}_{\mathcal{Q}_0} \upharpoonright \Theta)^{L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})}.$$

We now define an elementary embedding $j_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma} =_{\text{def}} j : \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{Q}, \Phi)$ such that $j \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}_0 = \pi_E \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}_0$.

Given $x \in \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Lambda)$, fix some normal Λ -iterate \mathcal{R} of \mathcal{P} such that for some $y \in \mathcal{R}$, $\pi_{\mathcal{R}, \infty}^\Lambda(y) = x$. Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}}$. Let \mathcal{U} be the full normalization of $\mathcal{T} \frown \{E\}$.⁹ Clearly, \mathcal{U} starts with E and continues with the minimal π_E -copy of \mathcal{T} . Thus, \mathcal{U} can be written as $\{E\} \frown \mathcal{W}$, where \mathcal{W} is a normal iteration tree on \mathcal{Q} according to Φ . If \mathcal{S} is the last model of \mathcal{W} , then $\mathcal{S} = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{R}, E)$. We set $j(x) = \pi_{\mathcal{S}, \infty}^\Phi(\pi_E^\mathcal{R}(y))$.

Claim 3.2. $j(x)$ is independent of the choice of \mathcal{R} .¹⁰

Proof. Pick another normal Λ -iterate \mathcal{R}' of \mathcal{P} such that for some $y' \in \mathcal{R}'$, $\pi_{\mathcal{R}', \infty}^\Lambda(y') = x$. It then follows from full normalization that we can compare $(\mathcal{R}, \Lambda_{\mathcal{R}})$ and $(\mathcal{R}', \Lambda_{\mathcal{R}'})$ via the least-extender-disagreement process and get some common iterate $(\mathcal{R}'', \Lambda_{\mathcal{R}''})$.¹¹ It then follows that $\pi_{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}''}(y) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R}''}(y')$. Set then $y'' = \pi_{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}''}(y)$.

Next, let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}}$, $\mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}'}$, $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}''}$ and $\mathcal{U}' = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R}''}$. Let $\mathcal{R}_E = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{R}, E)$, $\mathcal{R}'_E = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{R}', E)$ and $\mathcal{R}''_E = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{R}'', E)$. Notice that

(5.1) \mathcal{R}_E is the last model of the full normalization of $\mathcal{T} \frown \{E\}$,

(5.2) \mathcal{R}'_E is the last model of the full normalization of $\mathcal{T}' \frown \{E\}$,

(5.3) \mathcal{R}''_E is the last model of the full normalization of $\mathcal{U} \frown \{E\}$ and the full normalization of $\mathcal{U}' \frown \{E\}$,

(5.4) \mathcal{R}_E is a Φ -iterate of \mathcal{Q} via some normal tree \mathcal{X} such that the full normalization of $\mathcal{T} \frown \{E\}$ is $\{E\} \frown \mathcal{X}$,

(5.5) \mathcal{R}'_E is a Φ -iterate of \mathcal{Q} via some normal tree \mathcal{X}' such that the full normalization of $\mathcal{T}' \frown \{E\}$ is $\{E\} \frown \mathcal{X}'$,

(5.6) letting \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Y}' be the iteration trees according to $\Phi_{\mathcal{R}_E}$ and $\Phi_{\mathcal{R}'_E}$, respectively, such that $\{E\} \frown \mathcal{Y}$ is the full normalization of $\mathcal{U} \frown \{E\}$ and $\{E\} \frown \mathcal{Y}'$ is the full normalization of $\mathcal{U}' \frown \{E\}$, then \mathcal{R}''_E is the last model of both \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Y}' , and hence, \mathcal{R}''_E is a Φ -iterate of \mathcal{Q} via both $\mathcal{X} \frown \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{X}' \frown \mathcal{Y}'$.

⁹This is an iteration according to Σ .

¹⁰Note that $j \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}_0 = \pi_E \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}_0$ is immediate.

¹¹This comparison is entirely above $\text{Ord} \cap \mathcal{P}_0$. See Theorem 6.6.

We want to see that

$$(*) \quad \pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \infty}^{\Phi_{\mathcal{R}_E}}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}}(y)) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}'_E, \infty}^{\Phi_{\mathcal{R}'_E}}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}'}(y')).$$

It follows from (5.1)-(5.6) that (here we drop script Φ to make the formulas readable; all iteration embeddings appearing below are defined using Φ)

$$(6.1) \quad \pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \infty}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}}(y)) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}''_E, \infty}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \mathcal{R}''_E}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}}(y))),$$

$$(6.2) \quad \pi_{\mathcal{R}'_E, \infty}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}'}(y')) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}''_E, \infty}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}'_E, \mathcal{R}''_E}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}'}(y'))),$$

$$(6.3) \quad \pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \mathcal{R}''_E}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}}(y)) = \pi_E^{\mathcal{R}''}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}''}(y)),$$

$$(6.4) \quad \pi_{\mathcal{R}'_E, \mathcal{R}''_E}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}'}(y')) = \pi_E^{\mathcal{R}''}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R}''}(y')),$$

$$(6.5) \quad \pi_{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}''}(y) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R}''}(y')^{12}.$$

(*) now easily follows from (6.1)-(6.5). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \infty}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}}(y)) &= \pi_{\mathcal{R}''_E, \infty}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \mathcal{R}''_E}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}}(y))) \\ &= \pi_{\mathcal{R}''_E, \infty}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}''}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}''}(y))) \\ &= \pi_{\mathcal{R}''_E, \infty}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}''}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R}''}(y'))) \\ &= \pi_{\mathcal{R}'_E, \infty}(\pi_E^{\mathcal{R}'}(y')). \end{aligned}$$

□

The next claim essentially finishes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Claim 3.3. $j(N) = N$.

Proof. Working in \mathcal{P} , let $N_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the set of $x \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \infty}^{\Lambda}(x) \in N$. $N_{\mathcal{P}}$ is definable in \mathcal{P} by the following formula. Let $(\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^i : i \leq \omega)$ be the Woodin cardinals of \mathcal{P} and their limit. Let $\sigma[u, v, y, c]$ be a formula in the language containing $\{\in, c\}$, where c is a constant for x_0 , expressing the following:

$$(7.1) \quad v \text{ is a premouse and } u \text{ is an } \omega_1\text{-iteration strategy for } v,$$

$$(7.2) \quad y \in v,$$

$$(7.3) \quad \text{if } w \text{ is the } \text{OD}_c\text{-least } w' \text{ such that } \phi[w'] \text{ then } \pi_{v, \infty}^u(x) \in w.$$

We then have that

- (a) $x \in N_{\mathcal{P}}$ if and only if
 - (a.1) there is a \mathcal{P} -successor cutpoint cardinal $\beta < \delta_{\mathcal{P}}^0$ such that $x \in N_{\mathcal{P}}|\beta$, and
 - (a.2) whenever $\beta > (\tau^{++})^{\mathcal{P}}$ is a successor cutpoint cardinal of \mathcal{P} such that $x \in \mathcal{P}|\beta$,

$$\mathcal{P} \models (\exists \Psi \sigma[\Psi, \mathcal{P}|\beta, x, x_0])^{D(\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^{\omega})}.$$

It is important to note that the strategy Ψ is just $\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}|\beta}$, as $\mathcal{P}|\beta$ has a unique iteration strategy. Moreover, since β is a successor cutpoint cardinal of \mathcal{P} , $\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \infty}^{\Lambda}(x) = \pi_{\mathcal{P}|\beta, \infty}^{\Psi}(x)$.¹³

¹²This clause is a consequence of the fact that both y and y' are preimages of x .

¹³For more details on such calculations see [12, Chapter 3] and [31, Chapter 11.1].

Now let $\psi(u, v, w)$ be the formula on the right side of the above equivalence. Then $x \in N_{\mathcal{P}}$ if and only if $\mathcal{P} \models \psi[x]$.

Notice that $\pi_E(N_{\mathcal{P}}) = N_{\mathcal{Q}}$, where $N_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is such that $x \in N_{\mathcal{Q}}$ if and only if $\mathcal{Q} \models \psi[x]$. To finish the proof of the claim, we need to show that

$$(*) \pi_{\mathcal{P}, \infty}^{\Lambda}(N_{\mathcal{P}}) = N \text{ and } \pi_{\mathcal{Q}, \infty}^{\Phi}(N_{\mathcal{Q}}) = N.$$

We only establish the first equality as the second is very similar.¹⁴

Suppose $x \in \pi_{\mathcal{P}, \infty}^{\Lambda}(N_{\mathcal{P}})$. We want to see that $x \in N$. Let \mathcal{S} be a Λ -iterate of \mathcal{P} such that $x = \pi_{\mathcal{S}, \infty}^{\Lambda}(y)$ for some $y \in \mathcal{S}$. We then have that $\mathcal{S} \models \psi[y]$. Since we can realize $L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ as the derived model of \mathcal{S} , we have that $\pi_{\mathcal{S}, \infty}^{\Lambda}(y) \in N$.

Conversely, suppose $x \in N$. Let (y, \mathcal{S}) be such that \mathcal{S} is a Λ -iterate of \mathcal{P} , $y \in \mathcal{S}$, and $\pi_{\mathcal{S}, \infty}^{\Lambda}(y) = x$. Then $\mathcal{S} \models \psi[y]$, which implies that $y \in \pi_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}(N_{\mathcal{P}})$. Therefore, $x = \pi_{\mathcal{S}, \infty}^{\Lambda}(y) \in \pi_{\mathcal{P}, \infty}^{\Lambda}(N_{\mathcal{P}})$. \square

To finish the proof of Theorem 3.1, we need to produce a club $C \subseteq \omega_1$ such that for each $\alpha \in C$, there is an embedding $k : N \rightarrow N$ with $\text{crit}(k) = \alpha$. Above we have produced an elementary embedding $j_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma} : N \rightarrow N$ such that $\text{crit}(j_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma}) = \tau$, for τ the least measurable cardinal of \mathcal{P} . Let $(\mathcal{P}_{\alpha} : \alpha < \omega_1)$ be the sequence of linear iterates of \mathcal{P} by E and its images, and let τ_{α} be the least measurable cardinal of \mathcal{P}_{α} . Then $\text{crit}(j_{\mathcal{P}_{\alpha}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{P}_{\alpha}}}) = \tau_{\alpha}$, and since $C = \{\tau_{\alpha} : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is a club, we get a contradiction to the fact that $\phi[N]$ is true. \square

4. GOOD AND VERY-GOOD POINTCLASSES, A REVIEW OF [14].

We review concepts from coarse descriptive inner model theory used in the proof of Theorem 7.1. Many of the concepts have appeared in [14] and elsewhere, and many of them are due to Woodin. A reader familiar with them can skip this section and return to it as needed.

4.1. Very good pointclasses. Let \mathbb{R} be the Baire space. Following [21, Chapter 3]), we say that Γ is a *good pointclass* if

- (1) Γ is closed under recursive substitution and number quantification,
- (2) Γ is ω -parametrized,¹⁵
- (3) Γ has the scale property, and
- (4) Γ is closed under $\exists^{\mathbb{R}}$.

Each good pointclass has its associated C_{Γ} operator. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$C_{\Gamma}(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R} : y \text{ is } \Gamma\text{-definable from } x \text{ and a countable ordinal}\}.$$
¹⁶

The C_{Γ} operator can be extended to sets in HC via the category quantifier.¹⁷

Let C_{Γ}^{α} denote the α th iterate of C_{Γ} so that, e.g., $C_{\Gamma}^2(a) = C_{\Gamma}(C_{\Gamma}(a))$. We only need this notion for $\alpha \leq \omega$. Set $C_{\Gamma}^{\omega}(a) = \bigcup_{n < \omega} C_{\Gamma}^n(a)$.

Suppose T is the tree of a Γ -scale. For each $\alpha < \omega_1$, we let κ_{α} be the α th-infinite cardinal of $L[T, a]$. We can then simply set $C_{\Gamma}^{\alpha}(a) = H_{\kappa_{\alpha}}^{L[T, a]}$. Then, using this definition, we have $C_{\Gamma}(a) = C_{\Gamma}^1(a)$.

Given a transitive $P \models \text{ZFC} - \text{Replacement}$, we say P is a Γ -Woodin if for some δ ,

- (1) $P \models$ “ δ is the only Woodin cardinal”.

¹⁴This is once again a standard calculation in the theory of hod computations, and it goes back to Woodin’s computation of HOD of $L(\mathbb{R})$. See [29, Chapter 8] or [12, Chapter 4].

¹⁵So there is a set $U^k \subseteq \omega \times \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $U^k \in \Gamma$, and for every set $A \in \Gamma$, if $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$, then there is an integer n such that $x \in A \leftrightarrow (n, x) \in U^k$.

¹⁶This definition is usually used under AD.

¹⁷This is done, for instance, in [21, Chapter 3].

- (2) $P = C_\Gamma^\omega(P)$,
- (3) for every P -cardinal $\eta < \delta$, $C_\Gamma(V_\eta^P) \models$ “ η is not a Woodin cardinal”.

We let δ^P be the Woodin cardinal of P .

A sequence $(A_n : n < \omega) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\omega$ is a *self-justifying-system* (sjs) if for each $n \in \omega$,

- (1) there is a sequence $(A_{m_k} : k \in \omega)$ that codes a scale on A_n , and
- (2) there is $m < \omega$ such that $A_n^c = A_m$.

Let T_0 be the theory

- (1) $\text{AD}^+ + \text{ZF} - \text{Powerset Axiom}$,
- (2) “ Θ exists,”¹⁸ and
- (3) $V = L_{\Theta^+}(C, \mathbb{R})$ for some $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 4.1. *Suppose Γ is a good pointclass. Then Γ is a **very good pointclass (vg-pointclass)** if there is a sjs $\vec{A} = (A_n : n \in \omega)$, $\gamma < \Theta^{L(\vec{A}, \mathbb{R})}$, a Σ_1 -formula ϕ , and a real x such that $L_\gamma(\vec{A}, \mathbb{R})$ is the least initial segment of $L(\vec{A}, \mathbb{R})$ that satisfies $T_0 + \phi(x)$ and $\Gamma = (\Sigma_1^2(\vec{A}))^{L_\gamma(\vec{A}, \mathbb{R})}$. We say $M_\Gamma =_{\text{def}} L_\gamma(\vec{A}, \mathbb{R})$ is the parent of Γ .*

If Γ is a vg-pointclass and $M_\Gamma = L_\gamma(\vec{A}, \mathbb{R})$ is its parent, then for any countable transitive a , $C_\Gamma(a) = \text{OD}^{M_\Gamma}(\vec{A}, a)$.

