

### §1 Preliminaries

Let  $\mathcal{Y} = \langle \langle m_i \rangle, \langle \pi_i \rangle, \langle \nu_i \rangle, T \rangle$  be a  $\Sigma^*$ -iteration of a passive promouse  $M_0$ .

We assume that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is of limit length  $\lambda = \text{lh}(\mathcal{Y})$  and that it has two distinct cofinal well founded branches  $b_0$  and  $b_1$ . Fix  $\alpha < \lambda$  s.t.  $(b_0 \setminus \alpha) \cap (b_1 \setminus \alpha) = \emptyset$ . (In the sequel we shall occasionally place further requirements on  $\alpha$ .)

Define  $\langle i_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$  by:

- Def  $i_0 =$  the least  $i$  s.t.  $i+1 \in b_0 \setminus \alpha$
- $i_{2n+1} =$  the least  $i$  s.t.  $i+1 \in b_1$  and  $i > i_{2n}$
- $i_{2n+2} =$  " " " " "  $b_0$  "  $i > i_{2n+1}$ ,

Then  $\langle i_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$  is monotone. Moreover  $\sup_n i_n = \lambda$ , since otherwise

$$\sup_n i_n \in (b_0 \setminus \alpha) \cap (b_1 \setminus \alpha).$$

Set:  $\bar{z}_n = T(i_{n+1})$ .

We note that  $\bar{z}_{2n+1} \leq i_{2n}$ .

$\exists_{2m+1} \neq i_{2m} + 1$ , since  
otherwise  $\exists_{2m+1} \in b_{2m+1} \setminus \alpha$ .

since otherwise  $\exists_{2m+1} \in b_1, \exists_{2m+1} > i_{2m} + 1$ .

But then  $i_{2m+1} + 1 \leq \exists_{2m+1}$ , since  $i_{2m+1} + 1$  is the least  $\eta \in b_1$  s.t.  $\eta > i_{2m} + 1$ .

Contradiction! Similarly we get  $\exists_{2m+2} \leq i_{2m+1} + 1$ . Thus

$$(1) \exists_{m+1} \leq i_m \quad \text{for } m < \omega,$$

But then

$$(2) \kappa_{i_{m+1}} < \lambda_{\exists_{m+1}} \leq \lambda_{i_m} < \kappa_{i_{m+2}}$$

$$(\lambda_{i_m} \leq \kappa_{i_{m+2}}, \text{ since } (i_m + 1) \cdot \overline{(i_{m+2} + 1)})$$

In particular  $\kappa_{i_m} < \lambda_{\exists_m} < \kappa_{i_{m+1}}$

for  $m \geq 1$ . But we may assume  $\alpha$  is chosen that

$$(3) \kappa_{i_m} < \lambda_{\exists_m} < \kappa_{i_{m+1}} \quad \text{for } m < \omega,$$

(If not, replace  $d$  by  $d' = i_{2p} + 1$  for any  $p > 0$ . Our definition then yield a new sequence  $\langle i'_m \mid m < \omega \rangle$ . By induction

-3-

on  $n$  we then get:  $i'_n = i'_{2p+n}$   
for  $n < \omega$ .)

We have:  $(i_{n+1})_T (i'_{n+2} + 1)$ , hence:  
hence  $(i_{n+1}) \leq \sum_{n+2}$ .

Thus  $\sum_n < \sum_{n+1}$  for  $n \geq 1$ , since

$\sum_{n+1} \leq i'_n < \sum_{n+2}$ . Arguing

as above we can suppose  $d$  to  
be so chosen that:

(4)  $\sum_n < \sum_{n+1}$  for  $n < \omega$ .

It is occasionally useful to use  
the convention:

Def  $b_m = \begin{cases} b_0 & \text{if } m \text{ is even} \\ b_1 & \text{if } m \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$

Then:

(5)  $i_{n+1} \in b_m$  for  $n < \omega$ ,

We recall some basic notions.

Let  $M = \langle J_\alpha^A, B \rangle$  be amenable. We say that  $F$  is an extender at  $\kappa$  on  $M$  of length  $\lambda$ , determining the ultrapower  $M'$  with canonical embedding  $\pi$  (in symbols:  $\pi: M \xrightarrow[F]{} M'$ )

iff the following hold:

- $\lambda > \kappa$  is p.s. closed.
- $\pi: M \xrightarrow[\Sigma_0]{} M'$  cofinally, where  $M'$  is transitive
- $\kappa = \text{crit}(\pi)$  and  $\lambda \leq \pi(\kappa)$
- $M'$  is the  $\Sigma_0$ -closure of  $\text{rng}(\pi) \cup \lambda$  in itself
- $F: \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap M \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$  is defined by  $E(x) = \pi(x) \cap \lambda$ .

