

## LARGE CARDINALS AND LIGHTFACE DEFINABLE WELL-ORDERS, WITHOUT THE GCH

SY-DAVID FRIEDMAN, PETER HOLY, AND PHILIPP LÜCKE

**Abstract.** This paper deals with the question whether the assumption that for every inaccessible cardinal  $\kappa$  there is a well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$  definable over the structure  $\langle H(\kappa^+), \in \rangle$  by a formula without parameters is consistent with the existence of (large) large cardinals and failures of the GCH. We work under the assumption that the SCH holds at every singular fixed point of the  $\beth$ -function and construct a class forcing that adds such a well-order at every inaccessible cardinal and preserves ZFC, all cofinalities, the continuum function, and all supercompact cardinals. Even in the absence of a proper class of inaccessible cardinals, this forcing produces a model of “ $V = HOD$ ” and can therefore be used to force this axiom while preserving large cardinals and failures of the GCH. As another application, we show that we can start with a model containing an  $\omega$ -superstrong cardinal  $\kappa$  and use this forcing to build a model in which  $\kappa$  is still  $\omega$ -superstrong, the GCH fails at  $\kappa$  and there is a well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$  that is definable over  $H(\kappa^+)$  without parameters. Finally, we can apply the forcing to answer a question about the definable failure of the GCH at a measurable cardinal.

**§1. Introduction.** The *outer model program* aims to obtain desirable structural features of Gödel’s constructible universe in generic extensions of the ground model while preserving large cardinals. A related objective is to obtain desirable structural features of Gödel’s constructible universe in generic extensions of the ground model while not only preserving large cardinals, but also other features that are incompatible with the assumption “ $V = L$ ”. This paper focuses on the existence of well-orders of  $H(\kappa^+)$  definable over the structure  $\langle H(\kappa^+), \in \rangle$  by a formula without parameters, large cardinals, and failures of the GCH. Our main result shows that it is possible to add such well-orderings at every inaccessible cardinal  $\kappa$  using a class-forcing that preserves ZFC, all cofinalities, the continuum function, and supercompact cardinals. As a corollary, we also obtain a result on the relative consistency of the statement “ $V = HOD$ ” together with the existence of large cardinals and possible failures of the GCH. Before we state our results, we fix some definitions and give a brief overview of related existing results.

**DEFINITION 1.1.** Let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal,  $X \subseteq H(\kappa^+)$ ,  $p \in H(\kappa^+)$ , and  $n < \omega$ .

---

Received July 25, 2013.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E35, 03E47, 03E55.

*Key words and phrases.* Class forcing, Definable well-orders, Failures of the GCH, HOD, supercompact cardinals,  $\omega$ -superstrong cardinals

© 2015, Association for Symbolic Logic  
0022-4812/15/8001-0013  
DOI:10.1017/jsl.2013.41

- The set  $X$  is *lightface*  $\Sigma_n$ -definable (respectively, is  $\Sigma_n$ -definable in parameter  $p$ ) over  $H(\kappa^+)$  if  $X$  is definable over the structure  $\langle H(\kappa^+), \in \rangle$  by a  $\Sigma_n$ -formula without parameters (respectively, with parameter  $p$ ).
- We say that  $X$  is *boldface*  $\Sigma_n$ -definable over  $H(\kappa^+)$  if it is  $\Sigma_n$ -definable in some parameter (in  $H(\kappa^+)$ ) over  $H(\kappa^+)$ .
- The set  $X$  is *lightface*  $\Sigma_n$ -definable (respectively, is  $\Sigma_n$ -definable in parameter  $p$ ) in  $H(\kappa^+)$  if  $X$  is *lightface*  $\Sigma_n$ -definable (respectively,  $\Sigma_n$ -definable in parameter  $p$ ) over  $H(\kappa^+)$  and  $X$  is an element of  $H(\kappa^+)$ .
- We say that there is a *lightface*  $\Sigma_n$ -definable well-order (respectively, a *boldface*  $\Sigma_n$ -definable well-order) of  $H(\kappa^+)$  if there is a well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$ , which is *lightface* (respectively, *boldface*)  $\Sigma_n$ -definable over  $H(\kappa^+)$ .
- *Lightface definable* abbreviates *lightface*  $\Sigma_n$ -definable for some  $n \in \omega$  and *boldface definable* or simply *definable* abbreviate *boldface*  $\Sigma_n$ -definable for some  $n \in \omega$ .

In [2] and [3], David Asperó and the first author showed that assuming the GCH, there is a cofinality-preserving class forcing which introduces a *lightface* definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$  for every regular uncountable  $\kappa$  while preserving all instances of supercompactness, many other large cardinals, and the GCH. In [9], the first and second author independently obtained (as a side result) that assuming GCH, there is a cofinality-preserving forcing which introduces a *boldface* definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$  for every regular uncountable  $\kappa$  while preserving many large cardinals (including  $\omega$ -superstrong cardinals) and the GCH. While this result is basically weaker than the aforementioned, enhancements of the techniques developed in the proofs of this statement will be made heavy use of in the following.

The first and third author have shown in [11] that assuming the SCH holds at singular limits of inaccessibles (but not the GCH),<sup>1</sup> there is a cofinality-preserving forcing which introduces a *boldface* definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$  for every inaccessible  $\kappa$  and preserves all supercompacts, many instances of supercompactness, and the continuum function. This construction is based on results of the third author from [13] that allow us to add *boldface* definable well-orders of  $H(\kappa^+)$  by forcings which preserve the value of  $2^\kappa$ . These forcings will be another ingredient of our construction.

Our main result improves the result of [11] by obtaining *lightface* instead of *boldface* definable well-orders (starting from a slightly stronger SCH-assumption).

**THEOREM 1.2.** *Assume SCH holds at singular fixed points of the  $\beth$ -function. There is a ZFC-preserving class forcing  $\mathbb{P}$  definable without parameters that satisfies the following statements.*

- (i) *If  $\alpha$  is inaccessible and  $G$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over  $V$ , then there is a *lightface* definable well-order of  $H(\alpha^+)^{V[G]}$ .*
- (ii)  *$\mathbb{P}$  is cofinality-preserving.*
- (iii)  *$\mathbb{P}$  preserves the continuum function: If  $G$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over  $V$ , then  $(2^\alpha)^V = (2^\alpha)^{V[G]}$  for every  $\alpha$ .*
- (iv)  *$\mathbb{P}$  preserves the supercompactness of supercompact cardinals.*

---

<sup>1</sup>If  $X$  is a class of singular strong limit cardinals, SCH at  $X$  abbreviates the statement that  $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$  for every  $\kappa \in X$ .

In [5], Andrew Brooke-Taylor has shown that assuming GCH, there is a cofinality-preserving forcing to obtain “ $V = HOD$ ” in the generic extension while preserving various large cardinals and the GCH. In order to obtain this, he codes a class-function  $F : On \rightarrow 2$  into the validity of the principle  $\diamond_{\kappa}^*$  at various regular cardinals  $\kappa$ , making use of the fact that under the GCH, the validity of the principle  $\diamond_{\kappa}^*$  can be “switched on and off” by mild ( $<\kappa$ -closed and  $\kappa^+$ -c.c.) forcings.

In the proof of the above theorem, we improve this technique and develop a finer coding that does not rely on the GCH. This coding uses the fact that the existence of boldface definable well-orders of  $H(\kappa^+)$  for uncountable  $\kappa$  with  $\kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa}$  can be “switched on and off” by mild (again  $<\kappa$ -closed and  $\kappa^+$ -c.c.) forcing that preserves the value of  $2^{\kappa}$ . This follows from results contained in [13] that will be restated in Section 2 of this paper. Hence one could define a *Boldface Definable Well-order Oracle Partial Order* similar to the  $\diamond^*$ -Oracle Partial Order defined in [5, Definition 5] and use it to start with a model where the SCH holds on a proper class of singular strong limit cardinals<sup>2</sup> and force the statement “ $V = HOD$ ” while preserving all cofinalities and the continuum function. The class forcing constructed in the proof of Theorem 1.2 contains such a *Boldface Definable Well-order Oracle Partial Order* and uses it (in combination with other coding forcings) to make certain sets locally lightface definable. This construction will allow us to run the argument sketched above and derive the following corollary.<sup>3</sup>

**COROLLARY 1.3.** *If  $\mathbb{P}$  is the partial order from Theorem 1.2, then in any  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic forcing extension, “ $V = HOD$ ” holds.*

In particular, if the SCH holds at singular fixed points of the  $\beth$ -function, then we can force the statement “ $V = HOD$ ” with a class forcing that preserves ZFC, all cofinalities, the continuum function, and every supercompact cardinal. This generalizes a result of Arthur Apter and Shoshana Friedman from [1], where the above has been obtained under the assumption of (and preserving) GCH.

Moreover, one could replace the coding based on modifying the number of normal measures on measurable cardinals that is used in Section 3 of [1] by the boldface definable well-order existence coding to obtain, under the assumption of the SCH at singular fixed points of the  $\beth$ -function, a version of [1, Theorem 3.2] that does not need the assumption of the GCH (and preservation of the GCH is to be replaced by preservation of cofinalities and the continuum function). Since the SCH assumption above is only needed to ensure preservation of cofinalities, this also provides an alternative proof of [6, Theorem 4]. Under the assumption of SCH at singular fixed points of the  $\beth$ -function, we obtain the following version of that theorem (see [6] for the definition of HOD-supercompactness):

**THEOREM 1.4.** *Assume  $\kappa$  is supercompact and SCH holds at all singular fixed points of the  $\beth$ -function. Then there is a set-forcing extension that preserves both cofinalities and the continuum function, in which  $\kappa$  is still supercompact, but not HOD-supercompact.*

<sup>2</sup>Note that a classical theorem of Solovay (see Theorem 1.9) implies that this assumption becomes void in the presence of a strongly compact cardinal.

<sup>3</sup>Note that if there are unboundedly many inaccessibles, then the corollary follows directly from Theorem 1.2. Only in the case that the inaccessibles are bounded in the universe do we need to argue as above.

We discuss other applications of the forcing construction from Theorem 1.2. In [10], Radek Honzik and the first author show that it is possible to obtain a model containing a measurable cardinal  $\kappa$  with a lightface definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$  and  $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$ , starting with a  $\kappa^{++}$ -strong cardinal  $\kappa$ . The iteration of their paper cannot be used to make  $2^\kappa$  bigger than  $\kappa^{++}$ . This raises the question whether it is consistent to have a measurable cardinal  $\kappa$  with  $2^\kappa > \kappa^{++}$  and a lightface definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$ . Starting from a much stronger large cardinal assumption, we use the forcing from Theorem 1.2 to establish this consistency and thus answer [10, Question 6.1].

**COROLLARY 1.5.** *Assume that the SCH holds at singular fixed points of the  $\beth$ -function. Let  $\kappa$  be a regular cardinal and  $\delta$  be the least singular strong limit cardinal of cofinality  $\kappa$ . If  $\kappa$  is  $\delta$ -supercompact, then there is a cofinality-preserving set forcing which introduces a lightface definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$  and preserves the  $\delta$ -supercompactness (and thus the measurability) of  $\kappa$  and the value of  $2^\kappa$ .*

With the help of a folklore result (see Lemma 1.8), this immediately gives rise to the following.

**THEOREM 1.6.** *The consistency of ZFC plus*

- (i) “There is a  $\delta$ -supercompact cardinal  $\kappa$  such that  $\delta$  is the least singular strong limit cardinal of cofinality  $\kappa$ ”

*implies the consistency of ZFC plus*

- (ii) “There is a measurable cardinal  $\kappa$  with  $2^\kappa > \kappa^{++}$  and a lightface definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$ ”.

We also show that the  $\omega$ -superstrength of a given  $\omega$ -superstrong cardinal (see [9, Definition 5]) may be preserved while forcing with  $\mathbb{P}$ , which in particular yields the following result (again with the help of Lemma 1.8).

**THEOREM 1.7.** *The following statements are equiconsistent over ZFC.*

- (i) *There is an  $\omega$ -superstrong cardinal.*
- (ii) *There is an  $\omega$ -superstrong cardinal  $\kappa$  with  $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$  (or  $2^\kappa > \kappa^{++}$ ) and a lightface definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$ .*

Throughout this paper, we assume that the SCH holds at singular fixed points of the  $\beth$ -function. This will imply that the partial order  $\mathbb{P}$  constructed in the proof of Theorem 1.2 is cofinality-preserving. The following folklore result says that this assumption can be obtained by mild forcing (i.e., collapsing all “counterexamples” while preserving the continuum function and large cardinals).

**LEMMA 1.8.** *There is a class-sized iteration  $\mathbb{S}$  which satisfies the following:*

- *$\mathbb{S}$  forces SCH at singular fixed points of the  $\beth$ -function.*
- *$\mathbb{S}$  preserves the cofinality of  $\kappa$  whenever there is no singular fixed point  $\lambda$  of the  $\beth$ -function with  $\lambda^+ < \kappa \leq 2^\lambda$ .*
- *$\mathbb{S}$  preserves the value of  $2^\kappa$  whenever it preserves  $\kappa$  and  $\kappa$  is not a singular fixed point of the  $\beth$  function with  $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$ .*
- *$\mathbb{S}$  preserves the inaccessibility of all inaccessible and the supercompactness of all supercompact cardinals.*
- *If  $\gamma$  is a singular strong limit cardinal but not a fixed point of the  $\beth$ -function and  $\kappa$  is  $\gamma$ -supercompact with  $\gamma^{<\kappa} = \gamma$ , then forcing with  $\mathbb{S}$  preserves the  $\gamma$ -supercompactness of  $\kappa$ .*

- If  $\kappa$  is  $\omega$ -superstrong, then there is a condition in  $\mathbb{S}$ , which forces that the  $\omega$ -superstrength of  $\kappa$  is preserved by forcing with  $\mathbb{S}$ .

SKETCH OF THE PROOF. Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be the reverse Easton iteration which at stage  $\kappa$  adds a Cohen subset of  $\kappa^+$  if  $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$  and  $\kappa$  is a singular fixed point of the  $\beth$ -function. That  $\mathbb{S}$  forces SCH at singular fixed points of the  $\beth$ -function, preserves the relevant cofinalities, the relevant parts of the continuum function and all inaccessibles are standard arguments. That it preserves all instances of supercompactness as in the statement of the lemma can be shown by arguments similar to (but easier than) those in the proof of supercompactness preservation provided later in this paper for  $\mathbb{P}$ . The  $\omega$ -superstrength preservation can be shown similar to (but easier than) the proof of  $\omega$ -superstrength preservation provided later in this paper for  $\mathbb{P}$ . For those reasons and because this lemma is not actually essential to the content of this paper, we will not provide a detailed proof.  $\dashv$

Several computations in the following proofs will rely on the following classical theorem by Robert Solovay (see [12] for the refined statement below).

THEOREM 1.9 (Solovay). *If  $\gamma > \kappa$ ,  $\gamma$  is a singular strong limit cardinal and  $\kappa$  is  $\gamma$ -strongly compact, then  $2^\gamma = \gamma^+$ .*

In particular, this result shows that the assumptions of our main result automatically hold above the first supercompact cardinal.

**§2. Prerequisites.** In this section, we will introduce several concepts and results contained in [11] and [13] that we will make use of in later sections. Given an ordinal  $\lambda$ , we let  ${}^\lambda\lambda$  denote the set of all functions  $f : \lambda \rightarrow \lambda$  and  ${}^{<\lambda}\lambda$  denote the set of all functions  $g$  with  $\text{dom}(g) \in \lambda$  and  $\text{ran}(g) \subseteq \lambda$ . We let  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denote the Gödel pairing function on ordinals.

DEFINITION 2.1. Let  $\kappa$  be an uncountable cardinal with  $\kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa}$ . A pair  $\langle A, s \rangle$  is a  $\kappa$ -coding basis if  $A$  is a subset of  ${}^\kappa\kappa$  and  $s = \langle s_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  is an enumeration of  ${}^{<\kappa}\kappa$  such that  $\text{lh}(s_\alpha) \leq \alpha$  for all  $\alpha < \kappa$  and the set  $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid s_\alpha = t\}$  is unbounded in  $\kappa$  for each  $t \in {}^{<\kappa}\kappa$ .

Given an uncountable cardinal  $\kappa$  with  $\kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa}$  and a  $\kappa$ -coding basis  $\langle A, s \rangle$ , we define  $\mathbb{P}_s(A)$  to be the partial order consisting of conditions  $p = \langle T_p, g_p, h_p \rangle$  with the following properties.

- (i)  $T_p$  is a subtree of  ${}^{<\kappa}2$  that satisfies the following statements.
  - (a)  $T_p$  has cardinality less than  $\kappa$ .
  - (b) If  $t \in T_p$  with  $\text{lh}(t) + 1 < \text{ht}(T_p)$ , then  $t$  has two immediate successors in  $T_p$ .
- (ii)  $g_p : A \xrightarrow{\text{part}} [T_p]$  is a partial function such that  $\text{dom}(g_p)$  is of cardinality less than  $\kappa$ .
- (iii)  $h_p : A \xrightarrow{\text{part}} \kappa$  is a partial function with the following properties.
  - (a)  $\text{dom}(h_p) = \text{dom}(g_p)$ .
  - (b) For all  $x \in \text{dom}(h_p)$  and  $\alpha, \beta < \text{ht}(T_p)$  with  $\alpha = \langle h_p(x), \beta \rangle$ , we have

$$s_\beta \subseteq x \iff g_p(x)(\alpha) = 1.$$

We define  $p \leq_{\mathbb{P}_s(A)} q$  to hold if the following statements are satisfied.

- (a)  $T_p$  is an end-extension of  $T_q$ .<sup>4</sup>
- (b) For all  $x \in \text{dom}(g_q)$ ,  $x \in \text{dom}(g_p)$  and  $g_q(x)$  is an initial segment of  $g_p(x)$ .
- (c)  $h_q = h_p \upharpoonright \text{dom}(h_q)$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.2.** *If  $\kappa$  is an uncountable cardinal with  $\kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa}$  and  $\langle A, s \rangle$  is a  $\kappa$ -coding basis, then  $\mathbb{P}_s(A) \subseteq \mathbf{H}(\kappa^+)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_s(A)$  satisfies the  $\kappa^+$ -chain condition and is  $<\kappa$ -directed closed with infima.<sup>5</sup>*

**PROOF.** The first statement is immediate from the definition of the partial order and the second one is proven in [13, Lemma 3.2]. To show that the third statement holds, let  $D$  be a directed subset of  $\mathbb{P}_s(A)$  of cardinality less than  $\kappa$ . Define  $T = \bigcup\{T_p \mid p \in D\}$ ,

$$g = \{ \langle x, \bigcup\{g_p(x) \mid p \in D, x \in \text{dom}(g_p)\} \rangle \mid \exists p \in D \ x \in \text{dom}(g_p) \}$$

and  $h = \bigcup\{h_p \mid p \in D\}$ . Then  $T$  is a subtree of  ${}^{<\kappa}2$  of size less than  $\kappa$  and  $\text{dom}(g) = \text{dom}(h)$  is of size less than  $\kappa$ . Given  $p_0, p_1 \in D$ ,  $x \in \text{dom}(g)$ , and  $\alpha < \text{ht}(T)$ , there is a  $q \in D$  with  $q \leq p_0, p_1$ ,  $x \in \text{dom}(g_q)$ , and  $\text{ht}(T_q) \geq \alpha$ . If  $x \in \text{dom}(g_{p_i})$ , then  $g_{p_i}(x) \subseteq g_q(x)$  and  $h_{p_i}(x) = h_q(x)$ . This shows that  $g$  and  $h$  are partial functions and  $g(x) \in [T]$  for all  $x \in \text{dom}(g)$ . In particular, the triple  $p_D = \langle T, g, h \rangle$  is a condition in  $\mathbb{P}_s(A)$  and it is easy to check that  $p_D$  is the infimum of  $D$  in  $\mathbb{P}_s(A)$ . ⊥

In the above setting, we let  $\dot{T}_\kappa$  and  $\dot{F}_\kappa$  denote the canonical  $\mathbb{P}_s(A)$ -names with the property that  $\dot{T}_\kappa^G = \bigcup\{T_p \mid p \in G\}$  and

$$\dot{F}_\kappa^G : A \longrightarrow [\dot{T}_\kappa^G]^{V[G]}; \ x \longmapsto \bigcup\{g_p(x) \mid p \in G, x \in \text{dom}(g_p)\}$$

whenever  $G$  is  $\mathbb{P}_s(A)$ -generic over  $\mathbf{V}$ .