4.2. Γ -excellent pairs. Suppose Γ is a vg-pointclass. We say that $\vec{B} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\omega$ is a *weakly Γ -condensing sequence* if

- (1) B_0 codes a sjs such that $M_\Gamma = L_\gamma(B_0, \mathbb{R})$ and $\Gamma = (\Sigma_1^2(B_0))^{L_\gamma(B_0, \mathbb{R})}$,
- (2) $B_1 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y \in C_\Gamma(x)\}$,
- (3) $B_2 = B_1^c$,
- (4) B_3 is any $\text{OD}^{M_\Gamma}(B_0)$ set,¹⁹
- (5) $(B_{2i+1} : i \in [2, \omega)) \subseteq \Gamma$ is a scale on B_1 ,
- (6) $(B_{2i} : i \in [2, \omega)) \subseteq M_\Gamma$ is a scale on B_2 , and
- (7) for every $i \in [2, \omega)$, $M_\Gamma \models$ “ B_{2i} is ordinal definable from B_0 .”

Suppose Γ is a vg-pointclass and $M_\Gamma = L_\gamma(\vec{A}, \mathbb{R})$ is its parent. Suppose $B \in M_\Gamma \cap \wp(\mathbb{R})$ is $\text{OD}^{M_\Gamma}(\vec{A})$, and suppose $a \in HC$ is a transitive set. Consider the term relation τ_B^a consisting of pairs (p, σ) such that

- (1) $p \in \text{Coll}(\omega, a)$,
- (2) $\sigma \in C_\Gamma(a)$ is a standard $\text{Coll}(\omega, a)$ -name for a real, and
- (3) for co-meager many $g \subseteq \text{Coll}(\omega, a)$ (in the relevant topology) such that $p \in g$, $\sigma(g) \in B$.²⁰

Then because τ_B^a is $\text{OD}^{M_\Gamma}(\vec{A}, a)$, we have that $\tau_B^a \in C_\Gamma(C_\Gamma(a))$. Given $k \in \omega$, we let $\tau_{B,k}^a = \tau_{B,0}^{C_\Gamma^k}$. Thus, for every $k \in \omega$, $\tau_{B,k}^a \in C_\Gamma^{k+2}(a)$.

We say \vec{B} is a *Γ -condensing sequence* if it is a weakly Γ -condensing sequence with the additional property that for any transitive sets $a, b, M \in HC$ such that

- (1) $a \in M$ and
- (2) there is an embedding $\pi : M \rightarrow_{\Sigma_1} C_\Gamma^\omega(b)$ such that $\pi(a) = b$ and for every $i, k \in \omega$, $\tau_{B_i,k}^b \in \text{rng}(\pi)$,

$M = C^\omega(a)$ and for any $i, k \in \omega$, $\pi^{-1}(\tau_{B_i,k}^b) = \tau_{B_i,k}^a$. If P is a Γ -Woodin and $B \in \text{OD}^{M_\Gamma}(\vec{A})$, then for $k \in \omega$, we let $\tau_{B,k}^P = \tau_{B,k}^{V_{\delta^P}^P}$.

¹⁸More precisely, “there is an ordinal which is not the surjective image of \mathbb{R} ”.

¹⁹We will need the freedom to include any $\text{OD}^{M_\Gamma}(B_0)$ set of reals into our condensing sequence.

²⁰Here and elsewhere, $\sigma(g)$ is the realization of σ by g .

Definition 4.2 ([14, Definition 1.6]). *Suppose Γ is a vg-pointclass and $M_\Gamma = L_\gamma(\vec{A}, \mathbb{R})$ is its parent. Suppose P is a Γ -Woodin and Σ is an ω_1 -iteration strategy for P . Suppose $B \in M_\Gamma \cap \wp(\mathbb{R})$ is $\text{OD}^{M_\Gamma}(\vec{A})$.*

- (1) *We say Σ is a Γ -fullness preserving strategy for P if whenever $i : P \rightarrow Q$ is an iteration of P via Σ , Q is a Γ -Woodin.*
- (2) *Given that Σ is Γ -fullness preserving, we say Σ respects B if whenever $i : P \rightarrow Q$ is an iteration of P via Σ , for every k , $i(\tau_{B,k}^P) = \tau_{B,k}^Q$.*

The following theorem, which probably is originally due to Woodin, is unpublished. For its proof, see the discussion after [14, Theorem 1.7].

Theorem 4.3. *Assume AD⁺ and suppose Γ is a vg-pointclass. Let $M_\Gamma = L_\gamma(\vec{A}, \mathbb{R})$ ²¹ be its parent and $A \in \text{OD}(\vec{A})^{M_\Gamma}$. Then there is a pair (R, Ψ) and a Γ -condensing sequence \vec{B} such that*

- (1) *R is a Γ -Woodin,*
- (2) *Ψ is a Γ -fullness preserving ω_1 -iteration strategy for P ,*
- (3) *for each i , Ψ respects B_i ,*
- (4) *for every Ψ -iterate Q of R , for every $i \in \omega$ and for every Q -generic $g \subseteq \text{Coll}(\omega, \delta^Q)$, $\tau_i^Q(g) = Q[g] \cap B_i$,*
- (5) *for any iteration tree $\mathcal{T} \in \text{dom}(\Psi)$, $\Sigma(\mathcal{T}) = b$ if and only if either*
 - (a) *$C_\Gamma(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})) \models \text{“}\delta(\mathcal{T}) \text{ is not a Woodin cardinal”}$ and b is the unique well-founded cofinal branch c of \mathcal{T} such that $C_\Gamma(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})) \in \mathcal{M}_c^T$, or*
 - (b) *$C_\Gamma(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})) \models \text{“}\delta(\mathcal{T}) \text{ is a Woodin cardinal”}$ and b is the unique well-founded cofinal branch c of \mathcal{T} such that letting $Q = C_\Gamma^\omega(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}))$, $\mathcal{M}_c^T = Q$, and for every $i \in \omega$, $\pi_c^T(\tau_{B_i}^R) = \tau_{B_i}^Q$.*
- (6) *Ψ respects A .*

Moreover, for any set $a \in \text{HC}$, there is (R, Ψ) as above such that $a \in R$.

Definition 4.4. *Suppose Γ is a vg-pointclass. Then (R, Ψ) is a Γ -excellent pair if for some Γ -condensing sequence \vec{B} , (R, Ψ) has properties 1-5 described in Theorem 4.3 as witnessed by \vec{B} .*

4.3. Reflection points. Suppose (P, Ψ) is a Γ -excellent pair. For $n \leq \omega$, we let $\mathcal{M}_n^{\Psi, \#}$ be the minimal active Ψ -mouse that has exactly n Woodin cardinals. Under AD, $\mathcal{M}_n^{\Psi, \#}$, as a Ψ -mouse, has a unique ω_1 -iteration strategy. Letting Ψ_n^+ be this iteration strategy, we have that $\text{Code}(\Psi)$ is projective in $\text{Code}(\Psi_n^+)$.²²

Suppose (P, Ψ) is a Γ -excellent pair. Then $L^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$ is the minimal Ψ -mouse containing all the ordinals and reals. It can be defined as in [16] and in [12, Chapter 3.7]. Because \mathbb{R} is not well-ordered, the above references build $L^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$ relative to Ψ_2^+ , though in the case of excellent pairs, the same construction would work relative to Ψ .²³

Suppose (P, Ψ) is a Γ -excellent pair. Then $\delta_1^2(\Psi)$ is the least ordinal α such that $L_\alpha^\Psi(\mathbb{R}) \prec_1^{\mathbb{R}} L^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$. Here \prec_n^X stands for elementarity with respect to Σ_n -formulas with parameters from X . When discussing $L^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$, we will omit the superscript \mathbb{R} , as it is part of the language of $L^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$ (see [7, Chapter 2.4]).

Σ_1 -reflection for $L^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$. Suppose (P, Ψ) is a Γ -excellent pair, ϕ is a formula, and x is a real x . Then $\beta < \delta_1^2(\Psi)$ is a (T_0, ϕ, x) -reflection point if

- (1) $L_\beta^\Psi(\mathbb{R}) \models T_0$,

²¹Here \vec{A} is any sjs for which $M_\Gamma = L_\gamma(\vec{A}, \mathbb{R})$.

²² $\text{Code} : (\cup_{n < \omega} \text{HC}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function that codes subsets of HC^n . As is argued in [14], Ψ can be interpreted in generic extensions of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\Psi, \#}$ and its iterates via Ψ_n^+ , which easily implies the claim that $\text{Code}(\Psi)$ is projective in $\text{Code}(\Psi_n^+)$.

²³[17] is the general reference for hybrid mice over the reals.

- (2) $L_\beta^\Psi(\mathbb{R}) \models \phi[x]$, and
- (3) $\wp(\mathbb{R}) \cap (L_{\beta+2}^\Psi(\mathbb{R}) - L_{\beta+1}^\Psi(\mathbb{R})) \neq \emptyset$.

For each (ϕ, x) such that $L(\mathbb{R}) \models \phi[x]$, the set of (T_0, ϕ, x) -reflection points is unbounded below $\delta_1^2(\Psi)$ (see [7, Chapter 2.4], [22] and [17]).

Suppose (P, Ψ) is a Γ -excellent pair. Modifying the terminology of [22], we say β ends a (T_0, Ψ) -gap if clause (1) and (3) above hold. If β ends a (T_0, Ψ) -gap, then we set $\Theta^\beta = \Theta^{M_\beta}$, $M_\beta = L_\beta^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$, and $\mathcal{H}_{Y,x}^\beta = (\text{HOD}(Y, x))^{M_\beta}$.

It is shown in [9] that for each β that is a (T_0, ϕ, x) -reflection point, for any set $Y \in M_\beta$, and for any real x , $\mathcal{H}_{\Psi, Y, x}^\beta = \mathcal{H}_{\Psi, Y}^\beta[x]$.²⁴

4.4. Coarse tuples. The following definition is essential for the arguments to come.

Definition 4.5. *Suppose $\nu < \Theta$. Then (R, Ψ, H, α) is a **coarse tuple** if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) *For some very-good pointclass Γ , (R, Ψ) is a Γ -excellent pair.*
- (2) *$F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow V$ is a partial function such that $\text{dom}(H) \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R} : R \in L_1[x]\}$.*
- (3) *For every $x \in \text{dom}(H)$, setting $H(x) = (\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$, $(\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$ is a Ψ -pure mouse pair over x .*
- (4) *For every x , $\mathcal{P} \models \text{ZFC}$ and has exactly ω -Woodin cardinals.*
- (5) *\mathcal{P} is ω -small with respect to Ψ .*²⁵
- (6) *α is a (T_0, Ψ, ϕ) -reflection point and for each $x \in \text{dom}(H)$, the derived model of $(\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$ is $L_\alpha^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$.*²⁶
- (7) *$\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x) \upharpoonright \Theta^\alpha = \mathcal{H}_x^\alpha \upharpoonright \Theta^\alpha$ ²⁷ and $\Theta^\alpha = \pi_{\mathcal{P}_x, \infty}^{\Sigma_x}(\delta)$, where δ is the least Woodin cardinal of \mathcal{P}_x .*
- (8) *For any $x \in \text{dom}(H)$ and any \mathcal{P} -successor cutpoint cardinal $\beta < \delta$, where δ is the least Woodin cardinal of \mathcal{P}_x , $(\Sigma_x)_{\mathcal{P}_x \upharpoonright \beta} \in L_\alpha^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$.*

We say that (R, Ψ, H, α) **absorbs** ν if (R, Ψ, H, α) is a coarse tuple such that $\nu < (\delta_1^2)^{L_\alpha^\Psi(\mathbb{R})}$.²⁸

Remark 4.6. *Assuming $V = L(\mathbb{R})$, we could just work with ordinary pure mouse pairs. In this case, $H(x)$ is simply the least initial segment of $\mathcal{M}_\omega^\#(x)$ that has the desired properties.*

Theorem 4.7. *Assume AD^+ and suppose (R, Ψ) is a Γ -excellent pair for some Γ . Suppose ν is less than the largest Suslin cardinal of $L^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$. Then there is a coarse tuple (R, Ψ, H, α) absorbing ν .*

Theorem 4.7 can be demonstrated by combining Theorem 4.3, the hod analysis of $L(\mathbb{R})$ relativized to $L^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$,²⁹ and the results of [16].³⁰

Remark 4.8. *Suppose (R, Ψ, H, α) witnesses Theorem 4.7. Let $x \in \text{dom}(H)$, and let δ be the least Woodin cardinal of \mathcal{P}_x . Set $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_x \upharpoonright (\delta^{+\omega})^{\mathcal{P}_x}$ and $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\mathcal{P}_x}$. Then it can be shown that some*

²⁴One could also simply make this condition part of being a (T_0, Ψ) -gap.

²⁵I.e., there is no $\gamma < \text{Ord} \cap \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \gamma$ is active and has infinitely many Woodin cardinals.

²⁶The meaning of this statement is as follows: For any generic $g \subseteq \text{Coll}(\omega, \mathbb{R})$, letting \mathcal{Q} be the Σ_x -iterate of \mathcal{P}_x obtained via the $(g(i) : i < \omega)$ -genericity iteration of \mathcal{P}_x , the derived model of \mathcal{Q} as computed in $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{R})$ is $L_\alpha^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$. In particular, the derived model calculations are not only independent of the genericity iterations but also the real x used in this calculations. See [26].

²⁷Here we mean that the universe of the Ψ -premouse $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x) \upharpoonright \Theta^\alpha$ is $\mathcal{H}_x^\alpha \upharpoonright \Theta^\alpha$.

²⁸The results of [29, Chapter 8] relativized to Ψ imply that for any $x \in \text{dom}(H)$, $(\delta_1^2)^{L_\alpha^\Psi(\mathbb{R})}$ is the least $< \Theta^\alpha$ -strong cardinal of $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$.

²⁹This is needed to get clause (7) of Definition 4.5.

