

Mice with Woodin cardinals from a Reinhardt

Farmer Schlutzenberg
farmer.schlutzenberg@tuwien.ac.at

February 7, 2024

Abstract

If there is a Reinhardt cardinal then

1. $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is fully iterable (above X) for every transitive set X and every $n < \omega$; and
2. Projective Determinacy holds in every set generic extension.

1 Introduction

The purpose of this note is to provide a proof of the following result, which was originally announced in the author's abstract for the Oberwolfach set theory conference in 2020 [1, p. 834, Theorem 7], and also in [8, paragraph following Theorem 6.1]:¹

Theorem 1.1. *Assume $\text{ZF}(j)$ and that there is a Reinhardt cardinal as witnessed by j . Then $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is fully iterable (above X) for every transitive set X and every $n < \omega$.*

Recall here that $M_n(X)$ is the canonical proper class inner model containing X and having n Woodin cardinals $\delta > \text{rank}(X)$, and $M_n^\#(X)$ is its sharp. And the theory $\text{ZF}(j)$ is basically ZF with an extra symbol j ; it is described in detail below.

Well known results give the following corollary:

Corollary 1.2. *Assume $\text{ZF}(j)$ and that there is a Reinhardt cardinal as witnessed by j . Let $V[G]$ be any set generic extension of V . Then $V[G]$ satisfies Projective Determinacy.*

Definition 1.3. The language of set theory with predicate $\mathcal{L}_{\dot{\epsilon}, \dot{j}}$ is the first order language with binary predicate symbols $\dot{\epsilon}$ and $\dot{=}$ and predicate symbol \dot{j} .

The theory $\text{ZF}(j)$ is the theory in $\mathcal{L}_{\dot{\epsilon}, \dot{j}}$ with all ZF axioms (with $\dot{\epsilon}$ being membership and $\dot{=}$ equality), allowing all formulas of $\mathcal{L}_{\dot{\epsilon}, \dot{j}}$ for the Separation and Collection schemes.

The theory ZFR is the $\text{ZF}(j)$ together with the (single) axiom asserting that

$$\text{“}\dot{j} : (V, \dot{\epsilon}) \rightarrow (V, \dot{\epsilon}) \text{ is } \Sigma_1\text{-elementary.”}^2 \quad \dashv$$

¹The proof presented here uses a 2021 result of Gabe Goldberg at one point, to get around a gap in the original proof.

²One could add the axiom scheme, where for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the assertion that \dot{j} is Σ_n -elementary, but we will see that this already follows.

1.1 Acknowledgments

The author thanks the organizers of the Oberwolfach conference 2020, and for the opportunity to announce this and related work in the abstract for the conference. (The actual conference was unfortunately cancelled.)

This work was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 2044-390685587, Mathematics Münster: Dynamics-Geometry-Structure.

2 Some background

Definition 2.1. Let $j : V_\delta \rightarrow V_\delta$ or $j : V \rightarrow V$ be Σ_1 -elementary and $\kappa_0 = \text{cr}(j)$ and $\kappa_{n+1} = j(\kappa_n)$. Let $\lambda = \sup_{n < \omega} \kappa_n$. (Note that $\lambda \leq \delta$.) We write $\kappa_{n,j} = \kappa_n$ and $\lambda_j = \kappa_{\omega,j} = \lambda$. \dashv

Definition 2.2. Given a structure $M = ([M], \in^M, \dots)$ with universe $[M]$, and given $A \subseteq [M]$, we say that A is *amenable* to M iff for each $x \in [M]$, we have

$$\{y \in [M] \mid y \in A \text{ and } y \in^M x\} \in [M].$$

A *class* of a model M of ZF is a collection $X \subseteq M$ such that X is amenable to M and $(M, X) \models \text{ZF}$. (Here we must be working in some background model which sees M and collections $X \subseteq M$, where we make this definition.) \dashv

Definition 2.3. Work in ZF. Let C be a class. Then $\text{OD}_C(X)$ denotes the class of all sets y such that y is definable from the predicate C and parameters in $\text{OR} \cup X$. And $\text{HOD}_C(X)$ denotes the class of all y such that $\text{trcl}(\{y\}) \subseteq \text{OD}_C(X)$. And $\text{OD}(X) = \text{OD}_\emptyset(X)$ and $\text{HOD}(X) = \text{HOD}_\emptyset(X)$. \dashv

We give the relevant instance of Vopenka forcing:

Lemma 2.4. *Assume ZF. Then for every set x , $\text{HOD}_{\{x\}}$ is a set-generic extension of HOD .*

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \text{OR}$ be such that $x \in V_\alpha$. Let Vop^* be the partial order consisting of OD subsets of V_α , with $p \leq q \iff p \subseteq q$. Let $\text{Vop} \in \text{HOD}$ be the natural coding of Vop^* as a subset of some $\beta \in \text{OR}$. Write $p \mapsto p^*$ for the natural bijection $\text{Vop}^* \rightarrow \text{Vop}$. Note that this is OD.

Let $G_x = \{p \in \text{Vop} \mid x \in p^*\}$. Then by the usual Vopenka proof, G_x is (HOD, Vop) -generic. We claim that $\text{HOD}[G_x] = \text{HOD}_{\{x\}}$. For clearly $\text{HOD}[G_x] \subseteq \text{HOD}_{\{x\}}$. So let $A \subseteq \eta \in \text{OR}$ with $A \in \text{HOD}_{\{x\}}$. Let φ be a formula and $\xi \in \text{OR}$ such that

$$A = \{\gamma < \eta \mid \varphi(x, \xi, \gamma)\}.$$

For $y \in V_\alpha$ let

$$A_y = \{\gamma < \eta \mid \varphi(y, \xi, \gamma)\}.$$

Let $B_\gamma \in \text{Vop}$ be the condition such that

$$B_\gamma^* = \{y \in V_\alpha \mid \gamma \in A_y\} = \{y \in V_\alpha \mid \varphi(y, \xi, \gamma)\},$$

