

A MODEL FOR GLOBAL COMPACTNESS

SITTINON JIRATTIKANSAKUL, INBAR OREN, AND ASSAF RINOT

ABSTRACT. In a classical paper by Ben-David and Magidor, a model of set theory was exhibited in which $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ carries a uniform ultrafilter that is θ -indecomposable for every uncountable cardinal $\theta < \aleph_\omega$. In this paper, we give a global version of this result, as follows:

Assuming the consistency of a supercompact cardinal, we produce a model of set theory in which for every singular cardinal λ , there exists a uniform ultrafilter on λ^+ that is θ -indecomposable for every cardinal θ such that $\text{cf}(\lambda) < \theta < \lambda$. In our model, many instances of compactness for chromatic numbers hold, from which we infer that Hajnal's gap-1 counterexample to Hedetniemi's conjecture is best possible on the grounds of ZFC.

1. INTRODUCTION

An ultrafilter U over an uncountable cardinal κ is *uniform* iff $|X| = \kappa$ for all $X \in U$. It is θ -*indecomposable* (for an infinite cardinal $\theta < \kappa$) iff for every function $f : \kappa \rightarrow \theta$, there exists a set $X \in U$ such that $|f[X]| < \theta$. Note that for θ a regular cardinal, θ -indecomposability coincides with the requirement that U be closed under intersections of decreasing sequences of length exactly θ .

The existence of nontrivial indecomposable ultrafilters yields various forms of compactness. As a simple example, we mention that for every pair $\theta < \kappa$ of infinite regular cardinals, the existence of a θ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter on κ implies that every stationary subset of $E_\theta^\kappa := \{\alpha < \kappa \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \theta\}$ reflects. Richer combinatorial applications of indecomposable ultrafilters may be found in [She90, Eis12, JM12, RS20, LR24].

Sheard [She83] proved that a non-measurable inaccessible κ may consistently admit a uniform ultrafilter that is θ -indecomposable for all $\theta < \kappa$ except for $\theta = \omega$. This was recently extended [RYY24] to a non-measurable κ that is moreover weakly compact. As for successor cardinals, assuming the consistency of a supercompact cardinal κ , Ben-David and Magidor [BM86] constructed a model of set theory in which $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ carries a uniform ultrafilter that is θ -indecomposable for all $\theta < \aleph_\omega$ except for $\theta = \omega$. A variation for \aleph_{ω_1+1} has appeared in a note by Unger [Ung15]. This variation also secures homogeneity of the notion of forcing involved.

In this paper, a global version of these results is obtained. Our main theorem takes care of all successors of singulars simultaneously, as follows.

Main Theorem. *Assuming the consistency of a supercompact cardinal, there exists a model of ZFC + GCH in which, for every singular cardinal λ :*

- (1) *there exists a uniform ultrafilter on λ^+ that is θ -indecomposable for every cardinal θ with $\text{cf}(\lambda) < \theta < \lambda$;*

Date: Preprint as of December 18, 2024. For updates, visit <http://p.assafrinot.com/67>.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03E35; Secondary 05C63, 03E55.

- (2) every family of fewer than $\text{cf}(\lambda)$ many stationary subsets of $E_{>\text{cf}(\lambda)}^{\lambda^+}$ reflect simultaneously;
- (3) for every graph \mathcal{G} of size λ^+ , for every cardinal $\theta \in E_{>\text{cf}(\lambda)}^\lambda$, if every subgraph $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ of \mathcal{G} of size less than λ satisfies $\text{Chr}(\bar{\mathcal{G}}) \leq \theta$, then $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq \theta$;
- (4) for every two graphs \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H} , each of size at most λ^+ , if $\min\{\text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}), \text{Chr}(\mathcal{H})\} \geq \lambda$, then $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{H}) \geq \lambda$;
- (5) if $\text{cf}(\lambda) > \omega$, then in the forcing extension to add λ -many Cohen reals, $\mathfrak{u}_\kappa < 2^\kappa$ holds for every cardinal $\kappa < \lambda$ that is the successor of a singular of cofinality $\neq \text{cf}(\lambda)$.

Compared to the proof of Ben-David and Magidor [BM86], our proof replaces Magidor forcing by Radin forcing and weak homogeneity is secured here by a variant of guiding generics that we call *gurus*. Let us now describe the breakdown of this paper.

- In Section 2, we provide a few preliminaries, mostly around indecomposable ultrafilters and their combinatorial consequences.
- In Section 3, we build a coherent sequence \vec{U} of supercompact measures, together with a guru sequence \vec{t} , while ensuring that the two cohere in a certain way.
- In Section 4, we define *Radin forcing with gurus* $\mathbb{R}_{\vec{U}, \vec{t}}$ using the objects obtained in Section 3. We verify basic properties of this forcing as well as verify that it has the strong Prikry property.
- In Section 5, we determine the cardinal structure in the forcing extension by $\mathbb{R}_{\vec{U}, \vec{t}}$.
- In Section 6, we study a natural projection Π of our Radin forcing $\mathbb{R}_{\vec{U}, \vec{t}}$ to Prikry forcing $\mathbb{P}_{\vec{U}, \vec{t}}$.
- In Section 7, we study intermediate models between the extension by $\mathbb{P}_{\vec{U}, \vec{t}}$ and the extension by $\mathbb{R}_{\vec{U}, \vec{t}}$.
- In Section 8, we establish the aforementioned weak homogeneity of our forcing.
- In Section 9, we obtain the final model witnessing the conclusion of our Main Theorem.
- In Section 10, we outline a variation of the final model in which the SCH fails everywhere.

2. INDECOMPOSABLE ULTRAFILTERS AND ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARIES

For every set of ordinals x , we let $\pi_x : \text{otp}(x) \rightarrow x$ denote its inverse collapsing map. By a *supercompact measure* on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$, we mean a normal fine κ -complete ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$.

Given a filter D over a cardinal κ , we write D^* for its dual ideal $\{\kappa \setminus X \mid X \in D\}$, and D^+ for the collection $\mathcal{P}(\kappa) \setminus D^*$ of its positive sets. A *base* for D is a subset $\mathcal{B} \subseteq D$ such that for every $A \in D$, there is a $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $|B \setminus A| < \kappa$; the least size of a base is denoted by $\chi(D) := \min\{|\mathcal{B}| \mid \mathcal{B} \text{ is a base for } D\}$.

Definition 2.1 (Ultrafilter number). For every infinite cardinal κ :

$$\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) := \min\{\chi(U) \mid U \text{ is a uniform ultrafilter on } \kappa\}.$$

Definition 2.2 (Keisler, Prikry [Pri68]). Let D be a filter over a cardinal κ , and let θ be an infinite cardinal. D is said to be θ -indecosable iff for every $B \in D^+$ and every function $f : B \rightarrow \theta$, there exists a $T \in [\theta]^{<\theta}$ such that $f^{-1}[T]$ is in D^+ .

We say that D is $[\chi, \nu)$ -indecosable iff it is θ -indecosable for every cardinal θ with $\chi \leq \theta < \nu$. Note that D is ν -complete iff it is $[\omega, \nu)$ -indecosable.

Fact 2.3 ([IR24]). Suppose that D is a ν -complete uniform filter over a regular uncountable cardinal κ , and there is a family of fewer than ν many stationary subsets of $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid D \text{ is } \text{cf}(\alpha)\text{-indecosable}\}$ that do not reflect simultaneously. Then any element of D^+ may be decomposed into κ -many D^+ -sets. In particular, D is not an ultrafilter.

Fact 2.4 (Silver, [Sil74, Lemma 2]). Suppose $\chi = \text{cf}(\chi) < 2^\chi < \nu \leq \kappa$ are infinite cardinals, and U is a χ -incomplete $[\chi, \nu)$ -indecosable uniform ultrafilter over κ . Then there exist a $\vartheta < \chi$ and a map $\varphi : \kappa \rightarrow \vartheta$ such that the following two hold:

- for every $\tau < \vartheta$, $\varphi^{-1}[\tau] \notin U$, and
- for every function $f : \kappa \rightarrow \mu$ with $\mu < \nu$, there exists a function $g : \vartheta \rightarrow \mu$ such that $f = g \circ \varphi \pmod{U}$.

The following is an easy corollary to the work of Raghavan and Shelah [RS20]:

Lemma 2.5. Suppose that:

- θ is a regular uncountable cardinal;
- S is a nonempty set of singular cardinals;
- for every $\lambda \in S$, there is a θ -indecosable uniform ultrafilter over λ^+ ;
- μ is a singular strong limit of cofinality θ greater than $\sup(S)$.

Then, in the forcing extension to add μ -many Cohen reals, $\mathfrak{u}_{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^+}$ for every $\lambda \in S$.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in S$ and fix a θ -indecosable uniform ultrafilter U over $\kappa := \lambda^+$. Evidently, $\aleph_0 < \text{cf}(\mu) < \kappa < \mu$, with U being $\text{cf}(\mu)$ -indecosable. As U is an ultrafilter, $U = U^+$ and then [RS20, Definition 4] coincides with Definition 2.2 above. Thus, by [RS20, Theorem 7], in $V[G]$, for G an $\text{Add}(\aleph_0, \mu)$ -generic, every uniform ultrafilter on λ^+ that extends U has a basis of size no more than μ . Thus, $\mathfrak{u}_{\lambda^+} \leq \mu$. In addition, $2^{\lambda^+} \geq 2^{\aleph_0} \geq \mu$ with $\text{cf}(2^{\lambda^+}) > \lambda^+ > \text{cf}(\mu)$ and hence $2^{\lambda^+} > \mu \geq \mathfrak{u}_{\lambda^+}$. \square

Definition 2.6 (Keisler). A filter D is (λ, κ) -regular iff there is a sequence $\langle A_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa \rangle$ of sets in D such that $\bigcap_{\beta \in B} A_\beta = \emptyset$ for every $B \in [\kappa]^\lambda$.

Note that any uniform ultrafilter over a regular uncountable κ is (κ, κ) -regular.

Fact 2.7 (Kanamori, [Kan76, Corollary 2.4]). For every singular cardinal λ , every uniform ultrafilter over λ^+ is (λ, λ^+) -regular.

Next, we recall a Menas-type theorem for indecosable ultrafilters on singular cardinals.

Definition 2.8. Let λ be a singular cardinal of cofinality κ , $\langle \lambda_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$ an increasing sequence of cardinals converging to λ , where each λ_i carries a uniform ultrafilter U_{λ_i} . Let E be any uniform ultrafilter on κ . Define

$$E\text{-}\lim_{i < \kappa} U_{\lambda_i} := \{X \subseteq \lambda \mid \{i < \kappa \mid X \cap \lambda_i \in U_{\lambda_i}\} \in E\}.$$

Proposition 2.9. *Let \vec{U} and E be as in Definition 2.8. Then $E\text{-}\lim_{i < \kappa} U_{\lambda, i}$ is a uniform ultrafilter.*

Proof. We first show that U is an ultrafilter.

- $\lambda \in U$: For each $i < \kappa$, $\lambda \cap \lambda_i = \lambda_i \in U_{\lambda, i}$, so $\lambda \in U$.
- U is closed under the superset relation: Let $A \in U$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq \lambda$. Let $Y \in E$ be a witness for A , i.e. for $i \in Y$, $A \cap \lambda_i \in U_{\lambda, i}$. For such i , since $B \cap \lambda_i \supseteq A \cap \lambda_i$, we have $B \cap \lambda_i \in U_{\lambda, i}$, and hence, $B \in U$.
- The finite intersection property: Let $A_0, A_1 \in U$ with the witnesses $Y_0, Y_1 \in E$, respectively. Note that $Y_0 \cap Y_1 \in E$, and for $i \in Y_0 \cap Y_1$, $(A_0 \cap A_1) \cap \lambda_i = (A_0 \cap \lambda_i) \cap (A_1 \cap \lambda_i) \in U_{\lambda, i}$. Hence, $A_0 \cap A_1 \in U$.
- The ultrafilter property: Let $A \subseteq \lambda$. Define $f : \kappa \rightarrow 2$ by $f(i) = 0$ iff $A \cap \lambda_i \in i$. Note that $f(i) = 1$ iff $\lambda_i \setminus A \in U_{\lambda, i}$. Let $Y \in E$ be such that $f \upharpoonright Y$ is a constant. If the corresponding constant is 0, then $A \in U$, otherwise, $\lambda \setminus A \in U$. Note that the conclusions are mutually exclusive.

Now, observe that for each $X \in U$, for unboundedly many $i < \kappa$, we have that $X \cap \lambda_i \in U_{\lambda, i}$, in particular, $|X \cap \lambda_i| = \lambda_i$. Hence $|X| = \lambda$, which concludes that U is uniform. \square

Proposition 2.10. *Let λ be a singular cardinal of cofinality κ . Assume $\kappa < \theta < \lambda$. Suppose there is a set $S = \{\lambda_i \mid i < \kappa\}$ which is unbounded in λ such that each λ_i carries an ultrafilter which is θ -indecomposable. Then λ carries a θ -indecomposable ultrafilter.*

Proof. For each $i < \kappa$, let $U_{\lambda, i}$ be such a witness. Fix a uniform ultrafilter E on κ . Let $U = E\text{-}\lim_{i < \kappa} U_{\lambda, i}$.

We show that U is θ -indecomposable. Let $f : \lambda \rightarrow \theta$. For $i < \kappa$, let $f_i = f \upharpoonright \lambda_i$ so that f_i is a function from λ_i to θ . By the θ -indecomposability of $U_{\lambda, i}$, let $\gamma_i < \theta$ be such that $f_i^{-1}[\gamma_i] \in U_{\lambda, i}$. Since $\kappa < \theta$, we have that $\gamma^* = \sup_{i < \kappa} \gamma_i < \theta$. We then have that for each i ,

$$f^{-1}[\gamma^*] \cap \lambda_i = f_i^{-1}[\gamma^*] \supseteq f_i^{-1}[\gamma_i] \in U_{\lambda, i}.$$

This concludes that $f^{-1}[\gamma^*] \in U$. \square

Remark 2.11. • In the setting of Proposition 2.10, if $I \subseteq (\kappa, \lambda)$ is such that for each $i \in S$, $U_{\lambda, i}$ is θ -indecomposable for every $\theta \in I$, then as in the proof of Proposition 2.10, we also obtain U which is θ -indecomposable for every $\theta \in I$.

- Note that if λ is singular, then any uniform ultrafilter on λ is $\text{cf}(\lambda)$ -decomposable: fix a cofinal sequence $\langle \lambda_i \mid i < \text{cf}(\lambda) \rangle$ in λ . Define $f : \lambda \rightarrow \text{cf}(\lambda)$ via $f(\alpha) := \min\{i \mid \alpha < \lambda_i\}$. Then for any $i < \text{cf}(\lambda)$, $f^{-1}[i] = \lambda_i < \lambda$, and hence, $f^{-1}[i]$ will never belong to a uniform ultrafilter.

Another simple example is the following: let λ be a singular, $\kappa = \text{cf}(\lambda)$, and λ is a limit of measurable cardinals $\langle \lambda_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$, and each λ_i carries a normal measure $U_{\lambda, i}$. Let E be a uniform ultrafilter on κ . Then $E\text{-}\lim_{i < \kappa} U_{\lambda, i}$ is θ -indecomposable for every $\theta \in (\kappa, \lambda_0)$. With the similar constructions on the tails of $\langle \lambda_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$, for $\theta \in (\kappa, \lambda)$, there is a θ -indecomposable ultrafilter on λ .

Note that a regular cardinal λ has an ω -indecomposable ultrafilter iff λ is measurable. In fact, countably complete ultrafilters on λ are exactly those which are ω -indecomposable. The argument is the following. If λ is measurable, then any

countably complete ultrafilter on λ will be ω -indecomposable: furthermore, for each $f : \lambda \rightarrow \omega$, there is n such that $f^{-1}[\{n\}] \in U$. Conversely, let U be an ω -indecomposable ultrafilter, and suppose for a contradiction that U is not countably complete. Let $\langle A_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be such a witness. Assume that $\bigcap_n A_n = \emptyset$ and $\langle A_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ is \subseteq -decreasing. For $\alpha < \lambda$, let $f(\alpha) = \min\{n \mid \alpha \notin A_n\}$. By indecomposability, there is an n such that $f^{-1}[n] \in U$. Note that $f(\alpha) < n$ iff $\alpha \notin A_{n-1}$. Thus, $\lambda \setminus A_{n-1} \in U$, which is a contradiction.

2.1. Chromatic number of graphs. A *graph* is a structure $\mathcal{G} = (G, E)$ where E is an irreflexive symmetric relation on G . A coloring $f : G \rightarrow \mu$ is *good* iff for every $(x, y) \in E$, $f(x) \neq f(y)$. The *chromatic number of \mathcal{G}* is $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}) := \min\{\mu \in \text{On} \mid f : G \rightarrow \mu \text{ is a good coloring}\}$.

The following lemma can be extracted from the proof of [She90, Theorem 5.2].

Lemma 2.12. *Suppose that all of the following hold:*

- $\lambda, \kappa, \mu, \theta$ are infinite cardinals with $\lambda \leq \kappa$ and $\mu^{\theta^+} < \kappa$;
- U is a (λ, κ) -regular uniform ultrafilter on κ that is $(\theta, \mu^{\theta^+}]$ -indecomposable;
- \mathcal{G} is a graph of size no more than κ such that all of its subgraphs of size less than λ have chromatic number no more than μ .

Then $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq \mu^\theta$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, $\mathcal{G} = (\kappa, E)$. Define a binary relation \sim on the collection $\mathcal{F} := \bigcup_{A \in U} {}^A\mu$, letting $f \sim f'$ iff $\{\alpha \in \text{dom}(f) \cap \text{dom}(f') \mid f(\alpha) = f'(\alpha)\} \in U$. As U is in particular a filter, \sim is an equivalence relation.

Claim 2.12.1. (\mathcal{F}, \sim) has no more than μ^θ many equivalence classes.

Proof. If U is θ^+ -complete, then since it is also $(\theta, \mu]$ -indecomposable, it is μ^+ complete, and then any $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is \sim -equivalent to some constant map, and there are no more than μ many such maps. Hereafter, assume that U is not θ^+ -complete. Thus, letting $\chi := \theta^+$ and $\nu := (\mu^{\theta^+})^+$, it is the case that U is $[\chi, \nu)$ -indecomposable that is not χ -complete. It is also the case that $2^\chi = 2^{\theta^+} \leq \mu^{\theta^+} < \nu \leq \kappa$. By Lemma 2.4, then, we may fix a $\vartheta \leq \theta$ and a map $\varphi : \kappa \rightarrow \vartheta$ such that, for any $f : \kappa \rightarrow \mu$, there exists a function $g : \vartheta \rightarrow \mu$ such that $f = g \circ \varphi \pmod{U}$. In particular, for every pair $f \not\sim f'$ of elements of \mathcal{F} there are corresponding distinct elements g, g' of ${}^\vartheta\mu$. Therefore, the number of equivalence classes is no more than $\mu^\vartheta \leq \mu^\theta$, as sought. \square

Let $\langle A_\beta \mid \kappa < \beta \rangle$ be a witness that U is (λ, κ) -regular. Consequently, for every $\alpha < \kappa$, $G_\alpha := \{\beta < \kappa \mid \alpha \in A_\beta\}$ has size less than λ , and hence we may pick a good coloring $c_\alpha : G_\alpha \rightarrow \mu$. For every $\beta < \kappa$, for every $\alpha \in A_\beta$, it is the case that $\beta \in G_\alpha$, so we may define a function $f_\beta : A_\beta \rightarrow \mu$ via $f_\beta(\alpha) := c_\alpha(\beta)$.

Claim 2.12.2. $\beta \mapsto [f_\beta]_\sim$ is a good coloring of \mathcal{G} .

Proof. Fix an arbitrary pair $\beta \ E \ \beta'$. The set $A_\beta \cap A_{\beta'}$ is in U , and for every $\alpha \in A_\beta \cap A_{\beta'}$, we have that $\beta, \beta' \in G_\alpha$ with $c_\alpha(\beta) \neq c_\alpha(\beta')$ (since c_α is a good coloring). So $f_\beta \not\sim f_{\beta'}$. \square

By the last two claims, $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq \mu^\theta$. \square

Corollary 2.13. *Suppose that λ is a singular strong limit cardinal, and there exists a $(\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over λ^+ .*

For every graph \mathcal{G} of size λ^+ , for every cardinal μ , if $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \mu$ for every subgraph \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{G} of size less than λ , then $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq \mu^{\text{cf}(\lambda)}$. \square

Definition 2.14 (Product graph). Given two graphs $\mathcal{G}_0 = (G_0, E_0)$ and $\mathcal{G}_1 = (G_1, E_1)$, the product graph $\mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1$ is defined as follows:

- $V(\mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1)$ is $G_0 \times G_1 := \{(g_0, g_1) \mid g_0 \in G_0, g_1 \in G_1\}$;
- $E(\mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1)$ is $E_0 * E_1 := \{(g_0, g_1), (g'_0, g'_1)\} \mid (g_0, g'_0) \in E_0 \ \& \ (g_1, g'_1) \in E_1\}$.

Motivated by Hedetniemi's conjecture [Hed66], Hajnal [Haj85] proved that for every infinite cardinal λ , there are graphs $\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1$ of chromatic number λ^+ whose product has chromatic number λ . Then, Soukup [Sou88] gave a consistent example of a 2-cardinal gap by forcing to add graphs $\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1$ of size and chromatic number \aleph_2 whose product is countably chromatic. Finally, in [Rin17], an arbitrary gap was shown to be consistently feasible, where for every infinite cardinal λ , the axiom \mathbb{K}_λ yields two graphs $\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1$ of size and chromatic number λ^+ whose product is countably chromatic. We now show that a 1-cardinal gap is best possible on the grounds of ZFC alone.