³⁰This is needed to get clause (6) of Definition 4.5. In particular, see the proof of [16, Lemma 2.5]. Clause (8) of Definition 4.5 can be established using the arguments of [15, Section 1].

complete Σ -iterate of \mathcal{Q} of \mathcal{P}_x is such that (\mathcal{Q}, Σ) is Γ -excellent, where letting α witness clause (6) of Definition 4.5, $\Gamma = (\Sigma_1^2(\text{Code}(\Psi), x))^{L_\alpha^\Psi(\mathbb{R})}$. This is because, by the results of [22] and [17], there is a weakly Γ -condensing sequence $\vec{A} = (A_i : i < \omega)$ such that for each i , $A_i \in \text{OD}_{\Psi, x}^{L_\alpha^\Psi(\mathbb{R})}$. \mathcal{Q} is then a Σ -iterate of \mathcal{P} such that $\Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}}$ respects each A_i . We can find such a \mathcal{Q} using standard arguments from the hod analysis. See [32], [29, Chapter 8] and [12].

5. CUTPOINT SUSLIN CARDINALS ON A CONE

In order to prove that every regular Suslin cardinal is ω -club Θ -Berkeley, we need to represent Suslin cardinals as *cutpoint* cardinals in various HOD-like models. This topic has been studied in [30] and [2]. The present method is motivated by a precursor of [2, Theorem 0.3].

Theorem 5.1. *Assume AD⁺ and that δ is a regular Suslin cardinal such that there is a triple (R, Ψ, H, α) absorbing δ . Then letting $H(x) = (\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$, for a Turing cone of x , δ is a limit of cutpoint cardinals in $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$, and hence δ is also a cutpoint cardinal.*

Proof. For each $x \in \text{dom}(H)$, set $\mathcal{M}_x = \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$. We assume towards a contradiction that

(*) for a Turing cone of x , there is $\kappa < \delta$ such that $o^{\mathcal{M}_x}(\kappa) \geq \delta$.

Because δ is a regular cardinal, we have that for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{M}_x \models$ “ δ is a measurable cardinal.” To see this, assume not. Let \mathcal{Q} be a Σ_x -iterate of \mathcal{P}_x such that $\delta \in \text{rge}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}, \infty})$, and set $\delta_{\mathcal{Q}} = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}, \infty}^{-1}(\delta)$. We then have that $\mathcal{Q} \models$ “ $\delta_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is a regular non-measurable cardinal.” But then $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}, \infty}[\delta_{\mathcal{Q}}]$ is cofinal in δ , implying that $\text{cf}(\delta) = \omega$. It then follows from (*) that

(**) for a Turing cone of x , there is $\kappa < \delta$ such that $o^{\mathcal{M}_x}(\kappa) \geq (\delta^+)^{\mathcal{M}_x}$.

Because δ is a Suslin cardinal, we have a tree T on $\omega \times \delta$ such that $p[T]$ is not α -Suslin for any $\alpha < \delta$. Because (R, Ψ, H, α) absorbs δ , we have that for a Turing cone of x , $T \in \mathcal{M}_x$. Thus, we have an $x \in \text{dom}(H)$ such that

(***) there is $\kappa < \delta$ such that $o^{\mathcal{M}_x}(\kappa) \geq (\delta^+)^{\mathcal{M}_x}$ and $T \in \mathcal{M}_x$.

Let (κ, ι) be the lexicographically least pair (ν, ζ) such that ν witnesses (***) and, letting $F = \vec{E}^{\mathcal{M}_x}(\zeta)$, $\text{crit}(F) = \nu$ and $T \in \text{Ult}(\mathcal{M}_x, F)$. Thus, κ is a limit of cutpoints of \mathcal{M}_x . Let \mathcal{Q} be a Σ_x -iterate of \mathcal{P}_x such that $(\kappa, \delta, T, E) \in \text{rge}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}, \infty})$ where $E = \vec{E}^{\mathcal{M}_x}(\iota)$. Set $\Lambda = (\Sigma_x)_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Given a complete Λ -iterate \mathcal{R} of \mathcal{Q} , let $s_{\mathcal{R}} =_{\text{def}} (\kappa_{\mathcal{R}}, \delta_{\mathcal{R}}, T_{\mathcal{R}}, E_{\mathcal{R}}) \in \mathcal{R}$ be such that

$$\pi_{\mathcal{R}, \infty}(s_{\mathcal{R}}) = (\kappa, \delta, T, E).$$

If \mathcal{R} is a complete Λ -iterate of \mathcal{Q} , let $\mathcal{R}_E = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{R}, E_{\mathcal{R}})$. Let $(f_{\mathcal{Q}}, s_{\mathcal{Q}}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ be such that $s_{\mathcal{Q}} \in \nu(E_{\mathcal{Q}})^{<\omega}$, $f_{\mathcal{Q}} : [\kappa_{\mathcal{Q}}]^{s_{\mathcal{Q}}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}|\kappa_{\mathcal{Q}}$, and $\pi_{E_{\mathcal{Q}}}(f_{\mathcal{Q}})(s_{\mathcal{Q}}) = T_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Thus, if \mathcal{R} is a complete Λ -iterate of \mathcal{Q} , then $\pi_{E_{\mathcal{R}}}(f_{\mathcal{R}})(s_{\mathcal{R}}) = T_{\mathcal{R}}$.

Say $(\lambda, s) \in \kappa \times \kappa^{<\omega}$ is *good* if there is a complete Λ -iterate \mathcal{R} of \mathcal{Q} such that $(\lambda, s) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \infty}(\delta_{\mathcal{R}}, s_{\mathcal{R}})$. Suppose (λ, s) is good and \mathcal{R} witnesses it. Then let

$$T_{\mathcal{R}, \lambda, s} = \pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \infty}(T_{\mathcal{R}}).$$

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose (λ, s) is good as witnessed by \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' . Then $T_{\mathcal{R}, \lambda, s} = T_{\mathcal{R}', \lambda, s}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}'}$. Let ζ be the \mathcal{R}_E -successor of $o^{\mathcal{R}_E}(\kappa_{\mathcal{R}})$ and ζ' be the \mathcal{R}'_E -successor of $o^{\mathcal{R}'_E}(\kappa_{\mathcal{R}'})$. Let (\mathcal{R}'', Φ) be a common iterate of $(\mathcal{R}_E|\zeta, \Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_E})$ and $(\mathcal{R}'_E|\zeta', \Lambda_{\mathcal{R}'_E})$. It is enough to show that $\pi_{\mathcal{R}_E|\zeta, \mathcal{R}''}(T_{\mathcal{R}}) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}'_E|\zeta', \mathcal{R}''}(T_{\mathcal{R}'})$.

Let now \mathcal{Y} be the result of copying $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}_E|\zeta, \mathcal{R}''}$ onto \mathcal{R}_E via id , \mathcal{Y}' be the result of copying $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}'_E|\zeta', \mathcal{R}''}$ onto \mathcal{R}'_E via id , $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T} \frown \{E_{\mathcal{R}}\} \frown \mathcal{Y}$, and $\mathcal{X}' = \mathcal{T}' \frown \{E_{\mathcal{R}'}\} \frown \mathcal{Y}'$. Notice that we have

- (1.1) $\pi^{\mathcal{Y}} \upharpoonright \mathcal{R}_E|\zeta = \pi^{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}_E|\zeta, \mathcal{R}''}}$ and $\pi^{\mathcal{Y}'} \upharpoonright \mathcal{R}'_E|\zeta' = \pi^{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}'_E|\zeta', \mathcal{R}''}}$,
- (1.2) $\pi_{\mathcal{R}_E|\zeta, \mathcal{R}''}(\kappa_{\mathcal{R}}, \delta_{\mathcal{R}}, s_{\mathcal{R}}) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}'_E|\zeta', \mathcal{R}''}(\kappa_{\mathcal{R}'}, \delta_{\mathcal{R}'}, s_{\mathcal{R}'}) =_{def} (\kappa_0, \delta_0, s_0)$,
- (1.3) $\pi_{\mathcal{R}_E|\zeta, \mathcal{R}''}(T_{\mathcal{R}}) = \pi^{\mathcal{X}}(f_{\mathcal{Q}})(\pi_{\mathcal{R}_E|\zeta, \mathcal{R}''}(s_{\mathcal{R}})) = \pi^{\mathcal{X}}(f_{\mathcal{Q}})(s_0)$,
- (1.4) $\pi_{\mathcal{R}'_E|\zeta', \mathcal{R}''}(T_{\mathcal{R}'}) = \pi^{\mathcal{X}'}(f_{\mathcal{Q}})(\pi_{\mathcal{R}'_E|\zeta', \mathcal{R}''}(s_{\mathcal{R}'})) = \pi^{\mathcal{X}'}(f_{\mathcal{Q}})(s_0)$.

Let \mathcal{U} be the full normalization of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{U}' be the full normalization of \mathcal{X}' . Notice that if \mathcal{S} is the last model of \mathcal{U} , and \mathcal{S}' is the last model of \mathcal{U}' , then

- (2.1) $\mathcal{R}'' \trianglelefteq \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{R}'' \trianglelefteq \mathcal{S}'$,
- (2.2) $(\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}})_{\mathcal{R}''} = (\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}'})_{\mathcal{R}''}$,³¹ and
- (2.3) the least-extender-disagreement comparison of $(\mathcal{S}, \Lambda_{\mathcal{S}})$ and $(\mathcal{S}', \Lambda_{\mathcal{S}'})$ is above $\text{Ord} \cap \mathcal{R}''$.

Let then $(\mathcal{W}, \Lambda_{\mathcal{W}})$ be the common iterate of $(\mathcal{S}, \Lambda_{\mathcal{S}})$ and $(\mathcal{S}', \Lambda_{\mathcal{S}'})$ obtained via the least-extender-disagreement comparison process. We then have that

- (3.1) $\pi_{\mathcal{R}_E|\zeta, \mathcal{R}''}(T_{\mathcal{R}}) = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}}(f_{\mathcal{Q}})(s_0)$,
- (3.2) $\pi_{\mathcal{R}'_E|\zeta', \mathcal{R}''}(T_{\mathcal{R}'}) = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}}(f_{\mathcal{Q}})(s_0)$.

It then follows from (2.1)-(2.2) that $\pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \mathcal{R}''}(T_{\mathcal{R}}) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R}''}(T_{\mathcal{R}'})$. □

Thus, $T_{\mathcal{R}, \lambda, s}$ is independent of \mathcal{R} , and so we let $T_{\lambda, s} = T_{\mathcal{R}, \lambda, s}$.

Lemma 5.3. *For each good (λ, s) , $p[T_{\lambda, s}] \subseteq p[T]$.*

Proof. Suppose $(y, h) \in p[T_{\lambda, s}]$. Let \mathcal{R} witness that (λ, s) is good. Let \mathcal{S} be a complete $\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_E}$ -iterate of \mathcal{R}_E such that $h \subseteq \text{rge}(\pi_{\mathcal{S}, \infty})$. We can further assume that $\mathcal{T} =_{def} \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}_E, \mathcal{S}}$ is based on $\mathcal{R}|\zeta$, where ζ is the \mathcal{R}_E -successor of $o^{\mathcal{R}_E}(\kappa_{\mathcal{R}})$. Let $(\alpha_n : n \in \omega)$ be such that $h(n) = \pi_{\mathcal{S}, \infty}(\alpha_n)$. Let $U = \pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \mathcal{S}}(T_{\mathcal{R}})$. Thus if $h'(n) = \alpha_n$, then $(y, h') \in [U]$.

Notice that $\{E_{\mathcal{R}}\} \frown \mathcal{T}$ is not a normal tree, and its full normalization \mathcal{U} starts with \mathcal{T} . Notice also that for each $\alpha + 1 < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, if $E_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{T}}$ used on the main branch of \mathcal{T} at $\beta < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, then $\text{crit}(E_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{T}}) < \pi_{0, \beta}^{\mathcal{T}}(\delta_{\mathcal{R}})$. This is because $\mathcal{R}_E \models |o^{\mathcal{R}_E}(\kappa_{\mathcal{R}})| = \delta_{\mathcal{R}}$, as otherwise there would be another extender $F \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{R}_E} \cap \vec{E}^{\mathcal{R}}$ such that $\text{crit}(F) = \kappa_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $T_{\mathcal{R}} \in \text{Ult}(\mathcal{R}, F)$, contradicting the minimality of $E_{\mathcal{R}}$. Let α be such that $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright \alpha + 1$. Our discussion shows that $\pi_{0, \alpha}^{\mathcal{U}}$ is defined.

Set $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{U}}$ and $h^*(n) = \pi_{\mathcal{S}', \infty}^{\Lambda}(\alpha_n)$. We now have that $(y, h') \in [T_{\mathcal{S}'}]$. This is simply because $T_{\mathcal{S}'} = U$. It then follows that $(y, h^*) \in [T]$, and hence $y \in p[T]$. □

Lemma 5.4. *For each $y \in p[T]$, there is a good (λ, s) such that $y \in p[T_{\lambda, s}]$.*

Proof. Fix $y \in p[T]$, and let $h \in \kappa^{\omega}$ be such that $(y, h) \in [T]$. We can find a complete Λ -iterate \mathcal{R} of \mathcal{Q} such that for each n , $h(n) \in \text{rge}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}, \infty})$. Set $h'(n) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}, \infty}^{-1}(h(n))$. Let $(\lambda, s) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \infty}(\delta_{\mathcal{R}}, s_{\mathcal{R}})$. As $(y, h') \in [T_{\mathcal{R}}]$, we easily get that $(y, \pi_{\mathcal{R}_E, \infty}[h']) \in [T_{\lambda, s}]$. Hence, $y \in p[T_{\lambda, s}]$. □

We thus have that $p[T] = \bigcup \{p[T_{\lambda, s}] : (\lambda, s) \in \kappa \times \kappa^{<\omega} \text{ and } (\lambda, s) \text{ is good}\}$. Consider now the tree U give by: $(u, h) \in U$ if and only if

- (1) if $0 \in \text{dom}(h)$, then $h(0) = (\lambda_0, s_0)$ is good, and
- (2) if $\text{dom}(u) = \text{dom}(h) =_{def} m > 1$, then

³¹This follows from full normalization of Λ .

$$(\langle u(0), \dots, u(m-2) \rangle, \langle h(1), h(2), \dots, h(m-1) \rangle) \in T_{\lambda_0, s_0}.$$

Then if $(x, h) \in [U]$, then $(x, h') \in [T]$, where $h'(n) = h(n+1)$. Also, if $(x, h) \in [T]$, then for some good (λ, s) and $g \in \lambda^\omega$, $(x, g) \in [T_{\lambda, s}]$. Consequently, $(x, g') \in [U]$, where $g'(0) = (\lambda, s)$ and for $n \geq 1$, $g'(n) = h(n-1)$. We thus have that $p[T] = p[U]$, and as U can be represented as a tree on $\omega \times \kappa$ and $\kappa < \delta$, we get a contradiction to our assumption that $p[T]$ is not α -Suslin for any $\alpha < \delta$. \square

6. ON X -HOD ANALYSIS

Definition 6.1. Suppose \mathcal{P} is a premouse, an lbr premouse, or just some kind of hybrid premouse. Suppose $F \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{P}}$. Then F is **completely total** if F is a total extender of \mathcal{P} and $\nu(F)$ is a regular cardinal of F .