which is an OD subset of V_α . Note that $\langle B_\gamma \rangle_{\gamma < \eta} \in \text{HOD}$. Now note that

$$\gamma \in A \iff B_\gamma \in G_x,$$

so $A \in \text{HOD}[G_x]$, as desired. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Assume $(V, j) \models \text{ZFR}$. Then for no set X is $j \upharpoonright \text{OR}$ amenable to $\text{HOD}(X)$.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise. Then since j is proper class and $j \upharpoonright \alpha$ is a set of ordinals for each $\alpha \in \text{OR}$, there is $x \in X$ such that $j \upharpoonright \alpha \in \text{HOD}_{\{x\}}$ for proper class many $\alpha \in \text{OR}$. But then $j \upharpoonright \text{OR}$ is amenable to $\text{HOD}_{\{x\}}$. But by the previous lemma, $\text{HOD}_{\{x\}} = \text{HOD}[G_x]$ is a set-generic extension of HOD . But $j \upharpoonright \text{OR}$ determines

$$j \upharpoonright \text{HOD} : \text{HOD} \rightarrow \text{HOD},$$

through the standard class wellordering of HOD , and (since each of the set segments of this are in HOD) it follows that $(\text{HOD}[G_x], j \upharpoonright \text{HOD}) \models \text{ZFC}$. This contradicts [3]. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Assume $(V, j) \models \text{ZFR}$ and let (N_ω, j_ω) be the ω th iterate of (V, j) . Then $j \upharpoonright \text{OR}$ is not amenable to $N_\omega[A]$ for any set A .*

Proof. We have $j \upharpoonright \lambda_j \notin N_\omega$, since λ_j is inaccessible in N_ω , but from $j \upharpoonright \lambda_j$ one can recover the critical sequence of j . So the following claim gives a contradiction, completing the proof:

Claim 1. *If there is some set A such that $j \upharpoonright \text{OR}$ is amenable to $N_\omega[A]$, then $j \upharpoonright \alpha \in N_\omega$ for every $\alpha \in \text{OR}$.*

Proof. Suppose $j \upharpoonright \text{OR}$ is amenable to $N_\omega[A]$ for some set A . By [10, Theorem 3.15] (or [10, Lemma 3.9] suffices here), we can fix a forcing $\mathbb{P} \in N_\omega$ and an (N_ω, \mathbb{P}) -generic G with $A \in N_\omega[G]$. By our assumption, $j \upharpoonright \text{OR}$ is amenable to $N_\omega[G]$.

Fix $\alpha \in \text{OR}$. Let ξ be the least ordinal such that in V , ξ is not the surjective image of $\mathbb{P} \times \alpha$. Then considering the \mathbb{P} -forcing relation in N_ω as in [10, §2], we can find $X \in N_\omega$, with $X \subseteq \xi$, such that $j \upharpoonright X \in N_\omega$, and $\eta = \text{ot}(X) \geq \alpha$. Let $\pi : \eta \rightarrow X$ be the increasing enumeration of X , so $\pi \in N_\omega$. Now $j(N_\omega) = N_\omega$, so

$$j \upharpoonright N_\omega : N_\omega \rightarrow N_\omega,$$

so $j(\eta, X, \pi) = (j(\eta), j(X), j(\pi)) \in N_\omega$, and $j(\pi) : j(\eta) \rightarrow j(X)$ is the increasing enumeration of $j(X)$. We have $j \circ \pi = j(\pi) \circ j \upharpoonright \eta$, and $j \circ \pi \in N_\omega$ and $j(\pi) \in N_\omega$, so $j \upharpoonright \eta \in N_\omega$, but $\eta \geq \alpha$, so we are done. \square

With the claim, we have proven the lemma. \square

3 $M_n^\#(X)$

The following is by [9]:

Fact 3.1. *Assume ZF. Let $n < \omega$ and X be a transitive set and suppose $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable. Then $M_n^\#(X)$ is $(0, \text{OR}, \text{OR})^*$ -iterable.*

Remark 3.2. Note that one doesn't need to assume any choice for the result above. There is a use of the existence of sufficient regular cardinals involved in the proof in [9], but that proof can be executed in $L(A, X)$ for some class A of ordinals, where we get such things.

And a standard comparison argument shows:

Fact 3.3. *Assume ZF. Let $n < \omega$ and X a transitive set and suppose that $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable. Then there is a unique $(0, \text{OR})$ -strategy for $M_n^\#(X)$; we denote this by $\Sigma_{M_n^\#(X)}$.*

Lemma 3.4. *Assume ZF. Let $n < \omega$, and suppose that for every transitive set X , $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable. Let G be any set-generic filter over V . Then:*

1. $V[G] \models$ “For every transitive set X , $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable”,
2. For all transitive $X \in V$, we have:
 - $(M_n^\#(X))^{V[G]} = (M_n^\#(X))^V$; let $N = (M_n^\#(X))^V$, and
 - $\Sigma_N^V = \Sigma_N^{V[G]} \upharpoonright V$.
3. For any transitive set Y and class C :
 - (a) $\text{HOD}_C(Y) \models$ “For all transitive sets X , $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable”,
 - (b) for all transitive sets $X \in \text{HOD}_C(Y)$, we have:
 - i. $(M_n^\#(X))^{\text{HOD}_C(Y)} = (M_n^\#(X))^V$; let $N = (M_n^\#(X))^V$,
 - ii. $\Sigma_N^{\text{HOD}_C(X)} = \Sigma_N^V \upharpoonright \text{HOD}_C(Y)$.

Proof sketch. This is just a standard kind of absoluteness of iterability argument, involving reflection; see for example the arguments in [11, §2]. The basic point is much like in the proof of the following lemma, so one should see that. The proof is by induction on n , so we may assume that if $n > 0$ then it already holds for $n - 1$, and hence we already have closure under the $M_{n-1}^\#$ -operator etc. Using this operator, we can define a putative strategy for a putative $M_n^\#(X)$, and then prove that it works. Compare with the proof below.