Corollary 2.15. *Suppose that λ is a singular strong limit cardinal, and there exists a $(\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over λ^+ . Then for every two graphs $\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1$ of size λ^+ , if $\min\{\text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}_0), \text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}_1)\} \geq \lambda$, then $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1) \geq \lambda$.*

Proof. Hajnal [Haj04] proved that for every two infinitely chromatic graphs \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H} , every subgraph of \mathcal{G} of size less than $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{H})$ has chromatic number $\leq \text{Chr}(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{H})$. Now, towards a contradiction, suppose that $\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1$ are graphs of size λ^+ such that $\lambda \leq \text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}_1) \leq \text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}_0)$, and yet $\mu := \text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_1)$ is strictly smaller than λ . By Hajnal's lemma, then, every subgraph of \mathcal{G}_0 of size less than λ has chromatic number $\leq \mu$. But, then, by Corollary 2.13, $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{G}_0) \leq \mu^{\text{cf}(\lambda)} < \lambda$ since λ is a strong limit. This is a contradiction. \square

3. GURU SEQUENCES AND A COHERENT SEQUENCE OF MEASURES

In this section we build a coherent sequence of supercompact measures with some strengthening of coherent guiding generics that we call *gurus*.¹ These will be used to construct the Radin forcing and its variants in future sections of this paper.

As a first step, for a regular cardinal α , we attach a few objects, as follows:

- for every $x \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, we write $\alpha_x := \text{otp}(\alpha \cap x)$;
- $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\alpha^+) := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \mid \alpha \cap x \in \text{Reg}\}$;
- $\mathcal{A}_\alpha(\alpha^+) := \{x \in \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \mid \text{otp}(x) = (\alpha_x)^+\}$;
- $\mathcal{B}_\alpha(\alpha^+) := \{x \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \mid \alpha_x \text{ is strongly inaccessible}\}$;
- for every $x \in \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, let $\mathbb{C}_{\alpha,x} := \text{Col}((\alpha_x)^{++}, < \alpha)$.

Definition 3.1 (Guru). For a regular cardinal α , a sequence $\vec{t} = \langle t_i \mid i < \alpha^{++} \rangle$ is a *guru* for α iff all of the following hold:

- (1) for every $i < \alpha^{++}$, $t_i : \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \rightarrow V$ is a function such that $t_i(x) \in \mathbb{C}_{\alpha,x}$ for every $x \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$;
- (2) for all $j < i < \alpha^{++}$, the set $\{x \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \mid t_j(x) \not\subseteq t_i(x)\}$ is nonstationary in $\mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$;

¹We thank Inamdar for suggesting this terminology.

- (3) for every function $D : \mathcal{A}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \rightarrow V$ such that $D(x)$ is a dense subset of $\mathbb{C}_{\alpha,x}$ for every $x \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, there is an $i < \alpha^{++}$ such that $t_i(x) \in D(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$.

Remark 3.2. We call \vec{t} a guru since it can guide us similarly to a guiding generic but with a wider reach. Let us explain. First, by convention, we write “ $s \in \vec{t}$ ” to express that $s = t_i$ for some $i < \alpha^{++}$. Now, if U is a supercompact measure on $\mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$ and $j_U : V \rightarrow M_U$ is the corresponding ultrapower embedding, then $\mathcal{G}_U := \{[s]_U \mid s \in \vec{t}\}$ satisfies all of the following:

- \mathcal{G}_U is a subset of $\text{Col}(\alpha^{++}, < j_U(\alpha))^{M_U}$;
- For all $u, v \in \mathcal{G}_U$, there is a $w \in \mathcal{G}_U$ such that $w \leq u, v$;
- For every dense open subset D of $\text{Col}(\alpha^{++}, < j_U(\alpha))^{M_U}$ living in M_U , we have $\mathcal{G}_U \cap D \neq \emptyset$.

Thus, \mathcal{G}_U generates an $(M_U, \text{Col}(\kappa^{++}, < j_U(\kappa)))$ -generic filter.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that α is a regular limit cardinal such that $2^{\alpha^+} = \alpha^{++}$. Then there is a guru for α .*

Proof. The proof is a standard diagonalization argument as in [Git10, Lemma 3.5] and even more so as in [EH18, Lemma 36]. Let $\langle D_i \mid i < \alpha^{++} \rangle$ be an enumeration of all functions D as in Clause (3) of Definition 3.1. We build $\vec{t} = \langle t_i \mid i < \alpha^{++} \rangle$ by recursion, as follows.

► $t_0 : \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \rightarrow V$ is chosen arbitrarily subject to the requirement that $t_0(x) \in D_0(x)$ for every $x \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, and $t_0(x) := \emptyset$ for any other x .

► For every $i < \alpha^{++}$ such that $\langle t_j \mid j \leq i \rangle$ has already been successfully defined to satisfy (1)–(3), pick a $t_{i+1} : \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \rightarrow V$ satisfying that $t_{i+1}(x)$ is an element of $D_{i+1}(x)$ extending $t_i(x)$ for every $x \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, and $t_{i+1}(x) := \emptyset$ for any other x . It is clear that $\langle t_j \mid j \leq i+1 \rangle$ maintains requirements (1)–(3).

► For every $i \in \text{acc}(\alpha^{++})$ such that $\langle t_j \mid j < i \rangle$ has already been successfully defined to satisfy (1)–(3), first let $\langle j_\beta \mid \beta < \text{cf}(i) \rangle$ be a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals converging to i . For all $\beta < \gamma < \text{cf}(i)$, let $C_{\beta,\gamma}$ be a club in $\mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$ disjoint from $\{x \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \mid t_{j_\beta}(x) \not\subseteq t_{j_\gamma}(x)\}$. Then consider the following set C which is a club in $\mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$:

$$C := \bigtriangleup_{\beta < \gamma < \text{cf}(i)} C_{\beta,\gamma} := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \mid \forall \beta, \gamma \in x (\beta < \gamma < \text{cf}(i) \rightarrow x \in C_{\beta,\gamma})\}.$$

The definition of $t_i : \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \rightarrow V$ is now divided into two:

►► For every $x \in C \cap \mathcal{A}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, since $\langle t_{j_\beta}(x) \mid \beta \in x \cap \text{cf}(i) \rangle$ is a decreasing sequence of conditions in $\mathbb{C}_{\alpha,x}$ and since $|x \cap \text{cf}(i)| < (\alpha_x)^{++}$, we may define $t_i(x)$ to be an element of $D_i(x)$ extending all the conditions in the said sequence.

►► For any other x , we simply let $t_i(x) := \emptyset$.

It is clear that $\langle t_j \mid j \leq i \rangle$ maintains requirements (1)–(3). \square

Hereafter, we work in a model V of ZFC+GCH in which κ is a κ^{++} -supercompact cardinal. The following lemma tells us that there is a *coherent sequence of supercompact measures* \vec{U} and a corresponding *coherent sequence of gurus* \vec{t} . Its proof is an adaptation of [Kru07, Proposition 2.2].

Lemma 3.4. *There are:*

- a map $o^{\vec{U}}$ from a set of strongly inaccessible cardinals to the ordinals,

- a sequence $\vec{U} = \langle \langle U_{\alpha,i} \mid i < o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha) \rangle \mid \alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}}) \rangle$, and
- a sequence $\vec{t} = \langle \vec{t}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}}) \rangle$

such that all of the following hold:

- (1) $\max(\text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}})) = \kappa$ with $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa) = \kappa^{+3}$;
- (2) for every $\alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}})$, and \vec{t}_α is a guru for α ;
- (3) for every $\alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}})$ and every $i < o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha)$:
 - (a) $U_{\alpha,i}$ is a supercompact measure on $\mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, and we let $j_{\alpha,i} : V \rightarrow M_{\alpha,i}$ denote the corresponding ultrapower embedding;
 - (b) $\{x \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \mid \alpha_x \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}})\} \in U_{\alpha,i}$;
 - (c) $j_{\alpha,i}(\vec{U} \upharpoonright \alpha) \upharpoonright \alpha = \vec{U} \upharpoonright \alpha$;
 - (d) $j_{\alpha,i}(\vec{U} \upharpoonright \alpha)(\alpha) = \langle U_{\alpha,k} \mid k < i \rangle$;
 - (e) $j_{\alpha,i}(\vec{t} \upharpoonright \alpha)(\alpha) = \vec{t}_\alpha$.

Proof. For the sake of this proof, define a relation \preceq over $V \times V$, by letting $(a, b) \preceq (c, d)$ iff $a = c$ and $b \subseteq d$. Let $j : V \rightarrow M$ witness that κ is κ^{++} -supercompact. Define a map $g : \kappa \rightarrow V_\kappa$ by recursion on $\alpha < \kappa$, as follows. For every $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $g \upharpoonright \alpha$ has already been defined, set $g(\alpha) := \emptyset$ unless α is strongly inaccessible and $2^{\alpha^+} = \alpha^{++}$, in which case, we let $g(\alpha)$ be a maximal element of (X_α, \preceq) , where X_α is the collection of all pairs $(\vec{t}, \langle U_i \mid i < l \rangle)$ such that all of the following hold:

- \vec{t} is a guru for α ;
- for every $i < l$, U_i is a supercompact measure on $\mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, and we let $j_{U_i} : V \rightarrow M_i$ denote the corresponding ultrapower embedding;
- $\langle U_i \mid i < l \rangle$ is \triangleleft -increasing, that is, $U_i \in M_k$ for all $i < k < l$, or $l = 0$, i.e. the sequence $\langle U_i \mid i < l \rangle$ is empty;
- for every $i < l$, $j_{U_i}(g \upharpoonright \alpha)(\alpha)$ coincides with $(\vec{t}, \langle U_k \mid k < i \rangle)$.

Note that by Lemma 3.3, X_α is nonempty, and that by Zorn's lemma, (X_α, \preceq) indeed admits a maximal element. This completes the recursion.

Next, define $o^{\vec{U}}$ to be the following function from $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid g(\alpha) \neq \emptyset\} \cup \{\kappa\}$ to the ordinals, as follows. For every $\alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}}) \cap \kappa$, write $(\vec{t}_\alpha, \langle U_{\alpha,i} \mid i < l_\alpha \rangle) := g(\alpha)$, and then let $o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha) := l_\alpha$. Finally, to define $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)$, write $(\vec{t}_\kappa, \langle U_{\kappa,i} \mid i < l_\kappa \rangle) := j(g)(\kappa)$ and then let $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa) := l_\kappa$.

Claim 3.4.1. $l_\kappa = \kappa^{+3}$.

Proof. For every $\iota < l_\kappa$, let $j_{U_{\kappa,\iota}} : V \rightarrow M_{\kappa,\iota}$ denote the corresponding ultrapower embedding. Note that for every $k < l_\kappa$, for every $\iota < k$, $U_{\kappa,\iota}$ is in $M_{\kappa,k}$ and is represented by a function from $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$ to V_κ , and the number of such functions is κ^{++} , so that $k < \kappa^{+3}$. Therefore, $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa) \leq \kappa^{+3}$. Suppose for a contradiction that $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa) < \kappa^{+3}$. Using our original κ^{++} -supercompact embedding we define an ultrafilter U^* as follows:

$$U^* := \{A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid j^{\kappa^+} \in j(A)\}.$$

By the closure degree of M , it is the case that $U^* \in M$. Let $j^* : M \rightarrow \text{Ult}(M, U^*)$. Also let $i : V \rightarrow N$ be the ultrapower embedding using U^* in V , and let $k : N \rightarrow M$ be defined via $k([f])_{U^*} := j(f)(j^{\kappa^+})$. It is routine to check that $j = k \circ i$. Notice that for $\beta \leq \kappa^+$, $a \mapsto \text{otp}(a \cap \beta)$ represents β in N , hence by the definition of k , $k(\beta) = \text{otp}(j^{\kappa^+} \cap j(\beta))$, therefore $\text{crit}(k) > \kappa^+$. This implies $k(\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)) =$

$\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$ and $k(\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)) = \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$ since N, M are κ^+ -closed and therefore $k \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) = \text{id}$. Hence for every $\beta < (\kappa^{+3})^N$, $k(\beta) = \beta$ so that $\text{crit}(k) \geq (\kappa^{+3})^N$.

Let $\langle \langle \vec{t}, U'_{\kappa, \iota} \mid \iota < l'_\kappa \rangle \rangle := i(g)(\kappa)$. We see that $k(\vec{t}) = \vec{t}_\kappa$. Since $k(l'_\kappa) = l_\kappa < \kappa^{+3}$, we have $l'_\kappa < (\kappa^{+3})^N$. Therefore, $k(l'_\kappa) = l'_\kappa$ and for all ι , $k(U'_{\kappa, \iota}) = U'_{\kappa, \iota}$. It follows that $i(g)(\kappa) = \langle \langle \vec{t}, U_{\kappa, \iota} \mid \iota < l_\kappa \rangle \rangle$. Since $j^* = j \upharpoonright M$, it is the case that $j^*(g)(\kappa) = \langle \langle \vec{t}, U_{\kappa, \iota} \mid \iota < l_\kappa \rangle \rangle$. Because we can attach U^* to the end of $j^*(g)(\kappa)$, this contradicts the maximality used in the definition of g . \square

Consider $\vec{U} := \langle \langle U_{\alpha, i} \mid i < o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha) \rangle \mid \alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}}) \rangle$ and $\vec{t} := \langle \vec{t}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}}) \rangle$. Finally, since $\text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}}) = \{\alpha \leq \kappa \mid \alpha \text{ is strongly inaccessible}\}$, and for each U in $\langle U_{\alpha, i} \mid i < o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha) \rangle$ and $j_U : V \rightarrow M_U \cong \text{Ult}(V, U)$, we have that in M_U , α is strongly inaccessible and $2^{\alpha^+} = \alpha^{++}$, hence, U concentrates on x 's such that $\alpha_x \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}})$. Thus, \vec{U} and \vec{t} are as sought. \square

Let \vec{U} and \vec{t} be as in Lemma 3.4.

Convention 3.5. For each $\alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}})$, write $\vec{t}_\alpha = \langle t_{\alpha, i} \mid i < \alpha^{++} \rangle$. We write $\bigcap \vec{U}(\alpha)$ for $\bigcap_{i < o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha)} U_{\alpha, i}$. Next, for each $A \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\alpha)$, we disjointify $A = A_0 \cup A_1$ as follows:

- $A_0 := \{x \in A \mid o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha_x) = 0\}$, and
- $A_1 := \{x \in A \mid o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha_x) > 0\}$.

Note that $A_0 \in U_{\alpha, 0}$.

Definition 3.6 (Implicit gurus). For each $\alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}})$, we let $\mathcal{G}(\alpha)$ be the collection of all functions I with domain in $\bigcap \vec{U}(\alpha)$ such that, for some $i < \alpha^{++}$, $I \subseteq t_{\alpha, i}$.

Definition 3.7 (Strong inclusion). For two sets of ordinals x, y , we write

$$x \subsetneq y \text{ iff } x \subseteq y \text{ and } |x|^+ < \text{otp}(|\text{sup}(x)| \cap y).$$

And we denote a class $x^\uparrow := \{y \mid x \subsetneq y\}$.

Note that for $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, $x \subsetneq y$ iff $x \subseteq y$ and $(\alpha_x)^{++} < \alpha_y$.

Definition 3.8. For $A \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa)$ and $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$, write $A \upharpoonright x := \{y \in A \mid y \subsetneq x\}$.

Recall that π_x stands for the inverse collapsing map of x . This map naturally induces an isomorphism from $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa_x}((\kappa_x)^+)$ to $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa_x}(x)$, which in turn gives rise to a translation of each $U_{\kappa_x, i}$ to a corresponding ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa_x}(x)$, which we hereon call $\mathbf{U}_{x, i}$. Equivalently, $\mathbf{U}_{x, i} = \{A \in \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_x}(x) \mid j_{\kappa_x, i} "x \in j_{\kappa_x, i}(A)\}$. We likewise define $\vec{\mathbf{U}}_x := \langle \mathbf{U}_{x, i} \mid i < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) \rangle$ and $\bigcap \vec{\mathbf{U}}(x) := \bigcap_{i < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x)} U_{x, i}$. We also disjointify each A in $\bigcap \vec{\mathbf{U}}(x)$ as $A_0 \cup A_1$ in the same manner as before, so that $A_0 \in \mathbf{U}_{x, 0}$.

Proposition 3.9. Let $A \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa)$. The set $B := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid A \upharpoonright x \in \bigcap \vec{\mathbf{U}}(x)\}$ is in $\bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa)$.

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid \forall \iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) [A \upharpoonright x \in \mathbf{U}_{x,i}]\} \\
&= \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid \forall \iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) [j_{\kappa_x,\iota} \text{``}x \in j_{\kappa_x,\iota}(A \upharpoonright x)\text{''}]\} \\
&= \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid \forall \iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) [j_{\kappa_x,\iota} \text{``}x \in j_{\kappa_x,\iota}(\{y \in A \mid y \subsetneq x\})\text{''}]\} \\
&= \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid \forall \iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) [j_{\kappa_x,\iota} \text{``}x \in \{y \in j_{\kappa_x,\iota}(A) \mid y \subsetneq j_{\kappa_x,\iota}(x)\}\text{''}]\} \\
&= \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid \forall \iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) [j_{\kappa_x,\iota} \text{``}x \in j_{\kappa_x,\iota}(A) \ \& \ j_{\kappa_x,\iota} \text{``}x \subsetneq j_{\kappa_x,\iota}(x)\text{''}]\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, to show that $B \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa)$, let $i < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)$ and we shall show that $B \in U_{\kappa,i}$, i.e., that $x := j_{\kappa,i} \text{``}\kappa^+\text{''}$ is in $j_{\kappa,i}(B)$. Since $j_{\kappa,i}(\kappa)_x = \kappa$ and $j_{\kappa,i}(o^{\vec{U}})(j_{\kappa,i}(\kappa)_x) = i$, this amounts to showing that for all $\iota < i$, it is the case that

$$j_{\kappa,\iota} \text{``}x \in j_{\kappa,\iota}(A) \ \& \ j_{\kappa,\iota} \text{``}x \subsetneq j_{\kappa,\iota}(x)\text{''}.$$

The first part follows from the choice of A . The second part follows from reflection. \square

Fix $\alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}})$, $s \in \vec{t}_\alpha$. For each $x \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, let s_x be a function whose domain is $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha_x}((\alpha_x)^+)$ and for each $y \in \text{dom}(s_x)$, $s_x(y) := s(\pi_x[y])$.

Proposition 3.10. *Let $s \in \vec{t}_\kappa$. The set $B := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid s_x \in \vec{t}_{\kappa_x}\}$ is in $\bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa)$.*

Proof. Fix $i < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)$ and we shall show that $x := j_{\kappa,i} \text{``}\kappa^+\text{''}$ is in $j_{\kappa,i}(B)$. Note that

$$j_{\kappa,i}(B) = \{z \in \mathcal{P}_{j_{\kappa,i}(\kappa)}(j_{\kappa,i}(\kappa^+)) \mid j_{\kappa,i}(y \mapsto s_y)(z) \text{ is in } j_{\kappa,i}(\vec{t}_{j_{\kappa,i}(z)})\}.$$

Since $j_{\kappa,i}(x) = \kappa$, this amounts to showing that $j_{\kappa,i}(y \mapsto s_y)(x)$ is in \vec{t}_κ . However the latter coincides with our s . \square

Finally, we define the relativized version of implicit gurus. For $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$ we let $\mathbf{G}(x)$ be the collection of all functions I with domain in $\bigcap \vec{U}(x)$ such that, for some $i < (\kappa_x)^{++}$, $I \subseteq t_{x,i}$, where $t_{x,i} : \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_x}(x) \rightarrow V$ is defined via

$$t_{x,i}(y) := t_{\kappa_x,i}(\pi_x^{-1}[y]).$$

4. RADIN FORCING WITH GURUS

We continue with our setup from Section 3. In particular, $2^{\kappa^+} = \kappa^{++}$, there is a coherent sequence \vec{U} of supercompact measures, and a corresponding coherent sequence of guru sequences $\vec{\mathbf{t}}$. We define a supercompact Radin forcing with interleaved collapses $\mathbb{R}_{\vec{U},\vec{\mathbf{t}}}$, as follows.

Definition 4.1. The forcing $\mathbb{R}_{\vec{U},\vec{\mathbf{t}}}$ consists of conditions of the form

$$p = \langle c_{-1}, w_0, c_0, \dots, w_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, w_n \rangle,$$

where

- (1) $n < \omega$;
- (2) for $i = 0$ assuming $n > 0$:
 - w_0 is a pair $\langle x_0, I_0 \rangle$;
 - $x_0 \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$;
 - if $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_{x_0}) > 0$, then $I_0 \in \mathbf{G}(x_0)$; otherwise, $I_0 = \emptyset$;

- $c_{-1} \in \text{Col}(\omega_1, < \min\{\kappa_{x_0}, \kappa_x \mid x \in \text{dom}(I_0)\})$;
- (3) for $0 < i < n$:
- w_i is a pair $\langle x_i, I_i \rangle$;
 - $x_i \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$;
 - if $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_{x_i}) > 0$, then $I_i \in \mathbf{G}(x_i)$; otherwise, $I_i = \emptyset$;
 - $c_{i-1} \in \text{Col}((\kappa_{x_{i-1}})^{++}, < \min\{\kappa_{x_i}, \kappa_x \mid x \in \text{dom}(I_i)\})$;
- (4) for $i = n$:
- w_n is a pair $\langle x_n, I_n \rangle$;
 - $x_n = \kappa^+$;
 - $I_n \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa)$;
 - $c_{n-1} \in \text{Col}((\kappa_{x_{n-1}})^{++}, < \min\{\kappa_x \mid x \in \text{dom}(I_n)\})$;
- (5) $x_0 \prec \dots \prec x_{n-1}$.

