

# GALVIN'S CONJECTURE AND WEAKLY PRECIPITOUS IDEALS

TODD EISWORTH

ABSTRACT. We investigate a combinatorial game on  $\omega_1$  and show that mild large cardinal assumptions imply that every normal ideal on  $\omega_1$  satisfies a weak version of precipitousness. As an application, we show that the Raghavan-Todorćević proof [8] of a longstanding conjecture of Galvin (done assuming the existence of a Woodin cardinal) can be pushed through under much weaker large cardinal assumptions.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**Motivation.** This paper grows out of a recent result in Ramsey Theory due to Raghavan and Todorćević [8]. From the existence of a Woodin cardinal, they establish a partition relation for uncountable sets of reals first conjectured by Galvin in the 1970s and prove

If  $X$  is an uncountable set of reals and we color the (un-ordered) pairs from  $X$  with finitely many colors, then  $X$  contains a subset homeomorphic to the rationals on which at most two colors appear.

We will refer to the above statement as *Galvin's Conjecture*, although in Baumgartner's [1] the question is formulated only for the special case  $X = \mathbb{R}$ .

The value “two” in the phrase “at most two values” is critical: a classical construction of Sierpiński [12] provides a coloring  $c : [\mathbb{R}]^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  that takes on both colors on any subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  containing a subset order-isomorphic to the integers. Similarly, the restriction to uncountable sets of reals is necessary as well, as Baumgartner showed that there is a coloring of  $[\mathbb{Q}]^2$  with countably many colors that takes on all values on any subset of  $\mathbb{Q}$  homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{Q}$ . In contrast, Galvin showed earlier in unpublished work that for any coloring of  $[\mathbb{Q}]^2$  with finitely many colors, we can find a set of rationals that is order-isomorphic (though not necessarily homeomorphic) to  $\mathbb{Q}$  on which the coloring takes on at most two values. Thus, Galvin's Conjecture holds if we replace “homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{Q}$ ” with the weaker requirement “order-isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Q}$ ”, and Baumgartner's work shows that there is potentially a big difference between the two statements.

For more general topological spaces, unpublished work of Todorćević and Weiss shows that the result of Baumgartner mentioned above can be extended to the broader class of  $\sigma$ -discrete metric spaces: if  $X$  is a  $\sigma$ -discrete metric space, then there is a function  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow \omega$  that takes on every value on any subset of  $X$  homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{Q}$ . The authors of [8] were also able to extend their positive

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E02, 03E55.

*Key words and phrases.* Ramsey theory, partition relations, large cardinals.

This research was partly supported by NSF grant DMS-2400200. The author also thanks Tanmay Inamdar for pointing out an error in a previously circulated version of this manuscript.

answer to Galvin’s Conjecture to a much more extensive (and essentially optimal) class of topological spaces as long as there are enough large cardinals around.

**Theorem 1** (Raghavan-Todorčević [8]). *If there is a proper class of Woodin cardinals (or a single strongly compact cardinal) then the following statements are equivalent for a metrizable space  $X$*

- $X$  is not  $\sigma$ -discrete.
- Given  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow l$  with  $l < \omega$  there is a  $Y \subseteq X$  homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{Q}$  on which  $c$  assumes at most two values.

Under the same large cardinal assumptions, they show that the second statement in the above theorem holds for the broader class of regular spaces with a point-countable base that are not left-separated.

**New Results.** It is natural to ask about the role of large cardinals in their result. Their proof implicitly relies on the the existence of a generic elementary embedding with well-founded target model, so it is natural to ask if one can make do with such an embedding whose target model is known only to have a sufficient long well-founded initial segment because such embeddings exist under much weaker assumptions. We show this is possible by connecting their proof back to some old ideas of Shelah [9]. What we do here is show that under weak large cardinals assumptions that normal ideals on  $\omega_1$  automatically possess a weak form of precipitousness that is defined in terms of a two-player game, and then show how their construction can be modified to work with this game. The point is that our game is played with objects of small rank rather than with conditions in a large notion of forcing, and this allows us to reach the needed conclusion from weaker assumptions than their proof requires.

Note that Inamdar [5] has recently announced that the Raghavan-Todorčević Theorem can be obtained in ZFC, so this particular use of our techniques is potentially less interesting than when the work was originally done in the summer of 2023. In light of this development, we will limit our attention to Galvin’s original question concerning uncountable sets of reals rather than obtaining the most general result. This allows us to demonstrate how our approach works while minimizing the background required of a potential reader, and to focus the exposition of the theorem in its most concrete setting.

## 2. IDEALS, FILTERS, AND GENERIC ELEMENTARY EMBEDDINGS

We assume the reader has a basic familiarity with normal filters and ideals on  $\omega_1$ . If  $J$  is an ideal on a set  $X$ , then we let  $J^*$  denote the dual filter, and let  $J^+$  denote the collection of  $J$ -positive subsets of  $X$ . If  $A$  is a  $J$ -positive subset of  $X$ , then we define the restriction of  $J$  to  $A$  as

$$(2.1) \quad J \upharpoonright A := \{B \subseteq X : A \cap B \in J\}.$$

Note that  $J \upharpoonright A$  is an ideal on  $X$ , and  $A$  is in the filter dual to  $J \upharpoonright A$ .

We will use phrases such as “for  $J$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ” to mean that the set of such  $x$  is in  $J^*$ , and similarly “for a  $J$ -positive set of  $x \in X$ ” means that the set of such  $x$  is not in  $J$ . We also abbreviate these statements using quantifiers, so for example if  $\phi$  is some formula then

$$(\forall^J x \in X)\phi(x) \iff \{x \in X : \phi(x)\} \in J^*,$$

and

$$(\exists^J x \in X)\phi(x) \iff \{x \in X : \phi(x)\} \notin J.$$

**Generic elementary embeddings.** There is a vast literature concerning generic elementary embeddings in set theory, with Foreman's article [4] serving as a comprehensive resource for much of the material. Our arguments require only a vestigial piece of this theory, and we sketch what we need below.

Suppose  $\mathbb{P}$  is a notion of forcing, and let  $G$  be a generic subset of  $\mathbb{P}$ . In the extension  $V[G]$ , the subsets of  $\omega_1^V$  from the ground model are a Boolean algebra

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{P}(\omega_1)^V = \{A \subseteq \omega_1^V : A \in V\}.$$

Note that the ground model's  $\omega_1$  may be countable in the extension, but the Boolean algebra  $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)^V$  still makes sense as a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1^V)$ .