$\pi, M'$  are then uniquely determined by  $E, M$ .

At  $\kappa < \bar{\lambda} \leq \lambda$  and  $\bar{\lambda}$  is p.s. closed, we define  $F|_{\bar{\lambda}}$  of length  $\bar{\lambda}$  by:

$$F|_{\bar{\lambda}}(x) = F(x) \cap \bar{\lambda}$$

for  $x \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap M$ .

$F|\bar{\lambda}$  is then also an extender on  $M$ .

Moreover if  $\tilde{\pi}: M \xrightarrow{F|\lambda} \tilde{M}$ , there is

$k: \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$  defined by:

$$k(\tilde{\pi}(f)(\bar{z})) = \pi(f)(\bar{z})$$

for  $\bar{z} < \bar{\lambda}$  and  $f \in M, f: \kappa \rightarrow M$ . It

follows that:

$$k: \tilde{M} \xrightarrow{\Sigma_0} M' \text{ cofinally}$$

and:

$$\tilde{M}|\bar{\lambda} = M'|\bar{\lambda}, \quad k|\bar{\lambda} = \text{id},$$

where:  $\langle J_\alpha^A, B \rangle|\lambda \equiv_{\text{def}} \langle J_\lambda^A, B \cap J_\lambda^A \rangle$

Moreover  $k$  is the unique map

$$\text{s.t. } k: \tilde{M} \xrightarrow{\Sigma_0} M', \quad k|\bar{\lambda} = \text{id},$$

$$\text{and } k\tilde{\pi} = \pi.$$

(These are well known facts which we state without proof.)

If  $M$  is acceptable, then the  $\Sigma^*$ -ultrapower  $M'$  and the canonical  $\Sigma^*$ -embedding  $\pi$  are defined as in [MO].

(An symbols  $\pi: M \xrightarrow[F^*]{} M'$ .)

Analogues of the above facts continue to hold.

Note If  $F$  is an extender on  $M = J_{\alpha}^A$  and  $\langle M, B \rangle$  is amenable, then  $F$  is an extender on  $\langle M, B \rangle$ .

We recall that  $E$  is called  $\omega$ -complete iff whenever  $W \subset \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap M$  and  $Y \subset \lambda$  are countable, then there is  $\sigma : Y \rightarrow \kappa$  s.t.  $\sigma(\xi) \in X \Leftrightarrow \xi \in E(X)$  for all  $X \in W, \xi \in \lambda$ . We know that if  $E$  on  $M$  is  $\omega$ -complete and  $\mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap M = \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap M'$ , then  $E$  is also an extender on  $M'$ .

Hence:

(6) Let  $N = \langle J_{\delta}^E, B \rangle$  be acceptable.

Let  $F \in N$  be an extender on  $M = (J_{\kappa^+}^E)^N$  at  $\kappa$ . If  $N$  thinks that  $F$  is  $\omega$ -complete, then  $F$  is an extender on  $N$ .

proof.

For  $\alpha < \gamma$  in  $N$  we know that

$\pi_{\alpha\gamma} : (N|_{\alpha}) \xrightarrow{F} (N|_{\alpha})'$  exists. Set

$\pi = \bigcup_{\gamma} \pi_{\alpha\gamma}$ . Then  $\pi : N \xrightarrow{F} N'$

where  $N' = \bigcup_{\gamma < \delta} (N|_{\gamma})'$  QED

Def Let  $N = \langle J_{\delta}^E, B \rangle$  be acceptable  
 Let  $\kappa \in N$  and let  $F$  be an  
 extender on  $M = (J_{\kappa^+}^E)^N$  at  $\kappa$ . Let  
 $\kappa^{+M} < \lambda \in N$ .  $F$  is  $\lambda$ -strong w.r.t.  $N$

iff  $lh(F) = \lambda$  and, letting  $\pi: M \rightarrow M'$ ,  
 we have:  $J_{\lambda}^{EN} = J_{\lambda}^{EM'}$   $\wedge$   $B \cap J_{\lambda}^{EN} = B \cap J_{\lambda}^{EM'}$

By (6) we get:

(7) Let  $N$  be as above. Let  $F \in N$  be an  
 extender on  $M = (J_{\kappa^+}^E)^N$  at  $\kappa$  which is  
 $\lambda$ -strong where  $\lambda > \kappa$  is the length  
 of  $F$ . If  $\lambda$  is regular in  $N$ , then  
 $F$  is an extender on  $N$ .

prf.