Convention 4.2. For the rest of this section, we write \mathbb{R} instead of $\mathbb{R}_{\vec{U}, \vec{\mathfrak{t}}}$.

If p is as above, we write $\ell(p) := n$. The *working part* of p , denoted $\Omega(p)$, is $\langle x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \rangle$. For x in $\Omega(p)$, we shall write $i_p(x)$ for the unique i such that $x = x_i$. The *collapse part* of p is $\langle c_{-1}, \dots, c_{n-1} \rangle$. The *top part* of p , denoted $\text{top}(p)$, is $\langle \kappa^+, I_n \rangle$. We sometimes concise the expression of p while highlighting its top part by writing $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{w}, \langle \kappa^+, I \rangle \rangle$ for p , where $\vec{c} = \langle c_{-1}, c_0, \dots, c_{n-2}, c_{n-1} \rangle$ is the collapse part of p and $\vec{w} = \langle w_0, \dots, w_{n-1} \rangle$. Alternatively, we may concise p partially as

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{w}, w_m, c_m, \dots, w_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, \langle \kappa^+, I \rangle \rangle$$

where $\vec{c} = \langle c_{-1}, \dots, c_{m-1} \rangle$ and $\vec{w} = \langle w_0, \dots, w_{m-1} \rangle$. Later on, we may add the superscript p to indicate components of p , e.g., c_i^p, w_i^p, I_i^p .

Given $p, q \in \mathbb{R}_{\vec{U}, \vec{\mathfrak{t}}}$, say

- $p = \langle c_{-1}^p, w_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, w_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p, w_{\ell(p)}^p \rangle$, and
- $q = \langle c_{-1}^q, w_0^q, c_0^q, \dots, w_{\ell(q)-1}^q, c_{\ell(q)-1}^q, w_{\ell(q)}^q \rangle$,

define $p \leq q$ (p is stronger than q) iff all of the following hold:

- (1) $\ell(p) \geq \ell(q)$;
- (2) $c_{-1}^p \leq c_{-1}^q$;
- (3) there are $0 \leq i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_{\ell(q)} = \ell(p)$ such that, for each $k \leq \ell(q)$,
 - $x_{i_k}^p = x_k^q$,² $\text{dom}(I_{i_k}^p) \subseteq \text{dom}(I_k^q)$, and $c_{i_k}^p \leq c_k^q$;
 - if $i_{k-1} < i < i_k$ (where $i_{-1} = -1$), then $x_i^p \in \text{dom}(I_k^q)$, $\text{dom}(I_i^p) \subseteq \text{dom}(I_k^q)$, and $c_i^p \leq I_k^q(x_i^p)$;
 - if $i_{k-1} < i \leq i_k$, then for each $x \in \text{dom}(I_i^p)$, $I_i^p(x) \leq I_k^q(x)$.

We say that p is a *direct extension* of q , denoted $p \leq^* q$, iff $p \leq q$ and $\ell(p) = \ell(q)$.

Remark 4.3. For all $p, p_0, p_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\vec{U}, \vec{\mathfrak{t}}}$, if $p_0, p_1 \leq^* p$, then there is a $p_2 \leq^* p_0, p_1$.

Definition 4.4 (0-step extension). We say that p is a *0-step extension* of q , denoted $p \leq^{**} q$, iff

- (1) $p \leq^* q$;
- (2) the collapse parts of p and q are equal;
- (3) for every $i \leq \ell(p)$, for every $x \in \text{dom}(I_i^p)$, $I_i^p(x) = I_i^q(x)$.

Definition 4.5 (1-step extension). Let p be a condition.

²Recall that for $k = \ell(q)$ the two x 's are in fact κ^+ .

► For $x \in \text{dom}(I_i^p)$ with $i < \ell(p)$, the 1-step extension of p by x , denoted $p + \langle x \rangle$, is the condition

$$q = \langle c_{-1}^p, w_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, w', c', v', c_i^p, w_{i+1}^p, c_{i+1}^p, \dots, w_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p, w_{\ell(p)}^p \rangle,$$

where

- (1) $w' = \langle x, I_i^p \upharpoonright (\text{dom}(I_i^p) \upharpoonright x) \rangle$;
- (2) $c' = I_i^p(x)$;
- (3) $v' = \langle x_i^p, I_i^p \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle$.

► For $x \in \text{dom}(I_{\ell(p)}^p)$, the 1-step extension of p by x , denoted $p + \langle x \rangle$, is the condition

$$q = \langle c_{-1}^p, w_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, w_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p, w', c', \langle \kappa^+, I' \rangle \rangle,$$

where

- (1) $w' = \langle x, I_{\ell(p)}^p \upharpoonright (\text{dom}(I_{\ell(p)}^p) \upharpoonright x) \rangle$;
- (2) $c' = I_{\ell(p)}^p(x)$;
- (3) $I' = I_{\ell(p)}^p \upharpoonright x^\uparrow$.

Likewise, we can define $p + \langle x_0, \dots, x_{k+1} \rangle$ recursively as $(p + \langle x_0, \dots, x_k \rangle) + \langle x_{k+1} \rangle$. We shall say that $p + \langle x_0, \dots, x_n \rangle$ is an $(n+1)$ -step extension of p . Note that $p \leq q$ is equivalent to p being a direct extension of some n -step extension of q for some $n < \omega$. Now, to another useful variation.

Definition 4.6 (1-step extension while shrinking). Let p be a condition.

► For $x \in \text{dom}(I_i^p)$ with $i < \ell(p)$ and $B \in \bigcap \vec{\mathbf{U}}(x)$, the 1-step extension of p by $\langle x, B \rangle$, denoted $p + \langle x, B \rangle$, is the condition

$$q = \langle c_{-1}^p, w_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, w', c', v', c_i^p, w_{i+1}^p, c_{i+1}^p, \dots, w_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p, w_{\ell(p)}^p \rangle,$$

where

- (1) $w' = \langle x, I_i^p \upharpoonright (B \upharpoonright x) \rangle$;
- (2) c' and v' are as in the definition of $p + \langle x \rangle$.

► For $x \in \text{dom}(I_{\ell(p)}^p)$ and $B \in \bigcap \vec{\mathbf{U}}(x)$, the 1-step extension of p by $\langle x, B \rangle$, denoted $p + \langle x, B \rangle$, is the condition

$$q = \langle c_{-1}^p, w_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, w_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p, w', c', \langle \kappa^+, I' \rangle \rangle,$$

where

- (1) $w' = \langle x, I_{\ell(p)}^p \upharpoonright (B \upharpoonright x) \rangle$;
- (2) c' and I' are as in the definition of $p + \langle x \rangle$.

We define $p + \langle x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}, B_0, \dots, B_{k+1} \rangle$ recursively as $(p + \langle x_0, \dots, x_k, B_0, \dots, B_k \rangle) + \langle x_{k+1}, B_{k+1} \rangle$. We shall say that $p + \langle x_0, \dots, x_n, B_0, \dots, B_n \rangle$ is an $(n+1)$ -step extension of p while shrinking.

Proposition 4.7. \mathbb{R} is κ^+ -Linked₀, that is, there exists a map $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \kappa^+$ such that for all $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\varphi(p) = \varphi(q)$, there exists an $r \in \mathbb{R}$ with $r \leq^* p$ and $r \leq^* q$. In particular, \mathbb{R} has the κ^{++} -chain condition.

Proof. As $|\mathcal{H}_{\kappa^+}| = \kappa^+$, it suffices to define a map $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\kappa^+}$ with the above crucial property. We do so as follows. Given a condition $p = \langle c_{-1}^p, w_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, w_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p, w_{\ell(p)}^p \rangle$, we forget the implicit gurus and the top component, i.e.:

$$\varphi(p) := \langle c_{-1}^p, x_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, x_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p \rangle.$$

To see this works, let $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\varphi(p) = \varphi(q)$. By the definition of φ we get that $\ell(p) = \ell(q)$ and for all $i < \ell(p)$ $x_i^p = x_i^q$ and $c_i^p = c_i^q$.

► For each $i < \ell(p)$, as $I_i^p, I_i^q \in \mathbf{G}(x_i)$, there are $k_p^i, k_q^i < \kappa_{x_i}^{++}$ such that $(I_i^p)^{x_i} \subseteq t_{x_i, k_p^i}$ and $(I_i^q)^{x_i} \subseteq t_{x_i, k_q^i}$. Let $l_i := \max\{k_p^i, k_q^i\}$ and by the properties of the guru there is a club C_i in $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa_x}(x)$ such that $t_{x_i, l_i}(x) \leq t_{x_i, k_p^i}(x), t_{x_i, k_q^i}(x)$ for all $x \in C_i$. Set $A_i := \text{dom}(I_i^p) \cap \text{dom}(I_i^q) \cap C_i$ and let $\tilde{w}_i := \langle x_i, t_{x_i, l_i} \upharpoonright A_i \rangle$.

► As $I_{\ell(p)}^p, I_{\ell(p)}^q \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa)$ there are $l_p, l_q < \kappa^{++}$ such that $I_i^p \subseteq t_{\kappa, l_p}$ and $I_i^q \subseteq t_{\kappa, l_q}$, so we let $l := \max\{l_p, l_q\}$. By the properties of the guru there is a club C in $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa}(\kappa^+)$ such that $t_{\kappa, l}(x) \leq t_{\kappa, l_p}(x), t_{\kappa, l_q}(x)$ for all $x \in C$. Set $A_{\ell(p)} := \text{dom}(I_{\ell(p)}^p) \cap \text{dom}(I_{\ell(p)}^q) \cap C$, and then let $\tilde{w}_{\ell(p)} := \langle \kappa^+, t_{\kappa, l} \upharpoonright A_{\ell(p)} \rangle$.

Finally, let

$$r := \langle c_{-1}^p, \tilde{w}_0, c_0^p, \dots, \tilde{w}_{\ell(p)-1}, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p, \tilde{w}_{\ell(p)} \rangle$$

Then $r \leq^* p, q$, as sought. \square

Definition 4.8 (Factorization). Given a condition $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i < \ell(p)$ with $o_{\tilde{U}}(\kappa_{x_i}^p) > 0$, letting $x := x_i^p$, we factor \mathbb{R}/p as $\mathbb{R}_l^{p,x} \times \mathbb{R}_u^{p,x}$ as follows. Each $q \leq p$ is viewed as a pair (q_l, q_u) where

- $q_l = \langle c_{-1}^q, w_0^q, \dots, c_{i'-1}^q, w_{i'}^q \rangle$, where $i' := i_q(x)$, and
- $q_u = \langle c_{i'}^q, w_{i'+1}^q, \dots, c_{\ell(q)-1}^q, w_{\ell(q)}^q \rangle$.

Note that $\mathbb{R}_l^{p,x}$ is isomorphic to a cone of a natural variation of \mathbb{R} that we denote by $\mathbb{R}_{\tilde{U} \upharpoonright (\kappa_x+1), \tilde{\tau} \upharpoonright (\kappa_x+1)}$. Specifically, we identify q_l with

$$\langle c_{-1}^q, w'_0, c_0^q, \dots, c_{j-1}^q, w'_j \rangle,$$

where $w'_k = \langle \pi_x^{-1}[x_k^q], I_k^q \circ \pi_x \rangle$ for every $k \leq j$. We sometimes denote this collapsed version of q_l by $\pi_x(q)$. Also note that $\mathbb{R}_u^{p,x}$ is a regular subposet of \mathbb{R} in which the first component of a condition is an element of $\text{Col}((\kappa_x)^{++}, < \kappa)$, so that it is $(\kappa_x)^{++}$ -closed. We sometimes denote q_u by $q \upharpoonright \mathbb{R}_u^{p,x}$.

Several properties of the poset \mathbb{R} have reflected analogs for $\mathbb{R}_{\tilde{U} \upharpoonright (\kappa_x+1), \tilde{\tau} \upharpoonright (\kappa_x+1)}$. For example, we have seen that $\mathbb{R}_{\tilde{U}, \tilde{\tau}}$ has the κ^{++} -chain condition, and likewise $\mathbb{R}_{\tilde{U} \upharpoonright (\kappa_x+1), \tilde{\tau} \upharpoonright (\kappa_x+1)}$ has the $(\kappa_x)^{++}$ -chain condition. We will make use of this kind of analogous properties throughout the paper, especially when we determine the cardinal structure in various generic extensions.

Proposition 4.9. $(\mathbb{R}_u^{p,x}, \leq^*)$ is $(\kappa_x)^{++}$ -closed.

Proof. Let $\langle q_\beta \mid \beta < \gamma \rangle$ be a \leq^* -decreasing sequence of conditions in $\mathbb{R}_u^{p,x}$, with $\gamma < (\kappa_x)^{++}$. We may assume $\ell(q_\beta) > 0$ for each β , since the other case is simpler. Write $q_\beta = \langle c_{-1, \beta}, w_{0, \beta}, c_{0, \beta}, \dots, w_{n-1, \beta}, c_{n-1, \beta}, w_{n, \beta} \rangle$ where $w_{i, \beta} = \langle x_i, I_{i, \beta} \rangle$ and $c_{-1, \beta} \in \text{Col}((\kappa_x)^{++}, < \kappa_{x_0})$. For each $i \in n \cup \{-1\}$, let $c_i^* := \bigcup_{\beta < \gamma} c_{i, \beta}$.

► For each $i < n$, recall that $I_{i, \beta} \subseteq t_{x_i, l_{i, \beta}}$ for some $l_{i, \beta} < \kappa_{x_i}^{++}$. Since the club filter on $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{x_i}}(x_i)$ is κ_{x_i} -complete, we may pick a club C_i and a large enough l_i^* such

that for all $\beta < \gamma$ and $y \in C_i$, $t_{x_i, l_i^*}(y) \leq t_{x_i, l_{i, \beta}}(y)$. Let $A_i^* := \bigcap_{\beta < \gamma} \text{dom}(I_{i, \beta}) \cap C_i$ and $I_i^* := t_{x_i, l_i^*} \upharpoonright A_i^*$.

► For $i = n$, we similarly pick $A_n^* \subseteq \bigcap_{\beta < \gamma} \text{dom}(I_{n, \beta})$ and an implicit guru I_n^* such that for all $\beta < \gamma$ and $y \in A_n^*$, $I_n^*(y) \leq I_{n, \beta}(y)$.

Evidently,

$$q^* := \langle c_{-1}^*, \langle x_0, I_0^* \rangle, c_0^*, \dots, \langle x_{n-1}, I_{n-1}^* \rangle, c_{n-1}^*, \langle \kappa^+, I_n^* \rangle \rangle$$

is a \leq^* -lower bound of the sequence $\langle q_\beta \mid \beta < \gamma \rangle$. \square

Definition 4.10 (Tuple below). For each $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$, a *tuple below* x is a sequence

$$t = \langle c_{-1}, w_0, c_0, \dots, w_{m-1}, c_{m-1} \rangle$$

for which there exists a condition q in \mathbb{R} of the form

$$\langle c_{-1}, w_0, c_0, \dots, w_{m-1}, c_{m-1}, \langle x, I \rangle, c_m, \dots, w_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, w_n \rangle,$$

so that $q = t \hat{\wedge} \langle \langle x, \dots \rangle, \dots \rangle$.

An easy calculation yields the following.

Proposition 4.11. *The collection of all tuples below x has size at most $(\kappa_x)^+$.* \square

Definition 4.12 (Trees). A *tree* is a subset T of ${}^{\leq n} \mathcal{H}_{\kappa^+}$ for some $n < \omega$ such that every s in T is a finite nonempty sequence, all of whose nonempty initial segments are in T as well.³ The least such n is denoted by $n(T)$.⁴

- For every $s \in T$, let $\text{ht}(s) := \text{dom}(s) - 1$;
- For every $j < n$, set $\text{Lev}_j(T) := \{s \in T \mid \text{ht}(s) = j\}$;
- For every $s \in T$, let $\text{Succ}_T(s) := \{y \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa^+} \mid s \hat{\wedge} \langle y \rangle \in T\}$;
- A *maximal node in T* is an element $s \in T$ with $\text{dom}(s) = n$.
- $\text{Realm}(T) = \bigcup \{\text{Im}(s) \mid s \in T\}$.

Note that $T \subseteq {}^{\leq n(T)} \text{Realm}(T)$.

Definition 4.13 (Side-by-side maximality). For any sequence T_0, \dots, T_k of trees, we shall denote by $\mathbf{S}(T_0, \dots, T_k)$ the collection of all sequences $\vec{s} = \langle s_\iota \mid \iota \leq k \ \& \ T_\iota \neq \emptyset \rangle$ such that each s_ι is a maximal node in T_ι .

Definition 4.14 (Fat trees). A *fat tree* is either κ -fat tree or an x -fat tree for some x , where the two are defined below:

- A κ -*fat tree* is a tree T such that:
 - (1) every $s \in T$ is \subsetneq -increasing sequence of elements of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$;
 - (2) for some $i < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)$, $\{y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid \langle y \rangle \in \text{Lev}_0(T)\} \in U_{\kappa, i}$;
 - (3) for every $y \in \text{Lev}_j(T)$ that is not a maximal node, for some $i_y < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)$, $\text{Succ}_T(y) \in U_{\kappa, i_y}$.
- For $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$, an x -*fat tree* is a tree T such that:
 - (1) every $s \in T$ is \subsetneq -increasing sequence of elements of $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa_x}(x)$;
 - (2) for some $i < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x)$, $\{y \in \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_x}(x) \mid \langle y \rangle \in \text{Lev}_0(T)\} \in \mathbf{U}_{x, i}$;
 - (3) for every $y \in \text{Lev}_j(T)$ that is not a maximal node, for some $i_y < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x)$, $\text{Succ}_T(y) \in \mathbf{U}_{x, i_y}$.

³Our trees have no root.

⁴In particular, $n(T) = 0$ iff $T = \emptyset$.

Let T be a fat tree. We say that T is *compatible* with a condition p iff for some $\iota \leq \ell(p)$, $T \subseteq {}^{<\omega} \text{dom}(I_\iota^p)$. For every node $s = \langle y_0, \dots, y_m \rangle$ in T , a vector $\vec{B} = \langle B_0, \dots, B_m \rangle$ is of *s-measure-one* iff for all $i \leq m$, $B_i \in \bigcap \vec{U}(y_i)$. Note that in this case, $p + (s, \vec{B})$ is meaningful à la Definition 4.6. Furthermore, whenever T_0, \dots, T_k is a sequence of nonempty fat trees, each s_ι is a maximal node in T_ι , and \vec{B}_ι is of s_ι -measure-one, we may define $p + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{\mathbf{B}} \rangle$ for $\vec{s} := \langle s_0, \dots, s_k \rangle$ and $\vec{\mathbf{B}} := \langle \vec{B}_0, \dots, \vec{B}_k \rangle$ in the obvious way. We also extend it to accept empty trees by simply ignoring these ‘ghost’ coordinates.

Lemma 4.15. *Suppose:*

- p is a condition;
- for every $\iota < \ell(p)$, T_ι is an x_ι^p -fat tree;
- $T_{\ell(p)}$ is a κ -fat tree;
- for each \vec{s} in $\mathbf{S}(T_0, \dots, T_{\ell(p)})$, one attaches a sequence $\vec{\mathbf{B}}^{\vec{s}} = \langle \vec{B}_\iota^{\vec{s}} \mid \iota \leq \ell(p) \ \& \ T_\iota \neq \emptyset \rangle$ such that each $\vec{B}_\iota^{\vec{s}}$ is of s_ι -measure-one.

Then there are $p^* \leq^{**} p$ and for each $\iota \leq \ell(p)$, there is a fat subtree $T_\iota^* \subseteq T_\iota$ with $n(T_\iota^*) = n(T_\iota)$ such that the following set

$$\{p^* + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{\mathbf{B}}^{\vec{s}} \rangle \mid \vec{s} \in \mathbf{S}(T_0^*, \dots, T_{\ell(p)}^*)\}$$

is predense below p^* .

Proof. We only deal with the case $\ell(p) = 0$. The general case is obtained by obvious recursion. Thus, let p be some condition of the form $\langle c_{-1}, \langle \kappa^+, I \rangle \rangle$ and let T be a κ -fat tree. Denote $A := \text{dom}(I)$. We induct on $n(T)$. If $n(T) = 0$, then T is empty and the lemma is vacuously true. We assume $n(T) = 1$ and $\{z \mid \langle z \rangle \in \text{Lev}_0(T)\} \in U_{\kappa, i}$. Since $n(T) = 1$, each $x \in A$ may be identified with the maximal node $\langle x \rangle$, so let $B^x \in \bigcap \vec{U}(x)$ be the associated $\langle x \rangle$ -measure-one set. Consider

- $A_0 := \pi_{j_{U_{\kappa, i}}} {}^{“\kappa^+”} (j_{U_{\kappa, i}}(x \mapsto B^x)(j_{U_{\kappa, i}} {}^{“\kappa^+”})),$
- $A_1 := \{x \in A \mid (A_0 \upharpoonright x) = B^x\} \cap \text{Realm}(T)$, and
- $A_2 := \{x \in A \mid \exists k < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) [(A_1 \upharpoonright x) \in \mathbf{U}_{x, k}]\}.$

Then as in the proof of Proposition 3.9, $A_0 \in \bigcap_{i' < i} U_{\kappa, i'}$, $A_1 \in U_{\kappa, i}$ and $A_2 \in \bigcap_{i' > i} U_{\kappa, i'}$. Take $A^* := (A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2) \cap A \cap \text{Realm}(T)$, $I^* := I \upharpoonright A^*$ and $T^* := {}^1 A_1$. We claim that

$$p^* := \langle c_{-1}, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle$$

together with T^* satisfy the conclusion of the lemma. To this end, let $r \leq p^*$.