**THEOREM 2.3** ([13, Corollary 3.7]). *Let  $\kappa$  be an uncountable cardinal with  $\kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa}$ ,  $\langle A, s \rangle$  be a  $\kappa$ -coding basis, and  $G$  be  $\mathbb{P}_s(A)$ -generic over  $\mathbf{V}$ . Then  $[\dot{T}_\kappa^G]^{V[G]} = \text{ran}(\dot{F}_\kappa^G)$  and the following statements are equivalent for all  $x \in ({}^\kappa\kappa)^{V[G]}$ .*

- (i)  $x$  is an element of  $A$ .
- (ii) There is a  $z \in [\dot{T}_\kappa^G]^{V[G]}$  and an  $\alpha < \kappa$  such that

$$s_\beta \subseteq x \iff z(\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle) = 1$$

holds for all  $\beta < \kappa$ .

In particular,  $A$  is made boldface  $\Sigma_1$ -definable over  $\mathbf{H}(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . In the proof of Theorem 1.2, we will make use of the following direct consequence of Theorem 2.3.

**COROLLARY 2.4.** *Let  $\kappa$  be an uncountable cardinal with  $\kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa}$ ,  $\langle A, s \rangle$  be a  $\kappa$ -coding basis, and  $G$  be  $\mathbb{P}_s(A)$ -generic over  $\mathbf{V}$ . If  $\mathbf{W}$  is an outer model of  $\mathbf{V}[G]$  such that  $\kappa$  is a cardinal in  $\mathbf{W}$  and  $[\dot{T}_\kappa^G]^\mathbf{W} = [\dot{T}_\kappa^G]^{V[G]}$ , then  $A$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameters  $s$  and  $\dot{T}_\kappa^G$  over  $\langle \mathbf{H}(\kappa^+)^\mathbf{W}, \in \rangle$ .*

<sup>4</sup>In the sense that  $T_q = \{t \in T_p \mid \text{lh}(t) < \text{ht}(T_q)\}$ .

<sup>5</sup>We say that a subset  $D$  of a partial order  $\mathbb{P}$  is *directed* if for all  $p_0, p_1 \in D$  there is a  $p \in D$  with  $p \leq p_0, p_1$ . Given an infinite regular cardinal  $\kappa$ , a partial order  $\mathbb{P}$  is  $<\kappa$ -directed closed with infima if every directed subset of  $\mathbb{P}$  of cardinality less than  $\kappa$  has an infimum in  $\mathbb{P}$ .

Given functions  $x, y \in {}^\kappa\kappa$ , we let  $\langle x, y \rangle$  denote the unique function  $z \in {}^\kappa\kappa$  with

$$z(\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle) = \begin{cases} x(\beta), & \text{if } \alpha = 0, \\ y(\beta), & \text{if } \alpha = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We say that  $A \subseteq {}^\kappa\kappa$  codes a well-order of  ${}^\kappa\kappa$  if there is a well-order  $\prec$  of  ${}^\kappa\kappa$  such that

$$A = \{ \langle x, y \rangle \mid x, y \in {}^\kappa\kappa, x \prec y \}.$$

The following, which is notationally adapted from the original theorem in [13], provides us with a forcing to introduce a boldface definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$ .

**THEOREM 2.5** ([13, Theorem 6.1]). *Assume that  $\kappa$  is an uncountable cardinal with  $\kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa}$ ,  $\langle A, s \rangle$  is a  $\kappa$ -coding basis, and  $A$  codes a well-order of  ${}^\kappa\kappa$ . If  $G$  is  $\mathbb{P}_s(A)$ -generic over  $V$ , then there is a well-ordering of  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$  that is  $\Delta_2$ -definable over  $\langle H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}, \in \rangle$  in parameters  $s$  and  $\dot{T}_\kappa^G$ .*

In the other direction, we also need a forcing that allows us make sure that there are no definable well-orders of  $H(\kappa^+)$ . The following result is folklore. A proof of this statement can be found in [13, Section 9].

**THEOREM 2.6.** *If  $\kappa$  is an uncountable cardinal with  $\kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa}$  and  $G$  is  $\text{Add}(\kappa, \kappa^+)$ -generic over  $V$ , then the Axiom of Choice does not hold in  $\langle L(\mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{V[G]}), \in \rangle$ . In particular, there is no boldface definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ .*

**§3. Lightface definable well-orders of  $H(\kappa^+)$ .** In this section, we commence the proof of Theorem 1.2. Let  $B_s$  denote the class of all singular fixed points of the  $\sqcup$ -function,  $\Gamma$  be the class of all successor cardinals of elements of  $B_s$ , and  $\langle b_\gamma \mid \gamma \in \text{On} \rangle$  be the monotone enumeration of  $\Gamma$ . We will start by introducing a variant  $C_f(i)$  of the *canonical function coding*. This coding was first introduced in [2] and [3] and also made use of in [9].

Given an inaccessible cardinal  $\alpha, \gamma \in [\alpha, \alpha^+)$ , a bijection  $f : \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ , and  $i < 2$ , a set  $t$  is a condition in  $C_f(i)$  if the following statements hold.

- $t$  is a closed, bounded subset of  $\alpha$  and
- If  $\eta \in t$ , then  $c(\text{otp } f \upharpoonright \eta) = i$ , where  $c : \text{On} \rightarrow 2$  is defined by

$$c(\delta) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if there is a definable well-order of } H(b_\delta^+), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Conditions in  $C_f(i)$  are ordered by end-extension.

**DEFINITION 3.1.** Given a set  $X$ , the *lottery* of  $X$  is the forcing poset consisting of a weakest condition  $\mathbf{1}$  and all elements of  $X$ , where it is assumed that  $\mathbf{1} \notin X$ . Elements of  $X$  are pairwise incompatible in the lottery. If  $G$  is generic for the lottery of  $X$ ,  $G$  will be of the form  $\{x, \mathbf{1}\}$  for some  $x \in X$ ; we say that  $G$  decides for  $x$  in that case.

Before we commence with the details of the proof of Theorem 1.2 by stating the definition of our forcing iteration  $\mathbb{P}$ , we want to give a rough idea of what the iteration  $\mathbb{P}$  will do, as some of the basic ideas seem to be in danger of being buried by technicalities in the actual definition.

Our iteration will basically be Easton supported (but with an additional restriction on the supports) and we only force nontrivially at stage  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha + 1$  for  $\alpha \in \Gamma$  and stages in the interval  $[\alpha, \alpha \cdot \alpha)$  for inaccessible  $\alpha$ . We perform a lottery of the set  $\{0, 1\}$  at stage  $\alpha \in \Gamma$ . If the lottery decides for 0, then we ensure at stage  $\alpha + 1$  (by forcing, using Theorem 2.6) that there is no definable well-order of  $H(\alpha^+)$ . Otherwise, we ensure at stage  $\alpha + 1$  (by forcing, using Theorem 2.5) that there is a definable well-order of  $H(\alpha^+)$ . This way we obtain a generic predicate  $c$  that is coded by the *boldface definable well-order existence pattern*.

If  $\alpha$  is inaccessible, then we will first perform the lottery of all  $\alpha$ -coding bases  $\langle A, s \rangle$  such that  $A$  codes a well-ordering of  ${}^\alpha\alpha$ , to choose such an  $\alpha$ -coding basis  $\langle A_\alpha, s_\alpha \rangle$ . In the next step, we force with  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\alpha}(A_\alpha)$  (as defined in Section 2) to introduce a well-order of  $H(\alpha^+)$  that is definable over  $H(\alpha^+)$  in some generically added parameter  $x_\alpha \subseteq \alpha$ . In the next  $\alpha \cdot \alpha$ -many stages, we perform an iteration  $S_{<\alpha, \alpha}^\alpha$ , using supports of size less than  $\alpha$ , which applies appropriate instances of the forcing  $C_f(i)$  to make sure that  $x_\alpha$  and the generic for  $S_{<\alpha, \alpha}^\alpha$  itself are both definable from  $c \cap \alpha$ . This will allow us to infer that  $H(\alpha^+)$  has a lightface definable well-order in any  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic extension.

For the sake of large cardinal preservation, we must in fact not allow for the lottery of  $\{0, 1\}$  if  $\alpha$  is of the form  $b_{\kappa+2+\delta}$  for some inaccessible  $\kappa$  and  $\delta < \kappa$ , but choose either 0 or 1 (nongenerically) depending on the generic for the iteration below  $\alpha$ . This will be made use of in the proof of Claim 4.7.

Throughout the following, for every inaccessible  $\kappa$  we fix a uniformly (in parameter  $\kappa$ ) definable recursive sequence  $\langle f_\gamma \mid \gamma \in [\kappa, \kappa \cdot \kappa] \rangle$  such that every  $f_\gamma$  is a bijection from  $\kappa$  to  $\gamma$ .

**PROOF OF CLAUSES (i)–(iii) OF THEOREM 1.2.** Our forcing  $\mathbb{P}$  will be an “*Easton-like iteration*”<sup>6</sup> of the form  $\langle P_{<\alpha}, \dot{P}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \text{On} \rangle$ .  $\dot{P}_\alpha$  denotes the trivial forcing unless  $\alpha \in \Gamma$ ,  $\alpha = \beta + 1$  and  $\beta \in \Gamma$  or  $\text{card } \alpha = \kappa$  is inaccessible and  $\alpha \in [\kappa, \kappa \cdot \kappa)$ . If  $\alpha \in \Gamma$ , let  $\dot{P}_\alpha$  and  $\dot{P}_{\alpha+1}$  both denote the trivial forcing if  $\alpha^{<\alpha} > \alpha$  or  $\alpha$  is singular in the  $P_{<\alpha}$ -generic extension.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, if  $\text{card } \alpha = \kappa$  is inaccessible,  $\alpha \in [\kappa, \kappa \cdot \kappa)$  and  $\kappa$  is not inaccessible in the  $P_{<\alpha}$ -generic extension, let  $\dot{P}_\alpha$  denote the trivial forcing.<sup>7</sup> Given a generic  $G$  for  $\mathbb{P}$  or a generic  $G$  for some  $P_{<\beta}$  and an ordinal  $\alpha < \beta$ , we let  $G_{<\alpha}$  denote the generic on  $P_{<\alpha}$  induced by  $G$  or  $G$  respectively.

**CASE.  $\alpha$  is inaccessible and remains so in the  $P_{<\alpha}$ -generic extension** We let  $\dot{P}_\alpha$  denote the canonical  $P_{<\alpha}$ -name for the lottery of (the set of) all  $\alpha$ -coding bases  $\langle A, s \rangle$ , where  $A$  codes a well-order of  ${}^\alpha\alpha$  in the  $P_{<\alpha}$ -generic extension. If  $G$  is  $P_{<\alpha}$ -generic over  $V$ , a generic for  $\dot{P}_\alpha^G$  over  $V[G]$  decides for an  $\alpha$ -coding basis  $\langle A_\alpha, s_\alpha \rangle$ , where  $A_\alpha$  codes a well-order of  $({}^\alpha\alpha)^{V[G]}$ . Let  $\dot{A}_\alpha$  and  $\dot{s}_\alpha$  be canonical  $P_{<\alpha+1}$ -names for  $A_\alpha$  and  $s_\alpha$ .

Let  $\dot{P}_{\alpha+1}$  be a canonical  $P_{<\alpha+1}$ -name for  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\alpha}(\dot{A}_\alpha)$ . If  $G$  is  $P_{<\alpha+2}$ -generic over  $V$ ,  $s_\alpha = \dot{s}_\alpha^{G_{<\alpha+1}}$ ,  $A_\alpha = \dot{A}_\alpha^{G_{<\alpha+1}}$ , and  $\bar{G}$  is the filter in  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\alpha}(A_\alpha)$  induced by  $G$ , then the well-ordering of  $({}^\alpha\alpha)^{V[G_{\alpha+1}]}$  given by  $A_\alpha$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in some parameter  $x_\alpha \in {}^\alpha 2$  coding the sets  $s_\alpha$  and  $\dot{T}_\alpha^{\bar{G}}$ , where  $\dot{T}_\alpha^{\bar{G}}$  is the  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\alpha}(A_\alpha)$ -name in  $V[G_{<\alpha+1}]$  constructed in Section 2. Let  $\dot{x}_\alpha$  be a canonical  $P_{<\alpha+2}$ -name for such a parameter  $x_\alpha$ . Working in

<sup>6</sup>This name of course refers to the supports used - those will be specified just before Definition 3.2. A related forcing construction is used in [9].

<sup>7</sup>We will later show by induction that this is never the case (see Claim 3.18).



$W = V[G]$ , by Proposition 2.2 we have  $H(\alpha) \subseteq V[G_{<\alpha+1}]$  and  $\alpha^+ = (\alpha^+)^{V[G_{<\alpha+1}]}$ . Let  $<^\alpha$  denote the well-ordering of  $(^\alpha\alpha)^{V[G_{<\alpha+1}]}$  determined by the parameter  $\dot{x}_\alpha^G$ . There is a canonical surjection  $\sigma$  of  $(\alpha^2)$  onto  $H(\alpha^+)$  that is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $\alpha$  in  $H(\alpha^+)$ .<sup>8</sup> Since the definition of this function is absolute, the set  $H(\alpha^+)^{V[G_{<\alpha+1}]}$  is equal to the image of  $(\alpha^2)^{V[G_{<\alpha+1}]}$  under  $\sigma$ . Hence  $<^\alpha$  induces a well-ordering  $<_\alpha$  of  $H(\alpha^+)^{V[G_{<\alpha+1}]}$  in a canonical way.<sup>9</sup>  $<_\alpha$  induces a well-ordering of  $H(\alpha)^{V[G_{<\alpha+1}]}$  of order-type  $\xi \in [\alpha, \alpha^+)$  and, by using the  $<_\alpha$ -least bijection from  $\alpha$  to  $\xi$ ,  $<_\alpha$  actually induces a well-ordering  $\overline{<}_\alpha$  of  $H(\alpha)^{V[G_{<\alpha+1}]} = H(\alpha)$  of order-type  $\alpha$ . Let  $\overline{<}_\alpha(\delta)$  denote the  $\delta^{\text{th}}$  element of  $H(\alpha)$  in this ordering. We define by induction

- an auxiliary forcing iteration  $S_{<\alpha \cdot \alpha}^\alpha$  of the form  $\langle S_{<\delta}^\alpha, \dot{S}_\delta^\alpha \mid \delta < \alpha \cdot \alpha \rangle$  with  $<\alpha$ -support,
- a sequence  $\langle R_{<\delta}^\alpha \mid \delta \leq \alpha \cdot \alpha \rangle$  such that  $R_{<\delta}^\alpha \subseteq S_{<\delta}^\alpha$  for each  $\delta \leq \alpha \cdot \alpha$ , and
- a sequence  $\langle \dot{a}_\delta^\alpha \mid \delta < \alpha \cdot \alpha \rangle$  such that  $\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha$  is an  $S_{<\delta}^\alpha$ -name for each  $\delta < \alpha \cdot \alpha$ .

If  $S_{<\delta}^\alpha$  is defined, let

$$R_{<\delta}^\alpha = \{p \in S_{<\delta}^\alpha \mid \exists w_p : \delta \longrightarrow [\alpha]^{<\alpha} \forall \gamma < \delta \ p \upharpoonright \gamma \Vdash p(\gamma) = \check{w}_p(\gamma)\}.$$

Note that given  $p \in S_{<\delta}^\alpha$ , if  $w_p$  as desired exists, then it is uniquely determined. This allows us to define an injection  $\rho : R_{<\delta}^\alpha \longrightarrow H(\alpha)$  by setting  $\rho(p) = q$  if  $q$  is a function with domain  $f_{\alpha \cdot \alpha}^{-1} \text{supp}(p)$  and  $q(\gamma) = w_p(f_{\alpha \cdot \alpha}(\gamma))$  for all  $\gamma \in \text{dom}(q)$ .

We define  $\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha$  as follows. If  $\delta$  is of the form  $\alpha \cdot \bar{\delta}$ , then we let  $\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha$  be the canonical  $S_{<\delta}^\alpha$ -name for  $\dot{x}_\alpha^G(\bar{\delta})$ . If  $\delta$  is of the form  $\alpha \cdot \bar{\delta} + 1 + \gamma$  for some  $\gamma < \alpha$ , then we choose a canonical  $S_{<\delta}^\alpha$ -name such that

$$(\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha)^K = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \overline{<}_\alpha(\gamma) \in \bar{K}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

holds whenever  $K$  is  $S_{<\delta}^\alpha$ -generic over  $W$  and  $\bar{K} = \rho''(K \cap R_{<\delta}^\alpha)$ . Finally, choose  $\dot{S}_\delta^\alpha$  such that

$$(\dot{S}_\delta^\alpha)^K = (C_{f_{\alpha+2+\delta}}((\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha)^K))^{W[K]}$$

whenever  $K$  is  $S_{<\delta}^\alpha$ -generic over  $W$ .

We now want to define the iteration  $\mathbb{P}$  in the interval  $[\alpha + 2, \alpha \cdot \alpha)$  by induction. Assume  $\delta < \alpha \cdot \alpha$  and  $P_{<\alpha+2+\delta}$  is already defined. Let  $G$  be  $P_{<\alpha+2+\delta}$ -generic over  $V$  and let  $W = V[G_{<\alpha+2}]$ . Work in  $W$ . Define  $S_{<\delta}^\alpha$ ,  $R_{<\delta}^\alpha$ , and  $\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha$  as above. We will sometimes use  $\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha$  to also denote a canonical  $P_{<\alpha+2}$ -name for the actual  $S_{<\delta}^\alpha$ -name

<sup>8</sup>Fix  $x \in \alpha^2$ . We define a binary relation  $\in_x$  on  $\alpha$  by setting  $\beta \in_x \gamma$  if  $x(\langle 0, \langle \beta, \gamma \rangle \rangle) = 1$ . If  $(\alpha, \in_x)$  is well-founded and extensional and  $\pi : \alpha \longrightarrow y$  is the corresponding collapsing map, then we define  $\sigma(x) = \{\pi(\beta) \mid x(\langle 1, \beta \rangle) = 1\}$ . Otherwise, we define  $\sigma(x) = \emptyset$ . If  $z \in H(\alpha^+)$  and  $b : \alpha \longrightarrow \text{tc}(\{z\} \cup \alpha)$  is a bijection, then there is an  $x \in \alpha^2$  with  $\in_x = \{\langle \beta, \gamma \rangle \mid b(\beta) \in b(\gamma)\}$ ,  $x = \{b(\beta) \mid x(\langle 1, \beta \rangle) = 1\}$  and hence  $\sigma(x) = z$ .

<sup>9</sup>Define  $x <_\alpha y$  to hold if

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \bar{x}, \bar{y} \in (\alpha^2)^{V[G_{<\alpha+1}]} [\bar{x} <^\alpha \bar{y} \wedge \sigma(\bar{x}) = x \wedge \sigma(\bar{y}) = y \\ \wedge \forall \tilde{x} \in (\alpha^2)^{V[G_{<\alpha+1}]} (\tilde{x} <^\alpha \bar{x} \rightarrow \sigma(\tilde{x}) \neq x) \\ \wedge \forall \tilde{y} \in (\alpha^2)^{V[G_{<\alpha+1}]} (\tilde{y} <^\alpha \bar{y} \rightarrow \sigma(\tilde{y}) \neq y)]. \end{aligned}$$

$\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha$  in the  $P_{<\alpha+2}$ -generic extension. We say that an element  $q$  of  $R_{<\delta}^\alpha$  is *induced by an element  $r$  of  $G$*  if

$$r \upharpoonright [\alpha + 2, \alpha + 2 + \gamma) \Vdash r(\alpha + 2 + \gamma) = \check{w}_q(\gamma)$$

holds in  $W$  for all  $\gamma < \delta$ . Let

$$K = \{p \in S_{<\delta}^\alpha \mid \exists q \in R_{<\delta}^\alpha (q \leq p \wedge q \text{ is induced by an element of } G)\}.$$

Then  $K$  is a filter in  $S_{<\delta}^\alpha$ .<sup>10</sup> Choose a canonical  $P_{<\alpha+2+\delta}$ -name  $\dot{K}$  for  $K$  and define  $\dot{P}_{\alpha+2+\delta}$  to be a canonical  $P_{<\alpha+2+\delta}$ -name such that

$$\dot{P}_{\alpha+2+\delta}^G = (C_{f_{\alpha+2+\delta}}((\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha)^{G_{<\alpha+2+\delta} * \dot{K}^G}))^{V[G]}$$

holds whenever  $G$  is  $P_{<\alpha+2+\delta}$ -generic over  $V$ . We will later show inductively (see Clause 7 of Claim 3.18) that  $P_{<\alpha+2} * S_{<\delta}^\alpha$  can be densely embedded into  $P_{<\alpha+2+\delta}$  by a canonical embedding. We will thus sometimes identify  $\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha$  not only with a  $P_{<\alpha+2} * S_{<\delta}^\alpha$ -name, but also with a  $P_{<\alpha+2+\delta}$ -name.