We show that  $F$  is  $\omega$ -complete in  $N$ .

Let  $W \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ ,  $X \subseteq \lambda$  be countable in  
 $N$ . Let  $\langle \xi_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$  enumerate  $W$

and  $\langle \gamma_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$  enumerate  $X$  in  $N$ .

Set  $u = \{ \langle i, i \rangle \mid \xi_i \in \gamma_i \}$ . Then

$u \in \mathcal{P}(\omega) \subset M$  and  $\langle \gamma_i \mid i < \omega \rangle \in M$

in  $N$ . It suffices to show

that there is  $\sigma: \omega \rightarrow \kappa$  in  $N$  with  
 $\sigma(i) \in \gamma_i \iff \langle i, i \rangle \in u$  for  $i < \omega$

Note that if  $F$  is  $\lambda$ -strong,  
 $\kappa < \lambda$  and  $\bar{\lambda}$  is pin closed,  
 then  $F \restriction \bar{\lambda}$  is  $\bar{\lambda}$ -strong.

Since  $\pi : M \xrightarrow{F} M'$  is an elementary embedding, it suffices to show that the same statement holds of:

$\pi(u) = u$ ,  $\pi(\langle y_i \mid i < \omega \rangle) = \langle \pi(y_i) \mid i < \omega \rangle$   
 in  $M'$ . But that does hold if we take  
 $\sigma = \langle \bar{z}_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ , where  $\sigma \in H_\lambda^N = J_\lambda^E \in M'$ ,  
 QED (7)

Def Let  $N = \langle J_\delta^E, B \rangle$  be acceptable.

Let  $\kappa \in N$ ,  $\kappa$  is strong in  $N$  iff  
 for arbitrarily large  $\lambda \in N$  there is  
 an extender  $F \in N$  at  $\kappa$  on  $(J_{\kappa^+}^E)^N$   
 which is  $\lambda$ -strong wrt.  $N$ .

(We call  $\kappa$  strong in  $N = J_\delta^E$  iff it  
 is strong in  $\langle N, \emptyset \rangle$ .)

Trivially we have:

(8) Let  $\kappa$  be strong in  $N$ . Then for  
every p.r. closed  $\lambda > \kappa$  in  $N$  there is  
 an  $F \in N$  at  $\kappa$  which is  $\lambda$ -strong  
 wrt.  $N$

prf.

Let  $F' \in N$  be  $\lambda'$ -strong where  $\lambda \leq \lambda'$ ,

Set  $F = F' \upharpoonright \lambda$ . QED (8)



(9). Let  $N$  be acceptable s.t.

$N \models$  There are arbitrarily large cardinals,  
Let  $\kappa$  be  $\kappa$ -strong in  $N$ . Then for every  
p.p. closed  $\lambda > \kappa$  in  $N$  there is a  
 $\lambda$ -strong  $F \in N$  at  $\kappa$  which is an  
extender on  $N$ .

proof.

Let  $\bar{\kappa} \geq \kappa$  be regular in  $N$ . Let  $F' \in N$   
be  $\bar{\kappa}$ -strong. Then  $F'$  is an extender  
on  $N$  by (7). Hence so is  $F = F' \upharpoonright \lambda$ .

QED (9)

We now return to our iteration  $\mathcal{N}$  and the set  $N = J_\delta^E$  defined at the outset. \*\*/

We note:

$$(10) (E_{\kappa_{i_n}}^{M_{i_n}} | \kappa_{i_{n+1}}) \in N \text{ for } n < \omega.$$

prf.

Since there is no truncation we know that  $\tau_{i_{n+1}} = \kappa_{i_{n+1}}^+$  and  $H_{\tau_{i_{n+1}}} = J_{\tau_{i_{n+1}}}^E$  \*\*/

in  $M_j$  for all  $j \geq \beta_{n+1}$ . But

$\beta_{n+1} \leq i_n$ . Hence, taking  $j = i_n$ ,

we conclude:

$$(E_{\kappa_{i_n}}^{M_{i_n}} | \kappa_{i_{n+1}}) \in J_{\tau_{i_{n+1}}}^E \subset N. \text{ QED (8)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \sup_{i < \lambda} \kappa_i = \sup_{i < \lambda} \kappa_i \quad | \quad N = J_\delta^E = \\ &= \bigcup_{i < \lambda} J_{\kappa_i}^{E^{M_i}} = \bigcup_{i < \lambda} J_{\lambda_i}^{E^{M_i}} \end{aligned}$$

$$**/ \quad \tau_i = \bigoplus_{\alpha} (\kappa_i^+) \upharpoonright_{\alpha}^{E^{M_i}}$$