Definition 6.2. Suppose \mathcal{P} is a premouse, an lbr premouse or just some kind of hybrid premouse. Suppose $\xi < \gamma < \text{Ord} \cap \mathcal{P}$, and \mathcal{T} is an iteration tree on \mathcal{P} . Then \mathcal{T} **omits** (ξ, γ) if whenever $\alpha < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ is such that $\pi_{0, \alpha}^{\mathcal{T}}$ is defined, then

- (1) $\text{lh}(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}) \notin (\pi_{0, \alpha}^{\mathcal{T}}(\xi), \pi_{0, \alpha}^{\mathcal{T}}(\gamma))$, and
- (2) $\text{crit}(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}}) \notin (\pi_{0, \alpha}^{\mathcal{T}}(\xi), \pi_{0, \alpha}^{\mathcal{T}}(\gamma))$.

Suppose $F \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{P}}$ is a completely total extender and \mathcal{T} is an iteration tree on \mathcal{P} . Then \mathcal{T} **omits** F if \mathcal{T} omits the interval $(\nu(F), \text{lh}(F) + 1)$.

If (\mathcal{M}, Λ) is a mouse pair and $F \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{M}}$ is a completely total extender, we let $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}, \Lambda, F)$ ³² be the set of complete Λ -iterates \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{M} such that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}}$ omits F .

Definition 6.3. Suppose (P, Ψ, H, α) is a coarse tuple and $x \in \text{dom}(H)$. Set $H(x) = (P, \Sigma)$, and suppose $F \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{P}}$ is a completely total extender such that $\text{crit}(F)$ is a cutpoint cardinal of \mathcal{P} . Let F^+ , if it exists, be the extender on the extender sequence of \mathcal{P} such that $\text{crit}(F^+) = \text{crit}(F)$, $\text{lh}(F^+) > \text{lh}(F)$, and $\text{lh}(F)$ is a cutpoint of $\text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}, F^+)$. Let $\mathcal{P}(F) = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}, F^+)$, if F^+ is defined, and otherwise $\mathcal{P}(F) = \mathcal{P}$.

Given $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}(F), \Sigma, F)$, we set $\mathcal{Q} \leq_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F} \mathcal{R}$ if $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Q}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{P}(F), \mathcal{Q}}(F))$.

Theorem 6.4. Continuing with the set up of Definition 6.3, $\leq_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}$ is directed.

Proof. We will use the following straightforward lemma.

Lemma 6.5. Suppose (\mathcal{P}, Σ) is a mouse pair, and suppose \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{U} are two distinct iteration trees on \mathcal{P} according to Σ with last models \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{R} , respectively. Suppose further that γ is the least such that $\mathcal{Q} \upharpoonright \gamma = \mathcal{R} \upharpoonright \gamma$ and $\mathcal{Q} \upharpoonright \gamma \neq \mathcal{R} \upharpoonright \gamma$, and ξ is such that $\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \xi = \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright \xi$, but $\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \xi + 1 \neq \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright \xi + 1$. Assume $\text{lh}(E_\xi^{\mathcal{T}}) < \text{lh}(E_\xi^{\mathcal{U}})$. Then $\gamma \in \text{dom}(\vec{E}^{\mathcal{Q}}) \cup \text{dom}(\vec{E}^{\mathcal{R}})$, $\gamma \notin \vec{E}^{\mathcal{Q}}$, and $\vec{E}^{\mathcal{R}}(\gamma) = E_\xi^{\mathcal{T}}$.

Fix $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F)$, and let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}^\Sigma$ and $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}}^\Sigma$. It follows from full normalization that the least-extender-disagreement comparison between $(\mathcal{Q}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}})$ and $(\mathcal{R}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{R}})$ produces a common iterate $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})$. We want to see that $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F)$, which amounts to showing that $\mathcal{Z} =_{\text{def}} \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^\Sigma$ omits F .³³ Set $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{S}}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}}$. Then \mathcal{Z} is the full normalization of $\mathcal{T} \frown \mathcal{X}$.

³²We can also define the set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}, \Lambda, (\xi, \gamma))$ to be the set of those \mathcal{N} such that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}}$ omits (ξ, γ) and prove most of the results of this section. However, we only need to develop this material for completely total extenders.

³³In fact, we want to show that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{S}}$ omits $\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}(F)$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}}$ omits $\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}}(F)$. These statements follow from the fact that $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F)$. Indeed, if for example $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{S}}$ does not omit $\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}(F)$, then the full normalization process described below would show that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}$ does not omit F .

We now assume that \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} were built by allowing padding, so that $\text{lh}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{lh}(\mathcal{Y})$, and our strategy is to analyze the full normalization process that produces \mathcal{Z} out of $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X})$ and $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{Y})$. We review some facts about the normalization process, and we do this for $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X})$.

Recall that the full normalization process for $\mathcal{T} \frown \mathcal{X}$ produces iteration trees $(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha : \alpha < \text{lh}(\mathcal{X}))$ on \mathcal{P} , and \mathcal{Z} is simply $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{lh}(\mathcal{X})-1}$ (e.g. see [18] or [20]). The sequence satisfies the following conditions.

(1.1) The last model of each \mathcal{Z}_α is $\mathcal{M}_\alpha^\mathcal{X}$.

(1.2) For $\alpha + 1 < \text{lh}(\mathcal{X})$, $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}$ is obtained by letting β be the \mathcal{X} -predecessor of $\alpha + 1$, and *minimally inflating* \mathcal{Z}_β by $E_\alpha^\mathcal{X}$. More precisely, letting γ_0 be the least γ such that $E_\alpha^\mathcal{X} \in \bar{E}^{\mathcal{M}_\gamma^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha}}$ and γ_1 be the least γ such that $\text{lh}(E_\gamma^{\mathcal{Z}_\beta}) > \text{crit}(E_\alpha^\mathcal{X})$, $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright \gamma_0 + 1 = \mathcal{Z}_\alpha \upharpoonright \gamma_0 + 1$, and for $\iota > 0$ such that $\gamma_0 + \iota < \text{lh}(\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1})$, $\mathcal{M}_{\gamma_0+\iota}^{\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}} = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{M}_{\gamma_1+\iota-1}^{\mathcal{Z}_\beta}, E_\alpha^\mathcal{X})$. Also, for $\iota < \gamma_0$, $E_\iota^{\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}} = E_\iota^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha}$, $E_{\gamma_0}^{\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}} = E_\alpha^\mathcal{X}$ and for $\iota > 0$ such that $\gamma_0 + \iota < \text{lh}(\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1})$, $E_{\gamma_0+\iota}^{\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}}$ is the last extender of $\text{Ult}(\mathcal{M}_\iota^{\mathcal{Z}_\beta} \parallel \text{lh}(E_\iota^{\mathcal{Z}_\beta}), E_\alpha^\mathcal{X})$.

(1.3) Clause (1.2) above describes a natural embedding $\pi_{\beta, \alpha+1} : \mathcal{Z}_\beta \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}$, a *tree embedding*. If now $\alpha < \text{lh}(\mathcal{X})$ is a limit ordinal, then \mathcal{Z}_α is obtained as the direct limit of the system $(\mathcal{Z}_\beta, \pi_{\beta, \beta'} : \beta < \beta', \beta \in [0, \alpha)_\mathcal{X}, \beta' \in [0, \alpha)_\mathcal{X})$.

Now set $p = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X})$ and $q = (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$, and let $(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^p, \mathcal{Z}_\alpha^q : \alpha < \text{lh}(\mathcal{X}))$ be the two sequences produced by the respective normalization processes. To show that \mathcal{Z} omits F , we inductively show that for $\alpha < \text{lh}(\mathcal{X})$, \mathcal{Z}_α^p and \mathcal{Z}_α^q omit F , and a close examination shows that the limit case is trivial.

We now examine the successor stage of the induction. Suppose $\alpha + 1 < \text{lh}(\mathcal{X})$ is such that \mathcal{Z}_α^p and \mathcal{Z}_α^q omit F . We want to see that $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^p$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^q$ also omit F . Let γ be such that $\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^p \upharpoonright \gamma = \mathcal{Z}_\alpha^q \upharpoonright \gamma$, $\gamma + 1 \leq \max(\text{lh}(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^p), \text{lh}(\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^q))$, and $E_\gamma^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^p} \neq E_\gamma^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^q}$. Assume without loss of generality that $\text{lh}(E_\gamma^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^q}) < \text{lh}(E_\gamma^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^p})$. In this case, setting $G = E_\gamma^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^q}$, we have that $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^q = \mathcal{Z}_\alpha^q$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^p$ is the full normalization of $(\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^p) \frown \{G\}$.

Notice that since $G = E_\gamma^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^q}$ and \mathcal{Z}_α^q omits F , G cannot witness that $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^p$ does not omit F . Also, because $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^p \upharpoonright \gamma + 1 = \mathcal{Z}_\alpha^p \upharpoonright \gamma + 1$, we have that $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^p \upharpoonright \gamma + 2$ omits F .

Fix some $\iota > 0$, and let $\xi \leq \gamma$ be the predecessor of $\gamma + 1$ in $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^p$. Then $\mathcal{M}_{\gamma+\iota}^{\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^p} = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{M}_{\xi+\iota-1}^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^p}, G)$, and $E_{\gamma+\iota}^{\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^p}$ is the last extender of $\text{Ult}(\mathcal{M}_{\xi+\iota-1}^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^p} \parallel \text{lh}(E_{\xi+\iota-1}^{\mathcal{Z}_\alpha^p}), G)$. Because \mathcal{Z}_α^p omits F , it is now straightforward to verify that $\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha+1}^p \upharpoonright \gamma + \iota + 1$ omits F . \square

The preceding proof can be modified to show the following corollary.

Corollary 6.6. *Suppose (\mathcal{P}, Σ) is a mouse pair and $\eta < \text{Ord} \cap \mathcal{P}$. Suppose \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{R} are two Σ -iterates of \mathcal{P} such that both $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}}$ are strictly above η . Then the least-extender-comparison of $(\mathcal{Q}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}})$ and $(\mathcal{R}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{R}})$ produces iteration trees that are strictly above η .*

Suppose (P, Ψ, H, α) is a coarse tuple and $x \in \text{dom}(H)$. Set $(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma) = (\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$. Let $(\delta_\mathcal{P}^i : i \leq \omega)$ be the sequence of Woodin cardinals of \mathcal{P} and their limit. If \mathcal{Q} is a complete Σ -iterate of \mathcal{P} , then we write $\delta_\mathcal{Q}^i = \pi_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}(\delta_\mathcal{P}^i)$.

Suppose $\mu < \delta_\mathcal{P}^0$ is a measurable cutpoint of \mathcal{P} such that μ is below the least $< \delta_0$ -strong cardinal of \mathcal{P} and $F \in \bar{E}^\mathcal{P}$ is a completely total extender with $\text{crit}(F) = \mu$. Set $\mathcal{P}_F = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}, F)$, and let $\kappa_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F} = \pi_{\mathcal{P}_F, \infty}(\mu)$ and $\tau_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F} = o^{\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma)}(\kappa)$. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F} =_{\text{def}} \mathcal{T}$ be the least initial segment of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma)}$ such that if \mathcal{R} is the last model of \mathcal{T} , then $\mathcal{R} \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}} = \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma) \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}}$. We then set $E_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F} =_{\text{def}} E = \pi^\mathcal{T}(F)$,³⁴ $X_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F} = \mathcal{R} \parallel \text{lh}(E) =_{\text{def}} X$, and $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F) = (\text{HOD}_{\Psi, X} \upharpoonright \Theta)^W$.

³⁴ $\pi^\mathcal{T}$ is defined because F is completely total and \mathcal{T} is based on $\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \nu(F)$.

Theorem 6.7. *In the above set up, setting $W = L_\alpha^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$,*

$$\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F) \upharpoonright \Theta^W = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F) \upharpoonright \Theta^W. \text{ }^{35}$$

Proof. The argument is somewhat standard, so we will only give an outline. The key fact to keep in mind is that if \mathcal{T} is an iteration tree on $\mathcal{P}(F)$ which omits F , then \mathcal{T} can be split into two components $\mathcal{T}_l \frown \mathcal{T}_r$ such that \mathcal{T}_l is based on $\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \nu(F)$, and if $\mathcal{T}_l \neq \mathcal{T}$, then $\pi^{\mathcal{T}_l}$ is defined and \mathcal{T}_r is strictly above $\text{lh}(\pi^{\mathcal{T}_l}(F))$. Below and elsewhere, $F_Q = \pi^{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}(F), \mathcal{Q}}}(F)$.

Claim 6.8. *Suppose $j : \mathcal{P}(F) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ is an \mathbb{R} -genericity iteration according to Σ in which all iteration trees used omit F . Then*

- (1) $X_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F} \in \mathcal{Q}$,
- (2) $X_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}$ is a $\Sigma_{\mathcal{Q} \upharpoonright \text{lh}(F_Q)}$ -iterate of $\mathcal{Q} \upharpoonright \text{lh}(F_Q)$, and
- (3) $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q} \upharpoonright \text{lh}(F_Q), X_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}} \in \mathcal{Q}$.