If $\ell(r) = 0$, then r is compatible with $p^* + \langle x, B^x \rangle$ for any x with $\langle x \rangle \in T^*$,⁵ and we are done. Otherwise, $r \leq^* p^* + \langle x_0, \dots, x_n \rangle$ for some finite tuple $\langle x_0, \dots, x_n \rangle$ of elements of A^* . Now, if $\{x_\iota \mid \iota \leq n\} \subseteq A_0$, then we may pick an $x \in A_1 \cap \text{Realm}(T)$ such that $x_\iota \subsetneq x$ for all $\iota \leq n$. This means that for each $\iota \leq n$, $x_\iota \in A^* \upharpoonright x \supseteq A_0 \upharpoonright x = B^x$. It is then straightforward to show that r is compatible with $p^* + \langle x, B^x \rangle$.

Next, assume $\{x_\iota \mid \iota \leq n\} \not\subseteq A_0$, and fix the least $\iota \leq n$ such that $x_\iota \in A_1 \cup A_2$. If $x_\iota \in A_1$, then $x_\iota \in \text{Realm}(T^*)$ and a similar analysis as the above shows that r is compatible with $p^* + \langle x_\iota, B^{x_\iota} \rangle$, so we are done. Finally, suppose that $x_\iota \in A_2$ and write w_ι^r as $\langle x_\iota, J \rangle$. Denote $B := \text{dom}(J)$. Note that $B \cap (A_1 \upharpoonright x_\iota) \in \mathbf{U}_{x_\iota, k}$ for some $k < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_{x_\iota})$. Choose $x \in B \cap (A_1 \upharpoonright x_\iota)$. Then $x_\iota \in \text{Realm}(T^*)$ and a similar

⁵To ease on the reader, we write B^x instead of the more formally correct $B^{\langle x \rangle}$.

argument as before shows that r is compatible with $p^* + \langle x, B^x \rangle$. This completes the case where $n(T) = 1$.

Now consider the case where $\text{ht}(T) = n + 1$ for some $n > 0$. Let i be such that $\{z \mid \langle z \rangle \in \text{Lev}_0(T)\} \in U_{\kappa, i}$. A typical element of $\mathbf{S}(T)$ has the form $s = \langle y_0, \dots, y_n \rangle$, and it is equipped with a sequence \vec{B}^s of sets of s -measure-one. Recall that the i^{th} -element of \vec{B}^s is in $\bigcap \mathbf{U}(y_i)$. As there are fewer than κ -many sets in $\bigcap \mathbf{U}(y_i)$ and by the κ -completeness of $U_{\kappa, i}$, we may prune T to get a κ -fat subtree $T' \subseteq T$ such that the 0^{th} -element of \vec{B}^s for a sequence $s = \langle y_0, \dots, y_n \rangle$ depends only on y_0 . Thus, we denote it by B_{y_0} .

For a sequence $\vec{B} = \langle B_0, \dots, B_n \rangle$, we denote $\text{drop}(\vec{B}) = \langle B_1, \dots, B_n \rangle$. Now, for each x with $\langle x \rangle \in \text{Lev}_0(T)$, by the induction hypothesis, we may find a $p^x \leq^* p + \langle x, B_x \rangle$ and a subtree $T^x \subseteq T \cap <^\omega x^\uparrow$ with $n(T^x) = n$ for which

$$\{p^x + \langle \vec{s}, \text{drop}(\vec{B}^{\langle x \rangle \wedge \vec{s}}) \rangle \mid \vec{s} \in \mathbf{S}(T^x)\}$$

is predense below p^x .

As $p^x \leq^* p + \langle \langle x, B_x \rangle \rangle$, p^x is of the form $\langle c_{-1}, \langle x, I \upharpoonright B'_x \rangle, I(x), \langle \kappa^+, I \upharpoonright A_x \rangle \rangle$, where $B'_x \subseteq B_x$ and $A_x \subseteq A$. As before, we derive three sets:

- $A_0 := \pi_{j_{U_{\kappa, i}}} \text{“}\kappa^+ \text{”}(j_{U_{\kappa, i}}(x \mapsto B'_x)(j_{U_{\kappa, i}} \text{“}\kappa^+ \text{”})),$
- $A_1 := \{x \in A \mid (A_0 \upharpoonright x) = B'_x \ \& \ \langle x \rangle \in \text{Lev}_0(T)\},$ and
- $A_2 := \{x \in A \mid \exists k < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) [(A_1 \upharpoonright x) \in \mathbf{U}_{x, k}]\}.$

As before, $A_0 \in \bigcap_{i' < i} U_{\kappa, i'}$, $A_1 \in U_{\kappa, i}$ and $A_2 \in \bigcap_{i' > i} U_{\kappa, i'}$. Let $A^* := (A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2) \cap A \cap \text{Realm}(T)$, $I^* := I \upharpoonright A^*$, and T^* be the unique tree to satisfy that $\text{Lev}_0(T^*) = {}^1 A_1$, and $T^* \cap <^\omega x^\uparrow = T^x$ for each $x \in A_1$. A similar analysis establishes that

$$p^* := \langle c_{-1}, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle$$

together with T^* are as sought. \square

4.1. Strong Prikry property. This subsection will be devoted to proving the following key theorem.

Theorem 4.16 (Strong Prikry property). *For every $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and every dense open set D in \mathbb{R} , there are $p^* \leq^* p$ and fat trees $T_0, \dots, T_{\ell(p)-1}, T_{\ell(p)}$ such that:*

- (1) for every $i < \ell(p)$, T_i is a (possibly empty) x_i^p -fat tree,
- (2) $T_{\ell(p)}$ is a (possibly empty) κ -fat tree,
- (3) for every $\vec{s} = \langle s_0, \dots, s_{\ell(p)} \rangle$ in $\mathbf{S}(T_0, \dots, T_{\ell(p)})$, there are corresponding \vec{B}_i 's of s_i -measure-one such that

$$p^* + \langle \langle s_0, \vec{B}_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle s_{\ell(p)}, \vec{B}_{\ell(p)} \rangle \rangle \in D.$$

To motivate it, we point out the following consequence.

Corollary 4.17 (Prikry property). *Let φ be a forcing statement of \mathbb{R} and p be a condition. There is $p^* \leq^* p$ such that p^* decides φ , namely either $p^* \Vdash \varphi$ or $p^* \Vdash \neg\varphi$.*

Proof. Consider $D := \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid r \text{ decides } \varphi\}$. Then D is dense open. By the strong Prikry property that we are about to prove, let $p^* \leq^* p$ along with fat trees $T_0, \dots, T_{\ell(p)}$ be given by Theorem 4.16. If necessary, we shrink fat trees so that all extensions using fat trees give the same decision. By a density argument and Lemma 4.15, it must be the case that p^* decides φ . \square

Hereafter, we prove Theorem 4.16. As before, we only deal with conditions p with $\ell(p) = 0$, and leave the general case to the reader.

Lemma 4.18. *Let $p = \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I \rangle \rangle$ be a condition in \mathbb{R} , and D be a dense open set in \mathbb{R} . Then there are $p^* = \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle \leq^* p$ and $\langle J_x \mid x \in \text{dom}(I^*) \rangle$, such that for every $x \in \text{dom}(I^*)$, for every tuple $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ below x ,⁶ if there are K_x, c_x, I_x such that*

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, K_x \rangle, c_x, \langle \kappa^+, I_x \rangle \rangle$$

extends p^ and lies in D , then for some $B'_x \subseteq \text{dom}(K_x)$, it is already the case that*

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B'_x \rangle, I^*(x), \langle \kappa^+, I^* \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle \rangle \in D.$$

Proof. Denote $A := \text{dom}(I)$. Let $x \in A$. Fix an enumeration $\langle \langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta \rangle \mid \beta < (\kappa_x)^+ \rangle$ of all tuples below x . For each β , write $\langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta \rangle = \langle c_{-1}^\beta, w_0^\beta, c_0^\beta, \dots, w_{m_\beta-1}^\beta, c_{m_\beta-1}^\beta \rangle$. Write $D(x)$ for the collection of all $d \in \text{Col}((\kappa_x)^{++}, < \kappa)$ such that there is a pair $\langle J_x, I_x \rangle$ for which one of the following holds:

- (1) $d \not\parallel I(x)$;
- (2) for every $\beta < (\kappa_x)^+$, either
 - (a) for all $J \in \mathbf{G}(x)$,

$$\langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta, \langle x, J \rangle, d, \langle \kappa^+, I_x \rangle \rangle \notin D,$$

or

- (b) for some $B_x^\beta \in \bigcap \vec{\mathbf{U}}(x)$,

$$\langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B_x^\beta \rangle, d, \langle \kappa^+, I_x \rangle \rangle \in D.$$

Claim 4.18.1. $D(x)$ is dense open in $\text{Col}((\kappa_x)^{++}, < \kappa)$.

Proof. Let $d \in \text{Col}((\kappa_x)^{++}, < \kappa)$. If $d \not\parallel I(x)$, then $d \in D(x)$ and we are done with any choice of $\langle J_x, I_x \rangle$. Otherwise, by possibly extending d , we may assume that $d \leq I(x)$. Next, we shall construct a sequence $\langle \langle d_\gamma, J_\gamma, I_\gamma \rangle \mid \gamma < (\kappa_x)^+ \rangle$ such that:

- $\langle d_\gamma \mid \gamma < (\kappa_x)^+ \rangle$ is a decreasing sequence of conditions below d ;
- J_γ is either empty or it belongs to $\mathbf{G}(x)$ with $\text{dom}(J_\gamma) \subseteq A \upharpoonright x$;
- $I_\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa)$ with $\text{dom}(I_\gamma) \subseteq A$, and $I_\gamma(y) \leq I(y)$ for every $y \in \text{dom}(I_\gamma)$.

The construction is by recursion on $\gamma < (\kappa_x)^+$, as follows.

► For $\gamma = 0$, we let $\langle d_0, J_0, I_0 \rangle := \langle d, \emptyset, I \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle$.

► For $\gamma = \beta + 1$ such that $\langle d_\beta, J_\beta, I_\beta \rangle$ has already been defined, we do the following.

►► If there are J_γ, I_γ and $d_\gamma \leq d_\beta$ such that

$$\langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta, \langle x, J_\gamma \rangle, d_\gamma, \langle \kappa^+, I_\gamma \rangle \rangle$$

extends p and lies in D , then we keep them and form the triple $\langle d_\gamma, J_\gamma, I_\gamma \rangle$.

►► Otherwise, we let $\langle d_\gamma, J_\gamma, I_\gamma \rangle := \langle d_\beta, \emptyset, I_0 \rangle$.

► For γ a nonzero limit ordinal for which the sequence $\langle \langle d_\beta, J_\beta, I_\beta \rangle \mid \beta < \gamma \rangle$ has already been defined, we simply let d_γ be a lower bound of $\langle d_\beta \mid \beta < \gamma \rangle$, $J_\gamma := \emptyset$, and $I_\gamma := I_0$.

This completes the recursion.

⁶Recall Definition 4.10.

Let d^* be a lower bound for $\langle d_\gamma \mid \gamma < (\kappa_x)^+ \rangle$. We claim that d^* is in $D(x)$. By our setup, Case (1) is not satisfied, thus, we need to cook up J_x, A_x, I_x as in Case (2). Fix a large enough $i < \kappa^{++}$ such that the following set is in $\bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa)$:

$$A_x := \{y \mid \forall \gamma < (\kappa_x)^+ [y \in \text{dom}(I_\gamma) \ \& \ t_{\kappa,i}(y) \leq I_\gamma(y)]\},$$

and then let $I_x := t_{\kappa,i} \upharpoonright A_x$. In particular, $I_x \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa)$.

To construct J_x , first for each $\gamma < (\kappa_x)^+$, fix $i_\gamma < (\kappa_x)^{++}$ witnessing that $J_\gamma \in \mathbf{G}(x)$. Let $i^* := (\sup_{\gamma < (\kappa_x)^+} i_\gamma) + 1$. It follows that for each such γ , we may fix a club C_γ in $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa_x}(x)$ such that for all $y \in C_\gamma$, $t_{x,i^*}(y) \leq t_{x,i_\gamma}(y)$.

Finally, we take $J_x := t_{x,i^*}$. To verify that J_x, A_x and I_x are as sought, let $\beta < (\kappa_x)^+$. Suppose that there is $J \in \mathbf{G}(x)$ such that

$$\langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta, \langle x, J \rangle, d^*, \langle \kappa^+, I_x \rangle \rangle \in D,$$

and we will demonstrate the existence of $B_x^\beta \in \bigcap \vec{U}(x)$ such that

$$\langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B_x^\beta \rangle, d^*, \langle \kappa^+, I_x \rangle \rangle \in D.$$

By the definition of our recursion at step $\gamma := \beta + 1$, it is the case that the triple $\langle d_\gamma, J_\gamma, I_\gamma \rangle$ was chosen to satisfy that

$$\langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta, \langle x, J_\gamma \rangle, d_\gamma, \langle \kappa^+, I_\gamma \rangle \rangle$$

extends p and lies in D . Then $B_x^\beta := \text{dom}(J_\gamma) \cap C_\gamma$ is as sought. This completes the proof of Claim 4.18.1. \square

Fix $i_0 < \kappa^{++}$ such that $I \subseteq t_{\kappa,i_0}$. As all the $D(x)$'s are dense, we may use the feature of the guru to find a large enough $i_1 < \kappa^{++}$ such that for all $x \in A$, $t_{\kappa,i_1}(x) \in D(x)$. For each $x \in A$, let (J_x, I_x) be the witnessing pair for $t_{\kappa,i_1}(x) \in D(x)$, and also let i_x be such that $I_x \subseteq t_{\kappa,i_x}$. Now, let $i^* := \sup\{i_0, i_1, i_x \mid x \in A\} + 1$. Fix clubs C_0, C_1 , and likewise for each x , fix clubs $C_x \subseteq \text{dom}(I_x)$, such that for all $y \in \{0, 1\} \cup \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$ and $z \in C_y$, $t_{\kappa,i^*}(z) \leq t_{\kappa,i_y}(z)$.

Let

$$C^* := \{z \in C_0 \cap C_1 \mid \forall x (x \prec z \rightarrow z \in C_x)\},$$

and $I^* := t_{\kappa,i^*} \upharpoonright A^*$, where $A^* := A \cap C^*$. Consider $p^* := \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle$. We claim that $p^* \leq^* p$ together with $\langle J_x \mid x \in A^* \rangle$ are as promised by Lemma 4.18. To this end, let $x \in A^*$, let $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ below x , and assume that K_x, c_x, I_x are such that $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, K_x \rangle, c_x, \langle \kappa^+, I_x \rangle \rangle$ extends p^* and lies in D . Fix $\beta < (\kappa_x)^+$ such that $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle = \langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta \rangle$. Since $t_{\kappa,i_1}(x) \in D(x)$, the witnessing pair (J_x, I_x) along with some B_x^β satisfy

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B_x^\beta \rangle, d, \langle \kappa^+, I_x \rangle \rangle \in D.$$

Since $I^*(x) \leq t_{\kappa,i_1}(x)$, $A^* \cap x^\uparrow \subseteq C_x \subseteq \text{dom}(I_x)$, and for each $z \in A^* \cap x^\uparrow$, $I^*(z) \leq I_x(z)$, and D is open, we have that

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B_x^\beta \rangle, I^*(x), \langle \kappa^+, I^* \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle \rangle \in D,$$

as required. \square

For the scope of this subsection, we introduce the following ad hoc concept.

Definition 4.19. For a dense open set D and an $n < \omega$, we say that a condition $p = \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I \rangle \rangle$ satisfies $(D)_n$ iff for every $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ with x being the maximal working part of \vec{u} , and additional sets $y_0 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq y_{n-1}$ with $x \subsetneq y_0$, if there are $J_0, \dots, J_{n-1}, e_0, \dots, e_{n-1}, I'$ such that

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle y_0, J_0 \rangle, e_0, \dots, \langle y_{n-1}, J_{n-1} \rangle, e_{n-1}, \langle \kappa^+, I' \rangle \rangle$$

extends p and lies in D , then there are $p^* = \langle c^*, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle \leq^* p$, and a fat tree T of height n such that for every $\vec{s} \in \mathbf{S}(T)$, there is a \vec{B} of s -measure-one such that

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle \rangle + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{B} \rangle \in D.$$

Lemma 4.20. Let $p = \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I \rangle \rangle$ be a condition in \mathbb{R} , and D be a dense open set in \mathbb{R} . Then there is a $p^* = \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle \leq^* p$ witnessing as in $(D)_1$.

Proof. Denote $A := \text{dom}(I)$. By possibly passing to a direct extension of p , we may assume it satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 4.18 as witnessed by $\langle J_x \mid x \in A \rangle$.

For all $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ and $x \in A$, if

- $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ is a tuple below x , and
- there exists a B_x such that $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B_x \rangle, \langle \kappa^+, I \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle \rangle \in D$, then

we let $\varepsilon^{\vec{c}, \vec{u}}(x) := 1$. Otherwise, set $\varepsilon^{\vec{c}, \vec{u}}(x) := 0$.

Claim 4.20.1. Let $\iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)$. Then there exists an $\varepsilon_\iota < 2$ such that

$$X_\iota := \{x \in A \mid \forall \langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle \text{ a tuple below } x (\varepsilon^{\vec{c}, \vec{u}}(x) = \varepsilon_\iota)\}$$

is in $U_{\kappa, \iota}$.

Proof. For each $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$, fix some $A_{\vec{c}, \vec{u}} \in U_{\kappa, \iota}$ on which $x \mapsto \varepsilon^{\vec{c}, \vec{u}}(x)$ is constant. Let

$$X := \{x \in A \mid \text{if } \langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle \text{ is a tuple below } x \text{ then } x \in A_{\vec{c}, \vec{u}}\}.$$

Then by an application of the pigeonhole principle we find $X_\iota \subseteq X$ in $U_{\kappa, \iota}$ as sought. \square

Let $\langle X_\iota \in U_{\kappa, \iota} \mid \iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa) \rangle$ be given by the claim. Let $A^* := \bigcup_{\iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)} X_\iota$ and $I^* := I \upharpoonright A^*$. We claim that $p^* := \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle$ satisfies $(D)_1$.

Suppose $q \leq p^*$ with $q = \langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, J \rangle, e, \langle \kappa^+, I' \rangle \rangle \in D$. Since p satisfies Lemma 4.18, there is B_x such that

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B_x \rangle, I^*(x), \langle \kappa^+, I \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle \rangle \in D.$$

Fix the least ι such that $x \in X_\iota$. In particular, $\varepsilon_\iota = \varepsilon^{\vec{c}, \vec{u}}(x) = 1$. Thus, for every $y \in X_\iota$ such that $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ is a tuple below y , there is a B_y such that

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle y, J_y \upharpoonright B_y \rangle, I(y), \langle \kappa^+, I \upharpoonright y^\uparrow \rangle \rangle \in D.$$

Now, to construct p^{**} , consider $J := j_{\kappa, \iota}(y \mapsto J_y)(j_{\kappa, \iota} \text{ “}\kappa^+ \text{”})$. Then $A_0 := \text{dom}(J)$ is in $\bigcap_{\zeta < \iota} U_{\kappa, \zeta}$ and for some $i < \kappa^{++}$, $J = t_{\kappa, i} \upharpoonright A_0$. Then $A_1 := \{y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid J \upharpoonright (\text{dom}(J) \upharpoonright y) = J_y\}$ is in $U_{\kappa, \iota}$. Finally, let

$$A_2 := \{y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid \exists \zeta < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) [A_1 \upharpoonright y \in \mathbf{U}_{x, \zeta}]\}.$$

Then $A_2 \in \bigcap_{\zeta > \iota} U_{\kappa, \zeta}$. Now let I^{**} be an implicit guru with domain $A^{**} := A^* \cap (A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2)$ such that for every $y \in A^{**}$, $I^{**}(y) \leq J(y), I^*(y)$. Finally, let $p^{**} := \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I^{**} \rangle \rangle$ and $T := A^* \cap A_1$. Then it is straightforward to check that p^{**} and T are as required. \square

Lemma 4.21. *Let D be a dense open set in \mathbb{R} and $p = \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I \rangle \rangle$ be a condition that satisfies $(D)_n$ for a given positive integer n .*

Then there are $p^ = \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle \leq^* p$, and $\langle J_x \mid x \in \text{dom}(I^*) \rangle$ such that for every $x \in \text{dom}(I^*)$ and every $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ a tuple below x , if there are $d', J', y_0 \sqsubset \dots \sqsubset y_{n-1}, J_0, \dots, J_{n-1}, e_0, \dots, e_{n-1}$ and I' such that*

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, J' \rangle, d', \langle y_0, J_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle y_{n-1}, J_{n-1} \rangle, e_{n-1}, \langle \kappa^+, I' \rangle \rangle$$

extends p and lies in D , then there are $B_x \subseteq \text{dom}(J')$ and a fat tree T of height n compatible with p^ such that for every maximal node s of T , there is an s -measure-one \vec{B} such that*

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B_x \rangle, I^*(x), \langle \kappa^+, I^* \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle + \langle s, \vec{B} \rangle \in D.$$

Proof. Let $A := \text{dom}(I)$ and fix $x \in A$. Let $\langle \langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta \rangle \mid \beta < (\kappa_x)^+ \rangle$ be an enumeration of all the tuples below x .

