

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

## **SOME RESULTS ON SPECKER'S PROBLEM**

ARTHUR WILLIAM APTER AND MOTI GITIK

## SOME RESULTS ON SPECKER'S PROBLEM

ARTHUR W. APTER AND MOTI GITIK

Say that the Specker Property holds for a well ordered cardinal  $\aleph$ , and write this as  $SP(\aleph)$ , if the power set of  $\aleph$  can be written as a countable union of sets of cardinality  $\aleph$ . Specker's Problem asks whether it is possible to have a model in which  $SP(\aleph)$  holds for every  $\aleph$ . In this paper, we construct two models in which the Specker Property holds for a large class of cardinals. In the first model,  $SP(\aleph)$  holds for every successor  $\aleph$ . In the second model,  $SP(\aleph)$  holds for every limit  $\aleph$  and for certain successor  $\aleph$ 's.

In 1957, Specker [13] stated the following question (which will henceforth be referred to as Specker's Problem): Is it consistent with the axioms of ZF to have, for each ordinal  $\alpha$ , a countable sequence  $\langle A_n : n < \omega \rangle$  of subsets of  $2^{\aleph_\alpha}$  so that  $|A_n| = \aleph_\alpha$  for all  $n$  and  $2^{\aleph_\alpha} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} A_n$ ? Since the existence of one ordinal  $\alpha$  so that  $2^{\aleph_\alpha}$  is a countable union of sets of cardinality  $\aleph_\alpha$  implies that  $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$  is singular, a model in which the above holds would be one in which the Axiom of Choice is false. Indeed, it can easily be seen that in such a model,  $AC_\omega$  is false.

Lévy [9], shortly after the invention by Cohen of forcing, constructed a model in which  $2^{\aleph_0}$  is a countable union of countable sets. A later result on Specker's Problem was obtained in [6], in which it was shown that, relative to the existence of a proper class of strongly compact cardinals, it is consistent for every infinite set to be a countable union of sets of smaller cardinality.

Unfortunately, we still do not know whether Specker's Problem is consistent. In this paper, we will prove the following two theorems, each of which provides a partial answer to Specker's Problem for a large class of cardinals.

**THEOREM 1.**  $\text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \textit{There exists a regular limit of supercompact cardinals}) \Rightarrow \text{Con}(\text{ZF} + \textit{For every successor ordinal } \alpha, 2^{\aleph_\alpha} \textit{ is a countable union of sets of cardinality } \aleph_\alpha).$

**THEOREM 2.**  $\text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \text{GCH} + \textit{There is a cardinal } \kappa \textit{ which is } 2^{2^{|\kappa+\omega|<\omega}} \textit{ supercompact}) \Rightarrow \text{Con}(\text{ZF} + \textit{For every limit ordinal } \lambda, 2^{\aleph_\lambda} \textit{ is a}$

*countable union of sets of cardinality  $\aleph_\lambda$  + For every successor ordinal  $\alpha$  so that  $\alpha = 3n, 3n + 1, \lambda + 3n$ , or  $\lambda + 3n + 2$ , where  $\lambda$  is a limit ordinal and  $n \in \omega$ ,  $2^{\aleph_\alpha}$  is a countable union of sets of cardinality  $\aleph_\alpha$ ).*

The techniques used in the proofs of the above two theorems can be used to establish additional results on Specker's Problem. For example, it is possible to establish the relative consistency of the theory "ZF + For every successor ordinal  $\alpha$ ,  $2^{\aleph_\alpha}$  is a countable union of sets of cardinality  $\aleph_\alpha$  + For every limit ordinal  $\lambda$  so that  $\lambda = \lambda' + \omega$  where  $\lambda'$  is a limit ordinal,  $2^{\aleph_\lambda}$  is a countable union of sets of cardinality  $\aleph_\lambda$ ". However, as the proofs of such results involve amalgamations of the aforementioned techniques which are well illustrated by the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2, only the proofs of these theorems will be given here.