We can then develop the concept of suitable premouse, A -iterable suitable premouse, and other concepts used in the HOD analysis for iterations that omit F . For example, we define \mathcal{S} to be suitable if, in addition to the usual properties of suitability (see [32]), for some $G \in \vec{\mathcal{S}}$, $X_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}$ is a complete iterate of $\mathcal{S} \upharpoonright \text{lh}(G)$. A -iterability is defined for those $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ which are ordinal definable from $X_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}$, and given a suitable \mathcal{S} we define the concept of A -iterability only for those iterations of \mathcal{S} that omit G , where G is as above. Claim 6.8 can now be used to show that for every $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ that is ordinal definable from $X_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}$, there is a strongly A -iterable pair. The rest is just like in the ordinary HOD analysis, and we leave it to the reader. \square

For (\mathcal{P}, Σ, F) as above, let Σ^F be the fragment of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}(F)}$ that acts on stacks that omit F , and let $\pi_{\mathcal{P}(F), \infty}^{\Sigma^F} : \mathcal{P}(F) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F)$ be the direct limit embedding.

7. REGULAR SUSLIN CARDINALS ARE ω -CLUB Θ -BERKELEY

Theorem 7.1. *Assume AD⁺. Then every regular Suslin cardinal is ω -club Θ -Berkeley.*

Proof. Fix a regular Suslin cardinal δ , and towards a contradiction assume that δ is not an ω -club Θ -Berkeley cardinal. Fix a transitive N' such that

- (1.1) $|N'| < \Theta$,
- (1.2) $\delta \subseteq N'$, and
- (1.3) the set of $\alpha < \delta$ such that there is no elementary embedding $j : N' \rightarrow N'$ with the property that $\text{crit}(j) = \alpha$ is ω -stationary in δ .³⁶

Let $\phi(u, v)$ be the formula expressing (1.1)-(1.3). Thus $\phi[\delta, N']$ holds. Since $L(\wp(\mathbb{R})) \models \phi[\delta, N']$, we can assume that $V = L(\wp(\mathbb{R}))$. Without loss of generality, assume that δ is the least regular Suslin cardinal κ such that $\phi[\kappa, M]$ holds for some M . It then immediately follows that δ cannot be the largest Suslin cardinal, as if δ were the largest Suslin cardinal, then for some $\alpha < \delta$ and some $\beta < \delta$, letting $\Delta = \{A \subseteq \mathbb{R} : w(A) < \beta\}$,³⁷ $L_\alpha(\Delta) \models \text{ZF} - \text{Replacement} + \exists \kappa \exists M \phi[\kappa, M]$.³⁸ A similar reflection argument shows that we can assume without losing generality that $|N'|$ is

³⁵As is usual, here we mean that the universes of the structures are the same.

³⁶I.e., intersects every ω -club set.

³⁷Where $w(A)$ is the Wadge rank of A .

³⁸We actually need the Coding Lemma here. Let (κ, M) witness ϕ in $L_\alpha(\Delta)$. Let $S \subseteq \kappa$ consist of ordinals $\gamma < \kappa$ such that there is no elementary embedding $j : M \rightarrow M$ with $\text{crit}(j) = \gamma$ and $j \in L_\alpha(\Delta)$. Then S is stationary in $L_\alpha(\Delta)$ and hence, since $\wp(\kappa) \subseteq L_\alpha(\Delta)$, S is stationary in V . The fact that there is no $j : M \rightarrow M$ in $L_\alpha(\Delta)$ with $\text{crit}(j) \in S$ implies that there is no j with $\text{crit}(j) \in S$. Hence, $V \models \phi[\kappa, M]$.

less than some Suslin cardinal δ' such that $\delta < \delta'$ and δ' is not the largest Suslin cardinal. Fix now such a δ' so that $|N'| < \delta'$.

Let (R, Ψ, H, α) be as in Theorem 4.7 absorbing δ' . Notice that our discussion above implies that $W \models \phi[\delta, N']$, for $W = L_\alpha^\Psi(\mathbb{R})$. We can then find x_0 such that N' is OD_{Ψ, x_0}^W , and then by minimizing, we can let N be the OD_{Ψ, x_0}^W -least M such that $W \models \phi[\delta, M]$. We now fix $x_1 \in \text{dom}(H)$ such that

- (2.1) x_1 is Turing above x_0 and $N \in \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}_{x_1}, \Sigma_{x_1})$, where $(\mathcal{P}_{x_1}, \Sigma_{x_1}) = H(x_1)$, and
(2.2) δ is a limit of cutpoints of $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma)$, where $(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma) = (\mathcal{P}_{x_1}, \Sigma_{x_1})$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\delta \in \text{rge}(\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \infty}^\Sigma)$, and for \mathcal{Q} a complete Σ -iterate of \mathcal{P} , we let $\delta_{\mathcal{Q}} = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}, \infty}^{-1}(\delta)$. We set $\Lambda = \Sigma^F$ and $\Phi = \Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}}^{F_{\mathcal{Q}}}$.

Fix now any completely total extender $F \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{P}}$ such that $\text{crit}(F) = \delta_{\mathcal{P}}$, and set $X_{\mathcal{P}} = X_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}$. Let $\mathcal{Q} = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}(F), F)$, $F_{\mathcal{Q}} = \pi_F(F)$ and $X_{\mathcal{Q}} = X_{\mathcal{Q}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}}, F_{\mathcal{Q}}}$. As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we define $j : \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{Q}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}}, F_{\mathcal{Q}})$. It follows from Theorem 6.7 and the proof of Claim 3.3 that $N \in \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F) \cap \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{Q}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}}, F_{\mathcal{Q}})$ and $j(N) = N$, and therefore defining j is all that we will do.

Fix $u \in \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F)$, and let \mathcal{S} be a complete Λ -iterate of $\mathcal{P}(F)$ such that $u = \pi_{\mathcal{S}, \infty}^\Lambda(u_{\mathcal{S}})$ for some $u_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{S}$. Let $F_{\mathcal{S}} = \pi_{\mathcal{P}(F), \mathcal{S}}(F)$ ³⁹ and $\mathcal{S}_F = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{S}, F_{\mathcal{S}})$. We then let⁴⁰

$$j(u) = \pi_{\mathcal{S}_F, \infty}^\Phi(\pi_{F_{\mathcal{S}}}(u_{\mathcal{S}})).$$

The definition of $j(u)$ makes sense, as full normalization implies that \mathcal{S}_F is a complete Φ -iterate of \mathcal{Q} . To prove this and other claims in this section, we set $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(F)$ to simplify the notation.

Claim 7.2. *The definition of j is meaningful; more precisely, \mathcal{S}_F is a complete Φ -iterate of \mathcal{Q} .*

Proof. Notice that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}$ can be split into $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^l) \frown \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^r$ where $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^l$ is the longest portion of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}$ that is based on $\mathcal{P} \upharpoonright \nu(F)$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^r$ is the rest of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}$. If $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^r$ is defined, then it is above $\text{lh}(\pi^{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^l}(F))$. It then follows that the full normalization of $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}) \frown \{F_{\mathcal{S}}\}$ ⁴¹ is $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^l) \frown \{F_{\mathcal{S}}\} \frown \mathcal{U}$,⁴² where \mathcal{U} is above $\text{lh}(F_{\mathcal{S}})$. Notice next that the full normalization of $\{F\} \frown \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^l$ is $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^l) \frown \{F_{\mathcal{S}}\}$. Thus, \mathcal{S}_F is a Φ -iterate of \mathcal{Q} and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{S}_F} = (\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^l) \frown \mathcal{U}$. □

Claim 7.3. *$j(u)$ is independent of the choice of \mathcal{S} .*

Proof. To see this, pick another normal Λ -iterate \mathcal{S}' of \mathcal{P} such that $\pi_{\mathcal{S}', \infty}^\Lambda(u_{\mathcal{S}'}) = u$. It then follows from Lemma 6.4 that we can compare $(\mathcal{S}, \Lambda_{\mathcal{S}})$ and $(\mathcal{S}', \Lambda_{\mathcal{S}'})$ via the least-extender-disagreement process and get some common iterate $(\mathcal{S}'', \Lambda_{\mathcal{S}''})$. It then follows that $\pi_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}''}(u_{\mathcal{S}}) = \pi_{\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{S}''}(u_{\mathcal{S}'}) = u_{\mathcal{S}''}$.

Consider now $\mathcal{S}_F, \mathcal{S}'_F$, and \mathcal{S}''_F . We want to see that

$$(*) \quad \pi_{\mathcal{S}_F, \infty}^\Phi(\pi_{F_{\mathcal{S}}}(u_{\mathcal{S}})) = \pi_{\mathcal{S}'_F, \infty}^\Phi(\pi_{F_{\mathcal{S}'}}(u_{\mathcal{S}'})).$$

To show (*), we observe that

³⁹We will use this notation for all iterates of \mathcal{P} .

⁴⁰In this section, if we write π_G then we tacitly assume that it is the ultrapower embedding obtained by applying G to the model it is chosen from. If we apply G to some other model \mathcal{N} , then we will write $\pi_G^{\mathcal{N}}$.

⁴¹Here $F_{\mathcal{S}}$ is applied to \mathcal{S} .

⁴²Here $F_{\mathcal{S}}$ is applied in a way that keeps the iteration normal.

- (3.1) \mathcal{S}_F'' is a complete $\Phi_{\mathcal{S}_F}$ -iterate of \mathcal{S}_F ,
(3.2) \mathcal{S}_F'' is a complete $\Phi_{\mathcal{S}_F'}$ -iterate of \mathcal{S}_F' ,
(3.3) $\pi_{\mathcal{S}_F, \mathcal{S}_F''}(\pi_{F_S}(u_S)) = \pi_{\mathcal{S}_F', \mathcal{S}_F''}(\pi_{F_{S'}}(u_{S'}))$

Notice that (3.3) implies (*). (3.3) is an immediate consequence of (3.1) and (3.2), and (3.2) has the same proof as (3.1), and (3.1) follows from the proof of Claim 7.2. \square

Claim 7.4. $\text{crit}(j) = \text{crit}(E_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F})$

Proof. Suppose $\alpha < \text{crit}(E_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F})$. Let \mathcal{S} be a Φ -iterate of \mathcal{P} such that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}$ is based on $\mathcal{P}|\nu(F)$ and $\alpha \in \text{rge}(\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^\Sigma)$. We then have that if $\alpha_S = (\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}^\Sigma)^{-1}(\alpha)$, then $\pi_{\mathcal{S}, \infty}^\Lambda(\alpha_S) = \alpha$. Notice next that $j(x) = \pi_{\mathcal{S}_F, \infty}^\Phi(\pi_{F_S}(\alpha_S))$, and since $\pi_{F_S}(\alpha_S) = \alpha_S$ ⁴³, setting $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{S}_F|\nu(\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}(F))$, $\pi_{\mathcal{S}_F, \infty}^\Phi(\alpha_S) = \pi_{\mathcal{W}, \infty}^{\Sigma \mathcal{W}}(\alpha_S)$. Since $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{S}|\nu(\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}}(F))$, we have that $\pi_{\mathcal{S}_F, \infty}^\Phi(\alpha_S) = \alpha$, implying that $j(\alpha) = \alpha$. \square

To finish the proof of Theorem 7.1, we need to produce an ω -club $C \subseteq \omega_1$ such that for each $\alpha \in C$, there is an embedding $k : N \rightarrow N$ with $\text{crit}(k) = \alpha$. Above, we have produced an elementary embedding $j_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F} : N \rightarrow N$ such that $\text{crit}(j_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}) = \text{crit}(E_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F})$. We then apply this fact to the Mitchell order 0 extender F such that $\text{crit}(F) = \delta_{\mathcal{P}}$. Let C consist of ordinals κ such that for some complete Σ -iterate \mathcal{Q} of \mathcal{P} , $\kappa = \text{crit}(E_{\mathcal{Q}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{Q}}, F_{\mathcal{Q}}})$. Then C is an ω -club⁴⁴ and is such that for each $\kappa \in C$, there is $j : N \rightarrow N$ such that $\text{crit}(j) = \kappa$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 7.1. \square

Remark 7.5. The proof of Theorem 7.1 demonstrates that ω_2 is Θ -Berkeley. Indeed, fix some $\eta < \omega_2$, and pick $x \in \text{dom}(H)$ such that if τ_x is the second measurable cardinal of \mathcal{P}_x , then $\pi_{\mathcal{P}_x, \infty}(\tau_x) > \eta$. Let $F \in \vec{E}^{\mathcal{P}_x}$ be the Mitchell order 0 extender with $\text{crit}(F) = \tau_x$. We now repeat the proof of Theorem 7.1 and get that $\pi_{\mathcal{P}_x, \infty}(\tau_x)$ is a limit of ordinals α such that there is a $j : N \rightarrow N$ with $\text{crit}(j) = \alpha$. Since ordinals of the form $\pi_{\mathcal{P}_x, \infty}(\tau_x)$ are cofinal in ω_2 , we get that ω_2 is a Θ -Berkeley cardinal.

The same argument can be used to show that for any n , δ_{2n}^1 is Θ -Berkeley. This is because for each n and for each $x \in \text{dom}(H)$, $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$ has a cutpoint cardinal that belongs to the interval $(\delta_{2n+1}^1, \delta_{2n+2}^1)$,⁴⁵ and δ_{2n+2}^1 is a limit of measurable cardinals of $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$. If now $\kappa_x > \delta_{2n+1}^1$ is the least cutpoint measurable of $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}_x, \Sigma_x)$, then the proof of Theorem 7.1 shows that for unboundedly many $\alpha < \kappa_x$, there is $j : N \rightarrow N$ such that $\text{crit}(j) = \alpha$. Since δ_{2n+2}^1 is a limit of ordinals of the form κ_x , we have that δ_{2n+2}^1 is Θ -Berkeley.

8. TOWARDS HOD-BERKELEY CARDINALS

Remark 7.5 leaves open how ubiquitous Θ -Berkeley cardinals are.

Question 8.1. *Assume AD⁺. Is there an uncountable cardinal $\kappa < \Theta$ that is not Θ -Berkeley? Is every regular cardinal club Θ -Berkeley?*

A regular cardinal κ is a *club* (OD, λ)-Berkeley if for every $x \in H_\kappa$ and every transitive structure M of size $< \lambda$ such that M is ordinal definable from x , there is a club $C \subseteq \kappa$ such that for each $\alpha \in C$ there is an elementary embedding $j : M \rightarrow M$ with $\text{crit}(j) = \alpha$. The following is an easy corollary to Theorem 7.1. It follows from the fact that $\mathbb{P}_{\max} * \text{Add}(1, \omega_3)$ is a countably closed homogeneous poset.

⁴³This is where we use that $\alpha < \text{crit}(\text{crit}(E_{\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, F}))$.