Actually, we give a more detailed instance of this proof in the proof of Claim 2 of the proof of Theorem 4.1 later. \square

In the following lemma we use robust constructions as in [6].

Lemma 3.5. *Assume ZF. Let $n < \omega$, and suppose that for every transitive set X , $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable. Then either: Moreover, either:*

1. For every transitive set, $M_{n+1}^\#(X)$ exists and is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable, or
2. There is a transitive set X such that:
 - (a) There is no $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable $M_{n+1}^\#(X)$, and moreover, for all $\alpha \in \text{OR}$ with $X \in V_\alpha$, there is no $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable $M_{n+1}^\#(V_\alpha)$.
 - (b) Let C be any class³. Let G be $(\text{HOD}_C(X), \text{Col}(\omega, X))$ -generic. Work in $\text{HOD}_C(X)[G]$ (where ZFC holds). There we have the following:
 - i. Let $\langle N_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha \leq \theta}$ be a robust K^c construction over $N_0 = \mathcal{J}(X)$. Then for every $\alpha \leq \theta$ and every $m < \omega$, $\mathfrak{C}_m(N_\alpha)$ is (m, OR) -iterable, and N_α is $(n + 1)$ -small; moreover, there are no exotic creatures of the construction.

³In the end we not actually need to quantify over classes here.

ii. There is a maximal such robust K^c construction with $\theta = \text{OR}$.

Proof sketch. Suppose that for some X , there is no $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable $M_{n+1}^\#(X)$. Work in $\text{HOD}_C(X)[G]$ as described in the statement of the lemma, and fix a robust K^c construction as there. Then roughly, we use the $M_n^\#$ -operator in $\text{HOD}_C(X)[G]$ to produce the Q-structures which guide the formation of iteration trees on $\mathfrak{C}_m(N_\alpha)$. Because $M_n^\#(Y)$ exists and is fully iterable for every Y (in $\text{HOD}_C(X)[G]$), this is fairly reasonable. (That is, given a tree \mathcal{T} of limit length, we look at initial segments of $M_n^\#(M(\mathcal{T}))$ for the next Q-structure.) It gives an absolute enough definition that in case it fails, we can reflect it down by taking a countable substructure, and use robustness to ensure the existence of branches where needed, at the countable level; see [4] and [6]. There is a little more detail to handle in case we are iterating a non-sound structure which has Woodin cardinals. (So, the actual Q-structure we need might fail to be $\delta(\mathcal{T})$ -sound, and so it could differ from $M_n^\#(M(\mathcal{T}))$). In this case we instead need to look for a \mathcal{T} -cofinal branch b such that the $\delta(\mathcal{T})$ -core of $M_b^\mathcal{T}$ is a segment of $M_n^\#(M(\mathcal{T}))$. \square

4 ZFR and mice with some Woodin cardinals

Theorem 4.1. *ZFR implies that for every set X and $n < \omega$, $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable.*

The iterability here refers to (fine) iteration trees, which are above X .

Remark 4.2. The $n = 0$ case of the theorem (that is, that every set has a sharp) was observed independently and earlier by Gabe Goldberg.

The basic form of the proof to follow is like that of [8, Theorem 7.2]; however, the proof to follow was actually found earlier than that one (excluding the detail arranging that Ω is regular in V).

Proof. The proof is by induction on $n < \omega$; we start with a proof that every set has a sharp. We adopt the notation from the previous section. It suffices to see that for cofinally many $\eta \in \text{OR}$, V_η has a sharp. So fix a limit η such that $j(\eta) = \eta$. Then

$$j \upharpoonright L(V_\eta) : L(V_\eta) \rightarrow L(V_\eta).$$

Let E be the V_η -extender derived from j (see [7]). Let $U = \text{Ult}_0(L(V_\eta), E)$ (note that the subscript 0 means that the ultrapower is formed with pairs $[a, f]$ where $a \in \langle V_\eta \rangle^{<\omega}$ and $f \in L(V_\eta)$). The ultrapower satisfies Loś's theorem, because it is derived from j . That is, let $f : \langle V_\eta \rangle^{<\omega} \rightarrow L(V_\eta)$ with $f \in L(V_\eta)$ and let $a \in \langle V_\eta \rangle^{<\omega}$ and φ be a formula and suppose that

$$\forall_{E_a}^* k [L(V_\eta) \models \exists x \varphi(x, f(k))].$$

Then there is $b \in \langle V_\eta \rangle^{<\omega}$ with $a \subseteq b$, and $g \in L(V_\eta)$, such that

$$\forall_{E_b}^* k [L(V_\eta) \models \varphi(g(k), f^{ab}(k))].$$

(See [7] for more details.) So we get $U = L(V_\eta)$ and get an elementary ultrapower map

$$i = i_E^{L(V_\eta), 0} : L(V_\eta) \rightarrow U = L(V_\eta),$$

and the factor map $\ell : U = L(V_\eta) \rightarrow L(V_\eta)$, where $\ell([a, f]_E^{L(V_\eta)}) = j(f)(a)$; by Łoś's theorem, ℓ is well-defined and elementary. Note $i \upharpoonright V_\eta = j \upharpoonright V_\eta$ and $\ell \circ i = j \upharpoonright L(V_\eta)$. We have $\ell \upharpoonright V_\eta \cup \{\eta\} = \text{id}$. So it suffices to see that $\ell \neq \text{id}$. But if $\ell = \text{id}$ then $i = j \upharpoonright L(V_\eta)$, so $j \upharpoonright \text{OR}$ is definable over $L(A)$ for some set A , and hence is amenable to $N_\omega[A]$, contradicting Lemma 2.6. This completes the $n = 0$ case.

We next proceed through a (finite stage) core model induction.⁴ So fix $n < \omega$ and suppose that for all sets X , $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable (of course, this means above X). By Lemma 3.4, for every transitive set X , $\text{HOD}(X)$ is closed under the $M_n^\#$ -operator, and under the corresponding iteration strategies, and can define the operator and strategies. Likewise $\text{HOD}_A(X)$, for classes A . Now we want to verify the theorem at $n + 1$.