Note that some sort of strong hypotheses will be needed in order to prove the above theorems, since as previously mentioned, if  $2^{\aleph_\alpha}$  is a countable union of sets of cardinality  $\aleph_\alpha$ ,  $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$  is singular with cofinality  $\omega$ . Thus, if  $\aleph_\alpha$  and  $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$  are both so that  $2^{\aleph_\alpha}$  is a countable union of sets of cardinality  $\aleph_\alpha$  and  $2^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$  is a countable union of sets of cardinality  $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ ,  $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$  and  $\aleph_{\alpha+2}$  both have cofinality  $\omega$ . This implies the existence of inner models with measurable cardinals of high order.

The proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 will use the Easton iteration of partial orderings which satisfy the Prikry property developed in [7]. Before beginning the proofs of these theorems, however, we will briefly give some background information and preliminaries.

Our set theoretic notation is relatively standard. When  $\alpha < \beta$  are ordinals,  $[\alpha, \beta]$ ,  $(\alpha, \beta)$ ,  $(\alpha, \beta]$ , and  $(\alpha, \beta)$  are as in standard interval notation. When  $x$  is a set,  $\bar{x}$  is the order type of  $x$ . For our forcing notation, however, we adopt the notation of [12], and say that for  $p$  and  $q$  forcing conditions,  $q \Vdash p$  means that  $q$  contains more information than  $p$ . For  $\phi$  a statement in the appropriate forcing language,  $p \Vdash \phi$  means that  $p$  decides  $\phi$ .

Two partial orderings will be of particular importance in the proof of Theorems 1 and 2, namely the Lévy collapse and supercompact Prikry forcing. For  $\kappa < \lambda$  regular cardinals,  $\text{Col}(\kappa, \lambda)$  is the Lévy collapse of  $\lambda$  to  $\kappa^+$ , i.e.,  $\text{Col}(\kappa, \lambda) = \{f: \kappa \times \lambda \rightarrow \lambda: f \text{ is a function so that } |\text{dmn}(f)| < \kappa \text{ and } f(\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle) < \beta\}$ , ordered by  $q \Vdash p$  iff  $q \supseteq p$ . The trivial condition is the empty set  $\emptyset$ . If  $\beta_0 \in [\kappa, \lambda]$  is a regular cardinal and  $p \in \text{Col}(\kappa, \lambda)$ ,  $p \restriction \beta_0 = \{\langle \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle, \gamma \rangle \in p: \beta < \beta_0\}$ .  $p \restriction \beta_0$  is then a condition in  $\text{Col}(\kappa, \beta_0)$ , and for  $G$  generic on  $\text{Col}(\kappa, \lambda)$ ,

$G \upharpoonright \beta_0 = \{p \upharpoonright \beta_0 : p \in G\}$  is generic on  $\text{Col}(\kappa, \beta_0)$  which we may also sometimes write as  $\text{Col}(\kappa, \lambda) \upharpoonright \beta_0$ .

Supercompact Prikry forcing is a generalization of the usual notion of Prikry forcing which was first used by Magidor in the mid 1970's. Let  $\kappa < \lambda$  be such that  $\kappa$  is  $\lambda$  supercompact, and let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a normal ultrafilter on  $P_\kappa(\lambda)$  which satisfies the Jech-Menas partition property. (See [11] for a definition of this property.) For  $p, q \in P_\kappa(\lambda)$ , say  $p \subsetneq q$  iff  $p \subseteq q$  and  $\bar{p} < q \cap \kappa$ . Supercompact Prikry forcing  $\text{SC}(\kappa, \lambda)$  is then the set of all  $\pi = \langle p_1, \dots, p_n, A \rangle$  where:

1.  $n \in \omega$  and  $A \in \mathcal{U}$ .
2. For  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $p_i \in A$ .
3. For  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ ,  $p_i \subsetneq p_j$ .
4. For each  $q \in A$ ,  $p_n \subsetneq q$ , and  $|p_n| < |q|$ .

The sequence  $\langle p_1, \dots, p_n \rangle$  is called the  $p$ -part of  $\pi$  and is written  $p\text{-part}(\pi)$ .