Next, assume that  $\dot{D}$  is a  $\mathbb{P}$ -name for an ultrafilter on  $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)^V$ , and let  $D$  be the interpretation of  $\dot{D}$  in  $V[G]$ . Given functions  $f$  and  $g$  with domain  $\omega_1^V$  from the ground model, we can check whether they agree on a set in  $D$ , and since  $D$  measures any subset of  $\omega_1^V$  from the ground model this induces an equivalence relation on such functions. We let  $f/D$  denote the equivalence class of  $f$ .

Similarly, given two functions  $f$  and  $g$  from  $V$  that map  $\omega_1^V$  to the ordinals, we can compare them modulo  $D$  and declare

$$(2.3) \quad f \leq_D g \iff \{\alpha < \omega_1 : f(\alpha) \leq g(\alpha)\} \in D.$$

Since  $D$  is an ultrafilter on  $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)^V$ , this relation is a linear preorder of such functions, and it induces a linear ordering of the  $D$ -equivalence classes of such functions.

What will be important for us is guaranteeing that this linear ordering obtained above from the name  $\dot{D}$  has a sufficiently long well-ordered initial segment, and this is where large cardinal assumptions are useful. The following notation of Shelah [10] captures what we need.

**Definition 2.1.** Suppose  $\mathbb{P}$  is a notion of forcing, and let  $\dot{D}$  be a  $\mathbb{P}$ -name for an ultrafilter on the Boolean algebra  $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)^V$ .

- (1)  $t = (\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is *pre-nice* if  $\mathbb{P}$  has a strongest condition  $1_{\mathbb{P}}$ , and for each  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ ,

$$(2.4) \quad J_p^t := \{A \subseteq \omega_1 : p \Vdash \check{A} \notin \dot{D}\}$$

is a normal ideal on  $\omega_1$ .

- (2) Given a cardinal  $\kappa$ , we say that  $t = (\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is *nice to  $\kappa$*  if  $t$  is pre-nice and

$$(2.5) \quad \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} (\omega_1 \kappa)^V \text{ is pre-wellordered by } \leq_{\dot{D}}.$$

- (3) Given a function  $f : \omega_1 \rightarrow \text{On}$  we let  $\text{ext}(f)$  (the *extension* of  $f$ ) be a  $\mathbb{P}$ -name defined as

$$(2.6) \quad \text{ext}(f) := \{g/\dot{D} : g \in (\omega_1 \text{On})^V \wedge g <_{\dot{D}} f\}.$$

For set-theorists, if we use  $\dot{D}$  to generate an elementary embedding  $j : V \rightarrow \omega_1 V/\dot{D}$  in  $V[G]$  then  $f/\dot{D}$  will be a (possibly ill-founded) ordinal in the target model, and  $\text{ext}(f)$  is just a name for the predecessors of  $f$  in the corresponding order.

**Proposition 2.2.** Suppose  $\mathbb{P}$  is a notion of forcing and  $\dot{D}$  is a  $\mathbb{P}$ -name for an ultrafilter on the Boolean algebra  $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)^V$ .

- (1) Given a  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ , a set  $A$  is  $J_p$ -positive if and only if there is a  $q \leq p$  such that  $q \Vdash \dot{A} \in \dot{D}$ .
- (2)  $(\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is pre-nice if and only if every condition forces that  $\dot{D}$  names a  $V$ -normal and  $V$ -complete ultrafilter on  $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)^V$ .
- (3)  $(\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is nice to  $\kappa$  if and only if for any  $f : \omega_1 \rightarrow \kappa$  in the ground model, every condition forces that  $\text{ext}(f)$  is well-ordered by  $<_{\dot{D}}$ .
- (4) If  $(\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is nice to  $\kappa$  and  $f : \omega_1 \rightarrow \kappa$  in the ground model, then the set of conditions that decide the order-type of  $\text{ext}(f)$  is dense in  $\mathbb{P}$ .

*Proof.* All of these are easy using properties of the forcing relation.  $\square$

**Discussion 2.3.** For those with a more solid grounding in this material, if  $(\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is nice to  $\kappa$  then forcing with  $\mathbb{P}$  adds a generic elementary embedding with critical point  $\omega_1$  that is well-founded out to the image of  $\kappa$ . Any function mapping  $\omega_1$  to  $\kappa$  in the ground model will represent an actual (well-founded) ordinal in the target model, and the set of conditions that decide which ordinal this is will be dense in  $\mathbb{P}$ .

### 3. A GAME FROM AN EMBEDDING

The Raghavan-Todorćević solution to Galvin’s conjecture relies on playing a game with conditions in the countable stationary tower forcing  $\mathbb{Q}_{<\delta}$  with  $\delta$  a Woodin cardinal. The property of the game they use relies on the fact that this forcing adds a generic elementary embedding with critical point  $\omega_1$  and a well-founded target model. In this section, we develop a game that is strong enough to allow their argument to be pushed through, but weak enough so that the needed properties hold in the presence of a Ramsey cardinal rather than requiring a Woodin.

**The game.** The game we want to use is a variation on an idea that has appeared several places in the literature. What we do here is to implement the *weakly precipitous* game of Jech [6], except we make use of a parameter. The parameters we use are just families  $\mathbb{J}$  of normal ideals on  $\omega_1$  satisfying

- $\mathbb{J}$  has a  $\subseteq$ -minimal element  $\min(\mathbb{J})$ , and
- for each  $J \in \mathbb{J}$  and  $J$ -positive set  $A$ , there is an ideal in  $\mathbb{J}$  extending  $J \upharpoonright A$ .

We will (temporarily) refer to such collections  $\mathbb{J}$  as “suitable parameters” or just “parameters”, and for each such parameter  $\mathbb{J}$  we will have an associated game  $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{J})$ . These parameters form the 2nd level of a hierarchy of objects used by Shelah<sup>1</sup> in his study of generalizations of the Galvin-Hajnal theorem in cardinal arithmetic. Donder and Levinski use similar objects —  $\kappa$ -plain collections of filters — in their work in [3].

Clearly the collection of ALL normal ideals on  $\omega_1$  is a suitable parameter, and if  $t = (\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is pre-nice then the collection of ideals  $\{J_p^t : p \in \mathbb{P}\}$  is a suitable parameter as well. Finally, note that if  $\mathbb{J}$  is a suitable parameter and  $J \in \mathbb{J}$ , then  $\{I \in \mathbb{J} : J \subseteq I\}$  is also a suitable parameter.

**Definition 3.1.** Given a suitable parameter  $\mathbb{J}$ , the game  $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{J})$  is a contest of length  $\omega$  between two players Empty and Non-empty. At a stage  $n$ , Empty will be selecting a subset  $A_n$  of  $\omega_1$  and Non-empty will respond by choosing an ideal  $J_n$  from  $\mathbb{J}$ . The rules are as follows:

<sup>1</sup>With the collection of parameters denoted simply  $OB_2$  in [10] and [11].