Fix $\eta \in \text{OR}$ such that $j(\eta) = \eta$. It suffices to see that $M_{n+1}^\#(V_\eta)$ exists (and is fully iterable). Let $H = \text{HOD}(V_\eta)$ and $H_j = \text{HOD}_j(V_\eta)$ (Definition 2.3). Let g be $(H_j, \text{Col}(\omega, V_\eta))$ -generic; so $H[g] \models \text{ZFC}$ and $H_j[g] \models \text{ZFC}$. By standard arguments, $H[g]$ and $H_j[g]$ also satisfy “for every set X , $M_n^\#(X)$ exists and is OR -iterable”, and agree with H, H_j over the restrictions of these operators and their corresponding iteration strategies to H, H_j respectively. (One could use [9] to extend the iteration strategies to the generic extensions, but it should be easier than this in the current context.)

Claim 2. *Suppose $H[g] \models$ “ $M = M_{n+1}^\#(V')$ exists and is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable” where $V' = V_\eta$. Then $M \in H$ and M is also $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable in H and V .*

Proof. We get $M \in H$ by the uniqueness of M in $H[g]$ and homogeneity of the collapse. And M is similarly $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable in H . One can use an absoluteness argument to see that the iteration strategy extends to V , using that H is closed under the $M_n^\#$ -operator, and that every subset of $\text{OR} \times V_\eta$ in V is set-generic over H . That is, we claim that M is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable in V , via the following putative strategy Γ : given a limit length 0-maximal tree \mathcal{T} on M according to Γ , then $\Gamma(\mathcal{T})$ is the branch determined by the \mathbb{Q} -structure $Q \trianglelefteq M_n^\#(M(\mathcal{T}))$ for $M(\mathcal{T})$ (if there is such). Suppose there is some $\mathcal{T} \in V$ according to Γ for which this fails to yield a \mathbb{Q} -structure Q , or such that Q fails to yield a wellfounded \mathcal{T} -cofinal branch, or etc. Fix some $\xi \in \text{OR}$ such that there is a forcing $\mathbb{P} \in V_\xi^H$ and an (H, \mathbb{P}) -generic G such that the counterexample \mathcal{T} , etc, appears in $V_\xi^H[G]$. We have $M_n^\#(V_\xi^H) \in H$, and $M_n^\#(V_\xi^H)[G]$ is equivalent to $N = M_n^\#(V_\xi^H[G])$, and N computes $M_n^\#(Y)$ for all $Y \in V_\xi^H[G]$, and thus can be used to verify the construction of \mathcal{T} (and possibly Q) etc. All of this gets forced by some $p \in \mathbb{P}$ about some names in V_ξ^H . Thus, in $H[g]$ we have the tree T of attempts to build a countable elementary substructure $X \preccurlyeq M_n^\#(V_\xi^H)$, containing the relevant objects \mathbb{P} , etc, including all elements of V_η . Letting \bar{M} be the transitive collapse of X , in $H[g]$ we can choose a generic for $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ (the collapse of \mathbb{P}), etc, but this easily contradicts the iterability of $M_{n+1}^\#(V_\eta)$ in $H[g]$. \square

Claim 3. *Suppose $H[g] \models$ “There is a sound premouse N of the form of $M_{n+1}^\#(V')$ such that for every countable \bar{N} and every elementary $\pi : \bar{N} \rightarrow N$, \bar{N} is $(0, \omega_1)$ -iterable”. Then $H[g] \models$ “ $N = M_{n+1}^\#(X)$ and N is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable”.*

⁴The author does not know whether one can adapt the core model theory of [6] to ZF (or ZFR); if one can do that successfully, it might simplify the arguments to follow. Instead of that, we apply the standard core model theory directly in models of choice.

Proof. The proof is similar to the foregoing one; we use the totality of the $M_n^\#$ -operator to define a putative iteration strategy for N , and show that it does indeed work, by taking a countable elementary substructure of any failure, and running a comparison argument, using the $(0, \omega_1)$ -iterability of the countable structure; if a comparison reaches stage ω_1 then the Q-structure provided by the $(\omega_1 + 1)$ -iterable structure with which we are comparing, yields a branch through the tree on the substructure \bar{N} . \square

So it suffices to see that $H[g] \models$ “There is a countably iterable $M_{n+1}^\#(V')$ ” where $V' = V_\eta$, so suppose otherwise; we will reach a contradiction.

Work in $H[g]$. All premisses, robust constructions, etc, in what follows, are over V' (which is countable in $H[g]$), so we drop the phrase “over V' ”. By our assumption, every robust construction is $(n + 1)$ -small, and therefore does not reach any $M_n^\#$ -closed model satisfying “there is a Woodin cardinal”. (Here W is $M_n^\#$ -closed if for every $R \triangleleft W$, we have $M_n^\#(R) \triangleleft W$.)

Further, if W is any countably iterable $M_n^\#$ -closed premiss then $W \models$ “there is no Woodin cardinal” and W is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable, via strategy guided by Q-structures $Q \trianglelefteq M_n^\#(M(\mathcal{T}))$ (that is, analogous to Γ above). Thus, we can use core model theory relative to the $M_n^\#$ -operator.