⁴⁴See Steel's proof of measurability of regular cardinals, [29, Chapter 8]. This is easier to establish with full normalization. Each $\kappa \in C$ is on the main branch of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma)}$ and is non-measurable in $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma)$. It follows that the exit extender used is the image of F .

⁴⁵E.g., see [11].

Corollary 8.2. *Assume $\text{AD}_{\mathbb{R}} + V = L(\wp(\mathbb{R})) + “\Theta$ is a regular cardinal”. Let $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\max} * \text{Add}(1, \omega_3)$ be V -generic. Then in $V[G]$, ω_1 is club (OD, ω_3) -Berkeley.*

Obtaining a model of ZFC + “there is a HOD-Berkeley cardinal” by forcing seems like a hard problem. In this direction, Gabriel Goldberg has shown the following proposition. We include his argument with permission.⁴⁶

Proposition 8.3 (Goldberg). *Suppose there is a HOD-Berkeley cardinal. Then $A^\#$ exists for all sets A .*

Proof. Since every set of ordinals is set generic over HOD, it is enough to show that every set of ordinals that belongs to HOD has a sharp. Let A be a set of ordinals in HOD with $\sup A = \lambda$, and let γ be a Σ_2 -correct ordinal $> \lambda$ of uncountable cofinality. Let $j : V_\gamma^{\text{HOD}} \rightarrow V_\gamma^{\text{HOD}}$ be an elementary embedding. (Notice j is not definable over V ; if it were, it would belong to a $< \gamma$ -generic extension of HOD, contrary to Woodin’s proof [6, p. 320] of the Kunen Inconsistency.) Letting E be the extender of length $\lambda + 1$ derived from j , we have that j factors into embeddings $j_E : V_\gamma^{\text{HOD}} \rightarrow M$ and $k : M \rightarrow V_\gamma^{\text{HOD}}$. Since j is not definable and hence is not the extender ultrapower, k must be nontrivial with $\text{crit}(k) > \lambda$. Then $k : L_\gamma[A] \rightarrow L_\gamma[A]$ is a nontrivial elementary embedding with $\text{crit}(k) > \lambda$. \square

With a stronger hypothesis, we can get $\mathcal{M}_1^\#$.

Proposition 8.4. *Suppose there is a HOD-Berkeley cardinal and a measurable cardinal above it. Then $\mathcal{M}_1^\#$ exists and is Ord-iterable.*

Proof. Let ι be a measurable cardinal above the least HOD-Berkeley cardinal. We first show that the core model $K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K^{V_\iota}$ does not exist. Towards a contradiction, assume that it does. Since $K \in \text{HOD}$, we have a non-trivial embedding $j : K \rightarrow K$. But then [23, Theorem 8.8] gives a contradiction. It now follows from the same aforementioned theorem that in fact $(K^c)^{V_\iota} \models “\text{there is a Woodin cardinal,}”$ and since V is closed under sharps by Proposition 8.3, we get that $\mathcal{M}_1^\# \trianglelefteq (K^c)^{V_\iota}$. Because V is closed under sharps, it follows that $\mathcal{M}_1^\#$ is Ord-iterable (see [32]). \square

Combining the arguments for Proposition 8.3 and Proposition 8.4, we get some definable determinacy.

Theorem 8.5. *Suppose there is a HOD-Berkeley cardinal and a class of measurable cardinals. Then Projective Determinacy holds.*

Proof. The proof is via the core model induction as in [24]. We show that $\mathcal{M}_2^\#$ exists and leave the rest to the reader. To show that $\mathcal{M}_2^\#$ exists, it is enough to show that V is closed under the $\mathcal{M}_1^\#$ -operator and $K^c \models “\text{There is a Woodin cardinal}”$. The second statement is very much like the proof of Proposition 8.4, and so we only show that V is closed under the $\mathcal{M}_1^\#$ -operator.

As in the proof of Proposition 8.3, it is enough to show that for every set of ordinals $A \in \text{HOD}$, $\mathcal{M}_1^\#(A)$ exists, and to show this, it is enough to show that for every $A \in \text{HOD}$, $K(A)$ does not exist.

Fix now $A \in \text{HOD}$, $A \subseteq \lambda$, and let $\iota > \lambda$ be a measurable cardinal above the least HOD-Berkeley cardinal. Assume that $K = K(A)^{V_\iota}$ exists. Notice that $K \in \text{HOD}$. Let $\gamma > \iota$ be a Σ_2 -correct cardinal, and let $M \in \text{HOD}$ be such that, letting $a = \{V_\gamma^{\text{HOD}}, K\}$, $a \in M$ and a is definable in M (see [1, Lemma 3.1]). Let $j' : M \rightarrow M$ be non-trivial and elementary.

⁴⁶Goldberg observed that his argument works with the ostensibly weaker hypothesis “for all sufficiently large ordinals γ , there is an elementary embedding $j : V_\gamma^{\text{HOD}} \rightarrow V_\gamma^{\text{HOD}}$.”

Let $j = j' \upharpoonright V_\gamma^{\text{HOD}}$. Notice that $j(K) = K$. Let $\kappa = \text{crit}(j)$, and let F be the (κ, λ) -extender derived from j . As in the proof of Proposition 8.3, if $k' : \text{Ult}(V_\gamma^{\text{HOD}}, F) \rightarrow V_\gamma^{\text{HOD}}$ is the canonical factor map, then $\text{crit}(k') > \lambda$. Let then $\mathcal{M} = \pi_F(K)$, and set $\pi_F = i$ and $k' \upharpoonright \mathcal{M} = k$. We thus have that $i : K \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ and $k : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow K$. Moreover, $\text{crit}(k) > \lambda$.

Because $i : K \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, it follows that \mathcal{M} is universal among A -mice of ordinal height ι , and therefore there is $\sigma : K \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\text{crit}(\sigma) > \lambda$ (see [23]). It follows that $k \circ \sigma : K \rightarrow K$, and so we can get a contradiction as in Proposition 8.4. \square

These theorems show that obtaining HOD-Berkeley cardinals requires significant large cardinals. We believe that the proof of Theorem 8.5 can be extended to show that $L(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{AD}$ and the hypothesis that there is a class of measurable cardinals is unnecessary (see [5]). But establishing these beliefs is beyond the scope of this paper, and we conclude this discussion with the following conjecture.

Conjecture 8.6. *Suppose there is a HOD-Berkeley cardinal. Then the minimal model of $\text{AD}_{\mathbb{R}} + \text{“}\Theta \text{ is a regular cardinal”}$ exists.*

9. THEOREM 3.1 IS OPTIMAL

In this section we use the main idea of Proposition 8.3, ideas from [4], and the HOD analysis of $L(\mathbb{R})$ (see [32]) to show that Theorem 3.1 cannot be improved, assuming that $V = L(\mathbb{R})$.

9.1. Hod-like pairs. Our strategy for proving Theorem 9.14 is the following. Assume $V = L(\wp(\mathbb{R})) + \text{AD}$, and suppose there is an embedding $j : \text{HOD}|\Theta \rightarrow \text{HOD}|\Theta$. We want to show that j can be extended to $j^+ : \text{HOD} \rightarrow \text{HOD}$. Via the reasoning of Proposition 8.3, this leads to a contradiction.

To implement our strategy, we need to use more of the HOD analysis than the previous sections required. The HOD analysis that we need is developed in [32, Chapter 6], in particular [32, Theorem 6.1]. Recall from [32, Theorem 6.1] that assuming $V = L(\mathbb{R})$, $\text{HOD} = L[\mathcal{M}_\infty^+, \Lambda]$. While [32, Theorem 6.1] is proved assuming $\mathcal{M}_\infty^\#$ exists, the proof can also be done by first reflecting and then picking a coarse tuple as we have done in the arguments presented in the previous sections (see Definition 4.5). The proof simply needs a pair (\mathcal{P}, Σ) whose derived model is $L(\mathbb{R})$, or $L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$, as we will do below.

The exact meaning of \mathcal{M}_∞^+ and Λ are very important for us, and we will set up some notation to discuss these object.

Notation 9.1. *Suppose \mathcal{P} is a premouse. Then $(\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^\alpha : \alpha \leq \iota)$ denotes the increasing enumeration of the Woodin cardinals of \mathcal{P} and their limits, and $\eta_{\mathcal{P}}^\alpha$ denotes the \mathcal{P} -successor of $\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^\alpha$, if it exists.*

Definition 9.2. *Suppose \mathcal{P} is a premouse with exactly ω many Woodin cardinals. Let $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the premouse representation of $(\text{HOD}|\Theta)^{D(\mathcal{P}, \delta_{\mathcal{P}}^\omega)}$.⁴⁷*

We say \mathcal{P} is **hod-like** if

- (1) $\mathcal{P} \models \text{ZFC} - \text{Replacement}$, and
- (2) there is a tree $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{P}$ of limit length such that $\text{cop}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and \mathcal{T} is based on $\mathcal{P}|\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^0$.⁴⁸

If \mathcal{P} is hod-like, then we let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the normal tree \mathcal{T} such that $\text{cop}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$.

Suppose \mathcal{P} is a hod-like and b is a branch of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$. We say b is **friendly** to \mathcal{P} if $\pi_b^{\mathcal{T}}(\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^0) = \Theta^{D(\mathcal{P}, \delta_{\mathcal{P}}^\omega)}$.

Suppose \mathcal{P} is hod-like and b is friendly to \mathcal{P} . We then let $\xi_{\mathcal{P}} = \text{lh}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}})$, $b(\mathcal{P}) = \{\eta_{\mathcal{P}}^\omega + i : i \in b\}$ and

⁴⁷ $D(\mathcal{P}, \delta_{\mathcal{P}}^\omega)$ is the derived model of \mathcal{P} .

⁴⁸ $\text{cop}(\mathcal{T})$ is the common part of \mathcal{T} which usually is denoted by $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})$. Since \mathcal{M} is overused in inner model theory, we will use $\text{cop}(\mathcal{T})$.

$$\mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{P}, b) = (\mathcal{P}|\eta_{\mathcal{P}}^{\omega} + \xi_{\mathcal{P}}, b(\mathcal{P})).$$

We then say $\mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{P}, b)$ is the **pre-Varsovian model**⁴⁹ induced by (\mathcal{P}, b) . We say (\mathcal{P}, b) is *hod-like* if the core of $\mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{P}, b)$ is defined⁵⁰ and both its Σ_1 -projectum and projectum are $\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^0$. If (\mathcal{P}, b) is hod-like, then we let $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{P}, b)$ be the core of $\mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{P}, b)$.

We treat $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{P}, b)$ as a hybrid premouse, see [17]. Next we introduce hod-like pairs.

Definition 9.3. We say (\mathcal{P}, Σ) **resembles a hod-like pair** if it is a pure mouse pair such that the following conditions hold:

- (1) Σ is an $\omega_1 + 1$ -iteration strategy.
- (2) \mathcal{P} is hod-like.
- (3) If $b = \Sigma(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}})$ then (\mathcal{P}, b) is hod-like.

To turn pairs that resemble hod-like pairs into true hod-like pairs, we need to impose some conditions which fall naturally out of the HOD analysis.

Definition 9.4. A pair (\mathcal{P}, Σ) is a **hod-like pair** if it resembles a hod-like pair and the following conditions hold:

- (1) **Self-capturing:** For every cutpoint successor cardinal ν of \mathcal{P} and ordinal $\gamma < \nu$, if \mathcal{P} has no Woodin cardinals in the interval (γ, ν) , then the fragment of Σ that acts on iterations that are based on $\mathcal{P}|\nu$ and are above γ is in the derived model of (\mathcal{P}, Σ) .
- (2) **Self-similar:** For every $i \in [1, \omega)$, if \mathcal{W} is the output of the fully backgrounded construction of $\mathcal{P}|\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^i$ in which all extenders used have critical points $> \delta_{\mathcal{P}}^{i-1}$, then \mathcal{W} is a $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}|\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^0}$ -iterate of $\mathcal{P}|\delta^0$.

Suppose now that \mathcal{P} is hod-like with exactly ω many Woodin cardinals. Then \mathcal{P} is **self-similar** if for every $i \in \omega$ and $\gamma \in [\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^i, \delta_{\mathcal{P}}^{i+1})$, letting \mathcal{W}^i be the output of the fully backgrounded construction of $\mathcal{P}|\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^{i+1}$, there is a normal iteration tree $\mathcal{T}^i \in \mathcal{P}$ on \mathcal{P} such that \mathcal{T}^i is based on $\mathcal{P}|\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^0$ and $\text{cop}(\mathcal{T}^i) = \mathcal{W}^i$.

Lastly, we introduce the abstract Varsovian models and self-determining Varsovian models.

Definition 9.5. We say \mathcal{V} is a **Varsovian model** if for some hod-like (\mathcal{P}, b) with \mathcal{P} self-similar, $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{P}, b)$. If \mathcal{V} is a Varsovian model witnessed by (\mathcal{P}, b) , then we let $\mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$, $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$, $b^{\mathcal{V}} = b$, and for $i \in \omega$, $(\mathcal{W}_i^{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{T}_i^{\mathcal{V}}) = (\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{T}_i)$ where $(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{T}_i)$ is as in Definition 9.4.

Definition 9.6. Suppose $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{P}, b)$ is a Varsovian model. Then \mathcal{V} is **self-determining** if for each $i \in \omega$, letting $(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{T}_i) = (\mathcal{W}_i^{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{T}_i^{\mathcal{V}})$, there is $\mathcal{U}_i \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\text{cop}(\mathcal{U}_i) = \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{V}}$ and there is a unique pair of branches (c_i, d_i) such that $\pi_{b^{\mathcal{V}}}^{\mathcal{U}_i} = \pi_{d_i}^{\mathcal{U}_i} \circ \pi_{c_i}^{\mathcal{T}_i}$.

In the above situation, we let $(\mathcal{U}_i, c_i, d_i) = (\mathcal{U}_i^{\mathcal{V}}, c_i^{\mathcal{V}}, d_i^{\mathcal{V}})$.

Definition 9.7. We say that (\mathcal{V}, Λ) is a **Varsovian pair** if $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{P}, b)$ is a self-determining Varsovian model and Λ is an iteration strategy for \mathcal{V} such that, whenever \mathcal{V}' is a complete Λ -iterate of \mathcal{V} , \mathcal{V}' is self-determining, all the iteration trees $\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{V}'}, \mathcal{U}_i^{\mathcal{V}'}, \mathcal{T}_i^{\mathcal{V}'}$ and the associated branches $b^{\mathcal{V}'}, c_i^{\mathcal{V}'}, d_i^{\mathcal{V}'}$ are according to $\Lambda_{\mathcal{V}'|\delta_{\mathcal{V}}^0}$.