- (1) For bookkeeping purposes, set  $J_{-1}$  to be  $\min(\mathbb{J})$ .
- (2) Given  $J_n$ , **Empty** will select a  $J_n$ -positive set  $A_{n+1}$ , and **Non-empty** will respond by choosing some  $J_{n+1} \in \mathbb{J}$  that extends  $J_n \restriction A_{n+1}$ .
- (3) After  $\omega$  stages, **Empty** is declared the winner if  $\bigcap_{n < \omega} A_n = \emptyset$ .

**Definition 3.2.** We say a that a family  $\mathbb{J}$  of normal ideals on  $\omega_1$  is *weakly precipitous* if  $\mathbb{J}$  is a suitable parameter and **Empty** does not have a winning strategy in the game  $\mathfrak{D}(\min(\mathbb{J}))$ . We say that  $\mathbb{J}$  is *everywhere weakly precipitous* if  $\mathbb{J}$  if  $\{I \in \mathbb{J} : I \supseteq J\}$  is weakly precipitous for each  $J \in \mathbb{J}$ , and we refer to the corresponding version of the game simply as “*playing  $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{J})$  beyond  $J$* ” rather than introducing more notation.

**Discussion 3.3.** If  $J$  is a normal ideal on  $\omega_1$  and we take  $\mathbb{J}$  to be the parameter consisting of all normal ideals on  $\omega_1$  that extend  $J$ , then we arrive at the *weakly precipitous* game of Jech [6], and he calls a normal ideal on  $\omega_1$  *weakly precipitous* if **Empty** does not have a winning strategy in the corresponding game, and uses an argument of Shelah to show that the non-stationary ideal on  $\omega_1$  is weakly precipitous in the presence of a Ramsey cardinal. Note that if  $\mathbb{J}$  is a weakly precipitous family of ideals, then the ideal  $\min(\mathbb{J})$  will be weakly precipitous in this sense.

The game is also related to the  $\mathbb{Q}_{<\delta}$ -game used by Raghavan and Todorcević, and the *precipitous game* of Galvin characterizing precipitous ideals. The difference is that these games involve making moves with conditions in a notion of forcing, while  $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{J})$  works with the “projections” of forcing conditions on objects of small rank. This is why we can get away with partially well-founded embeddings in our argument: the game is being played with small objects, but **Non-empty** can use the (potentially quite large) notion of forcing to defeat any purported winning strategy for **Empty**.

**Theorem 2.** *If  $t = (\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is nice to  $\kappa = \beth_2(\omega_1)^+ = (2^{2^{\aleph_1}})^+$ , then  $\mathbb{J}^t = \{J_p^t : p \in \mathbb{P}\}$  is an everywhere weakly precipitous family of ideals.*

*Proof.* Given  $J \in \mathbb{J} = \mathbb{J}^t$ , assume by way of contradiction that **Empty** has a winning strategy in the version of  $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{J})$  played past  $J$ . For each  $\alpha < \omega_1$ , let  $T_\alpha$  consist of all finite sequences  $\sigma$  of odd length that comprise finite partial plays  $\langle A_0, F_0, \dots, A_{n-1}, F_{n-1}, A_n \rangle$  in the game where **Empty** is using her winning strategy, but for which  $\alpha$  has not yet been eliminated, that is, with  $\alpha \in A_n$ . Since **Empty** is using a winning strategy, we know  $T_\alpha$  is a well-founded tree and there is a corresponding ranking function of the elements of  $T_\alpha$ . For  $\sigma \in T_\alpha$  we let  $\text{rk}_\alpha(\sigma)$  denote the rank of  $\sigma$  in  $T_\alpha$ . There are at most  $\beth_2(\omega_1)$  moves available to each player in total, so this bounds the cardinality of  $T_\alpha$  and we conclude

$$(3.1) \quad \text{rk}_\alpha(\sigma) < \kappa$$

for any  $\alpha \in A_n$  and  $\sigma \in T_\alpha$ .

Fix  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  with  $J = J_p$ . The second player will work to defeat the winning strategy by building a decreasing sequence  $\langle p_n : n < \omega \rangle$  of conditions in  $\mathbb{P}$  below  $p$ , arranging that his move  $J_n$  will be the ideal  $J_{p_n} \in \mathbb{J}$ . Assume we have been playing a game in which **Empty** is using her strategy, and we have arrived at the sequence  $\sigma = \langle A_0, F_0, \dots, A_n, F_n, A_{n+1} \rangle$ . Since **Empty** is using her winning strategy, for each  $\alpha \in A_{n+1}$  the sequence  $\sigma$  is in the tree  $T_\alpha$  and therefore has been assigned corresponding rank less than  $\kappa$ . Putting this together gives us a single function

function  $\rho_{n+1} : \omega_1 \rightarrow \kappa$  defined by

$$(3.2) \quad \rho_{n+1}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \text{rk}_\alpha(\sigma) & \text{if } \alpha \in A_{n+1}, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Non-empty** now extends  $p_n$  to a condition  $q \in \mathbb{P}$  such that  $D_q$  extends  $J_n \upharpoonright A_{n+1}$ , and then chooses  $p_{n+1} \leq q$  deciding the order-type of  $\text{ext}(\rho_{n+1})$ . Finally, he sets  $J_{n+1} = J_{p_{n+1}}$  and play continues.

We show this leads to a contradiction. Assume that **Non-empty** plays as described above, so at stage  $n$  there is an ordinal  $\delta_n$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad p_n \Vdash \text{otp}(\text{ext}(\rho_n)) = \delta_n.$$

For each  $\alpha \in A_{n+1}$  we know  $\rho_{n+1}(\alpha) < \rho_n(\alpha)$  because by advancing our game we move further down the tree  $T_\alpha$ . Since

$$(3.4) \quad p_{n+1} \Vdash A_{n+1} \in \dot{D},$$

it follows that  $p_{n+1}$  forces  $\rho_{n+1} <_{\dot{D}} \rho_n$ , and therefore  $\delta_{n+1} < \delta_n$ . This leads to an immediate contradiction.  $\square$

We finish this section by noting that in the presence of a Ramsey cardinal, every normal ideal on  $\omega_1$  is weakly precipitous. This result is implicit in Chapter IV of [11], although it is somewhat hidden by the generality in which Shelah works. We assume more background knowledge than needed in the rest of the paper, but the proof consists of chaining together several standard facts from [4] and [7] about generalized stationary sets. All we will need to know about Ramsey cardinals is that they are *completely Jónsson*: if  $\lambda$  is a Ramsey cardinal and  $S$  is a stationary subset of  $[H(\theta)]^\omega$  for some sufficiently large regular  $\theta < \lambda$ , then the set

$$(3.5) \quad T := \{X \subseteq V_\lambda : T \cap H(\theta) \in S \text{ and } |T \cap \lambda| = \lambda\}$$

is stationary (in the generalized sense) in  $[V_\lambda]^\lambda$ . Larson [7] contains details about the relevance of completely Jónsson cardinals to stationary tower forcing, and for a proof (Remark 2.3.3) that Ramsey cardinals satisfy this property.