Write $D(x)$ for the collection of all $d \in \text{Col}((\kappa_x)^{++}, < \kappa)$ such that there is pair (J_x, I_x) for which one of the following holds:

- (1) $d' \not\parallel I(x)$;
- (2) for every $\beta < (\kappa_x)^+$, either
 - (a) for all $d', J', I', y_0, \dots, y_{n-1}, J_0, \dots, J_{n-1}, e_0, \dots, e_{n-1}$ such that:
 - $d' \leq d$;
 - $J' \in \mathbf{G}(x)$ with $J' \leq J_x$;
 - $I' \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa)$ with $I' \leq I$;
 - $x \sqsubset y_0 \sqsubset \dots \sqsubset y_{n-1}$;
 - for all $k < n$, $y_k \in \text{dom}(I_x)$, $e_k \leq I_x(y_k)$ and $J_k \in \mathbf{G}(y_k)$,

it is the case that

$$\langle \vec{c}^\gamma, \vec{u}^\gamma, \langle x, J' \rangle, d', \langle y_0, J_0 \rangle, e_0, \dots, \langle y_{n-1}, J_{n-1} \rangle, e_{n-1}, \langle \kappa^+, I' \rangle \rangle \notin D,$$

or

- (b) for some $B_x^\beta \in \bigcap \vec{\mathbf{U}}(x)$, there is an x -fat tree $T(x)$ of height n such that for every $\vec{s} \in \mathbf{S}(T(x))$, there is an \vec{s} -measure-one \vec{B} such that

$$\langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B_x^\beta \rangle, d, \langle \kappa^+, I_x \rangle \rangle + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{B} \rangle \in D.$$

Claim 4.21.1. *$D(x)$ is dense open.*

Proof. Let $d \in \text{Col}((\kappa_x)^{++}, < \kappa)$. If $d \not\parallel I(x)$, then we are done with any choice of (J_x, I_x) . Otherwise, by possibly extending d , we may assume that $d \leq I(x)$. Next, we shall construct a sequence $\langle \langle d_\gamma, J_\gamma, I_\gamma, T_\gamma \rangle \mid \gamma < (\kappa_x)^+ \rangle$ such that:

- $\langle d_\gamma \mid \gamma < (\kappa_x)^+ \rangle$ is a decreasing sequence of conditions below d ;
- J_γ is either empty or it belongs to $\mathbf{G}(x)$ with $\text{dom}(J_\gamma) \subseteq A \upharpoonright x$;
- $I_\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa)$ with $\text{dom}(I_\gamma) \subseteq A$, and $I_\gamma(y) \leq I(y)$ for every $y \in \text{dom}(I_\gamma)$;
- T_γ is an x -fat tree.

The construction is by recursion on $\gamma < (\kappa_x)^+$, as follows.

► For $\gamma = 0$, we let $\langle d_0, J_0, I_0, T_0 \rangle := \langle d, \emptyset, I \upharpoonright x^\uparrow, \emptyset \rangle$.

► For $\gamma = \beta + 1$ such that $\langle d_\beta, J_\beta, I_\beta, T_\beta \rangle$ has already been defined, we do the following.

►► If there are $J_\gamma, d_\gamma \leq d_\beta, y_0 \sqsubset \dots \sqsubset y_{n-1}, J_0, \dots, J_{n-1}, d_0, \dots, e_{n-1}$ and I_γ such that

$$\langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta, \langle x, J_\gamma \rangle, d_\gamma, \langle y_0, J_0 \rangle, \dots, e_{n-1}, \langle \kappa^+, I_\gamma \rangle \rangle$$

extends p and lies in D , then by $(D)_n$ applied to $\langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta, \langle x, J_\gamma \rangle, d_\gamma \rangle$, we may find a $p^* \leq^* p$ and a fat tree T_γ of height n such that for every $\vec{s} \in \mathbf{S}(T_\gamma)$, there is a \vec{B} of s -measure-one such that

$$\langle \langle \vec{c}^\beta, \vec{u}^\beta, \langle x, J_\gamma \rangle, d_\gamma, \langle \kappa^+, I_\gamma \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle \rangle + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{B} \rangle \in D,$$

then we keep them and form the quadruple $\langle d_\gamma, J_\gamma, I_\gamma, T_\gamma \rangle$.

►► Otherwise, let $\langle d_\gamma, J_\gamma, I_\gamma, T_\gamma \rangle := \langle d_\beta, J_\beta, I_0, \emptyset \rangle$.

► For γ a nonzero limit ordinal for which the sequence $\langle \langle d_\beta, J_\beta, I_\beta, T_\beta \rangle \mid \beta < \gamma \rangle$ has already been defined, we simply let d_γ be a lower bound of $\langle d_\beta \mid \beta < \gamma \rangle$, $J_\gamma := \emptyset$, $I_\gamma := I_0$ and $T_\gamma := \emptyset$. This completes the recursion.

Let d^* be a lower bound for $\langle d_\gamma \mid \gamma < (\kappa_x)^+ \rangle$. We need to show that d^* is in $D(x)$. However, from this point on, the verification is very similar to the one from Claim 4.18.1, and is left to the reader. \square

The conclusion of Lemma 4.21 now follows from an application of Claim 4.21.1 in the same way the conclusion of Lemma 4.18 follows from Claim 4.18.1. \square

Lemma 4.22. *Let D be a dense open set in \mathbb{R} and $p = \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I \rangle \rangle$ be a condition that satisfies $(D)_n$ for a given positive integer n . Then there is $p^* = \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle \leq^* p$ that satisfies $(D)_{n+1}$.*

Proof. Denote $A := \text{dom}(I)$. By possibly passing to a direct extension of p , we may assume it satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 4.21 as witnessed by $\langle J_x \mid x \in A \rangle$.

For all $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ and $x \in A$, if

- $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ is a tuple below x , and
- there exist B_x and $y_0 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq y_{n-1}$ in $A \cap x^\uparrow$, $K_0, \dots, K_{n-1}, e_0, \dots, e_{n-1}$ and I' such that

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B_x \rangle, I(x), \langle y_0, K_0 \rangle, e_0, \dots, e_{n-1}, \langle \kappa^+, I' \rangle \rangle$$

extends p and lies in D , then

we let $\varepsilon^{\vec{c}, \vec{u}}(x) := 1$. Otherwise, set $\varepsilon^{\vec{c}, \vec{u}}(x) := 0$.

The following is obvious.

Claim 4.22.1. *Let $\iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)$. Then there exists an $\varepsilon_\iota < 2$ such that*

$$X_\iota := \{x \in A \mid \forall \langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle \text{ a tuple below } x (\varepsilon^{\vec{c}, \vec{u}}(x) = \varepsilon_\iota)\}$$

is in $U_{\kappa, \iota}$. \square

Let $\langle X_\iota \in U_{\kappa, \iota} \mid \iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa) \rangle$ be given by the claim. Let $A^* := \bigcup_{\iota < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)} X_\iota$ and $I^* := I \upharpoonright A^*$. We claim that $p^* := \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle$ satisfies $(D)_{n+1}$. To this end, suppose $q \leq p^*$ with

$$q = \langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle y_0, J_0 \rangle, e_0, \dots, \langle y_n, J_n \rangle, e_n, \langle \kappa^+, I' \rangle \rangle \in D,$$

where $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ is a tuple below x , and $x = y_0 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq y_n$.

Since $p^* \leq p$ and the latter satisfies Lemma 4.21, there are $B_x \subseteq \text{dom}(J_0)$ and a fat tree T of height n compatible with p^* such that for every maximal node \vec{s} of T , there is an \vec{s} -measure-one \vec{B} such that

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle x, J_x \upharpoonright B_x \rangle, I^*(x), \langle \kappa^+, I^* \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle \rangle + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{B} \rangle \in D.$$

Fix the least ι such that $x \in X_\iota$. In particular, $\varepsilon_\iota = \varepsilon^{\vec{c}, \vec{u}}(x) = 1$. Thus, for every $y \in X_\iota$ such that $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ is a tuple below y , there are B_y and T_y a fat tree of height n such that

$$\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u}, \langle y, J_y \upharpoonright B_y \rangle, I^*(y), \langle \kappa^+, I^* \upharpoonright y^\uparrow \rangle \rangle + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{B} \rangle \in D.$$

Now, to construct p^{**} , consider $J := j_{U_{\kappa, \iota}}(x \mapsto J_x)(j_{U_{\kappa, \iota}} \text{“}\kappa^+\text{”})$. Then $A_0 := \text{dom}(J)$ is in $\bigcap_{\zeta < \iota} U_{\kappa, \zeta}$ and for some $i < \kappa^{++}$, $J = t_{\kappa, i} \upharpoonright A_0$. In addition, $A_1 := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid J \upharpoonright (\text{dom}(J) \upharpoonright x) = J_x\}$ is in $U_{\kappa, \iota}$. Finally, let

$$A_2 := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+) \mid \exists \zeta < o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) [A_1 \upharpoonright x \in \mathbf{U}_{x, \zeta}]\},$$

and note that $A_2 \in \bigcap_{\zeta > \iota} U_{\kappa, \zeta}$. Now let I^{**} be an implicit guru with domain $A^{**} := A^* \cap (A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2)$ such that for every $x \in A^{**}$, $I^{**}(x) \leq J(x), I^*(x)$. Finally, let $p^{**} := \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I^{**} \rangle \rangle$ and $T := A^* \cap A_1$. Then it is straightforward to check that p^{**} and T are as required. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.16. Let $p := \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I \rangle \rangle$ be a condition. Define a \leq^* -decreasing sequence $\langle p_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ by recursion, as follows. Let $p_0 := p$ and then appeal to Lemma 4.20 to receive a $p_1 := \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I_1 \rangle \rangle \leq^* p_0$ that satisfies $(D)_1$. Next, for a positive integer n such that $p_n = \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I_n \rangle \rangle$ has already been defined and it satisfies $(D)_n$, by Lemma 4.22, let $p_{n+1} := \langle c, \langle \kappa^+, I_1 \rangle \rangle \leq^* p_n$ be such that it satisfies $(D)_{n+1}$. Finally, let p^* be a \leq^* -lower bound for $\langle p_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$. Now, since D is dense, let $q \leq p^*$ be such that $q \in D$. Consider $n := \ell(q)$, and write $\Omega(q)$ as $\langle x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \rangle$. Since $q \leq p^* \leq p_n$ with p_n satisfying $(D)_n$, there is a $p_n^* \leq^* p_n$ and a κ -fat tree T of height n such that for all $\vec{s} \in \mathbf{S}(T)$ and corresponding measure-one sets \vec{B} ,

$$\langle c_{-1}^q, \langle \kappa^+, I^{p_n^*} \rangle \rangle + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{B} \rangle \in D.$$

Let $p^{**} \leq^* p_n^*$ be such that $c_{-1}^{p^{**}} \leq c_{-1}^q$, $T^* := T \cap {}^{<\omega} \text{dom}(I^{p^{**}})$ and for any $s \in \mathbf{S}(T^*)$ and \vec{B} is the associated s -measure-one, let $\vec{B}^* = \langle B_0 \cap \text{dom}(I)^{p^{**}}, \dots, B_{n-1} \cap \text{dom}(I)^{p^{**}} \rangle$. Then p^{**} satisfies the strong Prikry property with the witness T^* and the associated measure-one sets for each maximal node through T^* . \square

5. THE CARDINAL STRUCTURE IN $V^{\mathbb{R}}$

We continue with our setup from Section 4. Fix a generic object G for \mathbb{R} . Define

- $\mathbf{X} := \{x \mid \exists p \in G (x \in \Omega(p))\}$;
- $K_0 := \{\kappa_x \mid x \in \mathbf{X}\}$;
- $K_1 := \{((\kappa_x)^+)^V \mid x \in \mathbf{X}\}$;
- $K_2 := \{((\kappa_x)^{++})^V \mid x \in \mathbf{X}\}$;
- $\theta := \text{otp}(\mathbf{X}, \subsetneq)$.

By a density argument, K_0 is unbounded in κ , K_0 is closed below its supremum, and $\bigcup \mathbf{X} = (\kappa^+)^V$. This implies that $\{\text{sup}(x) \mid x \in \mathbf{X}\}$ is also continuous and unbounded in $(\kappa^+)^V$. Let $\langle x_\tau \mid \tau < \theta \rangle$ denote the increasing enumeration of \mathbf{X} , and write $\kappa_\tau := \kappa_{x_\tau}$, so that $K_0 = \{\kappa_\tau \mid \tau < \theta\}$. Maintaining continuity and for notational simplicity, we also write $x_\theta := (\kappa^+)^V$ and $\kappa_\theta := \kappa$.

For each $x \in \mathbf{X}$, let x^+ be the successive point of x in \mathbf{X} . Then there is a condition $p \in G$ such that $x, x^+ \in \Omega(p)$ and $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_{x^+}) = 0$. Define

- $C_{-1} := \{c_{-1}^p \mid p \in G\}$, and for every $\tau < \theta$,
- $C_\tau := \{c_k^p \mid p \in G, k < \ell(p), w_k^p = \langle x_\tau, J \rangle\}$.

Then C_{-1} is a generic for $\text{Col}(\omega_1, <\kappa_0)$, and likewise for each $\tau < \theta$, C_τ is a generic for $\text{Col}(\kappa_\tau^{++}, <\kappa_{\tau+1})$. Let

$$\mathcal{C} := \{C_\tau \mid \tau \in \{-1\} \cup \theta\}.$$

Due to the Lévy collapses, we have

Proposition 5.1. *In V , for a cardinal λ with $\omega_1 < \lambda < \kappa$, if $\lambda \notin K_0 \cup K_1 \cup K_2$, then λ is collapsed in $V[G]$. \square*

A standard inductive argument shows the following proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *For $\alpha \leq \kappa$ with $0 < o^{\vec{v}}(\alpha) < \alpha$, $\text{otp}(K_0 \cap \alpha) = \omega^{o^{\vec{v}}(\alpha)}$, where the last term concerns ordinal exponentiation. \square*

For $\tau \in \text{acc}(\theta)$, we have $\bigcup_{\varsigma < \tau} \pi_{x_\tau}^{-1}[x_\varsigma] = \pi_{x_\tau}^{-1}[x_\tau] = (\kappa_\tau)^+$.

Proposition 5.3. *$(\kappa^+)^V$ is collapsed. For $\tau \in \text{acc}(\theta)$, $(\kappa_\tau^+)^V$ is collapsed. \square*

Proposition 5.4. *All cardinals in $\{\omega_1\} \cup K_0 \cup K_2$ are preserved.*

Proof. We first show that cardinals in K_2 are preserved. Consider $\tau < \theta$ and suppose for a contradiction that $(\kappa_\tau^{++})^V$ is collapsed, as witnessed by a surjection $f : (\kappa_\tau^+)^V \rightarrow (\kappa_\tau^{++})^V$. By the definition of K_2 , there are $p \in G$ and $k < \ell(p)$ such that $w_k^p = \langle x_\tau, J \rangle$. Recalling Definition 4.8, factor \mathbb{R}/p as $\mathbb{R}_l^{p, x_\tau} \times \mathbb{R}_u^{p, x_\tau}$ and write p as (p_l, p_u) . As the right factor ordered by \leq^* is κ_τ^{++} -closed, by the Prikry property, we may obtain by recursion a $p'_u \leq^* p_u$ such that for every $\beta < (\kappa_\tau^+)^V$, there is a maximal antichain X_β below p_l such that for every $q \in X_\beta$, (q, p'_u) decides $\dot{f}(\beta)$. This means that (p_l, p'_u) forces that f lies in the extension by \mathbb{R}_l^{p, x_τ} , contradicting the fact that the latter has the $(\kappa_\tau^{++})^V$ -cc.

We leave it to the reader to verify that any κ_τ^+ , with $\tau \in \text{nacc}(\theta)$, is preserved, using a similar factorization as in Proposition 5.4. A similar argument (without any factorizations) shows that ω_1 is preserved. Thus, we are left with dealing with the cardinals from K_0 . To this end, let $\tau < \theta$, and we will show that κ_τ is not collapsed.

► If $\tau \in \text{acc}(\theta)$, then $\kappa_\tau = \sup_{\beta < \tau} (\kappa_\beta^{++})^V$, and hence κ_τ is preserved.

► If $\tau = \bar{\tau} + 1$, then we argue as follows. Suppose towards a contradiction that κ_τ is collapsed, as witnessed by some map f . Find $p \in G$ and $k < k+1 < \ell(p)$ such that $w_{k+1}^p = \langle x_\tau, \emptyset \rangle$. Write w_k^p as $\langle x_{\bar{\tau}}, J \rangle$. As before, \mathbb{R}/p is the product of two factors, and here the lower part may be further factored as $\mathbb{R}_l^{p, x_{\bar{\tau}}} \times \text{Col}(\kappa_{\bar{\tau}}^{++}, <\kappa_\tau)$. That is, \mathbb{R}/p is isomorphic to

$$\mathbb{R}_l^{p, x_{\bar{\tau}}} \times \text{Col}(\kappa_{\bar{\tau}}^{++}, <\kappa_\tau) \times \mathbb{R}_u^{p, x_\tau},$$

and we identify p with (p_l, p_m, p_u) . An argument as before yields $p'_u \leq^* p_u$ such that (p_l, p_m, p'_u) forces that f lies in the extension by $\mathbb{R}_l^{p, x_{\bar{\tau}}} \times \text{Col}(\kappa_{\bar{\tau}}^{++}, <\kappa_\tau)$. However, the product of this two notions of forcing has the κ_τ -cc, which yields a contradiction.

► If $\tau = 0$, then we argue as follows. Suppose towards a contradiction that κ_0 is collapsed, as witnessed by some map f . Find $p \in G$ with $\ell(p) > 1$ such that $w_0^p = \langle x_0, \emptyset \rangle$ and $w_1^p = \langle x_1, \emptyset \rangle$, so that \mathbb{R}/p is isomorphic to

$$\text{Col}(\omega_1, <\kappa_0) \times \text{Col}(\kappa_0^{++}, <\kappa_1) \times \mathbb{R}_u^{p, x_1},$$

so a similar analysis yields a contradiction. \square

Putting the last findings together, yields the following.

Proposition 5.5. *For $\alpha \leq \kappa$ with $0 < o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha) < \alpha$, $V[G] \models \text{cf}(\alpha) = \text{cf}(\omega^{o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha)})$. \square*

Recall that for each $\tau \leq \theta$, $2^{\kappa_\tau} = \kappa_\tau^+$, $2^{(\kappa_\tau)^+} = (\kappa_\tau)^{+2}$ and $2^{\kappa_\tau^{++}} = (\kappa_\tau)^{+3}$ in V . We leave to the reader to calculate the cardinal arithmetic in $V[G]$ since the analysis is essentially the same as that from Proposition 5.4. For instance:

Proposition 5.6. *In $V[G]$, for every $\tau \in \theta$, $2^{\kappa_\tau} = (\kappa_\tau)^+$. \square*

Proposition 5.7. *κ is strongly inaccessible in $V[G]$.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.6, it suffices to prove that κ remains regular in $V[G]$. Towards a contradiction, suppose $\mu < \kappa$ and \dot{f} are such that a condition p forces \dot{f} is a surjection from μ to κ . By possibly extending p , we may assume the existence of x in $\Omega(p)$ such that $\kappa_x > \mu$. Factor \mathbb{R}/p as $\mathbb{R}_l^{p,x} \times \mathbb{R}_u^{p,x}$ and recall that the lower factor has the κ_x^{++} -chain condition, and the upper factor ordered by \leq^* is κ_x^{++} -closed. Accordingly, write p as (p_l, p_u) .

Claim 5.7.1. *Let $\xi < \mu$. Then the following set is dense open:*

$$D_\xi = \{r \in \mathbb{R}_u^{p,x} \mid \exists \zeta < \kappa [(p_l, r) \Vdash \dot{f}(\check{\xi}) < \check{\zeta}]\}.$$

Proof. Only density requires an argument. Given $q \in \mathbb{R}_u^{p,x}$, pick an extension r of q and a $\mathbb{R}_l^{p,x}$ -name $\dot{\sigma}$ for an ordinal less than κ such that $r \Vdash_{\mathbb{R}_l^{p,x}} \dot{f}(\check{\xi}) = \dot{\sigma}$. Since $\mathbb{R}_l^{p,x}$ has cardinality less than κ , there is some $\Sigma \in [\kappa]^{<\kappa}$ such that $r \Vdash_{\mathbb{R}_l^{p,x}} \dot{f}(\check{\xi}) \in \check{\Sigma}$. Then $\zeta = \sup(\Sigma) + 1$ witnesses that r is in D_ξ . \square

Next let us construct a sequence $\langle (r_\xi, T_\xi, F_\xi) \mid \xi \leq \mu \rangle$, as follows. Set $r_0 := p_u$, and for $\xi \in \text{acc}(\mu)$, let r_ξ be some \leq^* -lower bound for $\langle r_{\xi'} \mid \xi' < \xi \rangle$. Suppose now that $\xi < \mu$ is such that r_ξ has already been constructed. By the strong Prikry property, find $r_{\xi+1} \leq^* r_\xi$ and a fat tree T_ξ such that for every maximal node \vec{s} of T_ξ there is a corresponding \vec{B}^s such that $r_{\xi+1} + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{B}^s \rangle \in D_\xi$. In particular, we may define a function $F_\xi : X(T_\xi) \rightarrow \kappa$ such that $r_{\xi+1} + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{B}^s \rangle$ forces $f(\xi) < F_\xi(\vec{s})$.