Clearly we can choose  $\alpha$  large enough that if  $\delta \in M_{b_m}$ , then  $\delta \in \text{rng}(\pi_{\sum_m, b_m})$

(where, as before,  $N = \bigcup_{\delta}^E$ ). From now on suppose  $\alpha$  to be so chosen. For

$n < \omega$  set:  $b_n^* = b_n \setminus \sum_n$ . Then

$$b_m^* \cap b_{m+1}^* = \emptyset \text{ and } b_{m+2}^* \subset b_m^*.$$

Def Let  $j \in b_h^*$  ( $h=0,1$ )

• At  $\delta \in M_{b_h}$  set:

$$N_i = \pi_{i, b_h}^{-1}(N) = \bigcup_{\delta}^{E M_i}$$

$$\overline{\pi}_j b_h = \overline{\pi}_j b_h \upharpoonright N_j$$

$$\overline{\pi}_{i, l} = \overline{\pi}_{i, l} \upharpoonright N_i \text{ for } i \leq l \in b_h.$$

• At  $\delta \notin M_{b_h}$ , then  $N = M_{b_h}$  and we

set:  $N_i = M_i$ ,  $\overline{\pi}_{i, b_h} = \overline{\pi}_{i, b_h}$ , and

$$\overline{\pi}_{i, l} = \overline{\pi}_{i, l} \text{ for } i \leq l \in b_h.$$

At  $B \subset N$ ,  $i \in b_h$ , we also set:

$$B_j = \overline{\pi}_{j, b_h}^{-1} \cap B.$$

We now introduce an important concept:

Def Let  $B \subset N$ .  $B$  is captured at  $n < \omega$

iff  $\langle N, B \rangle$  is amenable and for all

$j \in b_m^* \cup b_{m+1}^*$  we have:

- $\langle N_j, B_j \rangle$  is amenable

- $\bar{\pi}_j : \langle N_j, B_j \rangle \rightarrow_{\Sigma_0} \langle N, B \rangle$  if  $j \in b_m^*, m \geq n$

It is easily seen that:

(11) If  $B$  is captured at  $n$ , then it is captured at every  $m \geq n$ .

(12)  $\emptyset$  is captured at 0. Moreover, if  $B \subset N$  and  $B \in M_{b_0} \cap M_{b_1}$ , then  $B$  is captured at some  $n$ .

(13) If  $B$  is captured at  $n$  and  $B'$  is  $\Sigma_0(\langle N, B \rangle)$  in a parameter  $p \in J_{\kappa, m}^B$ , then  $B'$  is captured at  $n$ .

Lemma 1 If BCN is captured at  $m$ , then  $\kappa_{i_m}$  is strong in  $\langle N, B \rangle$ .

proof.

We display the proof for  $m=0$ .

We construct a sequence  $F^m (m < \omega)$  of extenders on  $\kappa_{i_0}$  s.t.  $\text{lh}(F^m) = \kappa_{i_{m+1}}$ .

We show that  $F^m \dot{\subseteq} N$  is  $\kappa_{i_{m+1}}$ -strong for  $\langle N, B \rangle$ .

Case 1  $m=0$

$F^0 = E_{\kappa_{i_0}} \upharpoonright \kappa_{i_1}$ . Then  $F^0 \dot{\subseteq} N$  by (10).

$B \cap \kappa_{i_0} = B_{\bar{\alpha}_0} \cap \kappa_{i_0}$ , since  $\text{crit}(\pi_{\bar{\alpha}_0, b_0}) = \kappa_{i_0}$

Let  $\pi : \langle J_{\bar{\alpha}_0}^E, B_{\bar{\alpha}_0} \cap J_{\bar{\alpha}_0}^E \rangle \rightarrow \langle J_{\kappa_{i_0}}^E, B' \rangle$

Then  $\pi = \pi_{\bar{\alpha}_0, i_0+1} \upharpoonright J_{\bar{\alpha}_0}^E$ . Hence:

$$B' = \bigcup_{x \in J_{\bar{\alpha}_0}^E} \pi(x \cap B_{\bar{\alpha}_0}) = B_{i_0+1} \cap J_{\kappa_{i_0}}^E$$