Work in V . Note that if $W \in H \models$ “ W is a countably iterable $M_n^\#$ -closed premiss” then W is $(0, \text{OR})$ -iterable, via a strategy as above. Note that

$$j \upharpoonright H : H \rightarrow H.$$

Let E be the V_η -extender derived from j . Let $J = \text{Ult}_0(H, E)$; then the ultrapower satisfies Los’ theorem and we get an elementary $i_E^{H,0} : H \rightarrow J$ and the natural factor map $k : J \rightarrow H$ with $k \circ i_E^{H,0} = j \upharpoonright H$. So $j \upharpoonright V_\eta \cup \{V_\eta\} \subseteq i_E^{H,0}$, so $\text{cr}(k) > \eta$, if $\text{cr}(k)$ exists. In fact, $\text{cr}(k)$ exists, because otherwise $i_E^{H,0} \upharpoonright \text{OR} = j \upharpoonright \text{OR}$, but $i_E^{H,0}$ is amenable to $N_\omega[G]$ for some N_ω -set-generic G , contradicting Lemma 2.6. So $\text{cr}(k) > \eta$. Let $\mu = \text{cr}(k)$. Let F be the $(\mu, k(\mu))$ -extender over J derived from k (so F measures $\mathcal{P}(\mu^{<\omega} \times V_\eta)$). Now E, F can be added generically to H via Vopenka forcings $\mathbb{Q}_E, \mathbb{Q}_F$. Let $\xi \in \text{OR}$ be such that $\xi > k(\mu)$ and $\mathbb{Q}_E, \mathbb{Q}_F \in V_\xi^H$ and $j(\xi) = \xi$.

Let θ be a regular cardinal with $\omega < \theta < \text{cr}(j)$ (note $\text{cr}(j)$ is an inaccessible limit of inaccessibles). Let $\tau_0 \in \text{OR}$ be such that:

- $\tau_0 > \xi$ and $\text{cof}(\tau_0) = \theta$,
- j “ $\tau_0 \subseteq \tau_0$ (it now follows that $j(\tau_0) = \tau_0$),
- there is no (α, π) such that $\alpha < \tau_0$ and $\pi : V_\alpha \rightarrow \tau_0$ is a surjection, and
- for every $\alpha < \tau_0$ and $A \subseteq V_\eta \times \alpha$, there is a forcing $\mathbb{P} \in V_{\tau_0}^H$ and an (H, \mathbb{P}) -generic filter G such that $A \in H[G]$.

Note that $H \subseteq H_j$ and $H_j[g] \models \text{ZFC}$. Let $\tau = (\tau_0^+)^{H_j[g]}$. Note that

$$H_j \models \text{“}\tau = \text{least } \chi \in \text{OR s.t. } \neg \exists \text{ surjection } \sigma : V_\eta \times \tau_0 \rightarrow \chi\text{”}. \quad (1)$$

By ZFC, τ is regular in $H_j[g]$, hence also in $H_j, H, H[g]$. Note that $H_j[g] \models \text{“}\tau_0^{\aleph_0} = \tau_0\text{”}$, so $H_j[g] \models \text{“}\alpha^{\aleph_0} < \tau \text{ for each } \alpha < \tau\text{”}$; it follows that $H[g]$ also satisfies these two statements (but it seems that we might have $(\tau_0^+)^{H[g]} < \tau$). Also,

$$H_j[g] \models \neg \exists (\alpha, \sigma) [\alpha < \tau \text{ and } \sigma : V_\eta^{<\omega} \times \alpha^{<\omega} \rightarrow \tau \text{ is cofinal}]; \quad (2)$$

It follows that $H, H[g]$ agree about which ordinals have cofinality τ .

Claim 4. $j(\tau) = \tau$.

Proof. $j(j)$ is definable (over V) from j , so $H_{j(j)} \subseteq H_j$. Note

$$j \upharpoonright H_j : H_j \rightarrow H_{j(j)}$$

is elementary. So lifting line (1) with j ,

$$H_{j(j)} \models \text{“}j(\tau) = \text{least } \chi \in \text{OR s.t. } \neg \exists \text{ surjection } \sigma : V_\eta \times \tau_0 \rightarrow \chi\text{”}, \quad (3)$$

and since $H_{j(j)} \subseteq H_j$, therefore $j(\tau) \leq \tau$, so $j(\tau) = \tau$. \square

By [2, Theorem 3.14], there is a club class of cardinals ε such that either ε or ε^+ is measurable. So by intersecting with more clubs, let $\Omega_0 > \tau$ be a cardinal with properties like τ_0 , and either Ω_0 or Ω_0^+ is measurable. Let $\Omega \in \{\Omega_0, \Omega_0^+\}$ be measurable; in particular, Ω is regular (in V). Note that both $H[g]$ and $H_j[g]$ satisfy “ τ, Ω are regular, $2^{<\tau} < \Omega$, and $\forall \alpha < \Omega [\alpha^\omega < \Omega]$ ”. Therefore we meet the requirements for developing K in these models, as described in [6, p. 6].

Work in $H[g]$. We follow [6], using notation as there. Let W, W^* be as there, with $W^* = W$ in Cases 1 and 2 of [6, pp. 6,7]. Likewise, let $S(W^*)$ be as there; so if W is a mini-universe then $W^* = W$ and $S(W^*) = S(W)$ is the stack over W , and otherwise $S(W^*) = W^*$. Note that $W, W^*, S(W^*)$ are defined in H and in V from the parameters V_η, Ω, τ (by homogeneity of the collapse and as bicephalus arguments give uniqueness of next extenders). As discussed above and by [4] and [6], W^* is fully iterable, in $H, H[g]$ and V , and $H[g] \models \text{“}W^* \text{ is stably-universal”}$ (universal with respect to stable weasels), which implies W^* is $M_n^\#$ -closed.

Let $K = \tilde{K}(\tau, \Omega)^{H[g]}$ and $\pi : K \rightarrow S(W^*)$ the uncollapse map, which is elementary. So K, π are also defined from the parameters V_η, τ, Ω in $H[g]$, in H and in V . The proofs of [6, Lemma 4.27, Lemma 4.31] go through as there, and hence $\tau \subseteq K$. Let $\tau'_0 = \sup \pi \text{“}\tau_0$.

Claim 5. $\tau'_0 < \Omega$.