**Theorem 3.** *If there is a Ramsey cardinal, then the set  $\mathbb{J}$  of all normal ideals on  $\omega_1$  is everywhere weakly precipitous. In particular, if there is a Ramsey cardinal then every normal ideal on  $\omega_1$  is weakly precipitous.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $J$  is a normal ideal on  $\omega_1$ , and let  $\lambda$  be a Ramsey cardinal. It suffices to show that there is a pair  $t = (\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  that is nice to  $\lambda$  (which is certainly much larger than  $\beth_2(\omega_1)^+$ ) such that  $J = \min(\mathbb{J}^t)$ . Working in  $V_\lambda$ , we apply a theorem due to Burke [2] to represent  $J$  as the canonical projection of the non-stationary ideal. Following the presentation of Burke's theorem from Foreman [4], if  $\theta$  is a sufficiently large regular cardinal, and we define  $S_J$  to be the collection of countably elementary submodels of  $H(\theta)$  containing  $J$  for which

$$(3.6) \quad M \cap \omega_1 \notin \bigcup (M \cap J),$$

then  $S_J$  is a stationary subset of  $[H(\theta)]^\omega$  and the canonical projection sending a model  $M$  to the ordinal  $M \cap \omega_1$  witnesses that  $J$  is the Rudin-Keisler projection of the non-stationary ideal restricted to  $S_J$ .

Now we use the fact that  $\lambda$  is completely Jónsson to “inflate” the elements of  $S_J$  to models of size  $\lambda$ : the set

$$(3.7) \quad T_J := \{X \subseteq V_\lambda : X \cap H(\theta) \in S_J \text{ and } |X \cap \lambda| = \lambda\}$$

is stationary in  $[V_\lambda]^\lambda$ . Now we force with let  $\mathbb{P} = \mathcal{P}(T_J)/\text{NS}$ , and let  $G$  be a generic subset of  $\mathbb{P}$ . Standard arguments tell us that  $G$  will project to a  $V$ -ultrafilter  $D$  on  $\omega_1$ , via the correspondence

$$(3.8) \quad A \in G \iff \{X \cap \omega_1 : X \in A\} \in D.$$

If we let  $\dot{D}$  be a name for this object, then  $t = (\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is a pre-nice pair with  $J$  equal to  $\min(\mathbb{J}^t)$ .

The argument that this pre-nice pair is nice to  $\lambda$  is a venerable one, attributed to Magidor in [6] and [9]. The fact that  $|X \cap \lambda| = \lambda$  and  $X \cap \omega_1 < \omega_1$  for  $X \in T_J$  is critical. Given a function  $f : \omega_1 \rightarrow \lambda$ , define a function  $\hat{f}$  on  $T_J$  by setting

$$(3.9) \quad \hat{f}(X) = \text{the } f(X \cap \omega_1)^{\text{th}} \text{ element of the increasing enumeration of } X \cap \lambda.$$

Note that  $\hat{f}(X)$  is an element of  $X$  as  $|X \cap \lambda| = \lambda$  and  $X \cap \omega_1 < \omega_1$ . A density argument using the normality of the non-stationary ideal on  $T_J$  tells us that  $\hat{f}$  will be constant (say with value  $\delta_f < \lambda$ ) on a set in  $G$  for any  $f : \omega_1 \rightarrow \lambda$  in the ground model. Given two such functions  $f$  and  $g$  from  $V$ , if  $f <_D g$  in  $V[G]$ , then  $\hat{f} <_G \hat{g}$  and so  $\delta_f < \delta_g$ . From this we conclude that  $t$  is nice to  $\lambda$ .  $\square$

#### 4. SATURATED PAIRS AND WINNING IDEALS

Our next move is to bring in a coloring and see how some of the arguments from [8] can be extended to work with the framework from the last section. We remind the reader of our promise to focus only on the case where we partition an uncountable set of reals. Thus, we fix the following context for our discussion.

**Context 4.1.** Fix a coloring  $c : [\omega_1]^2 \rightarrow l$  with  $l < \omega$ , and assume  $\mathcal{T}$  is a topology on  $\omega_1$  such that  $X = (\omega_1, \mathcal{T})$  homeomorphic to a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Our initial steps are straightforward modifications of some definitions from [8].

**Definition 4.2.** Suppose  $J$  is an ideal on  $\omega_1$ .

- (1) Given  $\alpha < \omega_1$ , a  $J$ -positive subset  $B$  of  $\omega_1$ , and a color  $i < l$ , we say that  $\alpha$  is  $i$ -large in  $B$  with respect to  $J$  if the set of  $\beta \in B$  with  $c(\alpha, \beta) = i$  is  $J$ -positive.
- (2) A pair  $\langle A, B \rangle$  of  $J$ -positive sets is said to be *weakly  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated over  $J$*  if the set of  $\alpha \in A$  that are  $i$ -large in  $B$  with respect to  $J$  is  $J$ -positive, and the set of  $\beta \in B$  that are  $j$ -large in  $A$  with respect to  $J$  is  $J$ -positive, that is, if

$$(4.1) \quad (\exists^J \alpha \in A)(\exists^J \beta \in B) [c(\alpha, \beta) = i],$$

and

$$(4.2) \quad (\exists^J \beta \in B)(\exists^J \alpha \in A) [c(\alpha, \beta) = j].$$

- (3) A pair  $\langle A, B \rangle$  of  $J$ -positive sets is  *$\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated over  $J$*  if for any  $J$ -positive  $C \subseteq A$  and  $D \subseteq B$ , the pair  $\langle C, D \rangle$  is weakly  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated over  $J$ . We may say that  $\langle C, D \rangle$  is a  $J$ -positive refinement of  $\langle A, B \rangle$ .

**Lemma 4.3** (Facts about Weak Saturation). Let  $J$  be an ideal on  $\omega_1$ , and assume  $A$  and  $B$  are  $J$ -positive sets.