Hence  $B' \cap \lambda_{i_0} = B \cap \lambda_{i_0}$ , since

$\text{crit}(\pi_{\bar{\alpha}_0, i_0+1, b_0}) \geq \lambda_{i_0}$ . Hence

if  $\bar{\pi} : \langle J_{\bar{\alpha}_0}^E, B_{\bar{\alpha}_0} \cap J_{\bar{\alpha}_0}^E \rangle \xrightarrow{F^0} \langle J_{\kappa_{i_0}}^{E'}, B'' \rangle$

we have:  $J_{\kappa_{i_0}}^{E'} = J_{\kappa_{i_0}}^E$  and:

$$B' \cap J_{\kappa_{i_1}}^E = B' \cap J_{\kappa_{i_1}}^E = B \cap J_{\kappa_{i_1}}^E, \text{ since}$$

$$\kappa_{i_1} < \lambda_{i_0}. \quad \text{QED (Case 1)}$$

Case 2  $m = m+1$ .

$$\text{Let } \pi : \langle J_{\tau_{i_0}}^E, B \cap J_{\tau_{i_0}}^E \rangle \xrightarrow{F^m} \langle J_{\nu_{i_1}}^{E'}, B' \rangle,$$

$$\text{We know: } J_{\kappa_{i_m}}^{E'} = J_{\kappa_{i_m}}^E \text{ and } B' \cap J_{\kappa_{i_m}}^{E'} = B \cap J_{\kappa_{i_m}}^{E'}$$

Since  $F^m \in N$ , we have:

$$F^m \in J_{\tau_{i_m}}^E, \text{ since } \tau_{i_m} = (n^+)^N,$$

Arguing as above with  $n$  in place of 0 we have:

$$\tilde{\pi} : \langle J_{\tau_{i_m}}^E, B \cap J_{\tau_{i_m}}^E \rangle \xrightarrow{E_{\nu_{i_m}}} \langle J_{\nu_{i_m}}^E, \tilde{B} \rangle$$

$$\text{with } \tilde{B} = B_{i_{m+1}} \cap J_{\nu_{i_m}}^E, \text{ where}$$

$$\tilde{\pi} = \pi \upharpoonright_{\sum_{n, b_n} J_{\tau_{i_m}}^E}, \text{ Hence}$$

$$\tilde{B} \cap J_{\lambda_{i_m}}^E = B \cap J_{\lambda_{i_m}}^E, \text{ since}$$

$$\text{crit}(\pi \upharpoonright_{\sum_{n, b_n} J_{\tau_{i_m}}^E}) \geq \lambda_{i_m}.$$

Set:

$$F^m = \pi \upharpoonright_{\text{pt}} (F^m) \upharpoonright_{\kappa_{i_{m+1}}}$$

Clearly  $\tilde{\pi}(F^m) \in J_{\nu_{im}}^E \subset N$ ; hence

$F^{m+1} \in N$ . Clearly  $\pi, \langle J_{\nu'}^{E'}, B' \rangle \in J_{\nu_{im}}^E$ ,  
 and  $F^m \in J_{\tau_{im}}^E$  and  $J_{\tau_{im}}^E$  is a ZFC-  
 model. Let  $\pi' = \tilde{\pi}(\pi)$  and

$\langle J_{\nu''}^{E''}, B'' \rangle = \tilde{\pi}(\langle J_{\nu'}^{E'}, B' \rangle)$ . Then

$$\tilde{\pi}' : \langle J_{\tau_{i0}}^E, B \cap J_{\tau_{i0}}^E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}(F^m)} \langle J_{\nu''}^{E''}, B'' \rangle.$$

Since  $J_{\kappa_{im}}^{E'} = J_{\kappa_{im}}^E$ ,  $B' \cap J_{\kappa_{im}}^E = B \cap J_{\kappa_{im}}^{E'}$

$$\text{and } \tilde{\pi}' : \langle J_{\tau_{im}}^E, B \cap J_{\tau_{im}}^E \rangle \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}(F^m)} \langle J_{\nu_{im}}^E, B \rangle,$$

where  $\tilde{\pi}'(\kappa_{im}) = \lambda_{im}$ , we conclude:

$$J_{\lambda_{im}}^{E''} = J_{\lambda_{im}}^E \quad \text{and!}$$

$$B'' \cap J_{\lambda_{im}}^E = \tilde{B} \cap J_{\lambda_{im}}^E = B \cap J_{\lambda_{im}}^m.$$