If  $\pi_1 = \langle p_1, \dots, p_n, A \rangle$  and  $\pi_2 = \langle q_1, \dots, q_m, B \rangle$  are elements of  $\text{SC}(\kappa, \lambda)$  then  $\pi_2 \Vdash \pi_1$  iff:

1.  $n \leq m$ .
2. For  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $p_i = q_i$ .
3. For  $i = n + 1, \dots, m$ ,  $q_i \in A$ .
4.  $B \subseteq A$ .

As with ordinary Prikry forcing, supercompact Prikry forcing satisfies the Prikry property, namely for  $\phi$  a statement in the forcing language of  $\text{SC}(\kappa, \lambda)$  and  $\pi$  a condition, it is possible to shrink the measure 1 set to form a condition  $\pi'$  so that  $\pi' \parallel \phi$ .

If  $G$  is generic on  $\text{SC}(\kappa, \lambda)$ , then the generic sequence  $r = \langle p_n : n \in \omega \rangle$  (where  $p_n \in r$  iff there is some  $\pi \in G$  so that  $p_n$  is the  $n$ th element of  $p\text{-part}(\pi)$ ) codes a cofinal  $\omega$  sequence through  $\lambda$  if  $\lambda$  is regular. In addition, if  $\alpha \in [\kappa, \lambda]$  is regular, then  $r \upharpoonright \alpha = \langle p_n \cap \alpha : n \in \omega \rangle$  codes a cofinal  $\omega$  sequence through  $\alpha$ ; when  $\alpha = \kappa$ ,  $r \upharpoonright \kappa$  is a Prikry sequence through  $\kappa$ . Also, in analogy to the Lévy collapse, for  $\alpha \in [\kappa, \lambda]$  regular, we can for  $\pi = \langle p_1, \dots, p_n, A \rangle$  define  $\pi \upharpoonright \alpha = \langle p_1 \cap \alpha, \dots, p_n \cap \alpha, A \upharpoonright \alpha \rangle$ , where  $A \upharpoonright \alpha = \{p \cap \alpha : p \in A\}$ .  $\pi \upharpoonright \alpha$  is then a condition in  $\text{SC}(\kappa, \alpha)$  (which is defined using the restriction ultrafilter  $\mathcal{U} \upharpoonright \alpha = \{A \upharpoonright \alpha : A \in \mathcal{U}\}$ ), and  $G \upharpoonright \alpha = \{\pi \upharpoonright \alpha : \pi \in G\}$  is generic on  $\text{SC}(\kappa, \alpha)$  which we may also sometimes write as  $\text{SC}(\kappa, \lambda) \upharpoonright \alpha$ .

Finally, we will say that  $\aleph_\alpha$  satisfies the Specker property, written  $\text{SP}(\aleph_\alpha)$ , if  $2^{\aleph_\alpha}$  can be written as a countable union of sets of cardinality  $\aleph_\alpha$ .

We turn now to the proof of Theorem 1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $V \models$  “ZFC + There exists a regular limit of supercompact cardinals”, and let  $\alpha_0$  be the least such limit, with  $\langle \kappa_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  the sequence of supercompact cardinals whose limit is  $\alpha_0$ . As each  $\kappa_\alpha$  is supercompact, a result in [1] shows that there is a supercompact ultrafilter  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  on  $P_{\kappa_\alpha}(\kappa_{\alpha+1})$  with the following property (\*):  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  satisfies the Menas partition property, and there is a set  $A_\alpha \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$  so that for  $q \in A_\alpha$ ,  $q \cap \kappa_\alpha$  is an inaccessible cardinal, and if  $p, q \in A_\alpha$  are so that  $p \cap \kappa_\alpha = q \cap \kappa_\alpha$ , then  $|p| = |q|$ . Let  $\langle \mathcal{U}_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  and  $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  be such a sequence of ultrafilters  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  and sets  $A_\alpha$ .

Define now a sequence  $\langle P_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  of partial orderings as follows:

$$P_0 = \text{Col}(\omega, \kappa_0).$$

$$P_{\alpha+1} = \text{SC}(\kappa_\alpha, \kappa_{\alpha+1}),$$

where each condition in  $P_{\alpha+1}$  is stronger than the trivial condition  $\langle \phi, A_\alpha \rangle$ .

$$P_\lambda = \text{Col} \left( \left( \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha \right)^+, \kappa_\lambda \right) \quad \text{for } \lambda \text{ a limit ordinal.}$$

Note that since  $\alpha_0$  is the least regular limit of supercompact cardinals, the definition of  $P_\lambda$  makes sense.