Definition 9.8. Suppose $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{P}, b)$ is a Varsovian model and Γ is an iteration strategy for $\mathcal{P}|\delta_{\mathcal{P}}^0$. Then (\mathcal{V}, Λ) is a Γ -**Varsovian pair** if \mathcal{V} has a $|\mathcal{V}|^+ + 1$ -iteration strategy Λ such that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{V}|\delta_{\mathcal{V}}^0} = \Gamma$.

We say \mathcal{V} is Γ -Varsovian model if there is a unique Λ such that (\mathcal{V}, Λ) is a Γ -Varsovian pair.

The following useful lemma is easy to verify and we leave it to the reader.

⁴⁹See [13].

⁵⁰See [29].

Lemma 9.9. *Suppose (\mathcal{V}, Λ) is a Varsovian pair and $i \in \omega$. Let \mathcal{T} be an iteration tree on \mathcal{V} according to Λ such that \mathcal{T} has a limit length, \mathcal{T} is based on $(\delta_{\mathcal{V}}^i, \delta_{\mathcal{V}}^{i+1})$,⁵¹ and letting $a = \Lambda(\mathcal{T})$, a is non-dropping. Then for every $\alpha < \delta_{\mathcal{V}}^0$ and $k \in \omega$,*

$$\pi_a^{\mathcal{T}}(\pi_{c_i^{\mathcal{V}}}^{\mathcal{T}_i^{\mathcal{V}}}(\alpha)) = \pi_{c_i^{\mathcal{V}'}}^{\mathcal{T}_i^{\mathcal{V}'}}(\alpha).$$

Hence, if $\pi_a^{\mathcal{T}}(\delta_{\mathcal{V}}^i) = \delta(\mathcal{T})$, then a is the unique branch e of \mathcal{T} such that $\pi_{c_i^{\mathcal{V}'}}^{\mathcal{T}_i^{\mathcal{V}'}}[\delta_{\mathcal{V}}^0] \subseteq \text{rge}(\pi_e^{\mathcal{T}})$.

The last clause of Lemma 9.9 is important because it shows that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{V}|\delta_{\mathcal{V}}^0}$ determines Λ . Indeed, $\pi_{c_i^{\mathcal{V}'}}^{\mathcal{T}_i^{\mathcal{V}'}}$ depends only on $\Lambda_{\mathcal{V}|\delta_{\mathcal{V}}^0}$ and $\text{cop}(\mathcal{T})$. We thus have that if (\mathcal{V}, Λ) is a Varsovian pair, then \mathcal{V} is $\Lambda_{\mathcal{V}|\delta_{\mathcal{V}}^0}$ -Varsovian.

We finish this section by introducing the universes that are the companions of hod-like pairs.

Definition 9.10. *We say that M and (\mathcal{P}, Σ) are **companions** if the following conditions hold.*

- (1) *Letting $\alpha = \text{Ord} \cap M$, $M = L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$, and for some sentence ϕ , α is the least β such that $L_{\beta}(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{“ZF – Replacement} + \phi\text{.”}$*
- (2) *M is the derived model of (\mathcal{P}, Σ) .*
- (3) *There is a sjs $(B_i : i < \omega) \subseteq \wp(\mathbb{R}) \cap L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ such that for each $i < \omega$, B_i is ordinal definable in M , and Σ is the unique $\omega_1 + 1$ -iteration strategy Λ such that for every $i \in \omega$, Λ respects B_i .*

We say M has a companion if there is a pair (\mathcal{P}, Σ) such that M and (\mathcal{P}, Σ) are companions.

The next theorem, the main result on companions, can be proved using the methods of [16].

Theorem 9.11. *Assume $V = L(\mathbb{R}) + \text{AD}$. Suppose α is such that for some sentence ϕ , α is the least β such that $L_{\beta}(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{“ZF – Replacement} + \phi\text{.”}$ Then $L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ has a companion.*

Remark 9.12. *In Theorem 9.11, the desired (\mathcal{P}, Σ) is built using hod pair constructions as in [16]. Clause 3 of Definition 9.10 can be achieved by fixing a sjs system for $L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$, which can be done by the results of [27], [3], [12], [35] and [36]. Clause 2 of Definition 9.4 is more or less automatic and has been treated extensively in the literature, e.g. [15].*

9.2. On HOD analysis. We exposit the HOD analysis of $L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$. Fix some ordinal α such that $L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{ZF – Replacement}$. We allow $\alpha = \text{Ord}$.

Recall from [32, Theorem 6.1] that assuming $V = L(\mathbb{R})$, $\text{HOD} = L[\mathcal{M}_{\infty}^+, \Lambda]$. Hence $\text{HOD}^{L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})} = L[\mathcal{M}_{\infty}^{+, \alpha}, \Lambda^{\alpha}]$, where $\mathcal{M}_{\infty}^{+, \alpha}$ is a hod-like premouse with exactly ω -Woodin cardinals, $\text{ORD} \cap \mathcal{M}_{\infty}^{+, \alpha} = \alpha$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\infty}^{+, \alpha}$ is definable in $L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ via a direct limit construction (see [32]). We set $\mathcal{M}^{\alpha} = \mathcal{M}_{\infty}^{+, \alpha}$. Λ^{α} is a partial iteration strategy for \mathcal{M}^{α} that acts on iteration trees which are in $\mathcal{M}^{\alpha}|\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{\alpha}}^{\omega}$ and are based on $\mathcal{M}^{\alpha}|\delta_{\mathcal{M}^{\alpha}}^0$. Λ^{α} induces a branch b^{α} for $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha} =_{\text{def}} \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{M}^{\alpha}}$ that is friendly to \mathcal{M}^{α} . In fact, Λ^{α} and b^{α} are definable from each other (see [32]). We set $\mathcal{V}'_{\alpha} = \mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{M}^{\alpha}, b^{\alpha})$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha} = \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M}^{\alpha}, b^{\alpha})$.⁵² We then have that $\text{HOD}^{L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})} = L_{\alpha}[\mathcal{V}_{\alpha}]$.⁵³ In fact more is true. Below and elsewhere, when studying objects like $\mathcal{V} =_{\text{def}} \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{P}, b)$, we will let $\mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $b^{\mathcal{V}} = b$.

Proposition 9.13. *Suppose $L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ and (\mathcal{P}, Σ) are companions. There is a Varsovian pair (\mathcal{R}, Ψ) such that \mathcal{V}_{α} is the direct limit of all complete Ψ -iterates \mathcal{Q} of \mathcal{R} such that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Q}}$ is based on $\mathcal{R}|\delta_{\mathcal{R}}^0$.*

⁵¹I.e. is above $\delta_{\mathcal{V}}^i$ and is based on $\mathcal{V}|\delta_{\mathcal{V}}^{i+1}$.

⁵²Our arguments below will show that $(\mathcal{M}^{\alpha}, b^{\alpha})$ is hod-like. See Proposition 9.13.

⁵³This is because if A is the Vopenka algebra of $L_{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ and A' is the Vopenka algebra of $D(\mathcal{M}^{\alpha}, \delta_{\mathcal{M}^{\alpha}}^{\omega})$, then we have that $\xi \in A$ if and only if $\pi_{b^{\alpha}}^{\mathcal{T}^{\alpha}}(\xi) \in A'$. Thus A is definable in $L[\mathcal{V}_{\alpha}]$. The same procedure also defines A in $L[\mathcal{V}_{\alpha}]$.

Proof. First find some coarse tuple $(R_0, \Psi_0, H, \alpha')$ that absorbs α , as in Theorem 4.7.⁵⁴ Next, let $x \in \text{dom}(H)$ be such that, letting $(\mathcal{Q}, \Lambda) = H(x)$, Σ is Suslin, co-Suslin captured by (\mathcal{Q}, Λ) .

Following [12] and [31], we can find a complete Σ -iterate \mathcal{W} that is build using the fully backgrounded construction of \mathcal{Q} . Let $\Phi = \Sigma_{\mathcal{W}}$. It follows from the results of [12] and [31] that Φ is the strategy of \mathcal{W} induced by Λ . It follows from [12] and [31] that \mathcal{W} is hod-like, and if $b = \Phi(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{W}})$, then (\mathcal{W}, b) is hod-like. Set $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{W}, b)$, and let Ψ' be the strategy of \mathcal{R}' .

It follows that whenever \mathcal{R}'' is a complete Ψ' -iterate of \mathcal{R}' , $b^{\mathcal{R}''}$ is according to $\Psi'_{\mathcal{R}''} = \Sigma_{\mathcal{R}''}$. Because $\mathcal{M}^\alpha = \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{P}, \Sigma)$, we have that $\mathcal{V}'_\alpha = \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathcal{R}', \Psi')$. Hence, the core of \mathcal{V}'_α is defined, and letting $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{W}, b)$ and Ψ be the strategy of \mathcal{R} induced by Ψ' , \mathcal{V}_α is the direct limit of all complete Ψ -iterates \mathcal{Q} of \mathcal{R} such that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Q}}$ is based on $\mathcal{R} \upharpoonright \delta_{\mathcal{R}}^0$.⁵⁵ \square

9.3. Theorem 3.1 cannot be improved.

Theorem 9.14. *Assume $V = L(\mathbb{R}) + \text{AD}$. Let \mathcal{H} be the premouse representation of V_Θ^{HOD} , and suppose $j : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is elementary. Then $j = \text{id}$.*

Proof. It is a well-known theorem of Woodin that in $L(\mathbb{R})$, $\mathcal{H} = L[A]$, where $A \subseteq \Theta$ is the set of ordinals coding the Vopenka algebra in some natural way (see [9], [33] or [32]). We now want to show that j can be extended to $j^+ : L[A] \rightarrow L[A]$. Because j^+ cannot be added to HOD by a set forcing, we can then use the proof of Proposition 8.3 to show that in fact $A^\#$ exists. We then have an embedding $k : \text{HOD} \rightarrow \text{HOD}$ with $\text{crit}(k) > \Theta$, which then induces $k^+ : L(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R})$. This is because $L(\mathbb{R})$ is a symmetric extension of HOD by a poset of size Θ (see [9]). Below $\Theta^\gamma = \Theta^{L_\gamma(\mathbb{R})}$.

Lemma 9.15. *Let E be the extender derived from j .⁵⁶ Then $\text{Ult}(L[\mathcal{V}_{\text{Ord}}], E)$ is well founded and is equal to $L[\mathcal{V}_{\text{Ord}}]$.*

Proof. Let ϕ be the sentence we are trying to prove. Towards a contradiction, assume ϕ is false. Let α be the least γ such that $L_\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{“ZF – Replacement} + \neg\phi\text{”}$ and γ is a limit of ordinals β such that $L_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{“ZF – Replacement} + \neg\phi\text{.”}$ Let (\mathcal{R}, Ψ) be as in Proposition 9.13 applied to α .

We now reflect inside $L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ and find

(1.1) $\beta \in (\Theta^\alpha, \alpha)$ such that $L_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{“ZF – Replacement} + \neg\phi\text{,”}$ and

(1.2) $\gamma < \Theta^\alpha$ and $\sigma : L_\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L_\beta(\mathbb{R})$ such that $j \in \text{rge}(\sigma)$ and Θ^γ is a regular cardinal.⁵⁷

We thus have that, letting $F = \sigma^{-1}(E)$,

(2.1) $L_\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \models \text{“Ult}(L[\mathcal{V}_\gamma], F) \text{ is ill-founded or } L[\mathcal{V}_\gamma] \neq \text{Ult}(L[\mathcal{V}_\gamma], F)\text{.”}$

We now establish a sequence of claims leading to the proof of Lemma 9.15.

Because $\sigma \upharpoonright \mathcal{V}'_\gamma : \mathcal{V}'_\gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'_\alpha$, we have that \mathcal{V}'_γ is iterable via the σ -pullback of $\Psi_{\mathcal{V}'_\alpha}$. Let Φ be the σ -pullback of $\Psi_{\mathcal{V}'_\alpha}$ and Φ' be the fragment of Φ that acts on iteration trees that are above Θ^γ . Notice that

⁵⁴Because we are working in $L(\mathbb{R})$, we in fact can assume that $(R_0, \Psi_0) = \emptyset$.

⁵⁵This argument also shows that the projectum of \mathcal{R} is $\delta_{\mathcal{R}}^0$.

⁵⁶More precisely, $(a, B) \in E$ if and only if $a \in \Theta^{<\omega}$, $B \in \mathcal{H}$ and $a \in j(B)$.

⁵⁷[7] shows that Θ^α is a Mahlo cardinal in $L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$. Indeed, if $C \in L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ is a club subset of Θ^α and $\delta < \Theta^\alpha$ is the least such that $L_\delta(\mathbb{R}, C) \prec_1^{\mathbb{R}} L_{\Theta^\alpha}(\mathbb{R}, C)$, then δ is a measurable cardinal as shown in [7], and clearly, $\delta \in C$. To get such an elementary embedding, notice that we can find, using DC and the usual argument for building Skolem hulls, a countable $X \prec L_\beta(\mathbb{R})$ such that for any $\zeta < \Theta^\alpha$, letting $\Delta_\zeta = \{B \subseteq \mathbb{R} : w(B) < \zeta\}$ and $X[\Delta_\zeta] = \{f(u) : u \in \Delta_\zeta \wedge f \in X\}$, $X[\Delta_\zeta] \prec_1^{\mathbb{R}} L_\beta(\mathbb{R})$.

$$(3.1) \quad \Phi_{\mathcal{V}'_\gamma|\Theta^\gamma} = \Psi_{\mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\gamma}.$$

Claim 9.16. $\mathcal{V}'_\gamma \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$, $\Phi' \upharpoonright \mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$, and $\Phi' \upharpoonright \mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha$ has a $\Theta^\alpha + 1$ -extension in \mathcal{M}^α .

Proof. Because $\mathcal{V}'_\gamma \in \text{HOD}^{L_\gamma(\mathbb{R})}$, we have that $\mathcal{V}'_\gamma \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$. We show that $\Phi' \upharpoonright \mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$. The proof will also show the third clause.