This completes the recursive definition. In particular, we have obtained r_μ .

Consider $p^* := (p_l, r_\mu)$. For every $\xi < \mu$, for every $y \in T_\xi$ which is not of the top level of the tree, let $g(y)$ be the unique ι such that $\text{Succ}_{T_\xi}(y) \in U_{\kappa,\iota}$. Since $\text{cf}(o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)) \geq \kappa^{++}$, $\text{Im}(g)$ is bounded in $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa)$. Let $\zeta := \sup(\text{Im}(g)) + 1$. Let $A' \in U_{\kappa,\zeta} \cap \text{dom}(I^{\mu}) \setminus \bigcap_{\iota < \zeta} U_{\kappa,\iota}$.

Evidently, for every $x \in A'$, the following set is bounded in κ :

$$\Sigma_x = \{F_\xi(\vec{s}) \mid \xi < \mu, \vec{s} \in X(T_\xi \upharpoonright x)\},$$

so that $p^* + \langle x \rangle \Vdash$ “ $\text{Im}(\dot{f})$ is bounded in κ ”. However, $\{p^* + \langle x \rangle \mid x \in A'\}$ is predense below p^* , so $p^* \Vdash$ “ \dot{f} is bounded in κ ”. \square

Proposition 5.8. *Let $\alpha \leq \kappa$ with $o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha) \in \{\alpha, \alpha^+\}$. Then $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$ in $V[G]$.*

Proof. \blacktriangleright Suppose first that $o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha) = \alpha$. Pick $p \in G$ with some $k < \ell(p)$ such that $w_k^p = \langle x_\alpha, I_k \rangle$. As $\{x \in P_\alpha(x_\alpha) \mid o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) < \kappa_x\} \in \mathbf{U}(x_\alpha)$, we may assume that $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) < \kappa_x$ for every x in $A := \text{dom}(I_k)$. Next, we partition A by letting $A_\iota := \{x \in A \mid o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) = \iota\}$ for each $\iota < \alpha$. As $o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha) = \alpha$, it is the case that $\sup\{\iota < \alpha \mid A_\iota \neq \emptyset\} = \alpha$. Consequently, we may recursively define a sequence $\langle \iota_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ as follows:

- $\alpha_0 := \min\{\text{rank}(\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle) \mid \langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle \text{ is a tuple below } x_\alpha\}$,⁷ and
- $\alpha_{n+1} := \min(\{\kappa_z \mid z \in A_{\alpha_n}\} \cap \text{acc}(K_0) \cap (\alpha_n, \alpha))$.

Next, we claim that $\nu := \sup_{n < \omega} \alpha_n$ is equal to α . Indeed, otherwise we may pick $q \leq p$ with $q \in G$ such that, for some i , w_i^q is of the form $\langle x, J \rangle$ with $\kappa_x = \nu$. Pick the unique ι such that $x \in A_\iota$. Hence, $\iota < \kappa_x = \nu$. In addition, $B := \text{dom}(J)$ is a subset of $\bigcup_{\iota' < \iota} A_{\iota'}$ lying in $\mathbf{U}(x)$. Consider $\varepsilon := \min\{\kappa_y \mid y \in B\}$ which is less than κ_x . Fix $n < \omega$ large enough that satisfies $\iota, \varepsilon < \alpha_n$ and such that for some $z \in B$ $\kappa_z = \alpha_{n+1}$ (it is possible since $\{\alpha_m \mid m < \omega\}$ is a club in ν , hence $B \cap \{y \mid \kappa_y \in \{\alpha_m \mid m < \omega\}\} \neq \emptyset$). Hence $z \in B \subseteq \bigcup_{\iota' < \iota} A_{\iota'}$ which is disjoint from A_{α_n} . But $\kappa_z = \alpha_{n+1}$ which by definition is in A_{α_n} and this is a contradiction.

► Suppose now that $o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha) = \alpha^+$. Pick $p \in G$ with some $k < \ell(p)$ such that $w_k^p = \langle x_\alpha, I_k \rangle$. We can disjointify $A := \text{dom}(I_k)$ as a union of A_ι (for $\iota < \alpha^+$), where for every $x \in A_\iota$, $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_x) = \text{otp}(x \cap \iota)$ and $\iota < \sup(x)$. Define $\langle (y_n, \alpha_n, \varsigma_n) \mid n < \omega \rangle$ as follows.

- $\alpha_0 := \min\{\text{rank}(\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle) \mid \langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle \text{ is a tuple below } x_\alpha\}$, y_0 be any working part from \mathbf{X} above $\langle \vec{c}, \vec{u} \rangle$ with $\kappa_{y_0} = \alpha_0$ and $\varsigma_0 = \sup(y_0)$.
- Let $\alpha_{n+1} = \min\{\gamma \in \text{acc}(K_0) \setminus \alpha_n + 1 \mid \exists x \in A_{\varsigma_n}(\kappa_x = \gamma)\}$ and y_{n+1} be the working part with $\kappa_{y_{n+1}} = \alpha_{n+1}$, $\varsigma_{n+1} = \sup(y_{n+1})$.

We first show that $\nu := \sup_n \varsigma_n = \alpha^+$. Otherwise, we may pick $q \leq p$ with $q \in G$ such that, for some i , w_i^q is of the form $\langle x, J \rangle$ with $\sup(x) = \nu$. Pick the unique $\iota < \alpha^+$ such that $x \in A_\iota$. Hence, $\iota < \sup(x) = \nu$. In addition, $B := \text{dom}(J)$ is a subset of $\bigcup_{\iota' < \iota} A_{\iota'}$ lying in $\mathbf{U}(x)$. Fix large enough $n < \omega$ be such that $\iota, \min(\{\kappa_z \mid z \in B\}) < \varsigma_n$ and $y_{n+1} \in B$. Thus, $y_{n+1} \in \bigcup_{\iota' < \iota} A_{\iota'}$, but $y_{n+1} \in A_{\varsigma_n}$ by definition and we get a contradiction.

This concludes that $V[G] \models \text{cf}((\alpha^+)^V) = \omega$. Now in $V[G]$, we see that $\sup(x_\gamma) \mapsto \kappa_{x_\gamma}$ is a well-defined cofinal map from α^+ to α . Hence, $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$ in $V[G]$. \square

6. PROJECTING FROM RADIN TO PRIKRY

Recall that for $s \in \vec{t}_\alpha$ and $x \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$, we have a notion s_x whose domain is $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha_x}(\alpha_x^+)$ and $s_x(y) = s(\pi_x[y])$ for all y . We also apply this notion to any $I \subseteq s$. Namely, if $I \subseteq t_{\alpha, i}$ for some i , define I_x to be a function whose domain is $\pi_x^{-1}[\text{dom}(I) \upharpoonright x]$ and $I_x(y) = I(\pi_x[y])$ for all y .

We continue with our setup from Section 5. We consider a projected forcing of $\mathbb{R}_{\vec{U}, \vec{t}}$ which we call $\mathbb{P}_{\vec{U}, \vec{t}}$.

Definition 6.1. The forcing $\mathbb{P}_{\vec{U}, \vec{t}}$ consists of conditions of the form

$$p = \langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, v_n \rangle,$$

where

- (1) $n < \omega$;
- (2) for $i = 0$ assuming $n > 0$:
 - v_0 is a pair $\langle \kappa_0, I_0 \rangle$;
 - $\kappa_0 < \kappa$;
 - if $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_0) > 0$, then $I_0 \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa_0)$; otherwise, $I_0 = \emptyset$;
 - $c_{-1} \in \text{Col}(\omega_1, < \min\{\kappa_0, \kappa_x \mid x \in \text{dom}(I_0)\})$;
- (3) for $0 < i < n$:

⁷Here, $\text{rank}(z)$ stands for the least ordinal ρ such that $z \in V_{\rho+1}$.

- v_i is a pair $\langle \kappa_i, I_i \rangle$;
 - $\kappa_i < \kappa$;
 - if $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_i) > 0$, then $I_i \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa_i)$; otherwise, $I_i = \emptyset$;
 - $c_{i-1} \in \text{Col}((\kappa_{i-1})^{++}, < \min\{\kappa_i, \kappa_x \mid x \in \text{dom}(I_i)\})$;
- (4) for $i = n$:
- $v_n = \langle \kappa_n, I_n \rangle$;
 - $\kappa_n = \kappa$;
 - $I_n \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa)$;
 - $c_{n-1} \in \text{Col}((\kappa_{n-1})^{++}, < \min\{\kappa_x \mid x \in \text{dom}(I_n)\})$;
- (5) $\kappa_0 < \dots < \kappa_{n-1}$.

Remark 6.2. We use similar notation to that we used for Radin forcing, namely we define $\Omega(p) = \langle \kappa_0, \dots, \kappa_{n-1} \rangle$, and other components in the same fashion: collapse part, the top part, etc'. Unlike with \mathbb{R} , here a generic object will not give sufficient information to collapse κ^+ or successors of singular cardinals below κ^+ .

Given $p, q \in \mathbb{P}_{\vec{U}, \vec{c}}$, say

- $p = \langle c_{-1}^p, v_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, v_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p, v_{\ell(p)}^p \rangle$, and
- $q = \langle c_{-1}^q, v_0^q, c_0^q, \dots, v_{\ell(q)-1}^q, c_{\ell(q)-1}^q, v_{\ell(q)}^q \rangle$,

define $p \leq q$ (p is stronger than q) iff all of the following hold:

- (1) $\ell(p) \geq \ell(q)$;
- (2) $c_{-1}^p \leq c_{-1}^q$;
- (3) there are $0 \leq i_0 < i_1 < \dots < \ell(p)$ such that for each $k \leq \ell(q)$,
 - $\kappa_{i_k}^p = \kappa_k^q$, $\text{dom}(I_{i_k}^p) \subseteq \text{dom}(I_k^q)$, and $c_{i_k}^p \leq c_k^q$;
 - if $i_{k-1} < i < i_k$ (where $i_{-1} = -1$), then there is an $x \in \text{dom}(I_k^q)$ such that $\kappa_x = \kappa_i^p$, $c_i^p \leq I_k^q(x)$, and $I_i^p(y) \leq (I_k^q)_x(y)$ for every y .
 - for every $k \leq \ell(q)$, $\text{dom}(I_{i_k}^p) \subseteq \text{dom}(I_k^q)$ and $I_{i_k}^p(y) \leq I_k^q(y)$ for every y ;

We say that p is a *direct extension* of q , denote $p \leq^* q$, if $p \leq q$ and $\ell(p) = \ell(q)$.

Definition 6.3 (0-step extension). We say that p is *0-step extension* of q , denoted $p \leq^{**} q$ iff

- (1) $p \leq^* q$;
- (2) the collapse parts of p and q are equal;
- (3) for every $i \leq \ell(p)$, for every $x \in \text{dom}(I_i^p)$, $I_i^p(x) = I_i^q(x)$.

Definition 6.4 (1-step extension). Let p be a condition. For $i \leq \ell(p)$ and $x \in \text{dom}(I_i^p)$, the *1-step extension* of p by x , denote $p + \langle x \rangle$, is the condition

$$q = \langle c_{-1}^p, v_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, u', c', v', c_i^p, v_{i+1}^p, c_{i+1}^p, \dots, v_{n-1}^p, c_{n-1}^p, v_n^p \rangle,$$

where

- (1) $u' = \langle \kappa_x, (I_i^p)_x \rangle$
- (2) $c' = I_i^p(x)$;
- (3) $v' = \langle \kappa_i^p, I_i^p \upharpoonright x^\uparrow \rangle$.

Define $p + \langle x_0, \dots, x_n \rangle$ by recursion, in the obvious way, which we hereafter call an *n -step extension* of p . As in the previous section, $p \leq q$ iff p is the direct extension of some n -step extension of q for some $n < \omega$.

Definition 6.5 (1-step extension while shrinking). Let p be a condition. For $x \in \text{dom}(I_i^p)$ with $i \leq \ell(p)$ and $B \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa_i^p)$, the 1-step extension of p by $\langle x, B \rangle$, denoted $p + \langle x, B \rangle$, is the condition

$$q = \langle c_{-1}^p, u_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, u', c', v', c_i^p, v_{i+1}^p, c_{i+1}^p, \dots, v_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p, v_{\ell(p)}^p \rangle,$$

where

- (1) $u' = \langle x, (I_i^p \upharpoonright B)_x \rangle$;
- (2) c' and v' are as in the definition of $p + \langle x \rangle$.

We note that for a condition p and $\alpha = \kappa_i^p$ for some i , then

$$\langle c_{-1}^p, v_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, v_{i-1}^p, c_{i-1}^p, v_i \rangle$$

is a condition in the natural variation $\mathbb{P}_{\vec{U} \upharpoonright (\alpha+1), \vec{\tau} \upharpoonright (\alpha+1)}$. Several properties which we will verify for $\mathbb{P}_{\vec{U}, \vec{\tau}}$ will have a reflected version for $\mathbb{P}_{\vec{U} \upharpoonright (\alpha+1), \vec{\tau} \upharpoonright (\alpha+1)}$.

Definition 6.6 (Translation map). For $\langle x, I \rangle$ such that $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$ and $I \in \mathbf{G}(x)$, define

$$\text{Tr}(\langle x, I \rangle) := \langle \kappa_x, I_x \rangle.$$

Throughout this section, unless stated otherwise, let $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}_{\vec{U}, \vec{\tau}}$ and $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_{\vec{U}, \vec{\tau}}$

Proposition 6.7. *There is a projection Π from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{P} .*

Proof. Given $r = \langle c_{-1}, w_0, c_0, \dots, w_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, w_n \rangle$ in \mathbb{R} , define

$$\Pi(r) = \langle c_{-1}, \text{Tr}(w_0), c_0, \dots, \text{Tr}(w_{n-1}), c_{n-1}, w_n \rangle.$$

We show that $\Pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ is a projection. It is easy to see that if $r' \leq r$ in \mathbb{R} , then $\Pi(r') \leq \Pi(r)$ in \mathbb{P} . Now, let $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$p = \langle d_{-1}, v_0, d_0, \dots, v_{m-1}, d_{m-1}, v_m \rangle$$

in \mathbb{P} be an extension of $\Pi(r)$. So $p \leq^* \Pi(r) + s$ for some $s = \langle y_0, \dots, y_{n-1} \rangle$. Define $\vec{z} = \langle z_0, \dots, z_{n-1} \rangle$ as follows:

$$z_i := \begin{cases} \pi_{x_j}^{-1}[y_i], & \text{if } y_i \in \text{dom}(I_j^{\Pi(r)}) \text{ with } j < \ell(r); \\ y_i, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Enumerate $\Omega(r) \cup \{z_0, \dots, z_{n-1}\} \subsetneq$ -increasingly as $\{a_0, \dots, a_{m-1}\}$. Note that for every $i < m$, if $v_i = \langle \kappa_i, J_i \rangle$, then $\kappa_{a_i} = \kappa_i$, so we let $w'_i := \langle a_i, (y \mapsto J_i(\pi_{a_i}^{-1}[y])) \rangle$. Finally, let $r' = \langle d_{-1}, w'_0, d_0, \dots, w'_{m-1}, d_{m-1}, \langle \kappa^+, J_m^p \rangle \rangle$. It is straightforward to check that $r' \leq^* r + s$, so that $r' \leq r$, and $\Pi(r') = p$. \square

Proposition 6.8. *\mathbb{P} has the κ -Linked₀ property. In particular, it has the κ^+ -chain condition.*

Proof. We define a map $\psi : \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\kappa$, as follows. Given a condition $p = \langle c_{-1}^p, v_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, v_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p, w_{\ell(p)-1}^p \rangle$, $\psi(p)$ is obtained by removing the implicit gurus and the top component of p :

$$\psi(p) = \langle c_{-1}^p, \kappa_0^p, c_0^p, \dots, \kappa_{\ell(p)-1}^p, c_{\ell(p)-1}^p \rangle.$$

To see this works, let $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ with $\psi(p) = \psi(q)$. By the definition of ψ we get $\ell(p) = \ell(q)$ and for all $i < \ell(p)$ $\kappa_i^p = \kappa_i^q$ and $c_i^p = c_i^q$. For all $i \leq \ell(p)$, it is the case that $I_i^p, I_i^q \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa_i)$ hence there are $l_p^i, l_q^i < \kappa_i^{++}$ such that $I_i^p \subseteq t_{\kappa_i, l_p^i}$ and $I_i^q \subseteq t_{\kappa_i, l_q^i}$. Let $l_i := \max\{l_p^i, l_q^i\}$ and by the properties of the guru \vec{t}_{κ_i} , there is a club C_i such

that $t_{\kappa_i, l_i}(x) \leq t_{\kappa_i, l_p^i}(x), t_{\kappa_i, l_q^i}(x)$ for all $x \in C_i$. Set $A_i = \text{dom}(I_i^p) \cap \text{dom}(I_i^q) \cap C_i$ and let $\tilde{v}_i = \langle \kappa_i, t_{\kappa_i, l_i} \upharpoonright A_i \rangle$. Consider

$$r := \langle c_{-1}^p, \tilde{v}_0, c_0^p, \dots, c_{\ell(p)-1}, \tilde{v}_{\ell(p)} \rangle.$$

Then $r \leq^* p, q$, as sought. \square

Definition 6.9 (\mathbb{P} -Factorization). Given a condition $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and $i < \ell(p)$ with $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa_i^p) > 0$, letting $\alpha := \kappa_i^p$, we factor \mathbb{P}/p as $\mathbb{P}_l^{p, \alpha} \times \mathbb{P}_u^{p, \alpha}$ as follows. Each $q \leq p$ is viewed as a pair (q_l, q_u) where

- $q_l = \langle c_{-1}^q, v_0^q, \dots, c_{i'-1}^q, v_{i'}^q \rangle$, where $i' := i_q(\alpha)$, and
- $q_u = \langle c_{i'}^q, v_{i'+1}^q, \dots, c_{\ell(q)-1}^q, v_{\ell(q)}^q \rangle$.

Note that $\mathbb{P}_l^{p, \eta}$ is a cone of a natural variation of \mathbb{P} that we denote by $\mathbb{P}_{\vec{U} \upharpoonright (\eta+1), \vec{\kappa} \upharpoonright (\eta+1)}$. Also note that $\mathbb{P}_u^{p, \eta}$ is a regular subposet of \mathbb{P} in which the first component of a condition is an element of $\text{Col}(\eta^{++}, < \kappa)$, so that it is η^{++} -closed.

We have the following closure property.

Proposition 6.10. *Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\alpha \in \Omega(p)$. Then $(\mathbb{P}_u^{p, \alpha}, \leq^*)$ is α^{++} -closed. \square*

Definition 6.11 (\mathbb{P} -Tuple below). For each $\alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}}) \cap \kappa$, a \mathbb{P} -tuple below α is a sequence

$$t = \langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{m-1}, c_{m-1} \rangle$$

such that there exists a condition q in \mathbb{P} of the form

$$\langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{m-1}, c_{m-1}, \langle \alpha, J \rangle, c_m, \dots, v_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, v_n \rangle,$$

so that $q = t \wedge \langle \langle \alpha, \dots \rangle \dots \rangle$.

An easy calculation yields the following.

Proposition 6.12. *The collection of \mathbb{P} -tuples below α has size at most α . \square*

Definition 6.13 (Fat trees). For $\alpha < \kappa$, α -fat tree is a tree T such that:

- (1) every $s \in T$ is \subseteq -increasing sequence of elements of $\mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+)$;
- (2) for some $i < o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha)$, $\{y \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\alpha^+) \mid \langle y \rangle \in \text{Lev}_0(T)\} \in U_{\alpha, i}$;
- (3) for every $y \in \text{Lev}_j(T)$ that is not a maximal node, for some $i_y < o^{\vec{U}}(\alpha)$, $\text{Succ}_T(y) \in U_{\alpha, i_y}$.

The following lemma is analogous to Lemma 4.15 and is proved in a similar fashion.

Lemma 6.14. *Suppose:*

- p is a \mathbb{P} -condition;
- for every $\iota \leq \ell(p)$, T_ι is a κ_ι^p -fat tree;
- for each \vec{s} in $\mathbf{S}(T_0, \dots, T_{\ell(p)})$, one attaches a sequence $\vec{\mathbf{B}}^{\vec{s}} = \langle \vec{B}_\iota^{\vec{s}} \mid \iota \leq \ell(p) \ \& \ T_\iota \neq \emptyset \rangle$ such that each $\vec{B}_\iota^{\vec{s}}$ is of s_ι -measure-one.

Then there are $p^* \leq^{**} p$ and for each $\iota \leq \ell(p)$, there is a fat subtree $T_\iota^* \subseteq T_\iota$ with $n(T_\iota^*) = n(T_\iota)$ such that the following set

$$\{p^* + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{\mathbf{B}}^{\vec{s}} \rangle \mid \vec{s} \in \mathbf{S}(T_0^*, \dots, T_{\ell(p)}^*)\}$$

is predense below p^* . \square

The following lemma is analogous to Theorem 4.16 and is proved in a similar fashion.