CASE. If there is no inaccessible  $\kappa$  such that  $\alpha$  is of the form  $b_{\kappa+2+\delta}$  for some  $\delta < \kappa$ , let  $\dot{P}_\alpha$  denote the lottery of 0 and all triples  $\langle 1, A, s \rangle$ , where  $\langle A, s \rangle$  is an  $\alpha$ -coding basis and  $A$  codes a well-order of  ${}^\alpha\alpha$  in the  $P_{<\alpha}$ -generic extension. If  $G$  is  $P_{<\alpha}$ -generic over  $V$ , a generic for  $\dot{P}_\alpha^G$  over  $V[G]$  decides for either 0 or 1 and if it decides for 1 it also decides for an  $\alpha$ -coding basis  $\langle A_\alpha, s_\alpha \rangle$ , where  $A_\alpha$  codes a well-order of  $({}^\alpha\alpha)^{V[G]}$ . If  $\alpha = b_{\kappa+2+\delta}$  for some inaccessible  $\kappa$  and  $\delta < \kappa$ , we demand that  $\dot{P}_\alpha$  decides for 1 if and only if  $\dot{a}_\delta^\alpha$  is decided by the filter on  $P_{<\kappa+2} * S_{<\delta}^\alpha$  induced by  $G$  to be 1 (it shall decide for 0 otherwise) and only in that case<sup>11</sup> let  $\dot{P}_\alpha$  also perform a lottery of all  $\alpha$ -coding bases  $\langle A, s \rangle$ , where  $A$  codes a well-order of  ${}^\kappa\kappa$  in the  $P_{<\alpha}$ -generic extension, and thus choose an  $\alpha$ -coding basis  $\langle A_\alpha, s_\alpha \rangle$  as above. Let  $\dot{A}_\alpha$  and  $\dot{s}_\alpha$  be canonical  $P_{<\alpha+1}$ -names for  $A_\alpha$  and  $s_\alpha$ . Let both denote  $\emptyset$  if no  $\alpha$ -coding basis was chosen.

Assume  $G$  is  $P_{<\alpha+1}$ -generic. Let  $A_\alpha = \dot{A}_\alpha^G$  and  $s_\alpha = \dot{s}_\alpha^G$ . Let  $\dot{P}_{\alpha+1}$  be a  $P_{<\alpha+1}$ -name such that  $\dot{P}_{\alpha+1}^G = \text{Add}(\alpha, \alpha^+)$  if  $G$  decided for 0 at stage  $\alpha$  and such that  $\dot{P}_{\alpha+1}^G = \mathbb{P}_{s_\alpha}(A_\alpha)$  if  $G$  decided for  $\langle 1, A_\alpha, s_\alpha \rangle$  at stage  $\alpha$ , with both  $\text{Add}(\alpha, \alpha^+)$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\alpha}(A_\alpha)$  defined in the sense of  $V[G]$ . Note that by Theorem 2.6,  $\text{Add}(\alpha, \alpha^+)$  ensures that  $H(\alpha^+)$  has no definable well-order in the generic extension, while  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\alpha}(A_\alpha)$  ensures that  $H(\alpha^+)$  has a definable well-order in the generic extension by Theorem 2.5. Both  $\text{Add}(\alpha, \alpha^+)$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\alpha}(A_\alpha)$  are  $<\alpha$ -closed and satisfy the  $\alpha^+$ -chain condition.

For  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ ,  $\lambda$  inaccessible and  $\gamma \in \text{supp}(p) \cap [\lambda + 2, \lambda \cdot \lambda)$ , we write  $p_\gamma^{**}$  for  $p(\gamma)$ . As a notational convention, we say  $p_\gamma^{**} = \check{1}$  otherwise. We define the *club support* of  $p$  to be the set  $C\text{-supp}(p) = \{\gamma \mid p_\gamma^{**} \neq \check{1}\}$ .

It remains to declare the supports used in the construction of our iteration. Assume  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal,  $P_{<\gamma}$  is defined for  $\gamma < \alpha$ ,  $T$  is the inverse limit of  $\langle P_{<\gamma} \mid \gamma < \alpha \rangle$  and  $p \in T$ . Then  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$  if

- $\text{supp}(p)$  is bounded in  $\alpha$  if  $\alpha$  is regular and
- for every inaccessible  $\theta$ ,  $\text{card}(C\text{-supp}(p) \cap \theta^+) < \theta$ .<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup>We will prove later that  $K$  is in fact generic for  $S_{<\delta}^\alpha$  (see Clause 7 of Claim 3.18).

<sup>11</sup>See Claim 4.7 for a motivation of this extra condition.

<sup>12</sup>The former condition is the reason why we called our iteration “*Easton-like*” earlier on.

Let  $\mathbb{P}$  be the direct limit of  $\langle P_{<\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \text{On} \rangle$ .

DEFINITION 3.2. If  $\alpha$  is inaccessible and  $v \subseteq [\alpha, \alpha \cdot \alpha]$  is of size less than  $\alpha$ , we say that  $C_v$  is the *canonical separating club for v* if

$$C_v = \{ \eta < \alpha \mid \forall \gamma_0, \gamma_1 \in v \ \gamma_0 < \gamma_1 \rightarrow f_{\gamma_0}[\eta] \text{ is a proper initial segment of } f_{\gamma_1}[\eta] \}.$$

As defined,  $C_v$  is easily seen to be a club subset of  $\alpha$ . Note that if  $v_1 \supseteq v_0$ , we have that  $C_{v_1} \subseteq C_{v_0}$ . We will tacitly make use of this in the following.

DEFINITION 3.3. If  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$  and  $\eta < \alpha$  is a cardinal, we define  $u_\eta(p)$  as follows:<sup>13</sup>

$$u_\eta(p)(\gamma) = \begin{cases} \check{1} & \text{if } \gamma < \eta, \\ \check{1} & \text{if } \gamma \in (\eta, \eta^+), \\ p(\gamma) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We will usually assume that for every  $\gamma \in \text{supp}(p)$ ,  $1_{P_{<\gamma}} \Vdash p(\gamma) \in \dot{P}_\gamma$ ; therefore  $u_\eta(p) \in P_{<\alpha}$ . We let  $u_\eta(P_{<\alpha}) = \{ u_\eta(p) \mid p \in P_{<\alpha} \}$ .

The following claim will often be tacitly used.

CLAIM 3.4. If  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ ,  $\eta < \alpha$  is a cardinal, and  $q \leq p$ , then there is  $r \leq q$  such that  $q \leq r$  (i.e.,  $q$  and  $r$  are equivalent) and  $u_\eta(r) \leq u_\eta(p)$ .

PROOF. Assume  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ ,  $\eta < \alpha$  is a cardinal and  $q \leq p$ . We want to construct  $r \leq q$  such that  $u_\eta(r) \leq u_\eta(p)$ . We define  $r$  by induction on  $i < \alpha$ . For  $i < \eta$ , let  $r(i) = q(i)$ . If  $i \geq \eta$ ,  $r \upharpoonright i$  is defined,  $r \upharpoonright i \leq q \upharpoonright i$ ,  $u_\eta(r \upharpoonright i) \leq u_\eta(p \upharpoonright i)$  and  $\dot{G}_{<\alpha}$  is the canonical name for the  $P_{<\alpha}$ -generic, let

$$r(i) = \begin{cases} q(i), & \text{if } r \upharpoonright i \in \dot{G}_{<\alpha}, \\ p(i), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then  $r \upharpoonright i \Vdash r(i) = q(i) \leq q(i)$ . Let  $A$  be a maximal antichain below  $u_\eta(r \upharpoonright i)$  that refines  $r \upharpoonright i$ , i.e., for every  $a \in A$  either  $a \leq r \upharpoonright i$  or  $a \perp r \upharpoonright i$ . If  $a \leq r \upharpoonright i$ , then  $a \Vdash r(i) = q(i) \leq p(i)$ . If  $a \perp r \upharpoonright i$ , then  $a \Vdash r(i) = p(i) \leq p(i)$ . Hence  $u_\eta(r \upharpoonright i) \Vdash r(i) \leq p(i)$ . This handles successor stages of our induction. The limit stages are immediate.  $\dashv$

DEFINITION 3.5. If  $\eta < \alpha$  is a cardinal and  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ , we define  $l_\eta(p)$  as follows:

$$l_\eta(p)(\gamma) = \begin{cases} \check{1}, & \text{if } \gamma \geq \eta^+, \\ \check{1}, & \text{if } \gamma = \eta, \\ p(\gamma), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We call  $l_\eta(p)$  the  $\eta$ -sized or the lower part of  $p$ . Note that  $l_\eta(p)$  complements  $u_\eta(p)$  in the sense that it carries exactly all information about  $p$  not contained in  $u_\eta(p)$ .

DEFINITION 3.6. (stable below  $\eta^+$ ). Assume  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  is a decreasing sequence of conditions in  $P_{<\alpha}$  of limit length  $\delta < \eta^+$ , where  $\eta < \alpha$  a cardinal. We say that  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  is stable below  $\eta^+$  iff

<sup>13</sup>We will usually use  $\check{1}$  to denote the canonical name for the weakest condition of a poset in a forcing extension, where both the poset and the forcing extension should always be clear from context.

- $\langle l_\eta(p^i) \mid i < \delta \rangle$  is eventually constant or
- $\eta$  is singular and for every cardinal  $\mu < \eta$ ,  $\langle l_\mu(p^i) \mid i < \delta \rangle$  is eventually constant.

The following definition will be the key ingredient for Claim 3.11 below. The basic idea is that if  $p$  and  $q$  are conditions in  $P_{<\alpha}$ , for  $q$  to be strategically below  $p$  means that  $q$  is (in a sense that is detailed below) *sufficiently strong* with respect to (w.r.t.)  $p$ .

**DEFINITION 3.7.** Assume  $\alpha' \leq \alpha$  and  $\theta$  is inaccessible. If  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ ,  $q \in P_{<\alpha'}$ , and  $q \leq p \upharpoonright \alpha'$ , we say that  $q$  is *strategically below  $p$  at  $\theta$*  if  $C\text{-supp}(p) \cap [\theta, \theta^+) = \emptyset$ , if  $\theta \geq \alpha'$ , or all of the following hold, letting  $\theta^* = \min(\{\alpha', \theta^+\})$ :

- (i) for all  $\gamma \in C\text{-supp}(p) \cap [\theta, \theta^*)$ ,  $q \upharpoonright \gamma$  forces that  $\dot{a}_\zeta^\theta$  has a  $P_{<\sup(\text{supp}(q) \cap \theta)}$ -name, where  $\zeta$  is such that  $\gamma = \theta + 2 + \zeta$ ,
- (ii) for all  $\gamma \in C\text{-supp}(p) \cap [\theta, \theta^*)$ ,  $q \upharpoonright \gamma$  forces that  $\max q_\gamma^{**} > \sup(\text{supp}(p) \cap \theta)$  and that  $\sup(\text{supp}(q) \cap \theta) > \max p_\gamma^{**}$ ,
- (iii)  $\sup(\text{supp}(q) \cap \theta)$  is larger than or equal to some element of  $C_{C\text{-supp}(p) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)}$  above  $\sup(\text{supp}(p) \cap \theta)$ , and
- (iv)  $\sup(\text{supp}(q) \cap \theta)$  is greater than the cardinality of  $C\text{-supp}(p) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)$ .
- (v) Let  $v := \text{card } \sup(\text{supp}(p) \cap \theta)$ . Then  $\sup(\text{supp}(q) \cap \theta) \geq v^{+ \cdot v}$ .

If  $\eta < \alpha' \leq \alpha$ ,  $\eta$  is a cardinal and  $q \leq p \upharpoonright \alpha'$ , we say that  $q$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$  if for every inaccessible  $\theta > \eta$ ,  $q$  is strategically below  $p$  at  $\theta$ . It is immediate that if  $\eta_0 < \eta_1$  are both cardinals and  $q$  is  $\eta_0^+$ -strategically below  $p$  then  $q$  is  $\eta_1^+$ -strategically below  $p$ .

The common case will be when  $\alpha' = \alpha$  in the above. If  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ ,  $q \in P_{<\alpha'}$ ,  $\alpha' < \alpha$ , and  $q$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$ , then  $q$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p \upharpoonright \alpha'$ . The reverse direction of this implication will usually not hold, as in general (iii) and (iv) get weaker as  $\alpha$  gets smaller. A couple more trivial facts that will be useful later on are the following.

- CLAIM 3.8.** • If  $\alpha < \alpha^*$ ,  $p, q \in P_{<\alpha^*}$ , and  $q$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$ , then  $q \upharpoonright \alpha$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p \upharpoonright \alpha$ .
- For  $p, q, r \in P_{<\alpha}$  and a cardinal  $\eta < \alpha$ , if  $q$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$  and  $r \leq q$ , then  $r$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$ .
  - For  $p, q, r \in P_{<\alpha}$  and a cardinal  $\eta < \alpha$ , if  $q \leq p$  and  $r$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $q$ , then  $r$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$ .

**PROOF.** Straightforward from Definition 3.7. ⊥

**NOTATION 3.9.** Given a decreasing sequence of conditions  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  in  $P_{<\alpha}$  of limit length  $\delta$ , we say that a sequence  $r = \langle r(\gamma) \mid \gamma < \alpha \rangle$  is the *componentwise union* of  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  if the following statements hold.

- If  $\gamma < \alpha$  with  $\gamma \in [\theta + 2, \theta \cdot \theta)$  for some inaccessible  $\theta$ , then  $r(\gamma)$  is the canonical  $P_{<\gamma}$ -name for the set  $\bigcup_{i < \delta} (p^i)_\gamma^{**}$ ; we denote  $r(\gamma)$  by  $r_\gamma^{**}$ .
- Otherwise,  $r(\gamma)$  is the canonical  $P_{<\gamma}$ -name for  $\inf\{p^i(\gamma) \mid i < \delta\}$ .

The sequence  $r$  is usually not a condition in  $P_{<\alpha}$  as the  $r_\gamma^{**}$  are not necessarily names for closed sets, but the supports of  $r$  can be calculated as if  $r$  were a condition by letting

$$\text{supp}(r) = \{\gamma \mid r(\gamma) \neq \check{1}\} = \bigcup_{i < \delta} \text{supp}(p^i)$$

and

$$\text{C-supp}(r) = \{\gamma \mid r_\gamma^{**} \neq \check{1}\} = \bigcup_{i < \delta} \text{C-supp}(p^i).$$

If  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ ,  $\dot{x}$  is a  $P_{<\gamma}$ -name for either 0 or 1 and  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$  for some  $\alpha > \gamma$ , we write  $p \upharpoonright \gamma \Vdash p(\gamma) = \dot{x}$  to abbreviate the following: there is a maximal antichain  $A$  below  $p \upharpoonright \gamma$  which decides  $\dot{x}$  such that if  $a \in A$  and  $a \Vdash \dot{x} = 0$  then  $a \Vdash p(\gamma) = 0$ , and if  $a \in A$  and  $a \Vdash \dot{x} = 1$  then there exist  $P_{<\gamma}$ -names  $\dot{s}$  and  $\dot{A}$  such that  $a \Vdash p(\gamma) = \langle 1, \dot{A}, \dot{s} \rangle$ .

**DEFINITION 3.10 (Strategic lower bound).** Given a cardinal  $\eta < \alpha$  and a sequence  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  of conditions in  $P_{<\alpha}$  of limit length  $\delta < \eta^+$  which is stable below  $\eta^+$ , form their componentwise union  $r$ , which exists by our assumptions.  $\text{supp}(r)$  is bounded below every regular cardinal and  $\text{C-supp}(r) \cap \theta^+$  has size less than  $\theta$  for every inaccessible  $\theta$ . We would like to obtain a condition  $q \in P_{<\alpha}$  with the following properties for every  $\gamma \in \text{C-supp}(r)$ ,  $\gamma \geq \eta^+$ ,  $\gamma = \text{card } \gamma + 2 + \xi$ :

- (1)  $q \upharpoonright \gamma \Vdash q(b_{\text{otp } f_\gamma[\text{sup } r_\gamma^{**}]}) = \dot{a}_\xi^{\text{card } \gamma}$  and
- (2)  $q \upharpoonright \gamma \Vdash q_\gamma^{**} := r_\gamma^{**} \cup \{\text{sup } r_\gamma^{**}\}$ .

Components of  $q$  other than the above should be equal to the respective components of  $r$ . If such  $q$  exists, we call  $q$  the  $\eta^+$ -strategic lower bound for  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$ . Whenever we want to apply the above, we will be in a situation where each  $\text{sup } r_\gamma^{**}$  will have been decided (by any lower bound of  $\langle p^i \upharpoonright \gamma \mid i < \delta \rangle$ ) to equal an actual ordinal value (and is not just a name for an ordinal). Note that (1) implies that  $q \upharpoonright \gamma$  forces that  $c(\text{otp } f_\gamma[\text{sup } r_\gamma^{**}]) = \dot{a}_\xi^{\text{card } \gamma}$ . It is immediate from the definitions that if our desired  $q$  exists as a condition in  $P_{<\alpha}$ , then  $q$  is a lower bound for  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$ , i.e.,  $q \leq p^i$  for each  $i < \delta$ .

**CLAIM 3.11.** *If  $\eta < \alpha$  is a cardinal and  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  is a decreasing sequence of conditions in  $P_{<\alpha}$  of limit length  $\delta < \eta^+$  which is stable below  $\eta^+$  such that  $p^{i+1}$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p^i$  for every  $i < \delta$ , then the sequence of conditions  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  has an  $\eta^+$ -strategic lower bound.*

**PROOF.** By induction on  $\alpha \geq \eta^+$ . If  $\alpha = \eta^+$ , the claim follows by stability of  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  below  $\eta^+$ . Given that the claim holds below  $\alpha$ , we want to show that there exists an  $\eta^+$ -strategic lower bound  $q^\alpha$  for  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$ . Inductively, for  $\gamma < \alpha$ , let  $q^\gamma$  be the  $\eta^+$ -strategic lower bound of  $\langle p^i \upharpoonright \gamma \mid i < \delta \rangle$ . We will also use that if  $\gamma_0 < \gamma_1 < \alpha$ , then  $q^{\gamma_1} \upharpoonright \gamma_0 \leq q^{\gamma_0}$ . Thus we also have to show that if  $\gamma < \alpha$ , then  $q^\alpha \upharpoonright \gamma \leq q^\gamma$ . Let  $r$  be the componentwise union of  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$ . We first show that the sequence  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  has the property that for every inaccessible  $\theta \in (\eta, \alpha)$ , either  $\text{C-supp}(p^i) \cap [\theta, \theta^+) = \emptyset$  for all  $i < \delta$  or the following hold:

- (i)  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) > \text{sup}(\text{supp}(p^i) \cap \theta)$  for all  $i < \delta$ ,
- (ii) for  $\gamma \in \text{C-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)$ ,  $q^\gamma \Vdash \text{sup } r_\gamma^{**} = \text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  and
- (iii)  $f_\gamma[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)] \supseteq \text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$ ,
- (iv) for  $\gamma_0 < \gamma_1$  both in  $\text{C-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)$ ,  $f_{\gamma_0}[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]$  is a proper initial segment of  $f_{\gamma_1}[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]$ ,
- (v) for  $\gamma \in \text{C-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)$ ,  $q^\gamma$  forces that  $\dot{a}_\xi^\theta$  has a  $P_{<\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)}$ -name, where  $\xi$  is such that  $\theta + 2 + \xi = \gamma$ ,

- (vi)  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) \geq \text{card}(\text{C-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+))$  and
- (vii) there is no inaccessible  $\lambda < \theta$  such that  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) \in [\lambda, \lambda \cdot \lambda)$ .