- (1) There is a pair of colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$  such that  $\langle A, B \rangle$  is weakly  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated over  $J$ .
- (2) If  $\langle A, B \rangle$  is NOT weakly  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated over  $J$ , then the same is true for any pair of  $J$ -positive sets  $\langle C, D \rangle$  with  $C \subseteq A$  and  $D \subseteq B$ .

*Proof.* Left to reader. □

**Lemma 4.4** (Facts about saturation). Under the same assumptions as the previous proposition:

- (1) If  $\langle A, B \rangle$  is  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated over  $J$ , then so is any  $J$ -positive refinement of  $\langle A, B \rangle$ .
- (2) If  $\langle A, B \rangle$  is  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated over  $J$ , then  $J$ -almost every  $\alpha \in A$  is  $i$ -large in  $B$ , and  $J$ -almost every  $\beta \in B$  is  $j$ -large in  $A$ .
- (3) For some choice of  $\langle i, j \rangle$  there is a pair of  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated sets over  $J$ .

*Proof.* The first statement is immediate from the definition, and easily implies the second. If (3) fails, then for any pair  $\langle A, B \rangle$  of  $J$ -positive sets and any pair of colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$ , we can find a  $J$ -positive refinement of  $\langle A, B \rangle$  that is not weakly  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated over  $J$ . Since this state of affairs is inherited by any further  $J$ -positive refinements, by making repeated extensions and working through all pairs of colors, we arrive at a pair of  $J$ -positive sets that fail to be weakly  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated for EVERY choice of  $\langle i, j \rangle$ . But then this contradicts part (1) of the previous lemma, and we are done. □

The preceding lemmas are both taken almost directly from [8]. We need to extend things a bit by lifting the concept of  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturation from pairs of sets to pairs of normal ideals, as in the following definition:

**Definition 4.5.** Let  $\langle i, j \rangle$  be a pair of colors. We say that a pair  $\langle J_0, J_1 \rangle$  of normal ideals on  $\omega_1$  is  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated if for any normal extensions  $I_0$  and  $I_1$  of  $J_0$  and  $J_1$  respectively, we have

$$(4.3) \quad (\forall^{I_0} \alpha < \omega_1)(\exists^{I_1} \beta < \omega_1) [c(\alpha, \beta) = i]$$

and

$$(4.4) \quad (\forall^{I_1} \beta < \omega_1)(\exists^{I_0} \alpha < \omega_1) [c(\alpha, \beta) = j].$$

Now the key point: we can use normality to see that  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pairs of sets give rise to  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pairs of ideals in the natural way.

**Lemma 4.6.** Suppose  $J$  is a normal ideal on  $\omega_1$  and  $\langle A, B \rangle$  is a pair of  $J$ -positive sets that is  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated over  $J$ . Then  $\langle J \upharpoonright A, J \upharpoonright B \rangle$  is an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair of normal ideals.

*Proof.* Suppose this fails as witnessed by ideals  $J_A$  and  $J_B$ . Assuming (without loss of generality) that the problem lies with (4.3), we can find a  $J_A$ -positive set  $C$  such that for each  $\alpha \in C$ ,

$$(4.5) \quad B_\alpha := \{\beta \in B : c(\alpha, \beta) \neq i\} \in J_B^*.$$



Since  $J_B$  is normal, we know the diagonal intersection  $D$  of these sets  $B_\alpha$  is in  $J_B^*$ , so

$$(4.6) \quad \beta \in D \text{ and } \alpha \in C \cap \beta \implies c(\alpha, \beta) \neq i.$$

Now both  $\langle C \cap A, D \cap B \rangle$  is a  $J$ -positive refinement of  $\langle A, B \rangle$ , and so forms an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair over  $J$ . In particular, we can find  $\alpha \in C$  such that  $C_\alpha := \{\beta \in D : c(\alpha, \beta) = i\}$  is  $J$ -positive. But this implies that there are arbitrarily large  $\beta \in D$  for which  $c(\alpha, \beta) = i$ , which contradicts (4.6).  $\square$

**Using a generic elementary embedding.** Our next goal is to explore how our coloring interacts with a pre-nice pair  $t = (\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$ , and the corresponding family of ideals  $\mathbb{J}^t = \{J_p^t : p \in \mathbb{P}\}$ .

**Lemma 4.7.** Suppose  $(\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is pre-nice. Then there is a  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  and a pair of colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$  such that the set of  $q \in \mathbb{P}$  for which there is an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair over  $J_q$  is dense below  $p$ .

*Proof.* Suppose not. Then for any condition  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  and pair of colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$  we can find a  $q \leq p$  so that given any  $r \leq q$  there is no  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair over  $J_r$ . Using this and by making successive extensions running through all the finitely many possible pairs  $\langle i, j \rangle$ , we arrive at a condition  $q$  such that  $J_q$  fails to have an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair for EVERY choice of  $\langle i, j \rangle$ , but this contradicts the last part of Lemma 4.4.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.8.** If  $t = (\mathbb{P}, \dot{D})$  is nice to the cardinal  $\kappa$  then we can find another such pair  $t' = (\mathbb{P}', \dot{D}')$  and a pair of colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$  such that for each  $q \in \mathbb{P}'$  there is an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair over  $J_q^{t'}$ .

*Proof.* Fix a condition  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  and colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$  as in the previous lemma, and define

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbb{P}' = \{q \in \mathbb{P} : q \leq p \text{ and there is an } \langle i, j \rangle\text{-saturated pair over } J_q\}.$$

Since  $\mathbb{P}'$  is dense below  $p$  in  $\mathbb{P}$ , forcing with  $\mathbb{P}'$  is equivalent to forcing with  $\mathbb{P}$  below  $p$ . In particular, there is a  $\mathbb{P}'$ -name  $\dot{D}'$  for the same ultrafilter adjoined by  $\mathbb{P}$ , and  $(\mathbb{P}', \dot{D}')$  will be nice to  $\kappa$ . Given  $q \in \mathbb{P}'$ , the ideal  $J_q$  is exactly the same whether computed using  $\mathbb{P}$  or  $\mathbb{P}'$ , so there will be an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair over it.  $\square$

**Definition 4.9.** A collection  $\mathbb{J}$  of normal ideals on  $\omega_1$  is  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated if for any  $J \in \mathbb{J}$  there is an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair over  $J$ .

Now we come to the point of this subsection, which we state in generality. This corollary requires than just the existence of weakly precipitous families of ideals, as the notion of forcing giving the embedding is needed to isolate the colors  $i$  and  $j$ .

**Corollary 4.10.** If there is a generic elementary embedding with critical point  $\omega_1$  that is well-founded out to the image of  $\beth_2(\omega_1)^+$ , then for any coloring  $c : [\omega_1]^2 \rightarrow l$  with  $l < \omega$ , there is a pair of colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$  for which an everywhere weakly precipitous  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated family of ideals can be found.