We are now in a position to define the partial ordering  $P$  which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.  $P$  consists of all elements  $p = \langle p_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  of  $\prod_{\alpha < \alpha_0} P_\alpha$  so that the support of  $p$  is some ordinal  $< \alpha_0$ , i.e., so that  $\exists \beta < \alpha_0 \forall \gamma \geq \beta [p_\gamma \text{ is the trivial condition}]$ . The ordering is the componentwise one.

Let  $G$  be  $V$ -generic on  $P$ . The model for Theorem 1 will be a certain submodel  $N$  of  $V[G]$ . The intuition behind the construction of  $N$  will be as follows. We wish to define  $N$  in a manner so that the  $\kappa_\alpha$ 's and the  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$ 's are the successor cardinals and so that each of these cardinals satisfies the Specker property. Thus, we will place in  $N$  just enough information to be able to collapse each of the above cardinals, preserve the fact that they indeed remain cardinals in  $N$ , and define the sequence which witnesses the fact that they satisfy the Specker property. For any cardinal  $\delta$  which becomes a successor cardinal in  $N$ , we will place in  $N$  for each  $n \in \omega$ , roughly speaking, the partial collapse map to  $\delta^+$  restricted to the  $n$ th element of the Prikry sequence through the least  $\kappa_\alpha > \delta$ , together with the partial collapse map to  $\gamma^+$  restricted to the  $n$ th element of the Prikry sequence through the least  $\kappa_\alpha > \gamma$  for every  $\gamma$  in a certain set of cardinals below  $\delta$ .

Getting specific, let for each  $\alpha < \alpha_0$ ,  $G_\alpha$  be the projection of  $G$  onto  $P_\alpha$ . Let  $r_0$  be the collapse map of  $\kappa_0$  to  $\omega_1$  generated by  $G_0$ . For  $\lambda$  a limit ordinal, let  $r_\lambda$  be the collapse map of  $\kappa_\lambda$  to  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^{++}$  generated by  $G_\lambda$ , and for  $\beta = \alpha + 1$  a successor ordinal, let  $r_\beta = \langle r_\alpha^n : n \in \omega \rangle$  be the  $\omega$  sequence generated by  $G$  which codes a cofinal  $\omega$  sequence through each regular cardinal in the interval  $[\kappa_\alpha, \kappa_{\alpha+1}]$ . We can now define, for each  $n < \omega$  and each  $\beta < \alpha_0$ ,  $s_n^\beta = \langle r_\alpha^n \upharpoonright (r_\alpha^n \cap \kappa_\alpha) : \alpha \leq \beta \rangle$ .  $N$  will then be defined as  $R(\alpha_0)$  of the least model  $M$  of ZF extending  $V$  which contains, for every  $n < \omega$  and every  $\beta < \alpha_0$ , the set  $s_n^\beta$ . More precisely, let  $L_1$  be a ramified sublanguage of the forcing language  $L$  associated with  $P$  which contains symbols  $\underline{v}$  for each  $v \in V$ , a predicate symbol  $\underline{V}$  (to be interpreted as  $\underline{V}(\underline{v}) \Leftrightarrow v \in V$ ), and all symbols of the form  $\underline{s}_n^\beta$  for  $n < \omega$  and  $\beta < \alpha_0$ . As usual, we can assume that each  $\underline{v}$  is invariant under any automorphism of  $P$ . We can also assume that each  $\tau \in L_1$  which mentions only  $\underline{s}_n^\beta$  is invariant under any automorphism  $\pi = \langle \pi_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  of  $P$  such that  $\pi_\alpha$  is generated by a function which is the identity on the ordinal determined by  $r_\alpha^n \cap \kappa_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \leq \beta$  if there is enough information to determine all such ordinals.