Suppose \mathcal{T} is a normal tree on \mathcal{V}'_γ that is above Θ^γ . Then \mathcal{T} naturally splits into a stack of ω -many normal iteration trees such that the i th normal iteration tree in the stack is based on the i th window (where by *window* we mean a maximal interval (ξ, ξ') that contains no Woodin cardinals). In light of this observation, it is enough to show that for each $i < \omega$, if $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha$ is a normal iteration tree according to Φ' with last model \mathcal{S} such that \mathcal{T} is based on $\mathcal{V}'_\gamma|\delta_{\mathcal{V}'_\gamma}^i$ and the main branch of \mathcal{T} doesn't drop, then the fragment of $\Phi'_\mathcal{S} \upharpoonright \mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha$ that acts on stacks that are above $\delta_\mathcal{S}^i$ and below $\delta_\mathcal{S}^{i+1}$ is in \mathcal{M}^α .

We prove this assuming $\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$ to simplify the notation, the general proof being only notationally more complex. Thus, set $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{V}'_\gamma$, and notice that $\Phi \upharpoonright \mathcal{M}^\alpha|\delta_{\mathcal{M}^\alpha}^\omega \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$. We thus prove the above claim for $i = 1$. More precisely, we show that if Λ is the fragment of $\Phi' \upharpoonright \mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha$ that acts on normal iteration trees that are based on the interval $(\delta_\mathcal{S}^0, \delta_\mathcal{S}^1)$, then $\Lambda \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$.

Suppose then $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha$ is a normal iteration tree on \mathcal{S} based on the interval $(\delta_\mathcal{S}^0, \delta_\mathcal{S}^1)$ such that \mathcal{U} has a limit length and is according to Λ . It is enough to show that if $c = \Lambda(\mathcal{U})$, then c is uniformly definable over \mathcal{M}^α from \mathcal{U} and Θ^γ .

We have two cases. Suppose first that either c has a drop or $\pi_c^\mathcal{U}(\delta_\mathcal{S}^1) > \delta(\mathcal{U})$. Either way, $\mathcal{Q}(c, \mathcal{U})$ is defined, and whenever $\tau : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(c, \mathcal{U})$ is such that $\tau \in L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ and \mathcal{W} is countable, \mathcal{W} has a $\omega_1 + 1$ -iteration strategy in $L_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$. It now follows that $\mathcal{Q}(c, \mathcal{U}) \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$ and is uniformly definable from \mathcal{U} and Θ^γ .⁵⁸

Suppose c doesn't have a drop and $\pi_c^\mathcal{U}(\delta_\mathcal{S}^1) = \delta(\mathcal{U})$. Let $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{M}_c^\mathcal{U}$. Let $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{S}$ be the normal tree on $\mathcal{S}|\delta_\mathcal{S}^0 (= \mathcal{V}'_\gamma|\Theta^\gamma)$ such that $\text{cop}(\mathcal{Y})$ is the output of the fully backgrounded construction of $\mathcal{S}|\delta_\mathcal{S}^1$ using extenders whose critical points are above $\delta_\mathcal{S}^0$. Notice that $\mathcal{Y}' =_{\text{def}} \pi_c^\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Y})$ only depends on $\text{cop}(\mathcal{U})$, and also if $\Phi(\mathcal{Y}) = d$ and $\Phi(\mathcal{Y}') = d'$, then $\pi_{d'}^{\mathcal{Y}'} = \pi_c^\mathcal{U} \upharpoonright \delta_\mathcal{S}^1 \circ \pi_d^{\mathcal{Y}}$.⁵⁹ Since $\Phi \upharpoonright \mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$, we have that $(\mathcal{Y}', d') \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$ is uniformly definable from \mathcal{U} . We now have that c is the unique branch of \mathcal{U} such that $\text{rge}(\pi_{d'}^{\mathcal{Y}'}) \subseteq \text{rge}(\pi_c^\mathcal{U})$. Hence, $c \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$ and is uniformly definable in \mathcal{M}^α from \mathcal{U} and Θ^γ . \square

The next claim follows immediately from Claim 9.16. Because $\mathcal{V}'_\gamma \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$, and because $\text{Ult}(\mathcal{M}^\alpha, F)$ is well-founded (as F is derived from j), $\text{Ult}(L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}'_\gamma], F)$ is well-founded. We thus need to show that $\text{Ult}(L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}'_\gamma], F) = L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}'_\gamma]$. Notice that $L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}'_\gamma] = L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}'_\gamma] = \text{HOD}^{L_\gamma(\mathbb{R})}$, so it is enough to show that $\text{Ult}(L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}'_\gamma], F) = L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}'_\gamma]$.

For $\xi < \Theta^\alpha$, let $\mathcal{K}_\xi \trianglelefteq \mathcal{M}^\alpha$ be the longest initial segment \mathcal{X} of \mathcal{M}^α such that $\mathcal{X} \models \text{“}\xi \text{ is a Woodin cardinal.”}$ Let $\Lambda_\xi \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$ be the unique $(\xi^+)^{\mathcal{M}^\alpha} + 1$ -strategy of \mathcal{K}_ξ .

Claim 9.17. In $\mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha$, \mathcal{V}_γ is the unique Θ^γ -sound Λ_{Θ^γ} -Varsovian model.⁶⁰

Claim 9.18. $\pi_F^{L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}_\gamma]}(\mathcal{V}_\gamma) = \mathcal{V}_\gamma$.

Proof. Just like with \mathcal{V}'_γ , we have that $\mathcal{V}_\gamma \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$. Let $k : \text{Ult}(\mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha$ be such that $j = k \circ \pi_F^{\mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha}$. Notice that $\text{crit}(k) \geq \Theta^\gamma$, and that we have $\tau : \pi_F^{L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}_\gamma]}(\mathcal{V}_\gamma) \rightarrow \pi_F^{\mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha}(\mathcal{V}_\gamma)$ with $\text{crit}(\tau) \geq \Theta^\gamma$ such that $\pi_F^{\mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha} \upharpoonright \mathcal{V}_\gamma = \tau \circ \pi_F^{L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}_\gamma]} \upharpoonright \mathcal{V}_\gamma$. We thus have that

⁵⁸For example, it appears in the fully backgrounded construction of $\mathcal{M}^\alpha|\Theta^\alpha$ done over $\text{cop}(\mathcal{U})$.

⁵⁹This uses the fact that $\pi_c^\mathcal{U}(b^\mathcal{S}) = \Phi(\pi_c^\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}^\mathcal{S}))$.

⁶⁰See Definition 9.8.

$$j \upharpoonright \mathcal{V}_\gamma = k \circ \tau \circ \pi_F^{L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}_\gamma]} \upharpoonright \mathcal{V}_\gamma.$$

It is enough to show that $\pi_F^{L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}_\gamma]}(\mathcal{V}_\gamma) \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{M}^\alpha \models \text{“}\pi_F^{L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}_\gamma]}(\mathcal{V}_\gamma) \text{ is the } \Lambda_{\Theta^\gamma}\text{-Varsovian model over } \mathcal{M}^\alpha \upharpoonright \Theta^\gamma\text{”}$. Notice that

- (4.1) $\mathcal{M}^\alpha \upharpoonright \Theta^\alpha \models \text{“}j(\mathcal{V}_\gamma) \text{ is the unique } j(\Theta^\gamma)\text{-sound } \Lambda_{j(\Theta^\gamma)}\text{-Varsovian model.} \text{”}$
(4.2) Λ_{Θ^γ} is the $k \circ \tau$ -pullback of $\Lambda_{j(\Theta^\gamma)}$.

It then follows from (4.1) and (4.2), and from the fact that $\pi_F^{L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}_\gamma]}(\Theta^\gamma) = \Theta^\gamma$, that $\pi_F^{L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}_\gamma]}(\mathcal{V}_\gamma)$ is the unique Θ^γ -sound Λ_{Θ^γ} -Varsovian model. Hence, it follows from Claim 9.17 that $\pi_F^{L_\gamma[\mathcal{V}_\gamma]}(\mathcal{V}_\gamma) = \mathcal{V}_\gamma$. \square

This finishes the proof of Lemma 9.15. \square

Since $L[\mathcal{V}_{\text{Ord}}] = \text{HOD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$, Lemma 9.15 implies Theorem 9.14. \square

The proof of Theorem 9.14, [12] and [34] can be used to show the following.

Theorem 9.19. *Suppose V is the minimal model of $\text{AD}_{\mathbb{R}} + \text{“}\Theta \text{ is a regular cardinal”}$, \mathcal{H} is the hod premouse representation of V_{Θ}^{HOD} and $j : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is an elementary embedding. Then $j = \text{id}$.*

REFERENCES

- [1] Joan Bagaria, Peter Koellner, and W Hugh Woodin. Large cardinals beyond choice. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 25(3):283–318, 2019.
- [2] Stephen Jackson, Grigor Sargsyan, and John Steel. Suslin cardinals and cutpoints in mouse limits, 2022.
- [3] Steve Jackson. Structural consequences of AD. In *Handbook of set theory. In 3 volumes*, pages 1753–1876. Dordrecht: Springer, 2010.
- [4] R. B. Jensen, E. Schimmerling, R. Schindler, and J. R. Steel. Stacking mice. *J. Symb. Log.*, 74(1):315–335, 2009.
- [5] R. B. Jensen and J. R. Steel. K without the measurable. *J. Symb. Log.*, 78(3):708–734, 2013.
- [6] Akihiro Kanamori. *The higher infinite: large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [7] Peter Koellner and W. Hugh Woodin. Large cardinals from determinacy. In *Handbook of set theory. In 3 volumes*, pages 1951–2119. Dordrecht: Springer, 2010.
- [8] Kenneth Kunen. Elementary embeddings and infinitary combinatorics. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 36(3):407–413, 1971.
- [9] Paul Larson. Extensions of the Axiom of Determinacy. *To appear, available at <http://www.users.miamioh.edu/larsonpb>*.
- [10] Y. N. Moschovakis. *Descriptive set theory, second edition*, volume 155 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. AMS, 2009.
- [11] G. Sargsyan. On the prewellorderings associated with directed systems of mice. *J. Symb. Log.*, 78(3):735–763, 2013.
- [12] G. Sargsyan. *Hod Mice and the Mouse Set Conjecture*, volume 236 of *Memoirs of the Amer. Math. Soc.* 2015.
- [13] G. Sargsyan and R. Schindler. Varsovian models I. *J. Symb. Log.*, 83(2):496–528, 2018.
- [14] Grigor Sargsyan. $\text{AD}_{\mathbb{R}}$ implies that all sets of reals are Θ universally Baire. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 60(1-2):1–15, 2021.
- [15] Grigor Sargsyan. Negative results on precipitous ideals on ω_1 . *J. Symb. Log.*, 88(2):490–509, 2023.
- [16] Grigor Sargsyan and John Steel. The mouse set conjecture for sets of reals. *J. Symb. Log.*, 80(2):671–683, 2015.
- [17] F. Schlutzenberg and N. D. Trang. Scales in hybrid mice over \mathbb{R} . *Submitted*, 2016.
- [18] Farmer Schlutzenberg. Full normalization for transfinite stacks, 2021.
- [19] Farmer Schlutzenberg. The definability of \mathbb{E} in self-iterable mice. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 174(2):59, 2023. Id/No 103208.
- [20] Benjamin Siskind and John Steel. Full normalization for mouse pairs, 2022.
- [21] J. R. Steel. A theorem of Woodin on Mouse Sets. available at math.berkeley.edu/~steel/.

- [22] J. R. Steel. Scales in $L(\mathbb{R})$. In A. S. Kechris, D. A. Martin, and Y. N. Moschovakis, editors, *Cabal Seminar 79–81: Proceedings, Caltech-UCLA Logic Seminar 1979–81*, pages 107–156. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1983.
- [23] J. R. Steel. *The core model iterability problem*, volume 8 of *Lec. Not. Log.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1996.
- [24] J. R. Steel. PFA implies AD^L(\mathbb{R}). *J. Symb. Log.*, 70(4):1255–1296, 2005.
- [25] J. R. Steel. A stationary-tower-free proof of the derived model theorem. In *Advances in Logic*, volume 425 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 1–8. Amer. Math. Soc., United States, 2007.
- [26] J. R. Steel. Derived models associated to mice. In *Computational Prospects of Infinity - Part I: Tutorials*, volume 14, pages 105–193. World Scientific, 2008.
- [27] J. R. Steel. Scales in $K(\mathbb{R})$. In A. S. Kechris, B. Löwe, and J. R. Steel, editors, *Games, Scales and Suslin Cardinals*. 2008.
- [28] J. R. Steel. The derived model theorem. In S. B. Cooper, H. Geuvers, A. Pillay, and J. Väänänen, editors, *Logic Colloquium 2006*, page 280–327. 2009.
- [29] J. R. Steel. *An Outline of Inner Model Theory*, pages 1595–1684. Springer, 2010.
- [30] J. R. Steel. Mouse pairs and Suslin cardinals, 2022, available at <https://math.berkeley.edu/~steel/>.
- [31] John R. Steel. *A comparison process for mouse pairs*, volume 51 of *Lect. Notes Log.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Ithaca, NY: Association for Symbolic Logic (ASL), 2023.
- [32] John R. Steel and W. Hugh Woodin. HOD as a core model. In *Ordinal definability and recursion theory. The Cabal Seminar, Vol. III. Reprints of papers and new material based on the Los Angeles Caltech-UCLA Logic Cabal Seminar 1976–1985*, pages 257–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Ithaca, NY: Association of Symbolic Logic (ASL), 2016.
- [33] N. D. Trang. HOD in natural models of AD⁺. *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.*, 165(10):1533 – 1556, 2014.
- [34] Nam Trang. HOD in natural models of AD⁺. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 165(10):1533–1556, 2014.
- [35] Trevor M. Wilson. The envelope of a pointclass under a local determinacy hypothesis. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 166(10):991–1018, 2015.
- [36] Trevor M. Wilson. Scales on Π_1^2 sets. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 22(1):301–316, 2015.

DOUGLAS BLUE, IMPAN, ANTONIEGO ABRAHAMA 18, 81-825 SOPOT, POLAND.
Email address: `dblue@impan.pl`

GRIGOR SARGSYAN, IMPAN, ANTONIEGO ABRAHAMA 18, 81-825 SOPOT, POLAND.
Email address: `gsargsyan@impan.pl`