**Bringing in topology.** We turn now to adapting another idea —  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -winners — from [8] to our context. This is where the topology on  $\omega_1$  (viewed as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ ) will be used.

**Observation 4.11.** Suppose  $J$  is a countably complete ideal on  $\omega_1$  and  $n < \omega_1$ . If  $A$  is  $J$ -positive then there is a  $J$ -positive  $B \subseteq A$  that is covered by an open interval of  $\mathbb{R}$  of length less than  $1/n$ .

*Proof.* Given  $n$ , we can cover  $A$  with countably many intervals of length  $< 1/n$  just using the topology of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Since  $J$  is countably complete, one of the corresponding pieces of  $A$  must be  $J$ -large.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.12.** Suppose  $\mathbb{J}$  is an everywhere weakly precipitous  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated family of normal ideals on  $\omega_1$ . For any  $J \in \mathbb{J}$ , for  $J$ -almost every  $\alpha$  we can find objects  $\langle I_n : n < \omega \rangle$  and  $\langle T_n : n < \omega \rangle$  such that

- (1)  $I_n$  is an extension of  $J$  in  $\mathbb{J}$ ,
- (2)  $T_n \in I_n^*$ ,
- (3)  $\langle I_k, I_n \rangle$  is  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated if  $k > n$ ,
- (4)  $c(\alpha, \beta) = i$  for each  $\beta \in \bigcup_{n < \omega} T_n$ , and
- (5) every open neighborhood of  $\alpha$  contains  $T_n$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that every  $J$ -positive set  $A$  contains such a point  $\alpha$ . Given  $A$ , we define a strategy for **Empty** in the game  $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{J})$  played beyond  $J$ . The initial move will be to select  $A_0 = A$ . Given **Non-empty**'s move  $J_n$ , **Empty** will choose sets  $A_{n+1}$  and  $B_{n+1}$  such that

- $\langle A_{n+1}, B_{n+1} \rangle$  is an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair over  $J_n$ ,
- $A_{n+1} \subseteq A_n$ ,
- $A_{n+1}$  is covered by an open interval of length less than  $1/n$ , and
- every  $\alpha \in A_{n+1}$  is  $i$ -large in  $B_{n+1}$  over  $J_n$ .

This is easily done because our assumptions on  $\mathbb{J}$  hand us a pair of  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated  $J_n$ -positive sets, and the left piece of such a pair has an  $I_n$ -positive subset that can serve as  $A_{n+1}$ . Since this strategy does not win for **Empty**, there is a run of the game for which  $\bigcap_{n < \omega} A_n \neq \emptyset$ , and we claim that any  $\alpha$  in this intersection will have the required properties.<sup>2</sup>

Now define  $T_n$  to be  $\{\beta \in B_{n+1} : c(\alpha, \beta) = i\}$ , and let  $I_n$  be an extension of  $J_n \upharpoonright T_n$  in  $\mathbb{J}$ . It is easy to check that this choice works, with perhaps everything but requirement (3) immediate from the construction. To see (3), note that if  $k > n$  then  $I_k$  and  $I_n$  are extensions of  $J_n \upharpoonright A_{n+1}$  and  $J_n \upharpoonright B_{n+1}$  in  $\mathbb{J}$ , and hence the pair  $\langle I_k, I_n \rangle$  is  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated.  $\square$

We now wrap this up in a definition, and summarize this section in a final theorem which provides what we need to push through the Raghavan-Todorćević construction.

**Definition 4.13.** Let  $\mathbb{J}$  be a collection of normal ideals on  $\omega_1$ .

- (1) Given  $J \in \mathbb{J}$ , a point  $\alpha < \omega_1$  is an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -winner for  $J$  in  $\mathbb{J}$  if the conclusion of Lemma 4.12 holds.
- (2) We say that  $\mathbb{J}$  is an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -winning family of normal ideals if for each  $J \in \mathbb{J}$ 
  - $J$ -almost every  $\alpha < \omega_1$  is an  $\langle i, j \rangle$  winner for  $J$  in  $\mathbb{J}$ , and
  - for each  $A \in J^+$  there is an ideal in  $\mathbb{J}$  extending  $J \upharpoonright A$ .
- (3) Given a coloring  $c : [\omega_1]^2 \rightarrow l$ , a pair of colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$  is a winning pair for  $c$  if there is a non-empty  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -winning family of normal ideals on  $\omega_1$ .

<sup>2</sup>Note that the intersection will be a singleton since  $A_n$  has diameter less than  $1/n$ , so in fact this  $\alpha$  is unique.

This vocabulary allows us to state succinctly the summarizing result of this section.

**Theorem 4.** *If there is a generic elementary embedding with critical point  $\omega_1$  that is well-founded out to the image of  $\beth_2(\omega_1)^+$ , then for any set  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  of cardinality  $\aleph_1$  and coloring  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow l$  with  $l < \omega$ , there is a winning pair of colors for  $c$ .*

*Proof.* Immediate based on our work. From the existence of the embedding we can find an everywhere weakly precipitous family of ideals that is  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated for some pair of colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$ , and Lemma 4.12 tells us that this suffices.  $\square$

## 5. THE RAGHAVAN-TODORČEVIĆ CONSTRUCTION

Now our challenge is to show that we can use a winning pair of colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$  to build a copy of the rationals on which our coloring assumes only the values  $i$  or  $j$ . This can be done through a modification of the argument from [8] tailored to take advantage of our hypothesis.

**Theorem 5** (The Raghavan-Todorčević Construction). *Assume  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is of cardinality  $\aleph_1$  and  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow l$  with  $l < \omega$ . If there is a winning pair of colors  $\langle i, j \rangle$  for  $c$ , then  $X$  has a subset  $Y$  homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{Q}$  on which  $c$  assumes only the colors  $i$  and  $j$ .*

*Proof.* We identify  $X$  and  $\omega_1$  as usual and let  $\mathbb{J}$  be an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -winning family of normal ideals. We will build  $Y$  using a construction with  $\omega$  stages, associating a point of  $X$  to each element of  ${}^{<\omega}\omega$ , associating a point  $\alpha_\sigma$  of  $X$  to each  $\sigma \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ . We will use the lexicographic ordering of  ${}^{<\omega}\omega$  to organize things, so recall that if  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are in  ${}^{<\omega}\omega$  then  $\sigma <_{\text{lex}} \tau$  means that  $\tau$  is a proper extension of  $\sigma$  or  $\sigma(i) < \tau(i)$  for the least  $i$  where the sequences differ.