Working in  $V[G]$ , we define an inner model  $M$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} M_0 &= \emptyset. \\ M_\lambda &= \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} M_\alpha \text{ if } \lambda \text{ is a limit ordinal.} \\ M_{\alpha+1} &= \{x \subseteq M_\alpha : x \text{ is definable over } M_\alpha \text{ by a term} \\ &\quad \tau \in L_1 \text{ of rank } \leq \alpha\}. \\ M &= \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ordinals}^V} M_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

The standard arguments will show that for  $N = R(\alpha_0)^M$ , since  $\alpha_0$  is a limit ordinal and  $M \models \text{ZF}$ ,  $N$  satisfies all axioms of ZF with the possible exception of Replacement.

We now prove a sequence of lemmas which shows that  $N$  is the desired model for Theorem 1.

**LEMMA 1.1.** *Assume that  $x \in M$  is a set of ordinals. Then:*

- (a)  $x \in V[s_n^\delta]$  for some  $n < \omega$  and  $\delta < \alpha_0$ .
- (b) If  $x \subseteq \omega$ ,  $x \in V[s_n^0]$  for some  $n < \omega$ .
- (c) If  $\alpha < \alpha_0$  and  $x \subseteq \kappa_\alpha$ ,  $x \in V[s_n^\delta]$  for some  $n < \omega$  and  $\delta = \alpha + 1$ .
- (d) If  $\lambda < \alpha_0$  is a limit ordinal and  $x \subseteq (\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$ ,  $x \in V[s_n^\delta]$  for some  $n < \omega$  and  $\delta = \lambda$ .

*Proof of Lemma 1.1.* We will first prove (a) and then show how (b), (c), and (d) all follow from (a). Let  $\tau \in L_1$  and  $p \in P$  be such that  $\tau$  denotes  $x$  and  $p \Vdash \tau \subseteq \gamma_0$  for some ordinal  $\gamma_0$ . As  $\tau \in L_1$ ,  $\tau$  contains only finitely many symbols of the form  $s_n^\delta$  for  $n < \omega$  and  $\delta < \alpha_0$ ; using standard coding tricks, we can assume that  $\tau$  mentions only one symbol of the form  $s_n^\delta$ . We show that  $p \Vdash "x \in V[s_n^\delta]"$ .

Let  $p = \langle p_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$ , where  $\gamma < \alpha_0$  is such that  $p_\alpha$  is trivial for  $\alpha \geq \gamma$ . First, since  $\delta < \alpha_0$ , we can assume without loss of generality that  $\gamma \geq \delta$  and for every  $\alpha \leq \delta$ ,  $r_\alpha^n$  is determined. (Simply extend  $p_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \leq \delta + 1$  so that the finite portion of the Prikry sequence determined by  $p_\alpha$  has length at least  $n$ .) Next, define a function  $f: \alpha_0 \rightarrow \alpha_0$  by  $f(\beta) = r_\beta^n \cap \kappa_\beta$  for  $\beta \leq \delta$ ,  $f(\lambda) = (\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$  for  $\lambda > \delta$  a limit ordinal, and for  $\beta = \alpha + 1 > \delta$  a successor ordinal,  $f(\beta) = \kappa_\alpha$ . Our first claim is that if  $q = \langle q_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$ ,  $s = \langle s_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$ ,  $q \Vdash p$ ,  $s \Vdash p$  are such that  $\forall \alpha < \alpha_0 [q_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) = s_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$ , then for any  $\beta_0 < \gamma_0$ , if  $q \Vdash "\beta_0 \in \tau"$ ,  $s \Vdash "\beta_0 \in \tau"$ .

The proof of this claim is very similar to the proofs of Lemmas 1.1 and 1.6 of [1]. Specifically, if the claim is false, then let  $r^0 = \langle u_\alpha^0 : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  be such that  $r^0 \Vdash s$  and  $r^0 \Vdash "\beta_0 \notin \tau"$ . For each successor  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ ,  $\alpha < \alpha_0$ , let  $u_\alpha^1 \in P_\alpha$  be such that  $u_\alpha^1 \Vdash q_\alpha$  and so that for  $\langle t_1^\alpha, \dots, t_k^\alpha \rangle$  the  $p$ -part of  $u_\alpha^1$  and  $\langle \hat{t}_1^\alpha, \dots, \hat{t}_k^\alpha \rangle$  the  $p$ -part of  $u_\alpha^0$ ,  $t_j^\alpha \cap f(\alpha) = \hat{t}_j^\alpha \cap f(\alpha)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . Form a condition  $r^2 = \langle u_\alpha^2 : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  by  $u_\alpha^2 = u_\alpha^1$  if  $\alpha$  is a successor ordinal and  $u_\alpha^2 = q_\alpha$  if  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal or  $\alpha = 0$ . Clearly,  $r^2 \Vdash q$  and  $r^2 \Vdash "\beta_0 \in \tau"$ .