Property (i) immediately follows from property (v) in Definition 3.7. Property (ii) follows from Property (ii) in Definition 3.7, using that  $q^\gamma$  is stronger than  $p^i \upharpoonright \gamma$  for every  $i < \delta$ . Property (iii) follows from Property (v) in Definition 3.7 as the latter implies that  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  is a cardinal. Property (iv) follows as Property (iii) in Definition 3.7 implies that  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  belongs to  $C_{\text{C-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)}$ . Property (v) follows from Property (i) in Definition 3.7 and Property (vi) follows from Property (iv) in Definition 3.7. We are thus left with proving Property (vii). Note that  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  cannot be equal to  $\lambda$  for some inaccessible  $\lambda < \theta$  as Property (v) in Definition 3.7 implies that  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  has cofinality  $\leq \eta$ , but stability of  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  implies that  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) \geq \eta$  and equality can only occur if  $\eta$  is singular. Moreover Property (v) in Definition 3.7 implies that it cannot be in  $(\lambda, \lambda \cdot \lambda)$ .

Now we show, using (i)-(vii), that we can form the  $\eta^+$ -strategic lower bound  $q^\alpha$  of  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$ . This is trivial (using induction) if  $\text{card } \alpha$  is not inaccessible. Note that if we can form  $q^\alpha \in P_{<\alpha}$  out of  $r$  as in definition 3.10, then  $q^\alpha \upharpoonright \gamma \leq q^\gamma$  for every  $\gamma < \alpha$ . Assume  $\theta \in (\eta, \alpha)$  is inaccessible and  $\gamma \in [\theta + 2, \theta \cdot \theta)$ . Given (i)-(iv),  $q^\gamma$  decides  $\text{sup } r_\gamma^{**}$  and  $\text{otp } f_\gamma[\text{sup } r_\gamma^{**}] \geq \text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  is distinct from  $\text{otp } f_\xi[\text{sup } r_\xi^{**}]$  for every  $\xi < \gamma$ . By (v), if  $\xi$  is such that  $\theta + 2 + \xi = \gamma$ ,  $q^\gamma$  forces that  $\dot{a}_\xi^\theta$  has a  $P_{<\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)}$ -name, allowing us to satisfy (1) as in definition 3.10, as  $b_{\text{otp } f_\gamma[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]} \geq \text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  and as by (vii) and (iii), there cannot be some inaccessible  $\lambda < \theta$  with  $\text{otp } f_\gamma[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)] \in [\lambda, \lambda \cdot \lambda)$ . (2) in Definition 3.10 can obviously be satisfied. Finally (vi) implies that  $\text{supp}(q^\alpha) \setminus \text{supp}(r)$  (and hence  $\text{supp}(q^\alpha)$ ) is bounded below every regular cardinal and hence  $q^\alpha$  actually is a condition in  $P_{<\alpha}$ . ⊣

**CLAIM 3.12.** *Assume  $\eta$  is a cardinal,  $\alpha > \eta$  is a limit ordinal,  $p$  and  $q$  are conditions in  $P_{<\alpha}$ ,  $\langle \alpha_j \mid j < \text{cof}(\alpha) \rangle$  is cofinal in  $\alpha$ , and increasing with  $\alpha_0 > \eta$  s.t. for every  $j < \text{cof}(\alpha)$ ,  $q \upharpoonright \alpha_j$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$ . Then  $q$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$ .*

**PROOF.** Immediate from Definition 3.7. ⊣

**CLAIM 3.13.** *Assume  $\eta < \alpha$  is a cardinal,  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal,  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  is a decreasing sequence of conditions of limit length  $\delta < \eta^+$  in  $P_{<\alpha}$  which is stable below  $\eta^+$ ,  $\langle \alpha_j \mid j < \text{cof}(\alpha) \rangle$  is cofinal in  $\alpha$  and increasing such that  $\alpha_0 > \eta$  and:*

- $\forall i < \delta$  there exists  $j < \text{cof}(\alpha)$  such that  $p^{i+1} \upharpoonright \alpha_j$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p^i$  and  $p^{i+1} \upharpoonright \alpha_j = p^i \upharpoonright \alpha_j$ .
- $\forall j < \text{cof}(\alpha)$  there are unboundedly many  $i < \delta$  for which there exists  $k \geq j$  such that  $p^{i+1} \upharpoonright \alpha_k$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p^i$ .

*Then the  $\eta^+$ -strategic lower bound for  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$  exists.*

**PROOF.** By Claim 3.11, we know that for every  $j < \text{cof}(\alpha)$ , the  $\eta^+$ -strategic lower bound for  $\langle p^i \upharpoonright \alpha_j \mid i < \delta \rangle$  exists and denote it by  $q^j$ . It is easily observed that the componentwise union of the  $q^j$  is a condition in  $P_{<\alpha}$ <sup>14</sup> and is the  $\eta^+$ -strategic lower bound for  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$ . ⊣

<sup>14</sup>As for every  $\gamma < \alpha$ ,  $\langle (q^j)_{\upharpoonright \gamma}^{**} \mid j < \text{cof}(\alpha) \rangle$  is eventually constant.

DEFINITION 3.14. If  $D$  is a dense subset of  $P_{<\alpha}$  and  $\eta < \alpha$  is a cardinal, we say that  $q$  reduces  $D$  below  $\eta$  if for every  $r \in P_{<\alpha}$  with  $u_\eta(r) \leq u_\eta(q)$ , there is  $s \leq r$  with  $u_\eta(s) = u_\eta(r)$  and such that  $s$  meets  $D$  in the sense that  $\exists d \in D \ s \leq d$ .

DEFINITION 3.15. If  $P$  is a notion of forcing and  $D \subseteq P$ , we say that  $D$  is an *equivalent dense subset* of  $P$  if for every  $p \in P$ , there is  $d \in D$  so that  $d \leq p$  and  $p \leq d$ , i.e.,  $p$  and  $d$  are *equivalent*.

DEFINITION 3.16. Let  $\gamma(\alpha)$  denote the supremum of the cardinals  $\gamma < \alpha$  such that  $\dot{P}_\gamma$  does not denote the trivial forcing, i.e., assuming that (as we will show later on inductively) initial segments of our iteration preserve cofinalities, inaccessibles, and the continuum function,

$$\gamma(\alpha) = \sup(\{\theta < \alpha \mid \theta \in \Gamma \text{ or } \theta \text{ is inaccessible}\}).$$

Let  $S : \text{On} \rightarrow \text{Card}$  be defined as follows:

$$S(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha \leq \min(\Gamma), \\ \alpha & \text{if } \alpha \text{ is inaccessible,} \\ \gamma(\alpha)^+ & \text{if } \gamma(\alpha) \text{ is a singular limit point of } \Gamma, \\ 2^{\gamma(\alpha)^+} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We will show later that for every  $\alpha$ ,  $P_{<\alpha}$  has a dense subset of size  $S(\alpha)$ .

CLAIM 3.17.  $\forall \beta \in \Gamma \ S(\beta) \leq \beta$ .

PROOF. If  $\beta \in \Gamma$ ,  $\beta = \lambda^+$  for some  $\lambda \in B_s$ . If  $\lambda$  is a (singular) limit point of  $\Gamma$ ,  $S(\beta) = S(\lambda) = \beta$ . If  $\lambda$  is not a limit point of  $\Gamma$ , then  $\gamma(\beta) < \lambda$  and therefore  $S(\beta) \leq 2^{\gamma(\beta)^+} < \lambda < \beta$ . ⊣

CLAIM 3.18. *Suppose  $\omega \leq \eta < \alpha$ ,  $\kappa = \text{card } \alpha$  and  $\eta$  is a cardinal such that either  $S(\eta) \leq \eta$  or  $\eta$  is a limit point of  $\{v \mid S(v) \leq v\}$ .*

1. [Strategic Successors, Strategic Closure]  
*If  $\alpha^* \geq \alpha$ ,  $p \in P_{<\alpha^*}$  and  $q \leq p \upharpoonright \alpha$ , then there is  $r \leq q$ , which is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$  such that  $l_\eta(r) = l_\eta(q)$ . Consequently,  $u_\eta(P_{<\alpha})$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically closed.*
2. [Smallness of the iteration]  
 *$P_{<\alpha}$  has a dense subset  $E_{<\alpha}$  of size  $S(\alpha)$ .*
3. [Early Club Information]  
*If  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ , then there is  $q \leq p$  so that  $l_\eta(q) = l_\eta(p)$  and  $q \upharpoonright i$  forces that  $q_i^{**}$  has a  $P_{<\text{card } i}$ -name whenever  $i \in C\text{-supp}(q)$ ,  $i \geq \eta^+$ . If  $q$  is such, we say that  $q$  has early club information above  $\eta$ .*
4. [Chain Condition]  
*Assume  $\eta$  is regular. If  $J$  is an antichain of  $P_{<\alpha}$  such that  $u_\eta(p) \parallel u_\eta(q)$  whenever  $p$  and  $q$  are in  $J$ , then  $|J| \leq \eta$ .*
5. [Reducing dense sets]
  - *Assume  $\eta$  is regular and  $\langle D_i \mid i < \eta \rangle$  is a collection of dense subsets of  $P_{<\alpha}$ . Then any condition in  $P_{<\alpha}$  can be strengthened to a condition  $q$  with the same  $\eta$ -sized part so that for every  $i < \eta$ ,  $q$  reduces  $D_i$  below  $\eta$ .*
  - *Assume  $\eta \leq \alpha$  is singular and  $\langle D_i \mid i < \eta \rangle$  is a collection of dense subsets of  $P_{<\alpha}$ . Then for any cardinal  $\zeta < \eta$ , any condition in  $P_{<\alpha}$  can be strengthened*

to a condition  $q$  with the same  $\zeta$ -sized part so that for every  $i < \eta$  there exists  $\eta_i < \eta$  so that  $q$  reduces  $D_i$  below  $\eta_i$ .

6. [Early names]

- Assume  $\eta$  is regular and  $\dot{f}$  is a  $P_{<\alpha}$ -name for an ordinal-valued function with domain  $\eta$ . Then any condition in  $P_{<\alpha}$  can be strengthened to a condition  $q$  with the same  $\eta$ -sized part forcing that for every  $i < \eta$ , there is a maximal antichain of size at most  $\eta$  below  $q$  deciding  $\dot{f}(i)$ , where for every element  $a$  of that antichain,  $u_\eta(a) = u_\eta(q)$ . In particular,  $q$  forces that  $\dot{f}$  has a  $P_\gamma$ -name for some  $\gamma < \eta^+$ .
- Let  $\eta \leq \alpha$  be a singular cardinal. Let  $\dot{f}$  be a  $P_{<\alpha}$ -name for an ordinal-valued function with domain  $\eta$ . Then for any cardinal  $\zeta < \eta$ , any condition in  $P_{<\alpha}$  can be strengthened to a condition  $q$  with the same  $\zeta$ -sized part, forcing that for every  $i < \eta$ , there is a maximal antichain of size less than  $\eta$  below  $q$  deciding  $\dot{f}(i)$ , where for every element  $a$  of that antichain,  $u_\eta(a) = u_\eta(q)$ . In particular,  $q$  forces that  $\dot{f}$  has a  $P_\eta$ -name.

7. [Factoring] If  $\kappa$  is inaccessible,  $\alpha \in (\kappa + 2, \kappa \cdot \kappa]$  and  $\alpha = \kappa + 2 + \delta$ , then there is an embedding  $\pi: P_{<\kappa+2} * S_{<\delta}^\kappa \rightarrow P_{<\alpha}$  such that  $\pi'' P_{<\kappa+2} * R_{<\delta}^\kappa$  is dense in  $P_{<\alpha}$ , with  $S_{<\delta}^\kappa$  and  $R_{<\delta}^\kappa$  as defined at the beginning of this section. Hence  $P_{<\alpha} \cong P_{<\kappa+2} * S_{<\delta}^\kappa \cong P_{<\kappa+2} * R_{<\delta}^\kappa$ .

8. [Covering, Preservation of Cofinalities]

For every cardinal  $\theta$ , for every  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$  and every  $P_{<\alpha}$ -name  $\dot{x}$  for a set of ordinals of size  $\theta$  there is a set  $X$  in  $V$  of size  $\theta$  and an extension  $q$  of  $p$  such that  $q \Vdash \dot{x} \subseteq X$ . Therefore forcing with  $P_{<\alpha}$  preserves all cofinalities.

9. [Preservation of the continuum function]

Forcing with  $P_{<\alpha}$  preserves the continuum function and thus in particular all inaccessibles.

10. [Club Extendibility]

If  $I \subseteq \alpha$  is s.t.  $\text{card}(I \cap \theta^+) < \theta$  for every regular  $\theta$ ,  $I \subseteq \bigcup\{[\theta + 2, \theta \cdot \theta) \mid \theta \text{ inaccessible}\}$  and  $\langle \bar{\delta}^i \mid i \in I \rangle$  is such that  $\bar{\delta}^i < \text{card } i$  for every  $i \in I$ , then for every  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ , there is  $q \leq p$  such that  $\forall i \in I \ q \upharpoonright i \Vdash \max q_i^{**} \geq \bar{\delta}^i$ . Moreover if  $\eta < \text{card min } I$  is regular, there is such  $q$  with  $l_\eta(q) = l_\eta(p)$ .

PROOF. We will proceed by induction on  $\alpha$ .

PROOF OF 1. This is trivial if  $\eta = \kappa$ . Thus assume  $\eta < \kappa$ . We distinguish several cases for  $\alpha$ . Note that (iii), (iv), and (v) in Definition 3.7 can easily be satisfied by choosing  $r$  such that  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  is sufficiently large whenever  $C\text{-supp}(p) \cap [\theta, \theta^+) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\theta \in (\eta, \alpha)$  is inaccessible. We will thus ignore (iii), (iv), and (v) in the following and concentrate only on (i) and (ii).

Case 1:  $\alpha = \beta + 1$  is a successor ordinal.

This is trivial by 1 inductively if  $\kappa$  is not inaccessible or  $\alpha \leq \kappa + 2$ . We thus assume that  $\kappa$  is inaccessible and  $\beta \geq \kappa + 2$ . Assume first that  $\eta$  is regular. Let  $\xi$  be such that  $\beta = \kappa + 2 + \xi$ . Using 6 inductively, we may strengthen  $q$  to  $q^*$  so that  $(q^*)_\beta^{**} = q_\beta^{**}$  and  $q^* \upharpoonright \beta$  forces that  $\dot{a}_\xi^\kappa$  and  $\text{sup } q_\beta^{**}$  have  $P_{<\text{sup}(\text{supp}(q^*) \cap \kappa)}$ -names while  $l_\eta(q^*) = l_\eta(q)$ . Now use 1 inductively to find  $r \leq q^*$  such that  $r \upharpoonright \beta$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$  while  $l_\eta(r) = l_\eta(q^*)$ . Choose a cardinal  $\delta < \kappa$  such that

- $\delta > \eta, \delta > \text{sup}(\text{supp}(p) \cap \kappa), q^* \upharpoonright \beta$  forces  $\delta > \text{sup } q_\beta^{**}$ , and
- $\text{otp } f_\beta[\delta] > \text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \kappa)$ .



The former is possible as by our (inductive) use of 6, there is a maximal antichain of size at most  $\eta < \kappa$  of conditions below  $q^* \restriction \beta$  deciding  $\text{sup } q^*$ . Let  $r_\beta^{**}$  be such that  $r \restriction \beta \Vdash r_\beta^{**} = q_\beta^{**} \cup \{\delta\}$  and set  $r(b_{\text{otp } f_\beta[\delta]})$  such that  $r \restriction \beta \Vdash r(b_{\text{otp } f_\beta[\delta]}) = \dot{a}_\xi^\kappa$ . Then  $r \leq q$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$  and  $I_\eta(r) = I_\eta(q)$ , as desired. The case when  $\eta$  is singular is similar.

Case 2:  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal,  $\text{cof}(\alpha) = \kappa$ .

Let  $\bar{\alpha} = \text{sup}(\text{supp}(q) \cap \alpha) < \alpha$ . Now use 1 inductively to find  $r \leq q$  such that  $r \restriction \bar{\alpha}$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$  and  $r[\bar{\alpha}, \alpha] = q[\bar{\alpha}, \alpha]$ . Then  $r \leq q$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$ , as desired. The additional lower parts agreement requirements are easy to satisfy using induction.

Case 3:  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal,  $\text{cof}(\alpha) < \kappa$ .

Let  $\eta^* = \max\{\eta, \text{cof}(\alpha)\}$ . Let  $\langle \alpha_i \mid i < \text{cof}(\alpha) \rangle$  be an increasing sequence cofinal in  $\alpha$  with  $\alpha_0 > \eta^*$ . We build a decreasing sequence of conditions  $\langle q^i \mid i \leq \text{cof}(\alpha) \rangle$  as follows.

- Let  $q^0$  be so that  $q^0 \restriction \alpha_0 \leq q \restriction \alpha_0$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$  and  $q^0[\alpha_0, \alpha] = q[\alpha_0, \alpha]$ .
- Given  $q^i$ , let  $q^{i+1}$  be so that  $q^{i+1} \restriction \alpha_i$  is  $(\eta^*)^+$ -strategically below  $q^i$  and  $q^{i+1}[\alpha_i, \alpha] = q^i[\alpha_i, \alpha]$ .
- If  $\delta \leq \text{cof}(\alpha)$  is a limit ordinal, let  $q^\delta$  be the  $(\eta^*)^+$ -strategic lower bound of  $\langle q^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$ , which exists by Claim 3.13.

$q^{\text{cof}(\alpha)} \leq q$  is  $(\eta^*)^+$ -strategically below  $p$  by Claim 3.13, hence by our assumption on  $q^0$  above,  $q^{\text{cof}(\alpha)}$  is  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p$ , as desired. The additional lower parts agreement requirements are easy to satisfy using induction.  $\dashv$

PROOF OF 2. We will show that  $D_{<\alpha} = \{p \in P_{<\alpha} \mid \forall \theta \in \text{Card } \text{supp}(p) \cap (\theta, \theta^+) \neq \emptyset \rightarrow p \restriction \theta \Vdash p(\theta) \neq \check{1}\}$  has an equivalent dense subset  $E_{<\alpha}$  of size  $S(\alpha)$ . Note that  $D_{<\alpha}$  itself is dense in  $P_{<\alpha}$  and that for different  $\alpha$ , the  $D_{<\alpha}$  cohere. The claim is trivial if  $\alpha \leq \min(\Gamma)$ , as  $P_{<\alpha}$  denotes the trivial iteration of length  $\alpha$  in this case.

Assume first that  $\alpha = \beta + 1$  and  $D_{<\beta}$  has an equivalent dense subset  $E_{<\beta}$  of size  $S(\beta)$  by 2 inductively. The only nontrivial cases are when  $\dot{P}_\beta$  does not denote the trivial forcing, i.e., when either  $\beta \in \Gamma$ ,  $\beta = \gamma + 1$  for some  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , or  $\text{card } \beta = \kappa$  is inaccessible and therefore  $\gamma(\alpha) = \kappa$ .

If  $\beta \in \Gamma$ , conditions in  $Q_\beta$  can canonically be identified with subsets of  $\beta^+$ , hence a  $P_{<\beta}$ -name for a condition in  $\dot{P}_\beta$  can be identified with a collection of  $\beta^+$ -many antichains of  $E_{<\beta}$ , which is of size  $\leq \beta$  and hence this gives rise to an equivalent dense subset  $E_{<\alpha}$  of  $D_{<\alpha}$  of size  $2^{\beta^+} = S(\alpha)$ .