But  $\kappa_{im+1} < \lambda_{im}$ . Hence, if

$$\bar{\pi} : \langle J_{\tau_{i0}}^E, B \cap J_{\tau_{i0}}^E \rangle \xrightarrow{F^m} \langle J_{\nu}^{\bar{E}}, \bar{B} \rangle,$$

we have  $\bar{B} \cap \kappa_{im+1} = \tilde{B} \cap \kappa_{im+1} = B \cap \kappa_{im+1}$

QED (Lemma 1)

By Lemma 1 and (13) we get:

Lemma 2 Let  $B$  be captured at  $n$ . Set  $\tilde{N} = \langle N, B \rangle$ . Then  $\tilde{N} \upharpoonright \kappa_{im}^E < \tilde{N}$ .

(where  $\tilde{N} \upharpoonright \kappa = \langle J_{\kappa}^E, B \cap J_{\kappa}^E \rangle$ ).

proof.

It suffices to show:

$$\tilde{N} \models \forall y \varphi(y, x) \rightarrow \tilde{N} \models \forall y \in J_{\kappa_{im}^E} \varphi(y, x)$$

if  $x \in J_{\kappa_{im}^E}$  and  $\varphi$  is  $\Sigma_0$ .

Suppose not. Let  $\varphi, x$  be a counterexample. Set:

$$B' = \{ y \mid \tilde{N} \models \varphi(y, x) \}.$$

Then  $B'$  is captured at  $n$ . Hence  $\kappa_{im}^E$  is strong wrt.  $\tilde{N}' = \langle N, B' \rangle$ .

Let  $y \in B'$ ,  $y \in J_{\lambda}^E$ . (Hence  $\lambda > \kappa_{im}^E$ .) By Lemma 1 there is

an extender  $F$  on  $\kappa_{im}^E$  in  $N$  w.t.

$$\bar{\pi}_F(B' \cap J_{\kappa_{im}^E}^E) \cap J_{\lambda}^E = B' \cap J_{\lambda}^E.$$

But  $B' \cap J_{\kappa_{im}^E}^E = \emptyset$ , hence

$$\bar{\pi}_F(B' \cap J_{\kappa_{im}^E}^E) = \emptyset, \text{ whereas}$$

$$B' \cap J_{\lambda}^E \neq \emptyset, \text{ Contr!}$$

QED (Lemma 2)



Before proceeding further, we place another requirement on the ordinal  $\delta$ .

Def  $b_h$  is of type A ( $h=0,1$ ) iff  
 for all  $j \in b_h \setminus \bar{z}_h$  we have:  $\sup \pi_{j|b_h} \delta_j < \delta$ .  
 Otherwise it is of type B.

From now on assume w.l.o.g. that  $\delta$  is large enough that  $\sup \pi_{j|b_h} \delta_j = \delta$  whenever  $b_h$  is of type b and  $j \in b_h \setminus \bar{z}_h$ .

(14) If  $b_h$  is of type A, then:

- (a)  $\delta$  is  $\Sigma^*$ -regular in  $M_{b_h}$  (i.e. if  $m > \omega$  and  $f$  is a good partial  $\Sigma_{-1}^{(m)}(M_{b_h})$  map of a  $\bar{\varepsilon} < \delta$  to  $\delta$ , then  $\sup f \bar{\varepsilon} < \delta$ ).
- (b)  $\delta \in M_{b_h}$  and there is  $\nu > \delta$  s.t.  $E_\nu \neq \emptyset$  in  $M_{b_h}$ .

proof

(a) Suppose not. Let  $f, \bar{\varepsilon} < \delta$  be a counter-example. Let  $f$  be a good  $\Sigma(M_{b_h})$  map in parameter  $p$ . Let  $j \in b_h \setminus \bar{z}_h$  s.t.  $\pi_{j|b_h}(\bar{\varepsilon}) = \bar{\varepsilon}$  and  $\pi_{j|b_h}(p) = p$ . Let  $\bar{f}$  be  $\Sigma_1(M_j)$  in  $\bar{p}$  by the same functionally absolute definition. Then  $\pi_{j|b_h}(\bar{f}(\bar{\varepsilon})) = f(\bar{\varepsilon})$  for  $\bar{\varepsilon} < \bar{\varepsilon}$ .  
 Hence  $\sup \pi_{j|b_h} \delta_j = \delta_j$ . Contr!