Theorem 6.15 (Strong Prikry property). *For every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and every dense open set D in \mathbb{P} , there are $p^* \leq^* p$ and fat trees $T_0, \dots, T_{\ell(p)-1}, T_{\ell(p)}$ such that:*

- (1) *for every $i \leq \ell(p)$, T_i is a (possibly empty) κ_i^p -fat tree, and*
- (2) *for every $\vec{s} = \langle s_0, \dots, s_{\ell(p)} \rangle$ in $\mathbf{S}(T_0, \dots, T_{\ell(p)})$, there are corresponding \vec{B}_i 's of s_i -measure-one such that*

$$p^* + \langle \langle s_0, \vec{B}_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle s_{\ell(p)}, \vec{B}_{\ell(p)} \rangle \rangle \in D. \quad \square$$

As a corollary, we get:

Corollary 6.16 (Prikry property). *Let φ be a forcing statement of \mathbb{P} and p be a condition. There is $p^* \leq^* p$ such that p^* decides φ . \square*

We will turn to the analysis of the cardinal arithmetic in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$, where we note that all of the proofs are similar to the proofs of Section 5. Let H be \mathbb{P} -generic. Define

- $\bar{K}_0 := \{\alpha \mid \exists p \in H(\alpha \in \Omega(p))\}$;
- $\bar{K}_1 := \{(\alpha^+)^V \mid \alpha \in \bar{K}_0\}$;
- $\bar{K}_2 := \{(\alpha^{++})^V \mid \alpha \in \bar{K}_0\}$.

By a density argument, \bar{K}_0 is unbounded in κ and \bar{K}_0 is closed below its supremum κ . Let $\langle \kappa_\tau \mid \tau < \theta \rangle$ denote the increasing enumeration of \bar{K}_0 . Define

- $\bar{C}_{-1} := \{c_{-1}^p \mid p \in H\}$, and for every $\tau < \theta$,
- $\bar{C}_\tau := \{c_k^p \mid p \in H, k < \ell(p), v_k^p = \langle \kappa_\tau, J \rangle\}$.

Then \bar{C}_{-1} is a generic for $\text{Col}(\omega_1, < \kappa_0)$, and likewise for each $\tau < \theta$, \bar{C}_τ is a generic for $\text{Col}(\kappa_\tau^{++}, < \kappa_{\tau+1})$. Let

$$\bar{C} := \{\bar{C}_\tau \mid \tau \in \{-1\} \cup \theta\}.$$

Theorem 6.17. *In $V[H]$, all of the following hold:*

- (1) ω_1 is preserved;
- (2) all cardinals in $\bar{K}_0 \cup \bar{K}_1 \cup \bar{K}_2$ and cardinals above κ are preserved;
- (3) for every $\alpha \in \bar{K}_0$ with $0 < o^{\bar{U}}(\alpha) < \alpha$, $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \text{cf}(\omega^{o^{\bar{U}}(\alpha)})$;
- (4) for every $\alpha \in \bar{K}_0$ with $o^{\bar{U}}(\alpha) = \alpha$, $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$;
- (5) for every $\alpha \in \bar{K}_0$ with $\text{cf}(o^{\bar{U}}(\alpha)) \geq \alpha^{++}$, α remains strongly inaccessible.
In particular κ remains strongly inaccessible;
- (6) GCH below κ . \square

Remark 6.18. We do not know whether a result analogous to Lemma 5.8 holds here. Specifically, we speculate that if $o^{\bar{U}}(\alpha) = \alpha^+$, then α remains regular in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$.

7. INTERMEDIATE FORCINGS

We continue with our setup from Section 6. Since \mathbb{R} projects to \mathbb{P} , let G be \mathbb{R} -generic and H the \mathbb{P} -generic set induced from G , hence $V \subseteq V[H] \subseteq V[G]$. This section is devoted to analyzing various intermediate forcing notions whose generic extensions lie in between $V[H]$ and $V[G]$.

Let us consider the following forcing notion:

Definition 7.1. Let $x, y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$ with $y \subsetneq x$. Define $\mathbb{Q}_{y,x}$ as the collection of $q = \langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{k-1}, c_{k-1}, w_k, c_k, \dots, w_{m-1}, c_{m-1}, v_m, c_m, \dots, v_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, v_n \rangle$, where

- (1) $\langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{k-1}, c_{k-1}, \langle \kappa_y, I_k \rangle \rangle \in \mathbb{P}_{\bar{\mathbf{U}} \upharpoonright_{\kappa_y+1}, \bar{\mathbf{t}} \upharpoonright_{\kappa_y+1}}$;
- (2) $w_k = \langle y, I_k \rangle$;
- (3) for $k \leq i < m$, write $w_i = \langle z_i, I_i \rangle$. Then for some tuple $\langle \vec{d}, \vec{u} \rangle$ below y , $\langle \vec{d}, \vec{u}, \langle \pi_x^{-1}[z_k], (I_k)_x \rangle, c_k, \dots, \langle \pi_x^{-1}[z_{m-1}], (I_{m-1})_x \rangle, c_{m-1}, \langle \kappa_x^+, I_m \rangle \rangle$ is in $\mathbb{R}_{\bar{\mathbf{U}} \upharpoonright_{\kappa_x+1}, \bar{\mathbf{t}} \upharpoonright_{\kappa_x+1}}$ (Recall the notion I_x in the beginning of Section 6);
- (4) $v_m = \langle \kappa_x^+, I_m \rangle$;
- (5) for some tuple \vec{e}, \vec{v} below κ_x , $\langle \vec{e}, \vec{v}, v_m, c_m, \dots, v_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, v_n \rangle \in \mathbb{P}$.

Similarly to $\mathbb{Q}_{y,x}$ we define

Definition 7.2. $\mathbb{Q}_{0,x}$ is the collection of all

$$q = \langle c_{-1}, w_0, c_0, \dots, w_{m-1}, c_{m-1}, v_m, c_m, \dots, v_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, v_n \rangle,$$

where

- (1) $v_m = \langle \kappa_x, I_m \rangle$;
- (2) for $i < m$, write $w_i = \langle z_i, I_i \rangle$. Then, $\langle c_{-1}, \langle \pi_x^{-1}[z_0], (I_0)_x \rangle, c_0, \dots, \langle \pi_x^{-1}[z_{m-1}], (I_{m-1})_x \rangle, c_{m-1}, v_m \rangle$ is a condition in $\mathbb{R}_{\bar{\mathbf{U}} \upharpoonright_{\kappa_x+1}, \bar{\mathbf{t}} \upharpoonright_{\kappa_x+1}}$;
- (3) for some \vec{e}, \vec{v} below κ_x , $\langle \vec{e}, \vec{v}, v_m, c_m, \dots, v_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, v_n \rangle \in \mathbb{P}$.

From now on, when we write $\mathbb{Q}_{y,x}$, we mean that $y \subsetneq x$ or $y = 0$. The order of $\mathbb{Q}_{y,x}$ is the one inherited naturally from \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{P} as defined in Section 4 and in Section 6. Intuitively this forcing notion can be thought as forcing with \mathbb{R} between a specific interval and with \mathbb{P} outside this interval.

For $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, y \in \Omega(p)$, write

$$p = \langle c_{-1}, w_0, c_0, \dots, w_{k-1}, c_{k-1}, w_k, c_k, \dots, w_{m-1}, c_{m-1}, w_m, c_m, \dots, w_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, w_n \rangle,$$

with the k^{th} working part being y and the m^{th} working part being x . Then there is a natural projection from p to the following corresponding condition in $\mathbb{Q}_{y,x}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_0^{y,x}(p) = & \langle c_{-1}, \text{Tr}(w_0), c_0, \dots, \text{Tr}(w_{k-1}), \\ & c_{k-1}, \text{Tr}_x(w_k), c_k, \dots, \text{Tr}_x(w_{m-1}), c_{m-1}, \text{Tr}(w_m), \\ & c_m, \dots, \text{Tr}(w_{n-1}), c_{n-1}, \langle \kappa, I \rangle \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where Tr is defined in Definition 6.6 and $\text{Tr}_x(\langle z, J \rangle) := \langle \pi_x^{-1}[z], J \circ \pi_x \rangle$.

Now, if

$$q = \langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{k-1}, c_{k-1}, w_k, c_k, \dots, w_{m-1}, c_{m-1}, v_m, c_m, \dots, v_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, v_n \rangle$$

is a condition in $\mathbb{Q}_{y,x}$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1^{y,x}(q) = & \langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{k-1}, c_{k-1}, \\ & \text{Tr}^x(w_k), c_k, \dots, \text{Tr}^x(w_{m-1}), \\ & c_{m-1}, v_m, \dots, v_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, v_n \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where for each $i \in \{k, \dots, m-1\}$, $w_i = \langle x_i^q, J_i^q \rangle$ and $\text{Tr}^x(w_i) = \langle \kappa_{x_i^q}, (J_i^q)_x \rangle$. Then $\Pi_1^{y,x}(q) \in \mathbb{P}$.

Proposition 7.3. Let $\mathbb{R}(y, x) := \{p \in \mathbb{R} \mid x, y \in \Omega(p) \text{ \& } y \subsetneq x\}$. Let $\text{Tr} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ be the projection as in Proposition 6.7. Then the maps $\Pi_0^{y,x}$ from $\mathbb{R}(y, x)$ to $\mathbb{Q}_{y,x}$, and $\Pi_1^{y,x}$ from $\mathbb{Q}_{y,x}$ to \mathbb{P} are projections such that

$$\Pi_1^{y,x} \circ \Pi_0^{y,x} = \text{Tr} \upharpoonright \mathbb{R}(y, x). \quad \square$$

Proposition 7.4. In $V^{\mathbb{Q}_{y,x}}$, $(\kappa_x)^+$ is collapsed and if $y \subsetneq x$, then κ_y^+ is preserved. \square

Let us consider another forcing notion:

Definition 7.5. Let $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$. Define \mathbb{Q}^x as the collection of all

$$q = \langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{m-1}, c_{m-1}, w_m, c_m, \dots, w_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, w_n \rangle,$$

where

- (1) $w_m = \langle x, I_m \rangle$;
- (2) $\langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{m-1}, c_{m-1}, \langle \kappa_x, (I_m)_x \rangle \rangle \in \mathbb{P}_{\bar{u} \upharpoonright \kappa_x + 1, \bar{v} \upharpoonright \kappa_x + 1}$;
- (3) for some tuple $\langle \vec{d}, \vec{u} \rangle$ below x , $\langle \vec{d}, \vec{u}, c_{m-1}, w_m, \dots, c_{n-1}, w_n \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$.

The order of \mathbb{Q}^x is inherited from the order of \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{P} as defined in Section 4 and in Section 6. One can intuitively think of this forcing notion as forcing with \mathbb{P} below some cardinal and with \mathbb{R} above it.

Suppose that $p \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x \in \Omega(p)$. Then there is a projection from p to a particular condition $\Pi_0^x(p)$ in \mathbb{Q}^x , namely,

$$\Pi_0^x(p) := \langle c_{-1}, \text{Tr}(w_0), c_0, \dots, \text{Tr}(w_{m-1}), c_{m-1}, w_m, c_m, \dots, w_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, w_n \rangle,$$

where Tr is defined as in Proposition 6.7.

For a condition

$$q = \langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{m-1}, c_{m-1}, w_m, c_m, \dots, w_{n-1}, c_{n-1}, w_n \rangle$$

in \mathbb{Q}^x , define $\Pi_1^x(q)$ as

$$\langle c_{-1}, v_0, c_0, \dots, v_{m-1}, c_{m-1}, \text{Tr}(w_m), c_m, \dots, \text{Tr}(w_{n-1}), c_{n-1}, \langle \kappa, I_n \rangle \rangle,$$

and note that it is a condition in \mathbb{P} .

Proposition 7.6. Let $\mathbb{R}^x = \{p \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \in \Omega(p)\}$ and $\text{Tr} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ be the projection as in Proposition 6.7. Then the maps Π_0^x from \mathbb{R}^x to \mathbb{Q}^x and Π_1^x from \mathbb{Q}^x to \mathbb{P} are the projections, and $\Pi_1^x \circ \Pi_0^x = \text{Tr} \upharpoonright \mathbb{R}^x$. \square

The following proposition follows from the inherited strong Prikry property, factorization, and the chain condition.

Proposition 7.7. In $V^{\mathbb{Q}^x}$, $(\kappa_x)^+$ is preserved. \square

8. WEAK HOMOGENEITY

We continue with our setup from Section 7.

Let us define:

$$\text{Aut}_\kappa(\kappa^+) = \{\Gamma \in \kappa^+ \kappa^+ \mid \Gamma \text{ is a bijection \& } \exists \gamma \in (\kappa, \kappa^+) \forall \xi \in [0, \kappa] \cup (\gamma, \kappa^+) (\Gamma(\xi) = \xi)\}.$$

For $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$, define:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Aut}_{\kappa_x}(x) = \{ & \Gamma \in {}^x x \mid \Gamma \text{ is a bijection \&} \\ & \exists \gamma \in (\kappa_x, \text{sup}(x)) \forall \xi \in [0, \kappa_x] \cup \{\kappa\} \cup (\gamma, \text{sup}(x)) (\Gamma(\xi) = \xi)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We lift those automorphisms to automorphisms of \mathbb{R} , $\mathbb{Q}_{y,x}$, and \mathbb{Q}^x as follows. Let $\Gamma \in \text{Aut}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$.

- (1) For $x \in \mathcal{R}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$, let $\Gamma(x) := \Gamma[x]$, so that $\kappa_x = \kappa_{\Gamma(x)}$.
- (2) For $A \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa)$, let $\Gamma(A) := \{\Gamma[a] \mid a \in A\}$. Note that as in [Mag77, Lemma 3.4], $\Gamma(A) \in \vec{U}$.
- (3) For I a function with $\text{dom}(I) = A \in \vec{U}(\kappa)$, let $\Gamma(I)$ be the function with domain $\Gamma(A)$ and $\Gamma(I)(\Gamma(y)) = I(y)$ for all y .
- (4) For $c \in \text{Col}(\eta, \kappa)$, let $\Gamma(c) := c$.

Lemma 8.1. *For every $I \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa)$, $\Gamma(I) \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa)$.*

Proof. Let $A := \text{dom}(I)$ and note that $\Gamma(A) \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa)$. Fix $B \subseteq A$ with $B \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa)$, and fix γ such that $I = t_{\kappa, \gamma} \upharpoonright B$. Since $\{y \in \mathcal{P}_{\kappa}(\kappa^+) \mid \Gamma(y) = y\} \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa)$, and for each $y \in B$ with $\Gamma(y) = y$, $\Gamma(I)(y) = \Gamma(I)(\Gamma(y)) = I(y)$, it is the case that $\Gamma(I)$ agrees with $t_{\kappa, \gamma}$ on a measure-one set. Therefore $\Gamma(I) \in \mathcal{G}(\kappa)$. \square

Lemma 8.2. *For every $A \in \bigcap \mathbf{U}(x)$, $\Gamma(A) \in \bigcap \mathbf{U}(\Gamma(x))$.*

Proof. Let $A \in \bigcap \mathbf{U}(x)$. Then

$$\{\pi_x^{-1}[a] \mid a \in A\} \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa_x).$$

Fix $i < o\vec{U}(\kappa_x)$, and let $j = j_{U_{\kappa_x, i}}$. Then, $j^{\ulcorner}x \in j(A)$. Since $j(\Gamma)(j^{\ulcorner}x) = j^{\ulcorner}(\Gamma(x))$ and $j(\Gamma)(j(A)) = j(\Gamma(A))$, we have $j^{\ulcorner}(\Gamma(x)) \in j(\Gamma(A))$. Hence, $\Gamma(A) \in \bigcap \mathbf{U}(\Gamma(x))$. \square

Lemma 8.3. *For every $I \in \mathbf{G}(x)$, $\Gamma(I) \in \mathbf{G}(\Gamma(x))$.*

Proof. Let $A := \text{dom}(I)$, hence $I = t_{x, i} \upharpoonright B$, for some $B \subseteq A$ such that $B \in \bigcap \vec{U}(x)$. Since $\{y \in \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_x}((\kappa_x)^+) \mid \pi_{\Gamma(x)}^{-1}[\Gamma[\pi_x[y]]] = y\} \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa_x)$ and $\Gamma(B) \subseteq \text{dom}(\Gamma(I))$ we get that $\tilde{B} := \{y \in \pi_x^{-1}[B] \mid \pi_{\Gamma(x)}^{-1}[\Gamma[\pi_x[y]]] = y\} \in \bigcap \vec{U}(\kappa_x)$. Let $D := \{\pi_{\Gamma(x)}[z] \mid z \in \tilde{B}\}$ which is an element of $\mathbf{U}(\Gamma(x))$. Hence $B \subseteq \Gamma(\tilde{B}) \subseteq \Gamma(A)$ and we get that $\Gamma(I) \upharpoonright D = t_{\Gamma(x), i} \upharpoonright \Gamma[\tilde{B}] \in \mathbf{G}(\Gamma(x))$. \square

Fix some $\Gamma' \in \text{Aut}_{\kappa_x}(x)$. Note that $\Gamma := \Gamma' \cup \text{id}_{\kappa^+ \setminus x}$ belongs to $\text{Aut}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$. Likewise, Γ' can be lifted to an automorphism of $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}_{y,x})$ or of $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}^x)$ in a similar manner to how Γ is lifted.

Recall that if G is \mathbb{R} -generic, then we can derive the projected Prikry sequence K_0 and the collection of collapses \mathcal{C} from the generic G . Let \dot{K}_0 and $\dot{\mathcal{C}}$ be their canonical names. Then each $\Gamma \in \text{Aut}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$ can be lifted to an automorphism of \mathbb{R} , and since Γ fixes all ordinals below κ , $\Gamma(\dot{K}_0) = \dot{K}_0$ and $\Gamma(\dot{\mathcal{C}}) = \dot{\mathcal{C}}$.

Proposition 8.4. *Let $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $\ell(p) = \ell(q) = n$, for every $i < n$, $\kappa_{x_i^p} = \kappa_{x_i^q}$, and for every $j \in n \cup \{-1\}$, $c_j^p \parallel c_j^q$. Then there is $\Gamma \in \text{Aut}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$ such that $\Gamma(p) \parallel q$.*

Proof. List $\Omega(p)$ and $\Omega(q) \subsetneq$ -increasingly as $\{x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$ and $\{y_0, \dots, y_{n-1}\}$, respectively. We build Γ block by block. We begin with $\Gamma_{-1} = \text{id}_\kappa$. Since $\text{otp}(x_0) = \kappa_{x_0^+} = \kappa_{y_0^+} = \text{otp}(y_0)$, we extend Γ_{-1} to Γ_0 which is a bijection from $\kappa \cup x_0$ to $\kappa \cup y_0$. Note that $\text{Im}(\Gamma_0 \upharpoonright x_0) \subseteq y_1$, and $\kappa_{x_1} = \kappa_{y_1}$, so we extend Γ_0 to Γ_1 which is a bijection from $\kappa \cup x_1$ to $\kappa \cup y_1$. Continue this process, we obtain partial functions $\Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \Gamma_{n-1}$ such that for each i , Γ_i is a bijection from $\kappa \cup x_i$ to $\kappa \cup y_i$.

In particular, Γ_{n-1} is a bijection from $\kappa \cup x_{n-1}$ to $\kappa \cup y_{n-1}$. Since $\kappa_{n-1} < \kappa < \kappa^+$, $\text{dom}(\Gamma_{n-1}), \text{Im}(\Gamma_{n-1})$ is bounded in κ^+ . Extend Γ_{n-1} to $\Gamma \in \text{Aut}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$. Thus, $\Gamma(x_i) = y_i$ for all i . We now show that $\Gamma(p) \parallel q$. For each $i \in n \cup \{-1\}$, let $c_i^* := c_i^p \cup c_i^q$.