If  $\beta = \gamma + 1$  for some  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , conditions in  $Q_\beta$  can canonically be identified with subsets of  $\gamma^+$ , hence if  $p \in D_{<\alpha}$ , we may assume that  $p \restriction \beta \in E_{<\beta}$  and  $p(\beta)$  can be identified with a collection of  $\gamma^+$ -many antichains of  $E_{<\beta}$  below  $p \restriction \beta$ . Since for any two elements  $a_0, a_1$  of such an antichain  $u_\gamma(a_0) = u_\gamma(a_1)$ , such an antichain will have size at most  $\gamma$  by 4 inductively, giving rise to an equivalent dense subset  $E_{<\alpha}$  of  $D_{<\alpha}$  of size  $2^{\gamma^+} = S(\alpha)$ .

If  $\text{card } \beta = \kappa$  is inaccessible, then  $S(\beta) \leq 2^{\kappa^+}$  and conditions in  $Q_\beta$  can canonically be identified with subsets of  $\kappa^+$ , hence if  $p \in D_{<\alpha}$ , we may assume that  $p \restriction \beta \in E_{<\beta}$  and  $p(\beta)$  can be identified with a collection of  $\kappa^+$ -many antichains of  $E_{<\beta}$  below  $p \restriction \beta$ . Since for any two elements  $a_0, a_1$  of such an antichain

$u_\kappa(a_0) = u_\kappa(a_1)$ , such an antichain will have size at most  $\kappa$  by 4 inductively, giving rise to an equivalent dense subset  $E_{<\alpha}$  of  $D_{<\alpha}$  of size  $2^{\kappa^+} = S(\alpha)$ .

Now we consider the case that  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal. Since the  $E_{<\beta}$  cohere for  $\beta < \alpha$ , if  $\alpha$  is a limit point of  $\Gamma$  and  $p \in D_{<\alpha}$ , we may assume that for every  $\beta < \alpha$  we have  $p \upharpoonright \beta \in E_{<\beta}$ . We will thus either obtain an equivalent dense subset  $E_{<\alpha}$  of  $D_{<\alpha}$  of size  $\alpha$  for  $\alpha$  inaccessible by the boundedness of the supports or of size  $\alpha^+$  for  $\alpha$  singular. If  $\alpha$  is singular but not a limit point of  $\Gamma$  or  $\alpha$  is regular but not inaccessible, we have that  $\gamma(\alpha) < \alpha$  and the result is therefore immediate inductively.  $\dashv$

**PROOF OF 3.** This proof is similar to the proof of 1: Let  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$  be given. We may assume that  $\kappa$  is inaccessible and  $\alpha > \kappa + 2$  as 3 is immediate by 3 inductively otherwise. We distinguish several cases for  $\alpha$ .

*Case 1:  $\alpha = \beta + 1$  is a successor ordinal.*

Strengthen  $p$  to  $p^*$  so that  $p^* \upharpoonright \beta$  forces that  $p_{\beta}^{**}$  has a  $P_{<\kappa}$ -name and so that  $l_\eta(p^*) = l_\eta(p)$ , using 6 inductively, and let  $(p^*)_{\beta}^{**} = p_{\beta}^{**}$ . Now use 3 inductively to find  $q \leq p^*$  with  $l_\eta(q) = l_\eta(p^*)$  such that  $q \upharpoonright \beta$  has early club information above  $\eta$  and  $q_{\beta}^{**} = (p^*)_{\beta}^{**}$ . Then  $q$  has early club information above  $\eta$ , as desired.

*Case 2:  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal,  $\text{cof}(\alpha) = \kappa$ .*

Let  $\bar{\alpha} = \sup(\text{supp}(p) \cap \alpha) < \alpha$ . Now use 3 inductively to find  $q \leq p$  such that  $q \upharpoonright \bar{\alpha}$  has early club information above  $\eta$ ,  $l_\eta(q) = l_\eta(p)$ , and  $q[\bar{\alpha}, \alpha) = p[\bar{\alpha}, \alpha)$ . Then  $q$  has early club information above  $\eta$ , as desired.

*Case 3:  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal,  $\text{cof}(\alpha) < \kappa$ .*

Let  $\eta^* = \max(\{\eta, \text{cof}(\alpha)\})$ . Let  $\langle \alpha_i \mid i < \text{cof}(\alpha) \rangle$  be an increasing sequence cofinal in  $\alpha$  with  $\alpha_0 > \eta^*$ . We build a decreasing sequence of conditions  $\langle p^i \mid i \leq \text{cof}(\alpha) \rangle$  as follows.

- Let  $p^0 \leq p$  be so that  $p^0 \upharpoonright \alpha_0$  has early club information above  $\eta$  and  $l_\eta(p^0) = l_\eta(p)$ .
- Given  $p^i$ , let  $p^{i+1}$  be so that  $p^{i+1}$  is  $(\eta^*)^+$ -strategically below  $p^i$ ,  $p^{i+1} \upharpoonright \alpha_i$  has early club information above  $\eta^*$  and  $l_{\eta^*}(p^{i+1}) = l_{\eta^*}(p^i)$ .
- If  $\delta \leq \text{cof}(\alpha)$  is a limit ordinal, let  $p^\delta$  be the  $(\eta^*)^+$ -strategic lower bound of  $\langle p^i \mid i < \delta \rangle$ , which exists by Claim 3.13.

$q := p^{\text{cof}(\alpha)} \leq p$  has early club information above  $\eta$ , as desired.  $\dashv$

**PROOF OF 4.** We may assume that  $\eta$  is inaccessible or  $\eta \in \Gamma$ , as otherwise 4 is immediate from our assumption that  $S(\eta) \leq \eta$  and the fact that  $\mathbb{P}$  is trivial in  $[\eta, \eta^+)$ . Assume  $J$  is an antichain of  $P_{<\alpha}$  such that whenever  $p$  and  $q$  are in  $J$ ,  $u_\eta(p) \parallel u_\eta(q)$ . We may assume that all conditions in  $J$  are from  $E_{<\alpha}$  and have early club information. Assume for a contradiction that  $J$  has size at least  $\eta^+$ . As  $E_{<\eta}$  has size  $\leq \eta$ ,  $p \upharpoonright \eta$  is the same for  $\eta^+$ -many conditions in  $J$  and thus we may assume it is the same for all conditions in  $J$ . As  $\eta^{<\eta} = \eta$  in  $V$  by the SCH at singular fixed points of the  $\beth$ -function, we can apply a  $\Delta$ -system argument and obtain that there is  $W \subseteq J$  of size  $\eta^+$  and a subset  $A$  of  $\eta^+$  of size less than  $\eta$  such that  $\text{C-supp}(p) \cap \text{C-supp}(q) \cap [\eta, \eta^+) = A$  whenever  $p \neq q$  are both in  $W$ . Using  $\eta^{<\eta} = \eta$  in the  $P_{<\eta^+}$ -generic extension by 9 inductively, it follows that for  $\eta^+$ -many conditions  $p$  in  $W$ ,  $\langle p_i^{**} \mid i \in A \rangle$  is the same (modulo equivalence). Using

the assumption that  $u_\eta(p) \parallel u_\eta(q)$  it follows that  $W$  induces an antichain of  $\mathbb{P}_{S_\kappa}(A_\kappa)$  of size  $\kappa^+$ , contradicting Proposition 2.2.  $\dashv$

PROOF OF 5. We will first show the following:

CLAIM 3.19. Assume  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ ,  $D$  is a dense subset of  $P_{<\alpha}$  and  $v < \alpha$  is regular with  $S(v) \leq v$ . Then there is  $q \leq p$  such that  $l_v(q) = l_v(p)$  and  $q$  reduces  $D$  below  $v$ .

PROOF. Build a decreasing sequence of conditions in  $P_{<\alpha}$  below  $p$  as follows: Let  $p^0 = p$ . Choose  $q^0$  so that  $q^0 \leq p^0$  and  $q^0 \in D$ . By possibly passing to an equivalent condition, we may also ensure that  $u_v(q^0) \leq u_v(p^0)$ . At stage  $j + 1$ , let  $p^{j+1} \leq p^0$  be any condition incompatible with all  $q^k$ ,  $k \leq j$ , such that  $u_v(p^{j+1}) = u_v(q^j)$  if such exists and choose  $q^{j+1}$  such that:

- $q^{j+1} \leq p^{j+1}$ ,
- $q^{j+1} \in D$ , and
- $u_v(q^{j+1})$  is chosen according to the strategy for  $v^+$ -strategic closure below  $\langle u_v(q^k) \mid k \leq j \rangle$ .

At limit stages  $j < v^+$ , let  $p^j \leq p^0$  be a condition which is incompatible with all  $q^k$ ,  $k < j$  so that for all  $k < j$ ,  $u_v(p^j) \leq u_v(q^k)$  if such exists. Note that a  $p^j$  satisfying the latter condition can always be found by the strategic choice of the  $u_v(q^k)$ . Choose  $q^j \leq p^j$  so that  $q^j \in D$  and  $u_v(q^j) \leq u_v(p^j)$ . Proceed until at some stage  $j$  no condition  $p^j$  as above can be chosen. By 4, this will be the case for some  $j < v^+$ . We can then find  $q \in P_{<\alpha}$  so that  $u_v(q) \leq u_v(q^k)$  for every  $k < j$  and  $l_v(q) = l_v(p)$ . By our construction,  $q$  reduces  $D$  below  $v$ .  $\dashv$

Using 1 and the claim for  $v = \eta$ , the case of regular  $\eta$  follows immediately. For the case of  $\eta \leq \alpha$  singular, choose a continuous, cofinal in  $\eta$ , increasing sequence  $\langle \eta_i \mid i < \text{cof}(\eta) \rangle$  of cardinals where  $\eta_0$  and each  $\eta_{i+1}$  is regular with  $S(\eta_{i+1}) \leq \eta_{i+1}$ ,  $S(\eta_0) \leq \eta_0$  and  $\eta_0 \geq \zeta, \text{cof}(\eta)$ . This is possible by our requirement that  $\eta$  is a limit point of  $\{v \mid S(v) \leq v\}$ . Build a sequence of conditions  $\langle q^i \mid i < \text{cof}(\eta) \rangle$  so that  $q^{i+1} = q^i$  for limit ordinals  $i$  and otherwise  $q^{i+1}$  reduces the first  $\eta_i$ -many given dense sets below  $\eta_i$ ,  $l_{\eta_i}(q^{i+1}) = l_{\eta_i}(q^i)$  and  $u_{\eta_i}(q^{i+1})$  is chosen according to the strategy for  $(\eta_i)^+$ -strategic closure of  $u_{\eta_i}(P_{<\alpha})$  for each  $i < \text{cof}(\eta)$ . At limit stages  $i \leq \text{cof}(\eta)$ , we may take lower bounds of the conditions obtained so far using stability of the obtained sequence of conditions below  $\eta_i$  and Claim reflowerbound.  $\dashv$

PROOF OF 6. Apply 5 to reduce the dense sets  $D_i$  of conditions which decide  $f(i)$ ,  $i < \eta$ .  $\dashv$

PROOF OF 7. Using 8 for  $\kappa + 2$  inductively, we let  $\pi$  be the canonical embedding from  $P_{<\kappa+2} * S_{<\delta}^\kappa$  to  $P_{<\alpha}$  - given  $(p, t) \in P_{<\kappa+2} * S_{<\delta}^\kappa$ , let  $q \in P_{<\alpha}$  be so that  $q \upharpoonright (\kappa + 2) = p$  and for  $\xi < \delta$  such that  $\gamma = \kappa + 2 + \xi$ ,  $q(\gamma)$  is a  $P_{<\gamma}$ -name for  $t(\xi)$ .

To show that  $\pi''(P_{<\kappa+2} * R_{<\delta}^\kappa)$  is dense in  $P_{<\alpha}$ , given  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$  let  $q \leq p$  be so that for all  $\gamma > \kappa$  in  $C\text{-supp}(q)$ ,  $q \upharpoonright \gamma$  forces that  $q_\gamma^{**}$  has a  $P_{<\kappa}$ -name. This is possible by 3. We can now find  $s \in P_{<\kappa+2} * R_{<\delta}^\kappa$  such that  $\pi(s)$  is equivalent to  $q$ .  $\dashv$

PROOF OF 8. Assume  $\theta$  is a cardinal,  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ , and  $\dot{x}$  is a  $P_{<\alpha}$ -name for a set of ordinals of size  $\theta$ . If  $S(\theta) \leq \theta$ , we may use 6 to reduce  $\dot{x}$  below  $\theta$  and obtain  $q$  as desired. Otherwise, let  $v \geq \theta$  be least such that  $S(v) \leq v$ . If  $v < \alpha$ , we may use 6 to find  $p' \leq p$  which reduces  $\dot{x}$  below  $\eta$ . We let  $p' = p$  otherwise. Note that our iteration is trivial on  $[\theta, \eta]$  by the case assumption. But this means that  $p'$  forces that  $\dot{x}$  has a  $P_{<\gamma(\theta)^+}$ -name. If  $\gamma(\theta) \in \Gamma$ , we can find  $p'' \leq p$  and a  $P_{<\gamma(\theta)}$ -name  $\dot{y}$

for a set of ordinals of size  $\theta$  such that  $p'' \Vdash \dot{x} \subseteq \dot{y}$  using that  $\dot{P}_{\gamma(\theta)+1}$  is forced to be  $<\gamma(\theta)$ -closed and  $\gamma(\theta)^+$ -cc and  $\dot{P}_{\gamma(\theta)}$  does not add any new sets. The desired result then follows using 8 inductively for  $P_{<\gamma(\theta)}$ .

Now assume  $\gamma(\theta)$  is inaccessible. For every  $\delta \leq \gamma(\theta) \cdot \gamma(\theta)$ ,  $P_\delta \cong P_{<\gamma(\theta)+2} * R_\delta$  with  $\delta = \gamma(\theta) + 2 + \bar{\delta}$  by 7.  $R_\delta$  has size  $\gamma(\theta) \leq \theta$  in any  $P_{<\gamma(\theta)+2}$ -generic extension and therefore has the desired covering property for  $\dot{x}$ . As  $\dot{P}_{\gamma(\theta)+1}$  is forced to be  $<\gamma(\theta)$ -closed and  $\gamma(\theta)^+$ -cc and  $\dot{P}_{\gamma(\theta)}$  does not add any new sets, the desired result follows using 8 inductively for  $P_{<\gamma(\theta)}$  as above.

The remaining case is when  $\gamma(\theta) \in \text{Lim}(\Gamma)$  is singular. Note that in this case  $S(\theta) = S(\gamma(\theta)) = \gamma(\theta)^+$ . Therefore, the only relevant case is when  $\theta = \gamma(\theta) \in \text{Lim}(\Gamma)$ . But we may now use the singular case of 6 to reduce  $\dot{x}$  below  $\theta$  and obtain  $q$  as desired.  $\dashv$

**PROOF OF 9.** Let  $\theta$  be any infinite cardinal and let  $\theta^* = \min(\{\theta^+, \alpha\})$ . All subsets of  $\theta$  which are added by  $P_{<\alpha}$  are in fact added by  $P_{<\theta^*}$  by 6. If  $S(\theta^*) \leq \theta$ , our desired result follows immediately. Otherwise, let  $\nu = \gamma(\theta^*) \leq \theta$ . If  $\nu \in \Gamma$ , our desired result follows as  $\dot{P}_{\nu+1}$  is forced to be  $\nu^+$ -cc,  $\dot{P}_\nu$  does not add any new sets and thus both preserve the value of  $2^\theta$  and  $P_{<\nu}$  preserves the value of  $2^\theta$  as  $S(\nu) \leq \nu$ . If  $\nu$  is inaccessible, our desired result follows using 7 as  $R_{<\nu,\nu}^\nu$  has size  $\nu$  and thus preserves the value of  $2^\theta$ ,  $\dot{P}_{\nu+1}$  is forced to be  $\nu^+$ -cc,  $\dot{P}_\nu$  does not add any new sets and thus both preserve the value of  $2^\theta$  and  $P_{<\nu}$  preserves the value of  $2^\theta$  as  $S(\nu) \leq \nu$ . Finally if  $\nu \in \text{Lim}(\Gamma)$  is singular, then  $S(\theta^+) = S(\nu) = \nu^+$  and thus the only relevant case is  $\nu = \theta$ . But then any subset of  $\theta$  added by  $P_{<\alpha}$  is in fact added by  $P_{<\theta}$  as  $P_{<\alpha}$  is trivial in  $[\theta, \theta^+)$ . The singular case of 6 shows that every  $P_{<\theta}$ -name for a subset of  $\theta$  can densely be reduced below  $\theta$  and the claim follows as there are only  $\theta^+$ -many inequivalent such reduced names by an easy cardinalities argument using 3.  $\dashv$

**PROOF OF 10.** Given  $p \in P_{<\alpha}$ ,  $I \subseteq \alpha$ , and  $\langle \bar{\delta}^i \mid i \in I \rangle$  as in the statement of the claim, let  $p' \leq p$  be such that for every  $\theta$  with  $I \cap [\theta, \theta^+) \neq \emptyset$ , we have that  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(p') \cap \theta) \geq \text{sup}(\{\bar{\delta}^i \mid i \in I \cap [\theta, \theta^+)\})$ . Let  $q \leq p'$  be  $\eta^+$ -strategically below  $p'$  (or  $\omega_1$ -strategically below  $p'$  if no  $\eta < \text{card min } I$  is specified). It follows that  $q$  is as desired. If  $\eta < \text{card min } I$  is regular, we may easily ensure that  $l_\eta(q) = l_\eta(p)$  in the above.  $\dashv$

This completes the proof of Claim 3.18.  $\dashv$

Note: For every  $i \in [\kappa + 2, \kappa \cdot \kappa)$  with  $\kappa$  inaccessible,  $\bigcup_{p \in G} p_i^{**}$  is club in  $\kappa$  for any  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic  $G$ . This is immediate from Clause 10 of Claim 3.18.

**COROLLARY 3.20.**  $\mathbb{P}$  preserves ZFC, cofinalities, and the value of  $2^\kappa$  for every  $\kappa$ .

**PROOF.** For every cardinal  $\kappa$  and  $P_{<\kappa}$ -generic  $G$ ,  $\mathbb{P}/G$  is  $<\kappa$ -distributive by Claim 3.18, Clause 6 and the observations that if  $\nu = \min\{\theta \geq \kappa \mid S(\theta) \leq \theta\} > \kappa$ , then  $P[\kappa, \kappa^+)$  is  $<\kappa$ -closed (or even trivial) and  $\mathbb{P}$  is trivial in the interval  $[\kappa^+, \nu)$ . By [7, Lemma 2.31], this implies that  $\mathbb{P}$  is tame below  $\kappa$ . Thus  $\mathbb{P}$  is tame, which implies that  $\mathbb{P}$  preserves ZFC (see [7, pp. 32]). Preservation of cofinalities is immediate from Claim 3.18, Clauses 8 and 6. Preservation of the continuum function is immediate from Claim 3.18, Clauses 9 and 6.  $\dashv$

**CLAIM 3.21.** Assume  $\alpha > \gamma$  are ordinals, let  $G_{<\gamma}$  be generic for  $P_{<\gamma}$  over  $\mathbb{V}$  and let  $P[\gamma, \alpha)$  denote the iteration  $\mathbb{P}$  from stage  $\gamma$  to stage  $\alpha$ , as defined in  $\mathbb{V}[G_{<\gamma}]$ .