We define now an automorphism  $\pi = \langle \pi_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  of  $P$  so that  $\pi(r^2)$  is compatible with  $r^0$  and  $\pi(r^2) \Vdash "\beta_0 \in \tau"$ . If  $\lambda = 0$  or  $\lambda$  is a limit ordinal, then by the homogeneity of the Lévy collapse, we can let  $\pi_\lambda$  be any automorphism of  $P_\lambda$  so that  $\pi_\lambda(u_\lambda^2)$  is compatible with  $u_\lambda^0$  and  $\pi_\lambda$  is generated by a function which is the identity on  $f(\lambda)$ . If  $\alpha = \beta + 1$  is a successor ordinal, then as in [3] or [1], Lemma 1.6, let  $\pi_\alpha$  be an automorphism so that  $\pi_\alpha(u_\alpha^2)$  is compatible with  $u_\alpha^0$  and  $\pi_\alpha$  is generated by a function which is the identity on  $f(\alpha)$ .  $\pi = \langle \pi_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  is thus an automorphism of  $P$  so that  $\pi(r^2)$  is compatible with  $r^0$ , and by the invariance properties of  $\tau$ ,  $\pi(r^2) \Vdash "\beta_0 \in \tau"$ . Since  $\pi(r^2)$  is compatible with  $r^0$  and  $r^0 \Vdash "\beta_0 \notin \tau"$ , this is a contradiction. Thus, if  $q = \langle q_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$ ,  $s = \langle s_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$ ,  $q \Vdash p$ ,  $s \Vdash p$  are such that  $\forall \alpha < \alpha_0 [q_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) = s_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$ , then if  $q \Vdash "\beta_0 \in \tau"$ ,  $s \Vdash "\beta_0 \in \tau"$ . Now, if we define  $y = \{ \rho < \gamma_0 : \exists q \Vdash p [q = \langle q_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle, q_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) \in G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha), \text{ and } q \Vdash "\rho \in \tau"] \}$ , then using the preceding fact, we can argue as

in Lemma 1.1 of [1] and show that  $x = y$ . Since  $y$  is definable in  $V[\prod_{\alpha < \alpha_0} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$ , this shows that  $x \in V[\prod_{\alpha < \alpha_0} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$ .

We next show that  $x \in V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$ . Since each  $G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$  is recoverable from  $r_\alpha \upharpoonright (r_\alpha^n \cap \kappa_\alpha)$ , this will show that  $x \in V[s_n^\delta]$ . To show that  $x \in V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$  we again argue as in Lemma 1.6 of [1]. Specifically, we know that for any successor  $\alpha = \beta + 1 > \delta$ ,  $P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$  is supercompact Prikry forcing on  $P_{\kappa_\beta}(\kappa_\beta)$  defined using the measure  $\mathcal{U}_\beta \upharpoonright \kappa_\beta = \{A \upharpoonright \kappa_\beta : A \in \mathcal{U}_\beta\}$ . It is well known that this partial ordering is canonically isomorphic to ordinary Prikry forcing  $P'_\alpha$  on  $\kappa_\beta$  defined using the canonical normal ultrafilter on  $\kappa_\beta$  generated by  $\mathcal{U}_\beta \upharpoonright \kappa_\beta$ . Call this normal ultrafilter  $\mathcal{U}'_\beta$ . If we let  $P''_\alpha = \{\langle s, S \rangle : s \in [\kappa_\beta]^{<\omega} \& S \in \mathcal{U}'_\beta\}$  ordered as in ordinary Prikry forcing, i.e., if we define  $P''_\alpha$  as in ordinary Prikry forcing except that it is not necessarily the case that  $\bigcup s < \bigcap S$ , then as in [5] and Lemma 1.6 of [1] we can without loss of generality replace  $P'_\alpha$  with  $P''_\alpha$ .