For each $i < n$, by Lemma 8.3, $\Gamma(I_i^p) \in \mathbf{G}(\Gamma(x_i)) = \mathbf{G}(y_i)$ hence there is $B \in \bigcap \mathbf{U}(y_i)$ and some $\iota < \kappa_{y_i}^{++}$ such that $\Gamma(I_i^p) = t_{y_i, \iota} \upharpoonright B$. By $I_i^q \in \mathbf{G}(y_i)$ there is some $\iota' < \kappa_{y_i}^{++}$ such that $\Gamma(I_i^q) = t_{y_i, \iota'} \upharpoonright (\text{dom } I_i^q)$. By the properties of the guru \vec{t}_{y_i} there is a club C such that for $\iota_i^* = \sup\{\iota, \iota'\} + 1$, we have for $z \in C$, $t_{y_i, \iota_i^*}(z) \leq \Gamma(I_i^p)(z), I_i^q(z)$. Let $I_i^* = t_{y_i, \iota_i^*} \upharpoonright (B \cap C \cap \text{dom}(I_i^q))$. This implies that

$$\langle c_{-1}^*, \langle y_0, I_0^* \rangle, c_0^*, \dots, \langle \kappa^+, I^* \rangle \rangle \leq \Gamma(p), q,$$

as required. \square

Similar proofs show that

Proposition 8.5. *Suppose $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}_{y,x}$ with $\ell(p) = \ell(q) = n$. Assume*

- $\Omega(p) = \{z_0, \dots, z_{k-1}, y, \kappa_{k+1}, \dots, \kappa_{m-1}, x, z_{m+1}, \dots, z_{n-1}\},$
- $\Omega(q) = \{z'_0, \dots, z'_{k-1}, y, \lambda_{k+1}, \dots, \lambda_{m-1}, x, z'_{m+1}, \dots, z'_{n-1}\},$

are such that for all $i < k$ or $i > m$, $\kappa_{z_i} = \kappa_{z'_i}$, for all $i \in (k, m)$, $\kappa_i = \lambda_i$, and for all $i < n$, $c_i^p \parallel c_i^q$. Then, there is some $\Gamma \in \text{Aut}_{\kappa_x}(\kappa_x^+)$ such that $\Gamma(p) \parallel q$. \square

Proposition 8.6. *Suppose $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}^x$ with $\ell(p) = \ell(q) = n$. Assume*

$$\Omega(p) = \{\kappa_0, \dots, \kappa_{m-1}, x, z_{m+1}, \dots, z_{n-1}\},$$

$$\Omega(q) = \{\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{m-1}, x, z'_{m+1}, \dots, z'_{n-1}\},$$

are such that for all $i < m$, $\kappa_{z_i} = \kappa_{z'_i}$, for each $i \in [m+1, n-1]$, $\kappa_{i'} = \lambda_{i'}$, and for $i \in [0, n-1]$, $c_i^p \parallel c_i^q$. Then, there is some $\Gamma \in \text{Aut}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$ such that $\Gamma(p) \parallel q$. \square

9. THE FINAL MODEL

We are now turning to prove our main result. We continue with our setup from Section 8. Let G be \mathbb{R} -generic and $H = \Pi[G]$. Then H is \mathbb{P} -generic. Let $K_0 = K_0^G$ and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_G$ be as in Section 5. From the projection Π from Proposition 6.7, it is easy to see that $K_0, \mathcal{C} \in V[H]$, and they can be derived from the working parts and the collapse parts of the conditions in H .

Definition 9.1. Let $W := V[K_0, \mathcal{C}]$ be the smallest ZFC extension of V containing K_0 and \mathcal{C} , so $W \subseteq V[H] \subseteq V[G]$.

An element $a \in W$ has an \mathbb{R} -name \dot{a} which is invariant under automorphisms of \mathbb{R} which fix elements in K_0 and \mathcal{C} . In particular, for $\Gamma \in \text{Aut}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$, $\Gamma(\dot{a}) = \dot{a}$. Our main goal in this section is to derive several indecomposable ultrafilters in W .

To analyze further, recall that we defined

- $\mathbf{X} := \{x \mid \exists p \in G (x \in \Omega(p))\};$
- $K_0 := \{\kappa_x \mid x \in \mathbf{X}\};$
- $K_1 := \{((\kappa_x)^+)^V \mid x \in \mathbf{X}\};$
- $K_2 := \{((\kappa_x)^{++})^V \mid x \in \mathbf{X}\};$
- $\theta := \text{otp}(\mathbf{X}, \subsetneq).$

Note that \mathbf{X} is a cofinal chain in $(\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+), \subsetneq)$. Hence $\bigcup \mathbf{X} = \kappa^+$. Furthermore, $\{\sup(x) \mid x \in \mathbf{X}\}$ is a club in κ^+ . As for the cardinal structure of W , by Proposition 5.1 all cardinals below κ outside of $\{\omega, \omega_1\} \cup K_0 \cup K_1 \cup K_2$ are collapsed. In addition, by Theorem 6.17, all singular cardinals below κ are from $\text{acc}(K_0)$. Moreover, an analog of Proposition 5.6 holds in W , that is, **GCH** holds below κ .

9.1. Ultrafilters at successors of singulars. Fix λ a singular cardinal in W . We recall a few more facts:

- $(\lambda^+)^V$ is preserved in $V[H]$, but collapsed in $V[G]$. In particular, $(\lambda^+)^V$ is preserved in W .
- Let $x^\lambda \in \mathbf{X}$ be the unique x such that $\kappa_x = \lambda$ so that $\text{otp}(x^\lambda) = (\lambda^+)^V$.
- $\mathbf{X}^\lambda := \{x \in \mathbf{X} \mid x \subsetneq x^\lambda\}$ is a cofinal chain in $(\mathcal{P}_{\kappa(x^\lambda)}(x^\lambda), \subsetneq)$, so that $\bigcup \mathbf{X}^\lambda = x^\lambda$.
- $\{\sup(\pi_{x^\lambda}(x)) \mid x \in \mathbf{X}^\lambda\}$ is a club in $(\lambda^+)^V$.
- Let $\mathbf{X}_\lambda \subseteq \{\pi_{x^\lambda}^{-1}[x] \mid x \in \mathbf{X}^\lambda\}$ be a cofinal chain in $(\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\lambda^+)^V, \subsetneq)$ such that $\text{otp}(\mathbf{X}_\lambda, \subsetneq)$ is regular, namely, $\text{cf}(\lambda)^{V[G]}$. An easy analysis yields that $\text{cf}(\lambda)^{V[G]} = \text{cf}(\lambda)^W$. Denote $\theta_\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda)^W$.
- Let G^{x^λ} be the \mathbb{Q}_{0,x^λ} -generic which is generated by $\Pi_0^{0,x}[G]$, where the projection map is from Proposition 7.3. Note that $W \subseteq V[G^{x^\lambda}]$ and $\mathbf{X}_\lambda \in V[G^{x^\lambda}]$.
- Let $\langle x_\tau \mid \tau < \theta_\lambda \rangle$ be the \subsetneq -increasing enumeration of \mathbf{X}_λ .

Definition 9.2. In $V[G^{x^\lambda}]$, define a filter F_λ over $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\lambda^+)$ via:

$$F_\lambda := \{A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\lambda^+) \mid \{\tau < \theta_\lambda \mid x_\tau \in A\} \text{ is co-bounded in } \theta_\lambda\}.$$

Lemma 9.3. $F_\lambda \cap W \in W$.

Proof. We aim to find $F^* \in W$ such that $F^* = F_\lambda \cap W$. Define $F^* \in W$ as the collection of all A such that:

- (1) A admits a $\mathbb{Q} := \mathbb{Q}_{0,x^\lambda}$ -name \dot{A} that is forced to be in \dot{W} , and
- (2) there is $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that:
 - (a) $\lambda = \kappa_n^p$ for some $n < \ell(p)$;
 - (b) for every $i < n$, $x_i^p \in \mathbf{X}_\lambda$, and let $\tau_i < \theta_\lambda$ be such that $\kappa_{x_i^p} = \kappa_{\tau_i}$;
 - (c) $c_{-1} \in C_{-1}$, and for every $i \geq 0$, $c_i \in C_{\tau_i}$;⁸
 - (d) for all $i < \ell(p)$ and $\tau \in (\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$, there is $x \in \text{dom}(I_{i+1}^p)$ with $\kappa_x = \kappa_\tau$ and $I_{i+1}^p(x) \in C_\tau$;
 - (e) for every $\tau > \tau_{\ell(p)-1}$, there is $x \in \text{dom}(I_{\ell(p)}^p)$ with $\kappa_x = \kappa_\tau$ and $I_{\ell(p)}^p(x) \in C_\tau$;
 - (f) $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{“}\dot{A} \in \dot{F}_\lambda\text{”}$.

We first check that F^* is well-defined. Suppose $A \in W$ with a \mathbb{Q} -name \dot{A} which is invariant under automorphisms fixing the elements of K_0, \mathcal{C} , and there are $p_0, p_1 \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying (2)(a)–(e) as above, and $p_0 \Vdash \text{“}\dot{A} \in \dot{F}_\lambda\text{”}$, but $p_1 \Vdash \text{“}\dot{A} \notin \dot{F}_\lambda\text{”}$. By extending p_0 and p_1 if necessary using those x 's in those requirements, we may assume that $\ell(p_0) = \ell(p_1)$.

By Lemma 8.5, there is a $\Gamma \in \text{Aut}_\lambda(\lambda^+)$ such that $\Gamma(p_0) \parallel p_1$. Since Γ fixes \dot{K}_0 and $\dot{\mathcal{C}}$, we have that $\Gamma(\dot{A}) = \dot{A}$. Furthermore, since Γ fixes the tail below λ^+ , Γ does

⁸Recall the definition of C_{τ_i} in the beginning of Section 5, where we note that $C_{\tau_i} \in \mathcal{C}$, so it is in W .

not change the definition of \dot{F}_λ , and hence, $\Gamma(p_0) \Vdash \dot{A} \in \dot{F}_\lambda$. Now, if $p_2 \leq \Gamma(p_0), p_1$, so p_2 forces the opposite statements, which is a contradiction.

We now show that $F^* = F_\lambda \cap W$. If $A \in F^*$, then there is $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying the requirements (a)–(e), so $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \dot{A} \in \dot{F}_\lambda$. Find $p' \in G$ which decides “ $\dot{A} \in \dot{F}_\lambda$ ”, but since p' also satisfies (a)–(e), there is $\Gamma \in \text{Aut}_\lambda(\lambda^+)$ with $\Gamma(p) \parallel p'$, hence, p' must force that “ $\dot{A} \in \dot{F}_\lambda$ ”. Thus, $A \in F_\lambda \cap W$. The proof that $F_\lambda \cap W \subseteq F^*$ is simpler since we can pick p directly from G deciding “ $\dot{A} \in \dot{F}_\lambda$ ” and so p satisfies (a)–(e). \square

By the definition of F_λ , it is easy to show that $F_\lambda \cap W$ is a filter on $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\lambda^+)$. We now move on to define the following objects in W :

- $F'_\lambda := \{\{\text{sup}(x) \mid x \in A\} \mid A \in F_\lambda \cap W\}$;
- \mathcal{U}_λ is an ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\lambda^+)$ that extends $F_\lambda \cap W$, and
- \mathcal{W}_λ is an ultrafilter on λ^+ extending F'_λ .

Note that \mathcal{W}_λ is a uniform ultrafilter over λ^+ .

Lemma 9.4. *In W , for every $\rho \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$ which is regular in $V[G^{x^\lambda}]$, \mathcal{W}_λ is ρ -indecomposable.*

Proof. Let $\langle A_i \mid i < \rho \rangle$ be a partition of λ^+ , where $\rho \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$ is regular in $V[G]$. In $V[G]$, for $j < \text{cf}(\lambda)$, let $\eta(j)$ be the unique η such that $\text{sup}(x_j) \in A_\eta$. Since $\text{cf}(\lambda) < \rho$, there is an $\alpha < \rho$ such that for all $j < \rho$, $\eta(j) < \alpha$. Hence, $\bigcup_{i < \alpha} A_i \in F_\lambda \cap W$, so $\bigcup_{i < \alpha} A_i \in \mathcal{W}_\lambda$. \square

Corollary 9.5. *In W , for every $\rho \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$ that is regular in W , \mathcal{W}_λ is ρ -indecomposable.*

Proof. Let $\rho \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$. Let $y, x \in \mathbf{X}$ be such that $y \subsetneq x$, $\rho < \kappa_y$, and $\kappa_x = \lambda$. Let $\eta := \kappa_y$. Let $G^{y,x}$ be the filter generated by $\Pi_0^{y,x}[G]$. Then, $G^{y,x}$ is generic for $\mathbb{Q}^{y,x}$. Note that $\mathbf{X}_{\lambda,\eta} := \{z \in \mathbf{X}_\lambda \mid y \subsetneq z\}$ is in $V[G^{y,x}]$, and ρ is preserved in $V[G^{y,x}]$.

In $V[G^{y,x}]$, define a filter $F_{\lambda,\eta}$ over $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\lambda^+)$ by $X \in F_{\lambda,\eta}$ iff there is $\alpha < \theta_\lambda$ such that for every $\tau \in (\alpha, \theta_\lambda)$, with $x_\tau \in \mathbf{X}_{\lambda,\eta}$, $x_\tau \in X$.

Claim 9.5.1. $V[G^{y,x}] \cap F'_\lambda = F_{\lambda,\eta}$. \square

As a consequence, we have $W \cap F_\lambda = W \cap F_{\lambda,\eta}$. Therefore \mathcal{W}_λ expands $F_{\lambda,\eta}$. One can show that \mathcal{W}_λ is ρ -indecomposable in a similar manner to Lemma 9.4 (by working in $V[G^{y,x}]$). \square

Corollary 9.6. *Let $\rho \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$ be some cardinal in W . Then \mathcal{W}_λ is ρ -indecomposable in W .*

Proof. By Corollary 9.5 we can assume that ρ is singular in W and let $\eta := \text{cf}^W(\rho)$. Let $\langle A_i \mid i < \rho \rangle$ be a partition in W of λ^+ into ρ parts.

Let $x, y \in \mathbf{X}$ such that $\rho < \kappa_y < \kappa_x = \lambda$. Then in $W[G^{y,x}]$ let $f : \eta \rightarrow \rho$ denote the function $f(i) := j \iff \text{sup}(x_i) \in A_j$. But $\mathbb{Q}^{y,x}/W$ is $\leq^* \text{-}\kappa_y^+$ -closed and since $\rho < \kappa_y$ there are no new bounded subsets of ρ , hence $f \in W$. Therefore in W , let $a = f \text{``}\eta$ and then $\bigcap_{i \in a} A_i \in \mathcal{W}_\lambda$. \square

Lemma 9.7. *For every $\eta \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$ that is regular in $V[G]$, $|\text{Ult}(\eta, \mathcal{U}_\lambda)| = \eta$.*

Proof. Work in W . Let $f : \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\lambda^+) \rightarrow \eta$. Define in $V[G]$ a function $g_f : \text{cf}(\lambda) \rightarrow \eta$ by $g_f(\gamma) = f(x_\gamma)$. Note that for f, f' , if g_f and $g_{f'}$ are equal on their tails, then $[f]_{\mathcal{U}_\lambda} = [f']_{\mathcal{U}_\lambda}$. In $V[G]$, define F as follows. For each $g : \text{cf}(\lambda) \rightarrow \eta$, if $g = g_f$ for some f , let $F(g) = [f]_{\mathcal{U}_\lambda}$, otherwise, $F(g) = 0$. We claim that $\text{Im}(F) \supseteq \text{Ult}(\eta, \mathcal{U}_\lambda)$. For each $[f]_{\mathcal{U}_\lambda}$, we show that $F(g_f) = [f]_{\mathcal{U}_\lambda}$. The point is that if $g_f = g_{f'}$, then $[f']_{\mathcal{U}_\lambda} = [f]_{\mathcal{U}_\lambda}$. Hence, in $V[G]$, $|\text{Ult}(\eta, \mathcal{U}_\lambda)| \leq \eta^{\text{cf}(\lambda)} = \eta$. Then this is also true in W . \square

A similar proof yields the following:

Lemma 9.8. *For every $\eta \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$ that is regular in W , $|\text{Ult}(\eta, \mathcal{U}_\lambda)| = \eta$. \square*

By tweaking the proof in Lemma 9.7 by redefining g_f to $g_f(\gamma) = f(\sup x_\gamma)$, we yield the following.

Lemma 9.9. *If $\lambda \leq \kappa$ is singular and $\eta \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$ is regular (in W), then $|\text{Ult}(\eta, \mathcal{W}_\lambda)| = \eta$. \square*

9.2. Summing up. We now conclude the main theorem.

Theorem 9.10. *In W , for every singular cardinal $\lambda \leq \kappa$, all of the following hold:*

- (1) GCH;
- (2) \mathcal{W}_λ is an ultrafilter on λ^+ that is ρ -indecomposable for any cardinal $\rho \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$. Furthermore, for any regular $\eta \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$, $|\text{Ult}(\eta, \mathcal{W}_\lambda)| = \eta$;
- (3) \mathcal{U}_λ is an ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\lambda^+)$ such that for every regular cardinal $\eta \in (\text{cf}(\lambda), \lambda)$, \mathcal{U}_λ is η -indecomposable and $|\text{Ult}(\eta, \mathcal{U}_\lambda)| = \eta$.

In particular, since we start with $o^{\vec{U}}(\kappa) = \kappa^{++}$ in V , we get that $W' := V_\kappa^W$ is a ZFC model such that for every singular cardinal λ , (1)–(3) holds. \square

Additional features of W' are given by Lemma 2.5 and Corollaries 2.13 and 2.15.

10. CONCLUDING REMARKS

A variation of our final model in which GCH fails and moreover SCH fails everywhere may be obtained, as follows. First, in Section 3, instead of starting with a model V of GCH, we start with a model in which κ is a κ^{++} -supercompact and $2^\kappa = 2^{\kappa^+} = \kappa^{++}$ (this can be achieved by a standard Easton-support iteration). Consequently, in Lemma 3.4, for every $\alpha \in \text{dom}(o^{\vec{U}})$, $2^\alpha = 2^{\alpha^+} = \alpha^{++}$. Consequently, Proposition 5.6 would assert that, in $V[G]$, for every $\tau \in \text{acc}(\theta)$, $2^{\kappa_\tau} = (\kappa_\tau)^+$, and for every $\tau \in \text{nacc}(\theta)$, $2^{\kappa_\tau} = (\kappa_\tau)^{++}$. Consequently, the last clause of Theorem 6.17 would assert that, in $V[H]$, for every $\alpha \in \bar{K}_0$, $2^\alpha = \alpha^{++}$. Consequently, the model W of Section 9 satisfies that $2^\mu = \mu^{++}$ for every $\mu \in K_0$, and $2^\mu = \mu^+$ for every infinite cardinal $\mu \in \kappa \setminus K_0$. In particular, in the final model W' , every singular cardinal λ is a strong limit satisfying $2^\lambda = \lambda^{++}$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The first author was partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant agreement 1216/18). The second author is the recipient of the Maria Pogonowska-Proner award for 2024 and is partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant agreement 1967/21). The third author is partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant agreement 203/22) and by the European Research Council (grant agreement ERC-2018-StG 802756).

The main result of this paper was presented by the second author at the *120 Years of Choice* conference in Leeds July 2024. We would like to thank the organizers for this opportunity, and the participants (especially Gitik) for a stimulating feedback.

REFERENCES

- [BM86] Shai Ben-David and Menachem Magidor. The weak \square^* is really weaker than the full \square . *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 51(4):1029–1033, 1986.
- [EH18] Monroe Eskew and Yair Hayut. On the consistency of local and global versions of Chang’s Conjecture. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 370:2879–2905, 2018.
- [Eis12] Todd Eisworth. Simultaneous reflection and impossible ideals. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 77(4):1325–1338, 2012.
- [Git10] Moti Gitik. On normal precipitous ideals. *Israel J. Math.*, 175:191–219, 2010.
- [Haj85] András Hajnal. The chromatic number of the product of two \aleph_1 -chromatic graphs can be countable. *Combinatorica*, 5(2):137–139, 1985.
- [Haj04] András Hajnal. On the chromatic number of graphs and set systems. In *PIMS Distinguished Chair Lectures*, pages 1–25. University of Calgary, 2004.
- [Hed66] T. Hedetniemi. *Homomorphisms of graphs and automata*. Technical Report 03 105-44-T, 1966. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Michigan.
- [IR24] Tanmay Inamdar and Assaf Rinot. Was Ulam right? III: Indecomposable ideals. In preparation, 2024. <http://assafrinot.com/paper/59>
- [JM12] Istvan Juhász and Menachem Magidor. On the maximal resolvability of monotonically normal spaces. *Israel J. Math.*, 192(2):637–666, 2012.
- [Kan76] A. Kanamori. Weakly normal filters and irregular ultrafilters. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 220:393–399, 1976.
- [Kru07] John Krueger. Radin Forcing and Its Iterations. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 46(3):223–252, Apr 2007.
- [LRZ24] Chris Lambie-Hanson, Assaf Rinot, and Jing Zhang. Squares, ultrafilters and forcing axioms. Submitted January 2024. <http://assafrinot.com/paper/64>
- [Mag77] Menachem Magidor. On the singular cardinals problem i. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 28:1–31, 1977.
- [Pri68] Karel Libor Prikry. Changing measurables into accessible cardinals. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1968.
- [Rin17] Assaf Rinot. Hedetniemi’s conjecture for uncountable graphs. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 19(1):285–298, 2017.
- [RS20] Dilip Raghavan and Saharon Shelah. A Small Ultrafilter Number at Smaller Cardinals. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 59:325–334, 2020.
- [RYY24] Assaf Rinot, Zhixing You, and Jiachen Yuan. Ketonen’s question and other cardinal sins. Submitted November 2024. <http://assafrinot.com/paper/69>
- [She83] Michael Sheard. Indecomposable ultrafilters over small large cardinals. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 48(4):1000–1007, 1983.
- [She90] Saharon Shelah. Incompactness for chromatic numbers of graphs. In *A tribute to Paul Erdős*, pages 361–371. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [Sil74] Jack H. Silver. On the singular cardinals problem. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vancouver, B. C.*, page 265–268, 1974.
- [Sou88] Lajos Soukup. On chromatic number of product of graphs. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.*, 29(1):1–12, 1988.
- [Ung15] Spencer Unger. Compactness for the chromatic number at \aleph_{ω_1} . Unpublished note, December 2015. <https://www.math.toronto.edu/sunger/chromatic-compactness.pdf>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, FACULTY OF SCIENCE CHULALONGKORN
UNIVERSITY, BANGKOK 10330 THAILAND
Email address: jir.sittinon@gmail.com

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, ISRAEL
URL: <https://inbarorendoesmaths.website>
Email address: inbar.oren2@mail.huji.ac.il

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT-GAN 5290002, ISRAEL.
URL: <http://www.assafrinot.com>