Let  $P[\gamma, \alpha]$  denote the canonical  $P_{<\gamma}$ -name for this iteration. Then

$$P_{<\alpha} \cong P_{<\gamma} * P[\gamma, \alpha].$$

PROOF. The proof is a standard argument using the covering properties of  $P_{<\gamma}$  provided by Clause 8 of Claim 3.18. ⊣

COROLLARY 3.22. *Suppose  $\omega \leq \eta < \eta^+ < \alpha$ ,  $\kappa = \text{card } \alpha$  and  $\eta$  is a cardinal. If  $\eta$  is not inaccessible, then  $P[\eta, \alpha]$  is  $<\eta$ -strategically closed in every  $P_{<\eta}$ -generic extension. If moreover  $\eta \notin \Gamma$ , then  $P[\eta, \alpha]$  is  $<\eta^+$ -strategically closed in every  $P_{<\eta}$ -generic extension.*

PROOF. The second statement follows from the first one, since if  $\eta$  is not inaccessible and not in  $\Gamma$ , then  $P[\eta, \eta^+]$  is trivial. Work in a  $P_{<\eta}$ -generic extension. The partial order  $P[\eta, \eta^+]$  is either trivial or  $<\eta$ -closed by Proposition 2.2. It is seen as in the proof of Claim 3.21 that

$$P[\eta, \alpha] \cong P[\eta, \eta^+] * P[\eta^+, \alpha]$$

and it thus suffices to show that  $P[\eta^+, \alpha]$  is  $<\eta$ -strategically closed, but this follows directly from Clause 1 of Claim 3.18. ⊣

CLAIM 3.23. *If  $\kappa$  is inaccessible,  $G$  is  $P_{<\kappa^+}$ -generic,  $K_{<\gamma}$  is the induced  $S_{<\gamma}^\kappa$ -generic, and  $a_\gamma^\kappa = (\dot{a}_\gamma^\kappa)^{G_{<\kappa+2} * K_{<\gamma}}$  for every  $\gamma < \kappa \cdot \kappa$ , then the sequence  $\langle a_\gamma^\kappa \mid \gamma < \kappa \cdot \kappa \rangle$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ .*

PROOF. Let  $c$  denote the class function defined at the beginning of this section. Then Clause 6 of Claim 3.18 implies  $c^{V[G]} \upharpoonright \kappa = c^{V[G_{<\kappa+2}]} \upharpoonright \kappa : \kappa \rightarrow 2$  and this function is  $\Delta_0$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . Since the sequence  $\langle f_\gamma : \kappa \rightarrow \gamma \mid \gamma \in [\kappa, \kappa \cdot \kappa] \rangle$  is  $\Delta_0$ -definable in parameter  $\kappa$  in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$  and the equivalence

$$a_\gamma^\kappa = 1 \iff \{\delta < \kappa \mid c(\text{otp } f_{\kappa+2+\gamma}[\delta]) = 1\} \text{ contains a club}$$

holds in  $V[G]$ , we can conclude the statement of the claim. ⊣

CLAIM 3.24. *Assume  $\kappa$  is inaccessible and  $G$  is  $P_{<\kappa^+}$ -generic. Let  $\rho : R_{<\kappa \cdot \kappa}^\kappa \rightarrow H(\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+2}]}$  denote the injection in  $V[G_{<\kappa+2}]$  constructed at the beginning of this section. Then the set  $\mathcal{R}_\kappa = \rho'' R_{<\kappa \cdot \kappa}^\kappa$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ .*

PROOF. In  $V[G]$ , a function  $w : \kappa \cdot \kappa \rightarrow [\kappa]^{<\kappa}$  in  $V[G_{<\kappa+2}]$  witnesses that some condition in  $S_{<\kappa \cdot \kappa}^\kappa$  is an element of  $R_{<\kappa \cdot \kappa}^\kappa$  if the following statements hold.

- (i)  $\text{card}(\{\gamma < \kappa \cdot \kappa \mid w(\gamma) \neq \emptyset\}) < \kappa$ .
- (ii)  $w(\gamma)$  is a closed, bounded subset of  $\kappa$  for all  $\gamma < \kappa \cdot \kappa$ .
- (iii)  $c(\text{otp } f_{\kappa+2+\gamma}[\eta]) = a_\gamma^\kappa$  for all  $\gamma < \kappa \cdot \kappa$  and  $\eta \in w(\gamma)$ .

Clause 6 of Claim 3.18 shows that all bounded subsets of  $\kappa$  added by forcing with  $\mathbb{P}$  already appear after forcing with  $P_{<\kappa}$ . This implies that  $\mathcal{R}_\kappa$  is the set of all partial functions  $q : \kappa \xrightarrow{\text{part}} [\kappa]^{<\kappa}$  in  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  such that  $q(\alpha)$  is a closed, bounded subset of  $\kappa$ , and  $c(\text{otp } f_{\kappa+2+\gamma}[\eta]) = a_\gamma^\kappa$  for all  $\alpha \in \text{dom}(q)$ ,  $\eta \in q(\alpha)$ , and  $\gamma = f_{\kappa \cdot \kappa}(\alpha)$ . By Claim 3.23 and its proof,  $\mathcal{R}_\kappa$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . ⊣

CLAIM 3.25. *If  $\kappa$  is inaccessible,  $G$  is  $P_{<\kappa^+}$ -generic over  $V$  and  $<^\kappa$  is the corresponding well-ordering of  $({}^\kappa \kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  in  $V[G]$ , then the sets  $({}^\kappa \kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  and  $<^\kappa$  are  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  over  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ .*

PROOF. We will use the notation from Section 2. Let  $\langle A_\kappa, s_\kappa \rangle$  be the  $\kappa$ -coding basis chosen by  $G_{<\kappa+1}$  and let  $\bar{G}$  be the filter in  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)$  induced by  $G$ . By the definition of the  $a_\delta^\kappa$ 's and Claim 3.23,  $\dot{x}_\kappa^{G_{<\kappa+2}}$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . Let  $\dot{F}_\kappa$  and  $\dot{T}_\kappa$  denote the  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)$ -names in  $V[G_{<\kappa+1}]$  constructed in Section 2. In this situation, Corollary 2.4 shows that the equality  $[\dot{T}_\kappa^{\bar{G}}]^{V[G]} = [\dot{T}_\kappa^{\bar{G}}]^{V[G_{<\kappa+2}]}$  would imply the statement of the claim.

Therefore, let us assume for a contradiction that there is a condition  $p_0 \in G$  and a  $P_{<\kappa^+}$ -name  $\dot{z}$  with

$$p_0 \Vdash \dot{z} \in [\dot{T}_\kappa] \wedge \dot{z} \notin \text{ran}(\dot{F}_\kappa).$$

We combine this assumption with Clauses 1 and 6 of Claim 3.18 and the fact that  $\kappa$  is a regular cardinal in every  $P_{<\kappa^+}$ -generic extension to construct

- a descending sequence  $\langle p_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$  of conditions in  $P_{<\kappa^+}$ ,
- strictly increasing sequences  $\langle \alpha_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$  and  $\langle \beta_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$  of ordinals smaller than  $\kappa$ , and
- a sequence  $\langle \dot{s}_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$  of  $P_{<\kappa}$ -names

such that the following statements hold for all  $n < \omega$ .

- (i)  $p_{n+1}$  is  $\omega_1$ -strategically below  $p_n$ ,
- (ii)  $\alpha_{n+1} > \beta_n$ ,
- (iii)  $p_{n+1} \upharpoonright (\kappa + 1) \Vdash \text{ht}(T_{p_n(\kappa+1)}) = \check{\alpha}_n$ ,
- (iv)  $p_{n+1} \Vdash \dot{z} \upharpoonright \check{\alpha}_n = \dot{s}_n$ , and
- (v)  $p_{n+1} \Vdash \forall x \in \text{dom}(g_{p_n(\kappa+1)}) \dot{F}_\kappa(x) \upharpoonright \check{\beta}_n \neq \dot{z} \upharpoonright \check{\beta}_n$ .

By Claim 3.11, there is a condition  $q$  in  $P_{<\kappa^+}$  with  $q \leq p_n$  for all  $n < \omega$  and

$$q \upharpoonright (\kappa + 1) \Vdash q(\kappa + 1) = \inf_{\dot{P}_{\kappa+1}} \{p_n(\kappa + 1) \mid n < \omega\}.$$

Let  $H$  be  $P_{<\kappa+1}$ -generic over  $V$  with  $q \upharpoonright (\kappa + 1) \in H$ ,  $\alpha = \sup_{n < \omega} \alpha_n \in \kappa \cap \text{Lim}$  and  $s = \bigcup \{\dot{s}_n^H \mid n < \omega\}$ . Our construction ensures that  $\text{ht}(T_{q(\kappa+1)^H}) = \alpha$  and  $s \neq g_{q(\kappa+1)^H}(x)$  for all  $x \in \text{dom}(g_{q(\kappa+1)^H})$ . This allows us to construct a condition  $r_{\kappa+1}$  in  $\dot{P}_{\kappa+1}^H$  with  $\text{ht}(T_{r_{\kappa+1}}) = \alpha + 1$ ,  $r_{\kappa+1} \leq q(\kappa + 1)$ , and  $s \notin T_{r_{\kappa+1}}$ . If  $r$  is the condition in  $P[\kappa + 1, \kappa^+]^{V[H]}$  with  $r(\kappa + 1) = r_{\kappa+1}$  and  $r \upharpoonright [\kappa + 2, \kappa^+] = q \upharpoonright [\kappa + 2, \kappa^+]$ , then the above construction ensures

$$r \upharpoonright [\kappa + 1, \kappa^+] \Vdash \dot{z} \in [\dot{T}_\kappa] \wedge \dot{z} \upharpoonright \check{\alpha} = \check{s} \wedge \check{s} \notin \dot{T}_\kappa,$$

a contradiction. ⊥

CLAIM 3.26. *If  $\kappa$  is inaccessible,  $G$  is  $P_{<\kappa^+}$ -generic over  $V$ ,  $\langle A_\kappa, s_\kappa \rangle$  is the  $\kappa$ -coding basis chosen by  $G_{<\kappa+1}$ , and  $\bar{G}$  is the filter in  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  induced by  $G$ , then the sets  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  and  $\bar{G}$  are  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  over  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ .*

PROOF.  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)^{V[G]} = \mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  as  $V[G]$  and  $V[G_{<\kappa+1}]$  contain the same bounded subsets of  $\kappa$  by Clause 6 of Claim 3.18. The proof of Claim 3.25 shows that  $A_\kappa$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  over  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$  and we can conclude that  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)^{V[G]}$  is definable in the same way. Next, if  $\dot{T}_\kappa$  denotes the  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)$ -name in  $V[G_{<\kappa+1}]$  defined in Section 2, then Claim 3.23 and the proof of Claim 3.25 show that the sets  $\dot{T}_\kappa^{\bar{G}}$  and  $s_\kappa$  are also definable in this way and  $[\dot{T}_\kappa^{\bar{G}}]^{V[G]} = [\dot{T}_\kappa^{\bar{G}}]^{V[G_{<\kappa+2}]}$  holds. In this situation, the computations of [13, Proof of Proposition 6.3] show that  $\bar{G}$  is also definable in the desired way. ⊥

CLAIM 3.27. *If  $\kappa$  is inaccessible, then every  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic extension of the ground model contains a well-ordering of  $H(\kappa^+)$  that is  $\Delta_2$ -definable in parameter  $\kappa$  over  $H(\kappa^+)$ .*

PROOF. Let  $G$  be  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over  $V$ ,  $G$  be the filter in  $P_{<\kappa^+}$  induced by  $G$ ,  $\langle A_\kappa, s_\kappa \rangle$  be the  $\kappa$ -coding basis chosen by  $G_{<\kappa+1}$ ,  $\tilde{G}$  be the filter in  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  induced by  $G$ , and  $<^\kappa$  be the corresponding well-ordering of  $(^\kappa\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  in  $V[G_{<\kappa+2}]$ . By the distributivity of the tails of  $\mathbb{P}$ , we have  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]} \subseteq V[G]$ .

By the remarks at the beginning of this section and Claim 3.25, there is a surjection  $\sigma : (^\kappa 2)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]} \rightarrow H(\kappa^+)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  that is contained in  $V[G_{<\kappa+1}]$  and  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . Together with Claim 3.25, this shows that  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  over  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . We define

$$e_0 : (^\kappa 2)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+2}]}$$

to be the map with

$$e_0(x) = \{ \alpha < \kappa \mid \exists y \in {}^\kappa\kappa \exists \beta < \kappa [ \sigma(y) \in \tilde{G} \wedge \forall \gamma < \kappa y(\gamma) = x(\prec \alpha, \prec \beta, \gamma \succ) ] \}.$$

Claim 3.25 and Claim 3.26 show that  $e_0$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  over  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . Since  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  satisfies the  $\kappa^+$ -chain condition in  $V[G_{<\kappa+1}]$  and every element of  $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+2}]}$  is represented by a  $\mathbb{P}_{s_\kappa}(A_\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$ -nice name of cardinality at most  $\kappa$ , we have  $\text{ran}(e_0) = \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+2}]}$  and this set is definable in the above way.

Let  $<_\kappa$  be the canonical well-ordering of  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  induced by  $<^\kappa$ ,  $\xi$  be the order-type of the restriction of  $<_\kappa$  to  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$ ,  $f$  be the  $<_\kappa$ -least bijection from  $\kappa$  to  $\xi$ ,  $\overline{<}_\kappa$  be the corresponding well-ordering of  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  of order-type  $\kappa$ , and let  $K$  be the filter in  $S_{<\kappa, \kappa}^\kappa$  induced by  $G$ . We define

$$e_1 : \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{V[G_{<\kappa+2}]} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{V[G]}$$

by setting

$$e_1(x) = \{ \alpha < \kappa \mid \exists \beta < \kappa (\prec \alpha, \beta \succ \in x \wedge \overline{<}_\kappa(\beta) \in \rho''(K \cap R_{<\kappa, \kappa}^\kappa)) \}.$$

Our construction ensures

$$\overline{<}_\kappa(\beta) \in \rho''(K \cap R_{<\kappa, \kappa}^\kappa) \iff a_{\kappa, \delta+1+\beta}^\kappa = 1 \text{ for some } \delta < \kappa.$$

Now Claim 3.23 shows that  $e_1$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameters  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  and  $\overline{<}_\kappa$  over  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . By Clause 7 of Claim 3.18, every element in  $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  has an  $R_{<\kappa, \kappa}^\kappa$ -nice name in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G_{<\kappa+2}]}$  and this implies that  $e_1$  is surjective.

By using the surjection  $\sigma$  constructed at the beginning of this section, we can find a surjection  $\tau : \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{V[G]} \rightarrow H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$  that is  $\Sigma_1$ -definable in parameter  $\kappa$  in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . Given  $x, y \in H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ , we define  $x <_\kappa^* y$  to hold if

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \bar{x}, \bar{y} \in (^\kappa 2)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]} [ \bar{x} <^\kappa \bar{y} \wedge (\tau \circ e_1 \circ e_0)(\bar{x}) = x \wedge (\tau \circ e_1 \circ e_0)(\bar{y}) = y \\ \wedge \forall \tilde{x} \in (^\kappa 2)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]} (\tilde{x} <^\kappa \bar{x} \implies (\tau \circ e_1 \circ e_0)(\tilde{x}) \neq x) \\ \wedge \forall \tilde{y} \in (^\kappa 2)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]} (\tilde{y} <^\kappa \bar{y} \implies (\tau \circ e_1 \circ e_0)(\tilde{y}) \neq y) ]. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $<_\kappa^*$  is a well-ordering of  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$  that is  $\Sigma_2$ -definable (and hence also  $\Pi_2$ -definable) in parameters  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  and  $\overline{<}_\kappa$  over  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . By its definition and Claim 3.25, the well-ordering  $<_\kappa$  of  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G_{<\kappa+1}]}$  is  $\Delta_2$ -definable in parameter

$H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  over  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . This implies that the ordering  $<_{\kappa}$  ( $H(\kappa)^{V[G]} \times H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$ ) is  $\Delta_2$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . We can conclude that the ordinal  $\xi$ , the function  $f$ , and the ordering  $<_{\kappa}$  are all  $\Sigma_2$ -definable in parameter  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  in  $H(\kappa^+)^{V[G]}$ . Since  $H(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  is  $\Pi_1$ -definable in parameter  $\kappa$  in this model, the above shows that  $<_{\kappa}^*$  is  $\Delta_2$ -definable in parameter  $\kappa$  in  $V[G]$ .  $\dashv$

CLAIM 3.28. *If  $\kappa$  is inaccessible, then every  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic extension of the ground model contains a well-ordering of  $H(\kappa^+)$  that is lightface  $\Delta_3$ -definable over  $H(\kappa^+)$ .*

PROOF. This follows directly from Claim 3.27 and the fact that the ordinal  $\kappa$  is lightface  $\Pi_2$ -definable in  $H(\kappa^+)$ .  $\dashv$

This completes the proof of Clauses (i)–(iii) of Theorem 1.2.  $\dashv$

All that remains to prove Theorem 1.2 is to show that  $\mathbb{P}$  preserves supercompact cardinals. We will do this in Section 4.

**§4. Supercompactness preservation.** This section will be devoted to the proof of the remaining clause of our main theorem.

PROOF OF CLAUSE (iv) OF THEOREM 1.2. It will suffice to prove the following claim that directly implies the last part of Theorem 1.2.

CLAIM 4.1. *If  $\gamma$  is a singular strong limit cardinal but not a fixed point of the  $\beth$ -function and  $\kappa$  is  $\gamma$ -supercompact such that  $\gamma^{<\kappa} = \gamma$ , then forcing with  $\mathbb{P}$  preserves the  $\gamma$ -supercompactness of  $\kappa$ .*

In the following, fix  $\kappa$  and  $\gamma$  as in the above claim, let

$$v = \sup\{\alpha < \gamma \mid \alpha \text{ is inaccessible or } \alpha \in \Gamma\} < \gamma$$

and let  $j : V \rightarrow M$  denote an elementary embedding witnessing the  $\gamma$ -supercompactness of  $\kappa$ . We may assume that  $M = \text{Ult}(V, U)$ , where  $U$  is a normal ultrafilter on  $\mathcal{P}_{\kappa}(\gamma)$ . Note that we have  $2^\gamma = \gamma^+$  by Theorem 1.9 and our assumptions imply that  $S(\gamma) \leq 2^{(v^+)} < \gamma$ .

CLAIM 4.2. *If  $\alpha \leq \gamma$ , then  $P_{<\alpha}^M = P_{<\alpha} \subseteq {}^\alpha V_\gamma$ .*

PROOF. Since  $\gamma$  is a strong limit cardinal, the definition of the forcing iteration directly implies  $P_{<\alpha} \subseteq V_\gamma$  for all  $\alpha < \gamma$  and hence  $P_{<\gamma} \subseteq {}^\gamma V_\gamma$ . The clauses defining  $P_{<\gamma}$  are absolute between transitive ZFC-models with the same  $\gamma$ -sequences and we can conclude  $P_{<\alpha} = P_{<\alpha}^M$  holds for all  $\alpha \leq \gamma$ .  $\dashv$

CLAIM 4.3. *If  $G_{<\gamma}$  is  $P_{<\gamma}$ -generic over  $V$ , then  $G_{<\gamma}$  is  $P_{<\gamma}^M$ -generic over  $M$  and  $({}^\gamma M[G_{<\gamma}])^{V[G_{<\gamma}]} \subseteq M[G_{<\gamma}]$ .*

PROOF. Let  $x \in \mathcal{P}(\gamma)^{V[G_{<\gamma}]}$ . By Clause 2 of Claim 3.18,  $P_{<\gamma}$  has a dense subset of cardinality  $S(\gamma) < \gamma$  and therefore satisfies the  $\gamma$ -chain condition. Let

$$\dot{x} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} A_\alpha \times \{\check{\alpha}\},$$

be a  $P_{<\gamma}$ -nice name with  $x = \dot{x}^{G_{<\gamma}}$ . Then the sequence  $\langle A_\alpha \mid \alpha < \gamma \rangle$  is an element of  $M$ ,  $\dot{x} \in M$  and  $x = \dot{x}^{G_{<\gamma}} \in M[G_{<\gamma}]$ .