To see how this will work, fix a one-to-one enumeration  $\langle \sigma_n : n < \omega \rangle$  of  ${}^{<\omega}\omega$  chosen so that a sequence will not be enumerated until after all of its proper initial segments have already appeared, and we will let  $\alpha_n$  denote the point chosen for the sake of  $\sigma_n$ . We will ensure that these points are all distinct, and aim for the following two goals:

**Goal 1:** For  $k < n$ ,  $c(\alpha_k, \alpha_n)$  will equal  $i$  if  $\sigma_k <_{\text{lex}} \sigma_n$ , and  $c(\alpha_k, \alpha_n)$  will equal  $j$  if  $\sigma_n <_{\text{lex}} \sigma_k$ .<sup>3</sup>

**Goal 2:** If  $\{k_m : m < \omega\}$  are the indices corresponding to the immediate successors of  $\sigma_n$  in  ${}^{<\omega}\omega$ , then  $\{\alpha_{k_m} : m < \omega\}$  converges to  $\alpha_n$ .

Note that this will be sufficient, as  $Y = \{\alpha_n : n < \omega\}$  will be a countable dense-in-itself subset of  $X$  on which  $c$  takes on at most two values.

For  $n < \omega$ , we let  $Q_n$  to consist of the sequences  $\sigma_k$  for  $k < n$  as well as all of their immediate successors in  ${}^{<\omega}\omega$ . With this arrangement, we can say the following:

- $Q_0$  is the empty set and  $\sigma_0$  is the empty sequence. For  $n > 0$ ,  $Q_n$  is a downward closed subtree of  ${}^{<\omega}\omega$  of finite height.
- If  $\sigma = \sigma_k$  for  $k < n$ , then  $Q_n$  will contain  $\sigma \widehat{\langle m \rangle}$  for all  $m < \omega$ . If  $\sigma \in Q_n$  is not of the form  $\sigma_k$  for  $k < n$ , then no proper extension of  $\sigma$  is in  $Q_n$ , and  $\sigma$  is of the form  $\sigma_k \widehat{\langle m \rangle}$  for some  $k < n$ .

<sup>3</sup>In other words, once we have picked  $\alpha_k$  then for  $n > k$  we promise to choose  $\alpha_n$  so that if it is (lexicographically) to the right of  $\alpha_k$  then  $c(\alpha_k, \alpha_n) = i$ , and if it is to the left then  $c(\alpha_k, \alpha_n) = j$ .

- The sequence  $\sigma_n$  is an element of  $Q_n$ , but no proper extension of  $\sigma_n$  is in  $Q_n$ .

Thus, the nodes of  $Q_n$  are divided into *leaves*  $L_n$  and *branching nodes*  $B_n$  with the usual meaning, and  $B_n$  will be exactly the set  $\{\sigma_k : k < n\}$ . As noted above, the sequence  $\sigma_n$  will be in  $Q_n$ , and since our enumeration is one-to-one we know that  $\sigma_n$  will be a leaf of  $Q_n$ . At stage  $n$  of the construction, we will be choosing the point  $\alpha_n$  assigned to  $\sigma_n$ , and we assume that our construction has provided us with the following circumstances:

- The set  $\{\sigma_k : k < n\}$  of sequences enumerated so far lists the branching nodes  $B_n$  of  $Q_n$ , and for each  $k < n$  a point  $\alpha_k$  has been assigned to  $\sigma_k$ . In addition, each leaf  $\tau$  in  $L_n$  has been assigned an ideal  $J(\tau, n)$  from  $\mathbb{J}$ , as well as a set  $T(\tau, n)$  from the dual filter  $J^*(\tau, n)$ .
- If  $\tau$  is a leaf of  $Q_n$  then for any  $\beta \in T(\tau, n)$  and  $k < n$ ,

$$c(\alpha_k, \beta) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } \sigma_k <_{\text{lex}} \tau, \\ j & \text{if } \tau <_{\text{lex}} \sigma_k. \end{cases}$$

- If  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are distinct leaves in  $Q_n$  with  $\sigma <_{\text{lex}} \tau$ , then the pair of ideals  $\langle J(\sigma, n), J(\tau, n) \rangle$  is a  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair of normal ideals.
- For  $k < n$ , the sequence of sets  $\langle T(\sigma_k \widehat{\langle m \rangle}, n) : \sigma_k \widehat{\langle m \rangle} \in L_n \rangle$  attached to the successors of  $\sigma_k$  in  $L_n$  converges to  $\alpha_k$ .

Getting the construction started is easy, as our requirements give us freedom to choose  $J(\sigma_0, 0)$  to be any ideal in  $\mathbb{J}$  and let  $T(\sigma_0, 0) = \omega_1$ . For larger  $n$ , our enumeration will hand us the sequence  $\sigma_n$  (a leaf of  $Q_n$ ) and we will choose the corresponding point  $\alpha_n$  from the current crop of candidates  $T(\sigma_n, n)$ . Because of assumption (b), this will maintain Goal 1 for  $k < n$ . There are some other restrictions on  $\alpha_n$ , though: we need to make sure that we will be able to find  $J(\tau, n+1)$  and  $T(\tau, n+1)$  for each leaf  $\tau$  of  $Q_{n+1}$ . Note that such  $\tau$  are either leaves of  $Q_n$  (for which  $J(\tau, n)$  and  $T(\tau, n)$  have already been defined), or else newly created leaves of the form  $\sigma_n \widehat{\langle m \rangle}$  for some  $m < \omega$ .

To make sure we can do this, we want to choose  $\alpha_n \in T(\sigma_n, n)$  that satisfies the following:

- If  $\tau \neq \sigma_n$  is another leaf of  $Q_n$ , then
  - $\sigma_n <_{\text{lex}} \tau \implies \{\beta \in T(\tau, n) : c(\alpha_n, \beta) = i\}$  is  $J(\tau, n)$ -positive.
  - $\tau <_{\text{lex}} \sigma_n \implies \{\beta \in T(\tau, n) : c(\alpha_n, \beta) = j\}$  is  $J(\tau, n)$ -positive, and
- $\alpha_n$  is an  $\langle i, j \rangle$  winner for  $J(\sigma_n, n)$  in  $\mathbb{J}$ .

It will be (e) that allows us to find  $J(\tau, n+1)$  and  $T(\tau, n+1)$  for those leaves of  $Q_{n+1}$  that come from  $Q_n$ , and it will be (f) that allows us to define the objects for leaves that arise as successors of  $\sigma_n$ . Thus, the following claim is key.

*Claim.*  $J(\sigma_n, n)$ -almost every  $\alpha \in T(\sigma_n, n)$  satisfies both (e) and (f).