(b) Suppose not. Then  $\nu \leq \delta$  for  $E_\nu \neq \emptyset$  in  $M_{b_h}$ .  
 Hence  $\nu < \delta$  for such  $\nu$ , since otherwise  $N$  would have a largest cardinal. But

Then if  $j' \in b_h$ ,  $\nu < \delta_j$  for  $E_\nu \neq \emptyset$  in  $M_{j'}$ ,  
 since  $\pi_j|_{b_h} : M_j \xrightarrow{\Sigma^*} M_{b_h}$ . Let

$j = T(i+1)$  where  $i+1 \in b_h$ . Then  $\kappa_i < \delta_j$ ,  
 since otherwise  $\delta_j < \kappa_i < \lambda_j < \nu_j$  when

$E_{\nu_j} \neq \emptyset$  in  $M_j$ . But  $\delta_j$  is  $\Sigma^*$ -regular  
 in  $M_j$ . Hence  $\pi_j|_{i+1}$  takes  $\delta_j$  cofinally

to  $\delta_{j+1}$ . Since this happens at all  
 successor points of  $b_h$ , it follows

that  $\pi_j|_{b_h}$  takes  $\delta_j$  cofinally to  $\delta$  for

$j \in b_h \setminus \bar{\Sigma}_h$ . Contradiction!

QED (81)

Def BCN is strongly captured at  $m$  iff

(a)  $B$  is captured at  $m$

(b)  $\forall b_h$  is of type A ( $h=0,1$ ) and

$j \in b_h \setminus \bar{\Sigma}_m$ , then  $B \in \text{ring}(\pi_j, b_h)$ .

Lemma 3 Let  $B$  be strongly captured

at  $m$ . Let  $B'$  be  $\Sigma_1(\langle N, B \rangle)$  in  $p \in J_{m,im}^1$ .

Then  $B'$  is strongly captured at  $m$ .

proof.

Claim 1  $\forall b_h$  is of type A and  $j \in b_h \setminus \bar{\Sigma}_m$ ,

then  $B' \in \text{ring}(\pi_j, b_h)$

proof.

Let  $\pi_{j, b_h}(\langle N_j, B_j \rangle) = \langle N, B \rangle$ . Let

$B_j'$  be  $\Sigma_1(\langle N_j, B_j \rangle)$  in  $p$  by the same definition. Then  $\pi_{j, b_h}(B_j') = B'$ .

QED (Claim 1)

This is all we need to prove about  $b_h$  of type A. Now let  $b_h$  be of

type B.

Claim 2  $\langle N, B' \rangle$  is amenable.

proof.

Let  $u \in N$ ,  $u \in J_{m,im}^E$ , where  $m \leq m$ ,

Then  $B' \cap J_{\kappa_{im}}^E$  is  $\tilde{N} | \kappa_{im}$ -definable by

Lemma 2, where  $\tilde{N} = \langle N, B \rangle$ . Hence  $B' \cap J_{\kappa_{im}}^E \in N$  and  $u \cap B' = (B' \cap J_{\kappa_{im}}^E) \cap u \in N$ .

QED (Claim 2)

Now let  $j \in b_h \setminus \sum_n$ . Let  $B_j' = (\bar{\pi}_{j|b_h}^{-1})^{-1} B'$ .

Since  $\bar{\pi}_{j|b_h} : \tilde{N}_j \rightarrow_{\Sigma_1} \tilde{N}$ , where  $\tilde{N}_j = \langle N_j, B_j' \rangle$

and  $B_j' = \bar{\pi}_{j|b_h}^{-1} \cap B$ , we know that

$B_j'$  is  $\Sigma_1(\tilde{N}_j)$  in  $p$  by the same definition.

Claim 3  $\langle N_j, B_j' \rangle$  is amenable.

proof.

Let  $u \in N_j$ . We claim that  $B_j' \cap u \in N_j$ .

Let  $\bar{\pi}_{j|b_h}(u) \in J_{\kappa_{im}}^E$ , where  $m \leq m$ .

Let  $\bar{\kappa}$  be least s.t.  $\bar{\pi}_{j|b_h}(\bar{\kappa}) \geq \kappa_{im}$ .

Subclaim 3.1  $\tilde{N}_j | \bar{\kappa} \prec_{\Sigma_1} \tilde{N}_j$

where  $\tilde{N}_j = \langle N_j, B_j' \rangle$ .

proof.