Proof. Suppose otherwise. Since Ω is regular in $H[g]$, therefore $\tau'_0 > \Omega$. Therefore $W = W^*$ is a mini-universe and $S(W)$ has largest cardinal Ω , so $\Omega \in \text{rg}(\pi)$, and letting $\pi(\bar{\Omega}) = \Omega$, therefore $\bar{\Omega} < \tau_0$ and $\bar{\Omega}$ is the largest cardinal of K . But $\tau \subseteq K$ and τ_0 is a cardinal in $H[g]$, hence also a cardinal in K , a contradiction. \square

Working in V , from the parameters η, τ, Ω , we can define a τ_0 -very soundness witness $Y \in H$; that is, a stably-universal weasel Y with the α -definability property at all $\alpha < \tau_0$.⁵ For note first that for each $\Gamma \in H[g]$, if $H[g] \models \text{“}\Gamma \text{ is } W^* \text{-thick”}$, then forcing calculations give some $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ such that $\Gamma' \in H$ and $H \models \text{Col}(\omega, V_\eta) \Vdash \text{“}\check{\Gamma}' \text{ is } \check{W}^* \text{-thick”}$. So for each $\alpha \in \tau'_0 \setminus \text{rg}(\pi)$, there is $\Gamma \in H$ such that $H \models \text{Col}(\omega, V_\eta) \Vdash \text{“}\check{\Gamma} \text{ is } \check{W}^* \text{-thick”}$ and $\alpha \notin \text{Hull}^{S(W^*)}(\Gamma)$, and we can find some $x \in V_\eta$ and ordinals $\beta_\alpha < \xi_\alpha$ such that some such Γ is definable over V_ξ from (x, η, β_α) . Letting ξ be such that $\xi \geq \sup_{\alpha < \tau'_0} \xi_\alpha$ and $V_\xi \preceq_{10} V$,

⁵Recall that our premouse language has symbols for all elements in V_η , so in particular, this is trivial for $\alpha < \eta$.

we may assume $\xi_\alpha = \xi$ for all α , and then may assume $\beta_\alpha = \alpha$ for all α , by minimizing other ordinals. Therefore in V , from parameters (τ, Ω, η) , we can define the function sending (x, α) to the minimal choice $\Gamma_{x\alpha}$ for α , if there is one determined by $x \in V_\eta$. This function is in H . Let Γ be the intersection of its range. Note that $H \models \text{Col}(\omega, V_\eta) \Vdash \check{\Gamma} \text{ is } \check{W}^*\text{-thick}$ (since $\tau'_0 < \Omega$). Let $Y' = \text{Hull}^{S(W^*)}(\Gamma)$, Y^+ be the transitive collapse of Y' , and $Y = Y^+ \upharpoonright \Omega$; then Y works.)

Since Y was defined from (η, τ, Ω) , we have $j \upharpoonright Y : Y \rightarrow Y$. Now let $Y_1 = \text{Ult}_0(Y, E)$. We have Loś's Theorem and $i = i_E^{Y,0} : Y \rightarrow Y_1$ is elementary and the natural factor map $k_Y : Y_1 \rightarrow Y$ is elementary with $k_Y \circ i = j \upharpoonright Y$ and $\text{cr}(k_Y) > \eta$, if $\text{cr}(k_Y)$ exists. Note that in fact, $\text{cr}(k_Y)$ exists and (define κ by

$$\kappa = \text{cr}(k_Y) \leq \text{cr}(k) = \mu < k(\mu) < \xi < \tau_0 < \text{OR}^Y.$$

Let F_Y be the $(\kappa, k_Y(\kappa))$ -extender over Y_1 derived from k_Y . Since $j(\tau_0) = \tau_0$, we have $i_E^{Y,0}(\tau_0) = k_Y(\tau_0) = \tau_0$, so $k_Y(\kappa) < \tau_0$, so our choice of τ_0 ensures that (E, F_Y) can be added generically to H via a forcing in $V_{\tau_0}^H$. We can assume that g is $H[E, F_Y]$ -generic, so (E, F_Y) is added via forcing over $H[g]$ via a forcing in $V_{\tau_0}^{H[g]}$, so $H[g]$ and $H[g, E, F_Y]$ agree about the relevant core model calculations (their collections of thick sets are similar enough).

Let $Y_2 = \text{Ult}_0(Y_1, F_Y)$ and $\ell_Y : Y_2 \rightarrow Y$ the factor map; again we have Loś and elementarity and $\ell_Y \circ i_{F_Y}^{Y_1,0} = k_Y$ and $\text{cr}(\ell_Y) > k_Y(\kappa)$. Write $S_Y = S(Y)^{H[E, F_Y, g]} = S(Y)^{H[g]}$, etc; recall that by convention, $S(Y) = Y$ unless Y is a mini-universe.

Claim 6. *Work in $H[E, F_Y, g]$. Then*

$$\text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E) = S_{Y_1} \text{ and } \text{Ult}_0(S_{Y_1}, F_Y) = S_{Y_2}$$

and the ultrapower maps extend correspondingly, in that

$$i_E^{Y,0} = i_E^{S_Y,0} \upharpoonright Y \text{ and } i_{F_Y}^{Y_1,0} = i_{F_Y}^{S_{Y_1},0} \upharpoonright Y_1.$$

Moreover, in V , letting $k_Y^+ : \text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E) \rightarrow j(S_Y)$ be the factor map, we have $k_Y \subseteq k_Y^+$, and likewise $\ell_Y \subseteq \ell_Y^+$.

Proof. Assume that W (and hence also Y) is a mini-universe, as otherwise $S_Y = Y$, etc, and everything is trivial.

Since Ω is regular, etc, we have

$$\text{Ult}_0(Y, E) = \text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E) \upharpoonright \Omega \text{ and } i_E^{Y,0} = i_E^{S_Y,0} \upharpoonright Y.$$

Also letting $k_Y^+ : \text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E) \rightarrow j(S_Y)$ be the factor map, we have $k_Y = k_Y^+ \upharpoonright Y_1$.

In V , $\text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E)$ is iterable, since we have k_Y^+ . Hence it is also iterable in $H[E, F_Y]$ and $H[E, F_Y, g]$. So $\text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E) \trianglelefteq S_{Y_1}$.

Now suppose $\text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E) \triangleleft S_{Y_1}$. Let $R \triangleleft S_{Y_1}$ be least projecting to Ω with $R \not\trianglelefteq \text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E)$. Note that R is $(n+1)$ -small (otherwise it would have $\rho_1 = V_\eta$).