Now let  $\sigma$  be a canonical term for  $x$  in the forcing language associated with

$$Q = \prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) \times \prod_{\{\alpha \in [\delta+1, \alpha_0] : \alpha \text{ is a successor ordinal}\}} P''_\alpha \\ \times \prod_{\{\lambda \in [\delta+1, \alpha_0] : \lambda \text{ is a limit ordinal}\}} P_\lambda \upharpoonright f(\lambda).$$

Define a term  $\eta$  in the forcing language associated with  $\prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$  by  $p = \langle p_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle \Vdash \text{“} \rho \in \eta \text{”}$  iff  $\langle p_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle \Vdash \text{“} \rho \in \sigma \text{”}$ , where for  $\alpha \geq \delta + 1$ ,  $p_\alpha$  is the trivial condition. Clearly,  $\eta$  will denote a set in  $V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$  which is a subset of  $x$ . The proof will be complete if we can show that  $\Vdash_Q \text{“} \sigma \subseteq \eta \text{”}$ .

To this end, let  $q = \langle q_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle \Vdash \text{“} \rho \in \sigma \text{”}$ . It suffices to show that  $r = \langle q_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle \times \langle \hat{r}_\alpha : \alpha > \delta \rangle \Vdash \text{“} \rho \in \sigma \text{”}$ , where for  $\alpha > \delta$ ,  $\hat{r}_\alpha$  is the trivial condition. If this is not the case, then let  $s = \langle s_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle \Vdash r$  be such that  $s \Vdash \text{“} \rho \notin \sigma \text{”}$ , and let  $\beta \in (\delta, \alpha_0)$  be such that for all  $\gamma \geq \beta$ ,  $s_\gamma$  and  $q_\gamma$  are the trivial condition. Without loss of generality, assume that for all successors  $\delta < \gamma < \beta$ , the  $p$ -parts of  $s_\gamma$  and  $q_\gamma$  have the same length.

We construct now an automorphism  $\psi = \langle \psi_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  of  $Q$  as follows. For ordinals  $\alpha \geq \beta$ , ordinals  $\alpha \leq \delta$ , and limit ordinals  $\alpha \in (\delta, \beta)$  let  $\psi_\alpha$  be the identity. (Note that for  $\alpha \in (\delta, \beta)$  a limit ordinal,  $P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$  is the trivial partial ordering.) For  $\alpha \in (\delta, \beta)$  a successor ordinal, as in Lemma 1.6 of [1] let  $\psi_\alpha$  be an automorphism of  $P''_\alpha$  so



that  $\psi_\alpha(s_\alpha)$  is compatible with  $q_\alpha$  and  $\psi_\alpha$  is generated by a function which is a permutation of  $\kappa_\gamma$  for  $\alpha = \gamma + 1$ .  $\psi = \langle \psi_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_0 \rangle$  is then an automorphism of  $Q$  so that  $\psi(s)$  is compatible with  $q$ , and since we can assume that  $\sigma$  is invariant under any automorphism generated by  $\psi_\alpha$ 's as just defined,  $\psi(s) \Vdash "p \notin \sigma"$  and  $q \Vdash "p \in \sigma"$ . This contradiction shows that  $x \in V[s_n^\delta]$ .

To show (b), (c), and (d), let  $\sigma$  be either  $\omega$ ,  $\kappa_\alpha$ , or  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$ , and let  $\gamma$  be such that  $x \subseteq \sigma$  and  $x \in V[s_n^\gamma]$ . If  $\gamma \leq \delta$  for  $\delta$  as defined in (b), (c), and (d), then the proof is complete, since  $V[s_n^\gamma] \subseteq V[s_n^\delta]$ . Thus, assume that  $\gamma > \delta$ . As in part (a), we know that  $x \in V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \gamma} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$  for  $f$  as defined previously. We show that  $x \in V[s_n^\delta]$  by showing that  $V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \gamma} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$  and  $V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$  contain the same subsets of  $\sigma$  and then using the identification of  $V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$  with  $V[s_n^\delta]$ .