Next, let  $X \in V[G_{<\gamma}]$  be a set of ordinals with  $(\text{card } X)^{V[G_{<\gamma}]} \leq \gamma$ . Clause 8 of Claim 3.18 shows that there is  $\bar{X}$  in  $V$  with  $(\text{card } \bar{X})^V = \gamma$  and  $X \subseteq \bar{X}$ . Then  $\bar{X} \in M$  and  $(\text{card } \bar{X})^M = \gamma$ . Let  $\langle a_\alpha \mid \alpha < \gamma \rangle$  be an enumeration of  $\bar{X}$  in  $M$ . By the above



computations, the set  $\{\alpha < \gamma \mid a_\alpha \in X\}$  is an element of  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$  and this shows that  $X \in M[G_{<\gamma}]$ . We can conclude  $(\gamma \text{ On})^{V[G_{<\gamma}]} \subseteq M[G_{<\gamma}]$  and this implies the statement of the claim.  $\dashv$

CLAIM 4.4. *If  $G_{<\gamma}$  is  $P_{<\gamma}$ -generic over  $V$ , then there is a set  $\mathcal{D} \in M[G_{<\gamma}]$  such that the following statements hold.*

- (i) *If  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , then  $D$  is a dense subset of  $P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]}$ .*
- (ii) *Every  $\mathcal{D}$ -generic filter for  $P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]}$  is  $P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]}$ -generic over  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ .*
- (iii) *The set  $\mathcal{D}$  has cardinality at most  $\gamma^+$  in  $V[G_{<\gamma}]$ .*

PROOF. Clause 2 of Claim 3.18 implies that  $P_{<j(v^+)}^M$  contains a dense subset  $E$  of cardinality less than  $j(\gamma)$  in  $M$ . Clauses 8 and 9 of the same claim show that  $j(\gamma)$  is still a strong limit cardinal in  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ . In  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ , we define

$$E[\gamma, j(v^+)] = \{q \in P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]} \mid \exists p \in G_{<\gamma} p \cup q \in E\}.$$

Then  $E[\gamma, j(v^+)]$  is a dense subset of  $P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]}$  of cardinality less than  $j(\gamma)$  in  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ . In  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ , let  $\mathcal{D}$  denote the set of all subsets of  $E[\gamma, j(v^+)]$  that are dense in  $P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]}$ . By the above remarks,  $\mathcal{D}$  has cardinality less than  $j(\gamma)$  in  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$  and it clearly satisfies the first two statements of the claim.

To complete the proof of the claim, it suffices to show that  $j(\gamma)$  has cardinality at most  $\gamma^+$  in  $V$ . If  $\alpha < j(\gamma)$ , then  $\alpha$  is represented in  $M = \text{Ult}(V, U)$  by a function  $f : \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\gamma) \rightarrow \gamma$  in  $V$ . In  $V$ , the set  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\gamma)$  has cardinality  $\gamma$  and the set of all such functions has cardinality  $2^\gamma = \gamma^+$  by Theorem 1.9.  $\dashv$

We will need a strengthening of Claim 3.11 in order to handle directed sets in suitable tails of the iteration  $\mathbb{P}$  instead of decreasing sequences of conditions in  $\mathbb{P}$ .

NOTATION 4.5. *Work in a  $P_{<\gamma}$ -generic extension of the universe. Given  $\alpha > \gamma$  and a directed set  $D$  of conditions in  $P[\gamma, \alpha]$  of size less than  $\gamma$ , we say that a sequence  $r = \langle r(\delta) \mid \delta \in [\gamma, \alpha] \rangle$  is the componentwise union of  $D$  if the following statements hold.*

- *If  $\delta \in [\gamma, \alpha]$  with  $\delta \in [\theta+2, \theta^+)$  for some inaccessible  $\theta$ , then  $r(\delta)$  is the canonical  $P[\gamma, \delta]$ -name for the set  $\bigcup_{p \in D} p_{\delta}^{**}$ ; we denote  $r(\delta)$  by  $r_{\delta}^{**}$ .*
- *Otherwise,  $r(\delta)$  is the canonical  $P_{<\delta}$ -name for  $\inf(\{p(\delta) \mid p \in D\})$ .<sup>15</sup>*

The sequence  $r$  is usually not a condition in  $P[\gamma, \alpha]$  as the  $r_{\delta}^{**}$  are not necessarily names for closed sets, but the supports of  $r$  can be calculated as if  $r$  were a condition by letting

$$\text{supp}(r) = \{\delta \mid r(\delta) \neq \check{1}\} = \bigcup_{p \in D} \text{supp}(p)$$

and

$$\text{C-supp}(r) = \{\delta \mid r_{\delta}^{**} \neq \check{1}\} = \bigcup_{p \in D} \text{C-supp}(p).$$

<sup>15</sup>This infimum exists by Proposition 2.2.

DEFINITION 4.6 (Strategic lower bound). Assume that  $G_{<v^+}$  is  $P_{<v^+}$ -generic over  $V$  (and hence over  $M$  by Claim 4.2). Note that  $\mathbb{P}$  is trivial in the interval  $[v^+, \gamma)$  and therefore we can identify  $G_{<\gamma}$  and  $G_{<v^+}$ . For every  $\alpha \in [\gamma, j(v^+)]$ , let

$$D_\alpha = \{j(p) \upharpoonright [\gamma, \alpha] \mid p \in G_{<v^+}\}.$$

Fix some particular  $\alpha \in [\gamma, j(v^+)]$ . Let  $r$  be the componentwise union of  $D_\alpha$ .  $\text{supp}(r)$  is bounded below every regular cardinal,  $C\text{-supp}(r) \cap \theta^+$  has size less than  $\theta$  for every inaccessible  $\theta$ . If for some ordinal  $\xi$ ,  $h$  is the bijection from  $\text{card } \xi$  to  $\xi$  chosen by some condition or generic in  $M$ , we denote this bijection by  $f_\xi^M$ , in order to be able to distinguish it from its  $V$ -counterpart  $f_\xi$ .

Working in  $M[G_{<\gamma}] = M[G_{<v^+}]$ , we would like to obtain a condition  $q \in P[\gamma, \alpha]^M$  that satisfies the following properties for every  $\delta \in C\text{-supp}(r)$  with  $\delta = \text{card } \delta + 2 + \xi$ .

- (1) If  $\delta > j(\kappa)^+$ , then

$$q \upharpoonright \delta \Vdash q(b_{\text{otp } f_\delta^M[\text{sup } r_\delta^{**}]}) = \dot{a}_\xi^{\text{card } \delta}.$$

- (2)  $q \upharpoonright \delta \Vdash q_\delta^{**} := r_\delta^{**} \cup \{\text{sup } r_\delta^{**}\}$ .

- (3) Components of  $q$  other than the above should be equal to the respective components of  $r$ .

If such  $q$  exists, we call  $q$  the *strategic lower bound* of  $D_\alpha$ .

CLAIM 4.7. In  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ , if our desired  $q$  exists as a condition in  $P[\gamma, \alpha]^M$ , then  $q$  is a lower bound for  $D_\alpha$ , i.e.,  $q \leq p$  for every  $p \in D_\alpha$ .

PROOF. Work in  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ . The only thing to check is that if  $\delta \in C\text{-supp}(r) \cap [j(\kappa), j(\kappa)^+)$  with  $\delta = j(\kappa) + 2 + \xi$ , then there is  $p \in G_{<\gamma}$  such that

$$q \upharpoonright \delta \Vdash p(b_{\text{otp } f_\delta^M[\text{sup } r_\delta^{**}]}) = (\dot{a}_\xi^{j(\kappa)})^M.$$

Note that

$$C\text{-supp}(r) \cap [j(\kappa), j(\kappa)^+) = \bigcup \{j(A) \mid A \subseteq [\kappa + 2, \kappa \cdot \kappa] \wedge \text{card } A < \kappa\} = j''[\kappa + 2, \kappa \cdot \kappa)$$

and hence such  $\delta$  will be of the form  $j(\bar{\delta})$  for some  $\bar{\delta} \in [\kappa + 2, \kappa \cdot \kappa)$  and  $f_\delta^M = j(f_{\bar{\delta}})$ . Similarly,  $(\dot{a}_\xi^{j(\kappa)})^M = j(\dot{a}_\xi^\kappa)$ , where  $\xi = j(\bar{\xi})$  and  $\bar{\delta} = \kappa + 2 + \bar{\xi}$ . Note that  $\text{sup } r_\delta^{**} = \kappa$ , and hence

$$\text{otp } f_\delta^M[\text{sup } r_\delta^{**}] = \text{otp } j(f_{\bar{\delta}})[\kappa] = \text{otp } j'' f_{\bar{\delta}}[\kappa] = \text{otp } j'' \bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta},$$

as  $j$  is order-preserving. Now the claim follows as  $q(b_{\bar{\delta}}) = \dot{a}_\xi^\kappa$  by the definition of our iteration.  $\dashv$

CLAIM 4.8. Assume  $G_{<v^+}$  is  $P_{<v^+}$ -generic over  $V$ . Then for every  $\alpha \in [\gamma, j(v^+)]$ , the set  $D_\alpha = \{j(p) \upharpoonright [\gamma, \alpha] \mid p \in G_{<v^+}\}$  has a strategic lower bound in  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ .

PROOF. By induction on  $\alpha \geq \gamma$  in  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ . If  $\alpha = \gamma$ , the claim is trivial. Given that the claim holds below  $\alpha$ , we want to show that there exists a strategic lower bound  $q^\alpha$  for  $D_\alpha$ , which is a directed set. Inductively, for  $\beta < \alpha$ , let  $q^\beta$  be the strategic lower bound for  $D_\beta$ . We also assume inductively that if  $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \alpha$ , then  $q^{\beta_1} \upharpoonright \beta_0 \leq q^{\beta_0}$ . Thus we also have to show that if  $\beta < \alpha$ , then  $q^\alpha \upharpoonright \beta \leq q^\beta$ . Let  $r$

be the componentwise union of  $D_\alpha$ . We first show that either for every inaccessible  $\theta \in (j(\kappa), \alpha)$ ,  $C\text{-supp}(p) \cap [\theta, \theta^+) = \emptyset$  for all  $p \in D_\alpha$  or the following hold:

- (o)  $\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) > \gamma$ ,
- (i)  $\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) > \sup(\text{supp}(p) \cap \theta)$  for all  $p \in D_\alpha$ ,
- (ii) for  $\delta \in C\text{-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)$ , we have

$$q^\delta \Vdash \sup r_\delta^{**} = \sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta),$$

- (iii) for  $\delta \in C\text{-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)$ , we have

$$f_\delta^M[\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)] \supseteq \sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta),$$

- (iv) for  $\delta_0 < \delta_1$  both in  $C\text{-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)$ , the set  $f_{\delta_0}^M[\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]$  is a proper initial segment of  $f_{\delta_1}^M[\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]$ ,
- (v) for  $\delta = \theta + 2 + \xi \in C\text{-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)$ , we have

$$q^\delta \Vdash (\dot{a}_\xi^\theta)^M \text{ has a } P[\gamma, \sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]} \text{-name,}$$

- (vi)  $\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) \geq \text{card}(C\text{-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+))$ ,
- (vii) there is no inaccessible  $\lambda < \theta$  such that  $\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) \in [\lambda, \lambda \cdot \lambda)$ .

PROOF OF (o): Let  $p \in D_\alpha$  such that  $C\text{-supp}(p) \cap [\theta, \theta^+) \neq \emptyset$  and  $p = j(t) \upharpoonright [\gamma, \alpha)$  for some  $t \in G_{<\nu^+}$ . Define  $X$  to be the set consisting of all  $s \in P_{<\nu^+}$  such that

$$C\text{-supp}(t) \cap [\eta, \eta^+) \neq \emptyset \implies \sup(\text{supp}(s) \cap \eta) > \kappa$$

holds for all inaccessible  $\eta > \kappa$ .  $X$  is dense below  $t$ . Pick  $s \in X \cap G_{<\nu^+}$ . Then

$$\sup(\text{supp}(j(s)) \cap \theta) > j(\kappa) > \gamma$$

and hence  $\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) > \gamma$ . ⊣

PROOF OF (i): Assume  $p \in D_\alpha$ . Then  $p = j(t) \upharpoonright [\gamma, \alpha)$  for some  $t \in G_{<\nu^+}$ . Define  $X$  to be the set consisting of all  $s \in P_{<\nu^+}$  such that

$$C\text{-supp}(t) \cap [\eta, \eta^+) \neq \emptyset \implies \sup(\text{supp}(s) \cap \eta) > \sup(\text{supp}(t) \cap \eta)$$

holds for every inaccessible  $\eta$ .  $X$  is dense below  $t$ . Then

$$\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) \geq \sup(\text{supp}(j(s)) \cap \theta) > \sup(\text{supp}(p) \cap \theta)$$

for all  $s \in X \cap G_{<\nu^+}$ . ⊣

PROOF OF (ii): Assume  $\xi < \sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$ . Then we can find a  $p \in D_\alpha$  such that  $\xi < \sup(\text{supp}(p) \cap \theta)$ ,  $\delta \in C\text{-supp}(p)$ , and  $p = j(t) \upharpoonright [\gamma, \alpha)$  for some  $t \in G_{<\nu^+}$ . Define  $X$  to be the set consisting of all  $s \in P_{<\nu^+}$  such that

$$s \upharpoonright \zeta \Vdash \sup(s_\zeta^{**}) \geq \sup(\text{supp}(t) \cap \text{card } \zeta)$$

holds for all  $\zeta \in C\text{-supp}(t)$ .  $X$  is dense below  $t$ . Let  $s \in X \cap G_{<\nu^+}$ . Then

$$q^\delta \leq j(s) \upharpoonright [\gamma, \delta) \Vdash \sup j(s)_\delta^{**} \geq \sup(\text{supp}(p) \cap \theta)$$

and hence  $q^\delta \Vdash \sup r_\delta^{**} \geq \sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$ . That also  $q^\delta \Vdash \sup r_\delta^{**} \leq \sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  is shown similarly. ⊣

PROOF OF (iii): We show that  $\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  is a cardinal in  $M$ , which clearly implies (iii). But the former follows as for every  $t \in G_{<\nu^+}$ , the set consisting of all  $s \in P_{<\nu^+}$  such that

$$C\text{-supp}(t) \cap [\eta, \eta^+) \neq \emptyset \implies \sup(\text{supp}(s) \cap \eta) > (\sup(\text{supp}(t) \cap \eta))^+$$

holds for every inaccessible  $\eta$  is dense below  $t$ . ⊣

PROOF OF (iv): Assume  $\xi < \text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$ . Then we can find a  $p \in D_\alpha$  such that  $\xi < \text{sup}(\text{supp}(p) \cap \theta)$ ,  $\delta_0, \delta_1 \in \text{C-supp}(p)$  and  $p = j(t) \upharpoonright [\gamma, \alpha)$  for some  $t \in G_{<v^+}$ . Define  $X$  to be the set consisting of all  $s \in P_{<v^+}$  such that

$$f_{\zeta_0}[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(t) \cap \eta)] \subseteq f_{\zeta_1}[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(s) \cap \eta)]$$

and

$$f_{\zeta_1}[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(t) \cap \eta)] \cap \zeta_0 \subseteq f_{\zeta_1}[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(s) \cap \eta)]$$

hold for every inaccessible  $\eta$  and all  $\zeta_0 < \zeta_1$  both of cardinality  $\eta$  and both in  $\text{C-supp}(t)$ .  $X$  is dense below  $t$ . Let  $s \in X \cap G_{<v^+}$ . Then  $f_{\delta_0}^M(\xi)$  is an element of  $f_{\delta_1}^M[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]$  and  $f_{\delta_1}^M(\xi)$  is an element of  $f_{\delta_0}^M[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]$  if the former is less than  $\delta_0$ . But this means that  $f_{\delta_0}^M[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]$  is a proper initial segment of  $f_{\delta_1}^M[\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]$ , as desired.  $\dashv$

PROOF OF (v): Pick  $p \in D_\alpha$  with  $\delta \in \text{C-supp}(p)$  and  $t \in G_{<v^+}$  with  $p = j(t) \upharpoonright [\gamma, \alpha)$ . Define  $X$  to be the set consisting of all  $s \in P_{<v^+}$  such that

$$s \upharpoonright \zeta \Vdash \dot{a}_{\zeta}^{\text{card } \zeta} \text{ has a } P_{<\text{sup}(\text{supp}(s) \cap \text{card } \zeta)}\text{-name}$$

holds for all  $\zeta \in \text{C-supp}(t)$  with  $\zeta = \text{card } \zeta + 2 + \bar{\zeta}$ .  $X$  is dense below  $t$ . Pick  $s \in X \cap G_{<v^+}$ . Then

$$j(s) \upharpoonright \delta \Vdash (\dot{a}_{\xi}^{\theta})^M \text{ has a } P_{<\text{sup}(\text{supp}(j(s)) \cap \theta)}^M\text{-name,}$$

hence in  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ ,  $q^\delta \leq j(s) \upharpoonright [\gamma, \delta) \Vdash (\dot{a}_{\xi}^{\theta})^M$  has a  $P[\gamma, \text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta))^M$ -name, as desired.  $\dashv$

PROOF OF (vi): We have

$$\text{card}(\text{C-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)) = \text{card}(\bigcup_{t \in G_{<v^+}} \text{C-supp}(j(t)) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)).$$

There are only  $2^v < \gamma < j(\kappa) < \theta$ -many possibilities for  $\text{C-supp}(p)$  for  $p \in G_{<v^+}$ . This implies that

$$\text{card}(\text{C-supp}(r) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)) = \text{sup}(\{\text{card}(\text{C-supp}(j(t)) \cap [\theta, \theta^+)) \mid t \in G_{<v^+}\}).$$

Pick some  $t \in G_{<v^+}$  and define  $X$  to be the set consisting of all  $s \in P_{<v^+}$  such that

$$\text{sup}(\text{supp}(s) \cap \eta) \geq \text{card}(\text{C-supp}(t) \cap [\eta, \eta^+))$$

holds for every inaccessible  $\eta$ .  $X$  is dense below  $t$ . Let  $s \in X \cap G_{<v^+}$ . Then

$$\text{sup}(\text{supp}(j(s)) \cap \theta) \geq \text{card}(\text{C-supp}(j(t)) \cap [\theta, \theta^+))$$

and (vi) follows by the above.  $\dashv$

PROOF OF (vii): Let us say that  $E \subseteq \text{On}$  is Easton iff  $E$  is bounded below every regular cardinal. In  $M$ , we have

$$\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) = \text{sup}(\bigcup\{j(E) \cap \theta \mid E \subseteq v \text{ Easton}\}).$$

It follows that  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  has cofinality  $\leq 2^v < \gamma$  while  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) > \gamma$  in  $M$  as  $j(\kappa) \in \text{supp}(r)$  and therefore  $\text{sup}(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$  cannot be inaccessible.