Note that $j(S_Y) = S_Y$, so $j \upharpoonright S_Y : S_Y \rightarrow S_Y$ and $\text{OR}^{S_Y} = \text{OR}^{\text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E)} = \text{OR}^{j(S_Y)}$, so $\text{OR}^R > \text{OR}^{S_Y}$. Recall $k_Y^+ : \text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E) \rightarrow j(S_Y) = S_Y$ is the factor, and $k_Y^+ \circ i_E^{S_Y,0} = j$. Let F_Y^+ be the long $\text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E)$ -extender derived from k_Y^+ . So $\text{Ult}_0(\text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E), F_Y^+) = S_Y$ and $k_Y^+ = i_{F_Y^+}^{\text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E), 0}$. Let $R' =$

$\text{Ult}_\omega(R, F_Y^+)$ (that is, use all functions definable from parameters over R in forming the ultrapower) and $\sigma_{RR'} : R \rightarrow R'$ the ultrapower map. So R' has the first-order theory of an iterable sound premouse, with $\Omega + 1 \in \text{wfp}(R')$ and $\rho_\omega^{R'} = \Omega$. In fact, R' is wellfounded. For otherwise, by the regularity of Ω , there is $\bar{\Omega} < \Omega$ such that $R_0 = \text{cHull}_\omega^{R'}(V_\eta \cup \bar{\Omega})$ is also illfounded, but by the first-order properties, we can find such an $\bar{\Omega}$ with $R_0 \triangleleft R'$, and hence $\text{OR}^{R_0} < \Omega$ wellfounded, a contradiction.

We have $R' \in H_j$. We claim that $H_j \models$ “For every countable sound premouse \bar{R} , if there is an elementary $\pi : \bar{R} \rightarrow R'$ then \bar{R} is $(\omega, \omega_1 + 1)$ -iterable”. For working in H_j , where Ω is regular, given any such Ω, \bar{R} , an appropriate application of condensation (which R' satisfies) gives that we can find $R'' \triangleleft Y$ and an elementary $\pi'' : \bar{R} \rightarrow R''$, and since Y is iterable in H_j , this suffices. But then by Claim 2, in fact $H_j \models$ “ R' is (ω, OR) -iterable”.

Now we claim that $R' \in H$. For $R' \in H[G^*]$ for G^* for H -generic filter G^* for the appropriate instance of Vopenka forcing Vop . So let $\gamma = \text{OR}^{H'}$. Suppose $R' \notin H$. Then there is some $p \in \text{Vop}$ and some Vop -name $\dot{R} \in H$ such that $H \models$ “ p forces that \dot{R} is a sound premouse satisfying condensation, $\check{S}_Y \triangleleft \dot{R}$, and $\rho_\omega^{\dot{R}} = \Omega$ ”. A standard feature of Vopenka forcing is that for every $q \in \text{Vop}$ there is a generic filter $G'' \in V$ with $q \in G''$. So fix such a filter G'' with $p \in G''$. Let $R'' = \dot{R}_{G''}$. Then $\text{OR}^{R'} = \text{OR}^{R''}$ and R', R'' are both sound premice satisfying condensation, with $\rho_\omega^{R'} = \rho_\omega^{R''}$. But Ω is regular (in $V!$), and so Jensen’s condensation argument (see the proof of [5, Lemma 3.1]) shows that $R' = R''$. It follows that $R' \in H$.

Since $R' \in H$ and is iterable in H_j , it is also iterable in H , and therefore $R' \triangleleft S_Y$, a contradiction.

Essentially the same proof works for S_{Y_2} . \square

Claim 7. *In $H[g, E, F_Y]$, Y_1 has the α -definability property at all $\alpha < \tau_0$. Therefore $Y_1|_{\tau_0} = Y|_{\tau_0} = K|_{\tau_0}$.*

Proof. We work in $H[g, E, F_Y]$. By Claim 6, $S_{Y_1} = \text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E)$. So let Γ be any Y_1 -thick set. Then there is a Y -thick, Y_1 -thick $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ such that $i_E^{S_Y, 0} \upharpoonright \Gamma' = \text{id}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} V_\eta \cup \tau_0 &\subseteq \text{Hull}^{S_Y}(V_\eta \cup \{V_\eta\} \cup \Gamma'), \\ i_E^{S_Y, 0} \text{``}(V_\eta \cup \tau_0) &\subseteq \text{Hull}^{S_{Y_1}}(i_E^{Y, 0} \text{``}(V_\eta \cup \{V_\eta\} \cup \Gamma'), \\ V_\eta \cup i_E^{S_Y, 0} \text{``}\tau_0 &\subseteq \text{Hull}^{S_{Y_1}}(V_\eta \cup \{V_\eta\} \cup \Gamma'), \end{aligned}$$

but since $S_{Y_1} = \text{Ult}_0(S_Y, E)$ and the generators of E are all in V_η , and also $j(\tau_0) = \tau_0$ and $i_E^{S_Y, 0}(\tau_0) = \tau_0$, we have

$$\tau_0 = \sup i_E^{S_Y, 0} \text{``}\tau_0 \subseteq \text{Hull}^{S_{Y_1}}(V_\eta \cup \{V_\eta\} \cup i_E^{S_Y, 0} \text{``}\tau_0),$$

and therefore

$$\tau_0 \subseteq \text{Hull}^{S_{Y_1}}(V_\eta \cup \{V_\eta\} \cup \Gamma'),$$

as desired.