*Proof.* Condition (f) is a consequence of Lemma 4.12. To see that (e) holds, we need to use our assumption (c) and the  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturation of the relevant ideals. This tells us that given another leaf  $\tau$  of  $Q_n$ , then

$$(5.1) \quad \sigma_n <_{\text{lex}} \tau \implies (\forall^{J(\sigma_n, n)} \alpha \in T(\sigma_n, n)) (\exists^{J(\tau, n)} \beta \in T(\tau, n)) [c(\alpha, \beta) = i]$$

and

$$(5.2) \quad \tau <_{\text{lex}} \sigma_n \implies (\forall^{J(\sigma_n, n)} \alpha \in T(\sigma_n, n)) (\exists^{J(\tau, n)} \beta \in T(\tau, n)) [c(\alpha, \beta) = j]$$

Informally it says that for any other leaf  $\tau$  of  $Q_n$ , almost every element of  $T(\sigma_n, n)$  is “suitably connected” (in the sense that the correct sets are large) to  $T(\tau, n)$ . Since  $J(\sigma, n)$  is countably complete, it follows that almost every element of  $T(\sigma, n)$  is suitably connected to  $T(\tau, n)$  for *ALL* other leaves  $\tau$  of  $Q_n$ , and so claim follows.  $\square$

Thus, we should choose  $\alpha_n \in T(\sigma_n, n)$  satisfying (e) and (f) and now we show how to define  $T(\tau, n+1)$  and  $J(\tau, n+1)$  for the leaves of  $Q_{n+1}$  so that our conditions (a)-(d) will be maintained. Given such a  $\tau$  that comes from  $Q_n$ , we use (f) to define  $T(\tau, n+1)$ :

$$(5.3) \quad \sigma_n <_{\text{lex}} \tau \implies T(\tau, n+1) = \{\beta \in T(\tau, n) : c(\alpha_n, \beta) = i\}$$

and

$$(5.4) \quad \tau <_{\text{lex}} \sigma_n \implies T(\tau, n+1) = \{\beta \in T(\tau, n) : c(\alpha_n, \beta) = j\}.$$

In either case, we know that  $T(\tau, n+1)$  will be  $J(\tau, n)$ -positive because  $\alpha_n$  was suitably connected to  $T(\tau, n)$ , and given this we are able to choose  $J(\tau, n+1)$  to be any ideal in  $\mathbb{J}$  that extends  $J(\tau, n) \upharpoonright T(\tau, n+1)$ .

It remains to assign sets and ideals to the sequences  $\sigma_n^\wedge \langle m \rangle$  that will appear as new leaves in  $Q_{n+1}$ . This is where we use our assumption that  $\alpha_n$  is an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -winner: if  $\langle I_m : m < \omega \rangle$  and  $\langle T_m : m < \omega \rangle$  are as in the conclusion of Lemma 4.6, then we define

$$(5.5) \quad J(\sigma^\wedge \langle m \rangle, n+1) = I_m$$

and

$$(5.6) \quad T(\sigma^\wedge \langle m \rangle, n+1) = T_m.$$

To finish, we need to check that (a) through (d) hold with  $n$  replaced by  $n+1$ . Condition (a) is immediate. For (b), we again use the fact that the leaves of  $Q_{n+1}$  either come from  $Q_n$ , or were added as an immediate successor of  $\sigma_n$ . Given a leaf  $\tau$  of the first sort, we know  $T(\tau, n+1)$  is a subset of  $T(\tau, n)$ , and if  $\tau$  is of the second sort then we know  $T(\tau, n+1)$  is a subset of  $T(\sigma_n, n)$ . This is enough to establish (b) for the case where  $k < n$ . If  $\tau$  is an immediate successor of  $\sigma_n$ , then we know (b) holds for  $k = n$  as this was part of the conclusion of Lemma 4.12. If on the other hand  $\tau$  is a leaf from  $Q_n$ , then (b) holds because of how we chose  $T(\tau, n+1)$  back in (5.3) and (5.4). Condition (c) holds because our construction guarantees  $\langle J(\sigma, n+1), J(\tau, n+1) \rangle$  extends an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -saturated pair of ideals. Finally, (e) holds for  $\sigma_n$  because this is part of being an  $\langle i, j \rangle$ -winner, and it continues to hold for  $k < n$  because the required convergence is unchanged when we shrink the sets as we pass from  $n$  to  $n+1$ . Thus, the construction can be maintained through stage  $n+1$ , and as noted above  $Y = \{\alpha_n : n < \omega\}$  will be as required.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.1.** If there is a generic elementary embedding with critical point  $\omega_1$  that is well-founded out to the image of  $\beth_2(\omega_1)^+$ , then for any uncountable set of reals  $X$  and coloring  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow l$  with  $l < \omega$ , there is a set  $Y \subseteq X$  homeomorphic to the rationals on which  $c$  takes on at most two colors.

## REFERENCES

- [1] James E. Baumgartner, *Partition relations for countable topological spaces*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **43** (1986), no. 2, 178–195.
- [2] Douglas R. Burke, *Precipitous towers of normal filters*, J. Symbolic Logic **62** (1997), no. 3, 741–754.
- [3] Hans-Dieter Donder and Jean-Pierre Levinski, *On weakly precipitous filters*, Israel J. Math. **67** (1989), no. 2, 225–242.
- [4] Matthew Foreman, *Ideals and generic elementary embeddings*, Handbook of set theory. Vols. 1, 2, 3, Springer, Dordrecht, 2010, pp. 885–1147.
- [5] Tanmay Inamdar, *A Ramsey theorem for the reals*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18431 (2024).
- [6] Thomas J. Jech, *Some properties of  $\kappa$ -complete ideals defined in terms of infinite games*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **26** (1984), no. 1, 31–45.
- [7] Paul B. Larson, *The stationary tower*, University Lecture Series, vol. 32, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004, Notes on a course by W. Hugh Woodin.
- [8] Dilip Raghavan and Stevo Todorćević, *Proof of a conjecture of Galvin*, Forum Math. Pi **8** (2020), e15, 23.
- [9] Saharon Shelah, *On power of singular cardinals*, Notre Dame J. Formal Logic **27** (1986), no. 2, 263–299.
- [10] ———, *More on powers of singular cardinals*, Israel J. Math. **59** (1987), no. 3, 299–326.
- [11] ———, *Cardinal arithmetic*, Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 29, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1994, Oxford Science Publications.
- [12] Waclaw Sierpiński, *Sur un problème de la théorie des relations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (2) **2** (1933), no. 3, 285–287.

*Email address:* eisworth@ohio.edu