$\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) \notin (\lambda, \lambda \cdot \lambda)$  for any inaccessible  $\lambda$  as for every  $t \in G_{<\nu^+}$ , letting  $\xi_\eta = \sup(\text{supp}(t) \cap \eta)$ , the set

$$\{s \in P_{<\nu^+} \mid \forall \eta \text{ inaccessible } (C\text{-supp}(t) \cap [\eta, \eta^+) \neq \emptyset \rightarrow \sup(\text{supp}(s) \cap \eta) > \xi_\eta^{+\xi_\eta \cdot \xi_\eta})\}$$

is dense in  $P_{<\nu^+}$ . ⊣

Now we show, using (o)-(vii), that we can form the strategic lower bound  $q^\alpha$  of  $D_\alpha$ . This is trivial (using induction) if  $\text{card } \alpha$  is not inaccessible. Note that if we can form  $q^\alpha \in P[\gamma, \alpha]^M$  out of  $r$  as in Definition 4.6, then  $q^\alpha \leq q^\alpha \upharpoonright \gamma \leq q^\gamma$  for every  $\gamma < \alpha$ . Assume  $\theta \in (j(\kappa), \alpha)$  is inaccessible and  $\delta \in [\theta + 2, \theta \cdot \theta)$ . Given (i)–(iv),  $q^\delta$  decides  $\sup r_\delta^{**}$  and forces that

$$\text{otp } f_\delta^M[\sup r_\delta^{**}] \geq \sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)$$

is distinct from  $\text{otp } f_\xi^M[\sup r_\xi^{**}]$  for every  $\xi < \delta$ . By (v), if  $\xi$  is such that  $\theta + 2 + \xi = \delta$ ,  $q^\delta$  forces that  $(\dot{a}_\xi^\theta)^M$  has a  $P^M[\gamma, \sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]$ -name, allowing us to satisfy (1) as in Definition 4.6, as

$$b_{\text{otp } f_\delta^M[\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)]} \geq \sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta) > \gamma$$

by (o) and as by (vii) and (iii), there cannot be some inaccessible  $\lambda < \theta$  with

$$\text{otp } f_\delta^M[\sup(\text{supp}(r) \cap \theta)] \in [\lambda, \lambda \cdot \lambda).$$

The statement (2) in Definition 4.6 can obviously be satisfied. Finally (vi) implies that  $\text{supp}(q^\alpha) \setminus \text{supp}(r)$  (and hence  $\text{supp}(q^\alpha)$ ) is bounded below every regular cardinal and hence  $q^\alpha$  actually is a condition in  $P[\gamma, \alpha]^M$ . ⊣

PROOF OF CLAIM 4.1. Let  $G_{<\gamma}$  be  $P_{<\gamma}$ -generic over  $V$ . Corollary 3.22 shows that the partial order  $P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]}$  is  $\gamma^+$ -strategically closed. Let  $q$  be the strategic lower bound of

$$D_{j(v^+)} = \{j(p) \upharpoonright [\gamma, j(v^+)) \mid p \in G_{<\gamma}\}$$

in  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$  provided by Claim 4.8 and let  $\mathcal{D}$  denote the collection of dense subsets of  $P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]}$  provided by Claim 4.4. Work in  $V[G_{<\gamma}]$  and fix an enumeration  $\langle D_\alpha \mid 1 \leq \alpha < \gamma^+ \rangle$  of  $\mathcal{D}$ . By the  $\gamma^+$ -strategic closure of  $P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]}$ , we can construct a decreasing sequence  $\langle p^\alpha \mid \alpha < \gamma^+ \rangle$  of conditions in  $P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]}$  such that  $p^0 = q$  and  $\alpha > 0$  implies that  $p^\alpha \leq d_\alpha$  for some  $d_\alpha \in D_\alpha$ . Define

$$H = \{p \in P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]} \mid \exists \alpha < \gamma^+ p^\alpha \leq p\} \in V[G_{<\gamma}].$$

By Claim 4.4,  $H$  is  $P[\gamma, j(v^+)]^{M[G_{<\gamma}]}$ -generic over  $M[G_{<\gamma}]$ . Since the partial order  $P[j(v^+), j(\gamma)]$  is trivial in every  $P_{<j(v^+)}$ -generic extension of  $M$ ,  $G * H$  induces a filter  $H_{<j(\gamma)}$  in  $P_{<j(\gamma)}^M$  that is generic over  $M$ . Our constructions ensure that  $j[G_{<\gamma}] \subseteq H_{<j(\gamma)}$  and we can extend  $j$  to an elementary embedding  $j_* : V[G_{<\gamma}] \rightarrow M[H_{<j(\gamma)}]$ . By Claim 4.3, we have

$$({}^\gamma\text{On})^{V[G_{<\gamma}]} \subseteq M[G_{<\gamma}] \subseteq M[H_{<j(\gamma)}]$$

and this implies  $({}^\gamma M[H_{<j(\gamma)}])^{V[G_{<\gamma}]} \subseteq M[H_{<j(\gamma)}]$ . Since  $H_{<j(\gamma)}$  is contained in  $V[G_{<\gamma}]$ , this shows that  $\kappa$  is still  $\gamma$ -supercompact in  $V[G_{<\gamma}]$ .

Now, let  $G$  be  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over  $V$  and let  $G_{<\gamma}$  be the filter in  $P_{<\gamma}$  induced by  $G$ . By our assumptions,  $P[\gamma, \gamma^+)$  is the trivial forcing in  $V[G_{<\gamma}]$  and Corollary 3.22

implies that  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\gamma))^{V[G]} \in V[G_{<\gamma}]$ . The above computations now show that there is a normal ultrafilter on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\gamma)$  in  $V[G]$  and hence  $\kappa$  remains  $\gamma$ -supercompact in  $V[G]$ .  $\dashv$

We will now derive Clause (iv) of Theorem 1.2 from Claim 4.1. Let  $\kappa$  be supercompact,  $\alpha \geq \kappa$  and let  $\nu$  denote the least fixed point of the  $\beth$ -function that is  $\geq \alpha$ . We let  $\gamma = \beth_{\nu+\kappa}$  denote the smallest strong limit cardinal of cofinality  $\kappa$  above  $\nu$ . Then  $\gamma^{<\kappa} = \gamma$ ,  $\gamma$  is singular and  $2^\gamma = \gamma^+$  by Theorem 1.9. Moreover  $\gamma$  is not a fixed point of the  $\beth$ -function. Hence by Claim 4.1,  $\kappa$  remains  $\alpha$ -supercompact in every  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic extension of the ground model.  $\dashv$

We have thus finished the proof of Theorem 1.2.

**§5. Omega-Superstrongs.** This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.7. We will make use of the following folklore theorem, of which we sketch a proof for the sake of completeness.

**THEOREM 5.1.** *If  $\kappa$  is  $\omega$ -superstrong and the GCH holds,  $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$  holds in a set forcing extension which preserves the  $\omega$ -superstrength of  $\kappa$  and preserves SCH.*

**PROOF.** Let  $P$  be the reverse Easton iteration that adds  $\lambda^{++}$ -many Cohen subsets of  $\lambda$  for every inaccessible  $\lambda < j^\omega(\kappa)$ . This obviously forces  $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$  and preserves SCH by standard reduction arguments. Hence it suffices to prove the following statement.

**CLAIM 5.2.** *Some condition in  $P$  forces that  $P$  preserves the  $\omega$ -superstrength of  $\kappa$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $j: V \rightarrow M$  witness the  $\omega$ -superstrength of  $\kappa$  in  $V$ . We may assume that  $j$  is given by an extender ultrapower embedding.<sup>16</sup> For every  $n < \omega$ ,  $P_{<j^n(\kappa)} = P_{<j^n(\kappa)}^M$ , latter denoting the  $M$ -version of  $P_{<j^n(\kappa)}$ . Let  $G$  be the canonical name for the  $P$ -generic. By the closure properties of our iterands,  $(j''G) \upharpoonright [\kappa, j^\omega(\kappa))$  gives rise to a condition in  $P$  (a “master condition”), which forces that  $j''G \subseteq G$ . Furthermore  $G \cap P^M$  is  $P^M$ -generic over  $M$ , using that  $j$  is given by an extender ultrapower embedding (the argument is given in the proof of 1 in the proof of Theorem 5.3 below). This enables us to lift  $j$  to  $j^*: V[G] \rightarrow M[G \cap P^M]$ .  $V[G]_{j^\omega(\kappa)} \subseteq M[G \cap P^M]$  follows as every element of  $V[G]_{j^\omega(\kappa)}$  has a  $P$ -name in  $V_{j^n(\kappa)}$  for some  $n < \omega$  by the closure properties of tails of  $P$ .  $\dashv$

This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\dashv$

**PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7.** Assume  $\kappa$  is  $\omega$ -superstrong in  $V$ . By [8], we can force the GCH to hold while preserving the  $\omega$ -superstrength of  $\kappa$ . Using Theorem 5.1, we may force further to obtain  $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$  while preserving SCH and the  $\omega$ -superstrength of  $\kappa$ . In this situation, the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 hold.

**CLAIM 5.3.** *There is a condition in  $\mathbb{P}$  which forces that the  $\omega$ -superstrength of  $\kappa$  is preserved.*

**PROOF.** Let  $j: V \rightarrow M$  witness the  $\omega$ -superstrength of  $\kappa$  in  $V$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $P_{<\alpha}$  denote the iteration and its restriction to  $\alpha$  as defined in the proof of Theorem 1.2, let

<sup>16</sup>This means that each element of  $M$  is of the form  $j(f)(a)$ , where  $a$  belongs to  $V_{j^\omega(\kappa)}$  and  $f$  is a function in  $V$  with domain  $V_{j^\omega(\kappa)}$ . This assumption is harmless as if the initial  $j: V \rightarrow M$  does not satisfy it, we can replace  $M$  by the transitive collapse  $\bar{M}$  of  $H$ , the elementary submodel of  $M$  consisting of all  $j(f)(a)$  of the above form and replace  $j$  by  $k \circ j$ , where  $k: H \cong \bar{M}$ .

$\mathbb{P}^M$  and  $P^M_{<\alpha}$  denote their respective M-versions. For every  $n < \omega$ ,  $P_{<j^n(\kappa)} = P^M_{<j^n(\kappa)}$ . Moreover if  $\delta < j^\omega(\kappa)$  and  $\delta = \text{card } \delta + 2 + \zeta$ ,  $f_\delta = f^M_\delta$ ,  $\dot{a}^{\text{card } \delta}_\zeta = (\dot{a}^{\text{card } \delta}_\zeta)^M$ ,  $P^M_{<j^\omega(\kappa)} = P_{<j^\omega(\kappa)} \cap M$  and also the extension relations of those two forcings agree. We will use those facts tacitly in the following. We want to find a V-generic  $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$  and an M-generic  $G^* \subseteq \mathbb{P}^M$  such that  $j''G \subseteq G^*$  and  $V[G]_{j^\omega(\kappa)} \subseteq M[G^*]$ . After finding a suitable  $P_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ -generic  $G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ , we will let  $G^*_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  be  $G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)} \cap P^M_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ . We will let  $G^*$  be the filter generated by  $G^*_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  together with the image of  $G$  under  $j$ . The inclusion  $V[G]_{j^\omega(\kappa)} \subseteq M[G^*]$  follows as every element of  $V[G]_{j^\omega(\kappa)}$  has a  $P$ -name in  $V_{j^n(\kappa)}$  for some  $n < \omega$  by Clause 6 of Claim 3.18.

It remains to show the following statements.

1.  $G^*_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  is  $P^M_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ -generic over  $M$ .
2.  $G^*$  is  $P^*$ -generic over  $M$ .
3. We can choose  $G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  in such a way that  $j''G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)} \subseteq G^*_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ .

We will assume 3 for the moment and prove 1 and 2 using 3. We will then prove 3 without using either 1 or 2. Assume that  $j$  is given by an extender ultrapower embedding.

PROOF OF 1. Suppose  $D \in M$  is dense on  $P^M_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  and write  $D$  as  $j(f)(a)$ , where  $\text{dom}(f) = V_{j^\omega(\kappa)}$  and  $a \in V_{j^{n+1}(\kappa)}$  for some  $n \in \omega$ . Choose  $p \in G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  such that  $p$  reduces  $f(\bar{a})$  below  $j^n(\kappa)$  whenever  $\bar{a}$  belongs to  $V_{j^n(\kappa)}$  and  $f(\bar{a})$  is dense on  $P_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ . The existence of  $p$  follows from Clause 5 of Claim 3.18, using that  $V_{j^n(\kappa)}$  has size  $j^n(\kappa)$ . Then  $j(p)$  belongs to  $j''G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)} \subseteq G^*_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  by 3 and reduces  $D$  below  $j^{n+1}(\kappa)$ . Hence  $E = \{q \in P_{<j^{n+2}(\kappa)} \mid q \frown j(p)[j^{n+2}(\kappa), j^\omega(\kappa)] \in D\}$  is dense below  $j(p) \upharpoonright j^{n+2}(\kappa)$  in  $P_{<j^{n+2}(\kappa)}$ . Since  $G_{<j^{n+2}(\kappa)}$  contains  $j(p) \upharpoonright j^{n+2}(\kappa)$  and is  $P_{<j^{n+2}(\kappa)}$ -generic over  $M$ ,  $G_{<j^{n+2}(\kappa)} \cap E \neq \emptyset$ . Choose  $q$  in that intersection. Then  $q \frown j(p)[j^{n+2}(\kappa), j^\omega(\kappa)] \in D \cap G^*_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ .  $\dashv$

PROOF OF 2. Like 1, using that  $j''G \subseteq G^*$  as an immediate consequence of 3.  $\dashv$

PROOF OF 3. We will specify a *master condition*  $q \in P_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  so that  $q \in G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  ensures  $j''G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)} \subseteq G^*_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ . Let  $G$  be the canonical name in  $V$  for the  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic. We define  $r$  as the componentwise union of  $(j''G)[j(\kappa), j^\omega(\kappa)]$  and define the strategic lower bound  $q$  for this (directed) set to be — similar to Definition 4.6 — the condition obtained by letting, for every  $\delta \in C\text{-supp}(r)$  with  $\delta = \text{card } \delta + 2 + \zeta$ :

- (1) If  $\delta > j(\kappa)^+$ , then

$$q \upharpoonright \delta \Vdash q(b_{\text{otp } f_\delta[\text{sup } r_\delta^{**}]}) = \dot{a}^{\text{card } \delta}_\zeta.$$

- (2)  $q \upharpoonright \delta \Vdash q_\delta^{**} := r_\delta^{**} \cup \{\text{sup } r_\delta^{**}\}$ .
- (3) Components of  $q$  other than the above should be equal to the respective components of  $r$ .

If such  $q$  exists as a condition in  $P_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ ,<sup>17</sup> we call  $q$  the *strategic lower bound* of  $(j''G)[j(\kappa), j^\omega(\kappa)]$ . In this case, it is seen as in the proof of Claim 4.7 that  $q$  is a lower bound for  $(j''G)[j(\kappa), j^\omega(\kappa)]$ . Furthermore it is seen similar to the proof of

<sup>17</sup>In contrast to Section 4, we do not claim here that either  $r$  or  $q$  are elements of  $M$ .

Claim 4.8 that such  $q$  exists as a condition in  $P_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ .<sup>18</sup> We will finish the proof of 3 by showing the following claim.

CLAIM 5.4. *Whenever  $p \leq q$ ,  $p \in G$ , then  $p \leq j(p)$ ; hence if  $q \in G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  and  $p$  is any condition in  $G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ , then  $j(p) \in G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ , i.e.,  $j''G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)} \subseteq G_{j^\omega(\kappa)}^M$ .*

PROOF. Assume  $p \leq q$ . Then  $p \leq j(p)$  as  $p \upharpoonright \kappa = j(p) \upharpoonright \kappa$ ,  $j(p) \upharpoonright [\kappa, j(\kappa)) = \mathbf{1}$  and  $p \upharpoonright j(\kappa) \Vdash p[j(\kappa), j^\omega(\kappa)] \leq q[j(\kappa), j^\omega(\kappa)] \leq j(p)[j(\kappa), j^\omega(\kappa)]$  by our choice of  $q$ . Now if  $p$  is any condition in  $G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)} \ni q$ , then there is  $p' \in G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ , which is stronger than both  $p$  and  $q$ . By the above,  $p' \leq j(p')$ , but by elementarity  $j(p') \leq j(p)$  and therefore  $j(p) \in G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$ . Since  $j(p) \in M$ , the last statement of the claim follows. →

If we now choose  $G_{<j^\omega(\kappa)}$  containing  $q$ , the above implies that 3 holds. →

This completes the proof of Claim 5.3. →

In the situation assembled above, we can now combine Theorem 1.2, Theorem 5.1, and Claim 5.3 to force the existence of a lightface definable well-order of  $H_{\kappa^+}$  together with a failure of the GCH at  $\kappa$ . →

Note that we could have similarly obtained  $2^\kappa > \kappa^{++}$  in the above proof.

**§6. Corollaries.** This short section contains the proofs of the two corollaries mentioned in the Introduction.

PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.3. We show that in any  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic extension, for any ordinal  $\alpha$  and  $x \subseteq \alpha$ , there is an ordinal  $\xi$  so that for all  $\gamma < \alpha$ ,

$$\gamma \in x \iff c_{\xi+\gamma} = 1.$$

Let  $\alpha$ ,  $x \subseteq \alpha$ , and  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  be given. By the distributivity properties of  $\mathbb{P}$ , it follows that there is a condition  $p' \leq p$  which forces that  $x$  has a  $P_{<\alpha^+}$ -name  $\dot{x}$ . Let  $\xi$  be greater than both  $\sup(\text{supp}(p'))$  and  $\alpha$ . We may extend  $p'$  to  $q$  so that for every  $\gamma < \alpha$ ,  $q$  forces that  $c(\xi + \gamma) = 1$  iff  $\gamma \in \dot{x}$ . But this means that  $q$  forces that  $\dot{x}$  is ordinal-definable. →

PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.5. As in the proof of Clause (iv) of Theorem 1.2 at the end of Section 4, letting  $\alpha = \kappa$ . →

**§7. Open Questions.** One could ask whether the results of [2] and [3] can be generalized to a non-GCH context without any restrictions (like in the case of Theorem 1.2 the restriction to inaccessible  $\kappa$ ). It seems like completely new techniques would be necessary to provide an answer.

QUESTION 7.1. *Does every model of set theory (which satisfies SCH?) have a cofinality-preserving forcing extension in which for every regular uncountable  $\kappa$  there is a lightface definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$ ? Can this be done at least for boldface definable well-orders?*

---

<sup>18</sup>The only difference is that for every  $n < \omega$ , the intervals  $[j^n(\kappa), j^{n+1}(\kappa))$  have to be treated separately.



Easier questions are the following.

QUESTION 7.2. *Can one force to add a boldface definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$  when  $\kappa^{<\kappa} > \kappa$  and  $\kappa$  is regular while preserving cofinalities?*

QUESTION 7.3. *Can one force to add a lightface definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$  when  $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$  but  $\kappa$  is not inaccessible while preserving cofinalities?*

The latter question will be answered positively in the forthcoming [4].

While answering [10, Question 6.1], Corollary 1.5 still left open the following question, which again seems cannot be answered using the techniques introduced in our paper.

QUESTION 7.4. *Starting from a large cardinal assumption weaker than a strong cardinal, is it possible to obtain a model with a measurable cardinal  $\kappa$  with  $2^\kappa > \kappa^{++}$  and a definable well-order of  $H(\kappa^+)$ ?*

**§8. Acknowledgment.** The first author wishes to thank the FWF (Austrian Science Fund) for its generous support through Project P 23316 N13. The second author wishes to thank the EPSRC for its generous support through Project EP/J005630/1.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] ARTHUR W. APTER and SHOSHANA FRIEDMAN, *Coding into HOD via normal measures with some applications*. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, vol. 57 (2011), no. 4, pp. 366–372.
- [2] DAVID ASPERÓ and SY-DAVID FRIEDMAN, *Large cardinals and locally defined well-orders of the universe*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 157 (2009), no. 1, pp. 1–15.
- [3] ———, *Definable well-orders of  $H(\omega_2)$  and GCH*. this JOURNAL, vol. 77 (2012), no. 4, pp. 1101–112.
- [4] DAVID ASPERÓ, PETER HOLY, and PHILIPP LÜCKE, *Forcing lightface definable well-orders without GCH*, submitted.
- [5] ANDREW D. BROOKE-TAYLOR, *Large cardinals and definable well-orders on the universe*. this JOURNAL, vol. 74 (2009), pp. 641–654.
- [6] SHOSHANA FRIEDMAN, *Accessing the switchboard via set forcing*. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, vol. 58 (2012), no. (4-5), pp. 303–306.
- [7] SY-DAVID FRIEDMAN, *Fine structure and class forcing*. de Gruyter Series in Logic and its Applications, vol. 3, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2000.
- [8] ———, *Large cardinals and L-like universes*. *Set theory: recent trends and applications*, vol. 17, Quad. Mat. Dept. Math., Seconda Univ. Napoli, Caserta, 2006, pp. 93–110.
- [9] SY-DAVID FRIEDMAN and PETER HOLY, *Condensation and large cardinals*. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, vol. 215 (2011), no. 2, pp. 133–166.
- [10] SY-DAVID FRIEDMAN and RADEK HONZIK, *A definable failure of the singular cardinal hypothesis*. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, Vol. 192 (2012), no. 2, pp. 719–762.
- [11] SY-DAVID FRIEDMAN and PHILIPP LÜCKE, *Large cardinals and definable well-orders, without the GCH*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, accepted.
- [12] A. KANAMORI and M. MAGIDOR, *The evolution of large cardinal axioms in set theory*. *Higher set theory, Proc. Conference Math. Forschungsinst., Oberwolfach, 1977*, vol. 669, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, 1978, pp. 99–275.
- [13] PHILIPP LÜCKE,  $\Sigma_1^1$ -definability at uncountable regular cardinals. this JOURNAL, vol. 77 (2012), no. 3, pp. 1011–1046.

UNIVERSITÄT WIEN

KURT GÖDEL RESEARCH CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL LOGIC

WÄHRINGER STRASSE 25, 1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA

E-mail: sdf@logic.univie.ac.at

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL  
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
UNIVERSITY WALK, BRISTOL BS8 1TW, UK  
*E-mail*: maxph@bristol.ac.uk

RHEINISCHE FRIEDRICH-WILHELMS-UNIVERSITÄT BONN  
MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT  
ENDENICHER ALLEE 60, 53115 BONN  
GERMANY  
*E-mail*: pluecke@math.uni-bonn.de