The fact that $Y_1|_{\tau_0} = Y|_{\tau_0} = K|_{\tau_0}$ is then a standard conclusion, via comparing Y_1 with Y and using that both Y and Y_1 have the definability property at all $\alpha < \tau_0$. \square

Claim 8. *The phalanx $((Y, < k_Y(\kappa)), Y_2)$ is iterable in V , hence also in $H[E, F_Y]$ and $H[E, F_Y, g]$.*

Proof. In V , we can lift trees on $((Y, < k_Y(\kappa)), Y_2)$ to trees on $((Y, < k_Y(\kappa)), Y)$ via lifting maps (id, ℓ_Y) . This works because $\text{cr}(\ell_Y) > k_Y(\kappa)$. \square

Claim 9. *$k_Y(\kappa) < \tau_0$ and $k_Y(\kappa)$ is an inaccessible cardinal of each of Y, Y_1, Y_2 , and $Y|_{k_Y(\kappa)} = Y_1|_{k_Y(\kappa)} = Y_2|_{k_Y(\kappa)}$.*

Proof. Recall that $k_Y : Y_1 \rightarrow Y$ is elementary and $\kappa = \text{cr}(k_Y) \leq \text{cr}(k) = \mu < k(\mu) < \tau_0$, and also $k_Y(\kappa) < \tau_0$ since $j(\tau_0) = \tau_0$. So $\kappa = \text{cr}(k_Y)$ is regular in Y_1 and $k_Y(\kappa)$ is regular in Y . We have $Y|_{\tau_0} = Y_1|_{\tau_0}$ by Claim 7, and τ_0 is a cardinal of V , hence of Y and Y_1 . And $k_Y(\kappa) < \tau_0$, so $k_Y(\kappa)$ is also a regular cardinal of Y_1 , and since $Y|_{\tau_0} = Y|_{\tau_1}$, not a successor, so is inaccessible there. We also have $k_Y(\kappa) = i_{F_Y}^{Y_1, 0}(\kappa)$ is inaccessible in Y_2 , and $\ell_Y : Y_2 \rightarrow Y$ is elementary with $k_Y(\kappa) < \text{cr}(\ell_Y)$ (if $\text{cr}(\ell_Y)$ exists), so $Y_2|_{k_Y(\kappa)} = Y|_{k_Y(\kappa)} = Y_1|_{k_Y(\kappa)}$. \square

We can now complete the proof. We work in $H[E, F_Y, g]$. We compare the phalanx mentioned in Claim 8 with Y_1 . We get a successful comparison $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U})$ with \mathcal{T} on the phalanx and \mathcal{U} on Y_1 . By the arguments in [6], $M_\infty^{\mathcal{T}} = M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}$ and $b^{\mathcal{T}}, b^{\mathcal{U}}$ are non-dropping. Both Y and Y_1 have the definability property at all $\alpha < \tau_0$. But $k_Y(\kappa) < \tau_0$. So if $b^{\mathcal{T}}$ is above Y , the usual calculations with the definability and hull properties give a contradiction. So $b^{\mathcal{T}}$ is above Y_2 . Let $Z = M_\infty^{\mathcal{T}} = M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}$. Then as in [6], $S_Z = M_\infty^{\mathcal{T}^+} = M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}^+}$ where $\mathcal{T}^+, \mathcal{U}^+$ are \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U} construed as trees on $((S_Y, < k_Y(\kappa)), S_{Y_2})$ and S_{Y_1} . Let Γ be Y_2 -thick, Y_1 -thick and Z -thick and consist of fixed points for the embeddings $i^{\mathcal{T}}, i^{\mathcal{U}}, i_{F_Y}^{S_{Y_1}, 0}$. Then since by Claim 7 we have

$$\tau_0 \subseteq \text{Hull}^{S_{Y_1}}(V_\eta \cup \{V_\eta\} \cup \Gamma),$$

we get

$$i^{\mathcal{T}} \circ i_{F_Y}^{S_{Y_1}, 0} \upharpoonright \tau_0 = i^{\mathcal{U}} \upharpoonright \tau_0.$$

But $\text{cr}(i^{\mathcal{T}}) > k_Y(\kappa)$, and therefore $\text{cr}(i^{\mathcal{U}}) = \kappa$ and $i^{\mathcal{U}}(\kappa) = k_Y(\kappa)$ and F_Y is the $(\kappa, i^{\mathcal{U}}(\kappa))$ -extender derived from $i^{\mathcal{U}}$. But by Claim 9, the comparison uses only extenders with index $> i^{\mathcal{U}}(\kappa)$ and $i^{\mathcal{U}}(\kappa)$ is a cardinal of Y_1 , but then by the ISC, the first extender used along $b^{\mathcal{U}}$ witnesses that κ is superstrong in Y_1 , a contradiction. \square

References

- [1] Ilijas Farah, Ralf Schindler, Dima Sinpova, and W. Hugh Woodin. Set Theory, Oberwolfach Report 17 (2020). *Oberwolfach Reports*, (2/3):797–855, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.4171/owr/2020/14>.
- [2] Gabriel Goldberg. Measurable cardinals and choiceless axioms. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 175(1, Part B):103323, 2024. Kenneth Kunen (1943-2020).
- [3] Joel David Hamkins, Greg Kirmayer, and Norman Lewis Perlmutter. Generalizations of the kunen inconsistency. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 163(12), 2012.

- [4] Ronald Jensen. Robust extenders. Available at <https://www.mathematik.hu-berlin.de/~raesch/org/jensen.html>, 2003.
- [5] Ronald Jensen, Ernest Schimmerling, Ralf Schindler, and John Steel. Stacking mice. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 74(1):315–335, 2009.
- [6] Ronald Jensen and John Steel. K without the measurable. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 78(3).
- [7] Farmer Schlutzenberg. Extenders under ZF and constructibility of rank-to-rank embeddings. arXiv:2006.10574v3.
- [8] Farmer Schlutzenberg. On the consistency of ZF with an elementary embedding from $V_{\lambda+2}$ into $V_{\lambda+2}$. arXiv:2006.01077v3.
- [9] Farmer Schlutzenberg. Iterability for (transfinite) stacks. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, 21(2), 2021.
- [10] Farmer Schlutzenberg. Reinhardt cardinals and iterates of V . *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 173, 2022. arXiv: 2002.01215 ($vn > 1$).
- [11] John R. Steel. *The core model iterability problem*. Number 8 in Lecture Notes in Logic. Springer-Verlag, 1996.