Let  $\varphi$  be  $\Sigma_1$ . Let  $x \in \tilde{N}_j | \bar{\kappa}$ . Then

Then  $\bar{\pi}_{j|b_h}(x) \in \tilde{N} | \kappa_{im}$ , where

$\bar{\pi}_{j|b_h} = \bar{\pi}_{j|b_h}$ . Then:

$$\tilde{N}_1 \models \varphi(x) \rightarrow \tilde{N} \models \varphi(\bar{\pi}(x))$$

$$\rightarrow (\tilde{N} |_{\kappa_{i_m}}) \models \varphi(\bar{\pi}(x))$$

$$\rightarrow (\tilde{N} |_{\bar{\pi}(u)}) \models \varphi(\bar{\pi}(x))$$

$$\text{since } \tilde{N} |_{\kappa_{i_m}} \prec_{\Sigma_0} (\tilde{N} |_{\bar{\pi}(u)})$$

$$\rightarrow (\tilde{N}_1 |_{\tilde{u}}) \models \varphi(\tilde{u})$$

$$\text{since } \bar{\pi}(\tilde{N}_1 |_{\tilde{u}}) = \tilde{N} |_{\bar{\pi}(u)}$$

QED (Subclaim 3.1)

But then if  $\bar{\pi}$  is as above,

then  $B'_1 \cap J_{\bar{\pi}}^{EN_1}$  is  $\tilde{N}_1 |_{\bar{\pi}}$ -definable,

Hence  $B'_1 \cap J_{\bar{\pi}}^{EN_1} \in \tilde{N}_1$ . Hence

$$u \cap B'_1 = u \cap (B'_1 \cap J_{\bar{\pi}}^{EN_1}) \in \tilde{N}_1.$$

QED (Claim 3)

Claim 4  $\bar{\pi}_1 |_{\kappa_h} : \langle N_1, B'_1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\Sigma_0} \langle N_1, B'_1 \rangle$

proof.

This follows by

Claim 4.1  $\bar{\pi}_0(B'_1 \cap u) = B'_1 \cap \bar{\pi}_0(u)$

for  $u \in N_1$ ,  $\bar{\pi}_0 = \bar{\pi}_1 |_{\kappa_h}$ .

proof.

Let  $u, \bar{u}, i_m$  be as in the proof of Claim 3.

We first note that  $\tilde{N}/\kappa \prec_{\Sigma_1} \tilde{N}$ ,  
 where  $\kappa = \bar{\pi}(\bar{\kappa})$ . To see this,  
 let  $\varphi(x)$  be  $\Sigma_1$  in  $\tilde{N}_j$  we have

$$\wedge x \in J_{\kappa}^E (\varphi(x) \rightarrow \varphi(x)_{\tilde{N}_j/\bar{\kappa}})$$

which is a  $\Pi_1$  statement about  $\bar{\kappa}$ . But then the same  $\Pi_1$  statement holds of  $\kappa$  in  $\tilde{N}$ .

Thus  $B_j' \cap J_{\kappa}^{EN}$  is  $\tilde{N}_j/\bar{\kappa}$  definable  
 in  $\bar{p} = \bar{\pi}^{-1}(p)$  and  $B_j' \cap J_{\kappa}^{EN}$  is  
 $\tilde{N}/\kappa$ -definable in  $p$ , where  
 $\bar{\pi}(\tilde{N}_j/\bar{\kappa}) = \tilde{N}/\kappa$ . Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\pi}(u \cap B_j') &= \bar{\pi}(u \cap B_j' \cap J_{\kappa}^{EN}) = \\ &= \bar{\pi}(u) \cap (B_j' \cap J_{\kappa}^{EN}) = \bar{\pi}(u) \cap B_j', \end{aligned}$$

QED (Lemma 3)

Iterated application of Lemma 2  
 and Lemma 3 then gives:

Corollary 4 Let  $B$  be strongly captured at  $m$ . Set  $\tilde{N} = \langle N, B \rangle$ . Then

(a)  $\tilde{N} \upharpoonright \kappa_{i_m} < \tilde{N}$

(b) If  $B'$  is  $\tilde{N}$ -definable in a  $p \in J_{\kappa_{i_m}}^E$ , then  $B'$  is strongly captured at  $m$ .

Note Since  $\tilde{N} \upharpoonright \kappa_{i_m} \in N$  and  $\kappa_{i_m}$  is inaccessible in  $N$ , it follows that  $\tilde{N}$  is a ZFC<sup>-</sup> model. In particular,  $N$  is a ZFC<sup>-</sup> model, since  $\emptyset$  is strongly captured at every  $m$ .