To this end, we need to show that forcing over  $V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$  with  $\prod_{\alpha \in [\delta+1, \gamma]} P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$  adds no new subsets of  $\sigma$ . Write

$$\prod_{\alpha \in [\delta+1, \gamma]} P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$$

as  $Q' \times Q''$ , where

$$Q' = \prod_{\{\alpha : \alpha \in [\delta+1, \gamma] \text{ and } \alpha \text{ is a successor ordinal}\}} P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$$

and

$$Q'' = \prod_{\{\lambda : \lambda \in [\delta+1, \gamma] \text{ and } \lambda \text{ is a limit ordinal}\}} P_\lambda \upharpoonright f(\lambda).$$

This factorization generates a factorization of  $\prod_{\alpha \in [\delta+1, \gamma]} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$  into  $G' \times G''$ . Since each  $\lambda$  so that  $P_\lambda \upharpoonright f(\lambda)$  is a component partial ordering of  $Q''$  is  $> \delta$ , the closure properties of the Lévy collapse and the definition of  $Q''$  ensure that the subsets of  $\sigma$  in  $V[G'']$  and  $V$  are the same. Further, by the definition of  $f$  and each  $P_\eta$ , for  $\alpha = \beta + 1$  a fixed but arbitrary successor ordinal in  $[\delta + 1, \gamma]$ ,  $|\prod_{\eta \leq \beta} P_\eta \upharpoonright f(\eta)| < \kappa_\beta$ . Also, if  $\lambda > \alpha$  is a limit ordinal, the closure properties of the Lévy collapse and the definition of  $P$  ensure that each  $P_\lambda \upharpoonright f(\lambda)$  is (at least)  $2^{2^{f(\alpha)}}$  closed. Thus, since  $P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$  is a supercompact Prikry partial ordering on  $P_{\kappa_\beta}(f(\alpha))$  with  $|P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)| < 2^{2^{f(\alpha)}}$ , an application of the closure properties of

$$\prod_{\{\lambda : \lambda \in [\alpha, \gamma] \text{ and } \lambda \text{ is a limit ordinal}\}} P_\lambda \upharpoonright f(\lambda) = Q'''$$

followed by an application of the Lévy-Solovay results [10] shows that  $V^{Q''} \times \prod_{\eta \leq \beta} P_\eta \upharpoonright f(\eta) \models "P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) \text{ is a partial ordering which satisfies the Prikry property and adds no new bounded subsets to } \kappa_\beta"$ . Thus,  $Q'$  can be regarded in  $V[G'']$  as a full support iteration of partial orderings each of which satisfies the Prikry property and adds no new bounded subsets to  $\kappa_\delta$ , so since  $\alpha_0$  is the least regular limit of supercompact cardinals, the result of [7] shows that forcing over  $V[G'']$  with  $Q'$  adds no new bounded subsets to  $\kappa_\delta$ , i.e., since  $\sigma < \kappa_\delta$ ,  $V[G''] [G'] = V[G'] [G''] = V[\prod_{\alpha \in [\delta+1, \gamma]} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)] \models "The \text{ subsets of } \sigma \text{ are the same as those in } V"$ . Thus, any new subsets of  $\sigma$  in  $V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \gamma} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$  are generated by forcing over  $V[\prod_{\alpha \in [\delta+1, \gamma]} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$  with  $\prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$ , i.e., since

$$\begin{aligned} V \left[ \prod_{\alpha \in [\delta+1, \gamma]} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) \right] \left[ \prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) \right] \\ = V \left[ \prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) \right] \left[ \prod_{\alpha \in [\delta+1, \gamma]} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) \right], \end{aligned}$$

forcing over  $V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$  with  $\prod_{\alpha \in [\delta+1, \gamma]} P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$  adds no new subsets of  $\sigma$ . Thus,  $x \in V[s_n^\delta]$ . This proves Lemma 1.1.  $\square$

LEMMA 1.2. *For  $\sigma = \kappa_\alpha$  or  $\sigma = (\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$ ,  $\lambda$  a limit ordinal,  $N \models " \sigma \text{ is a cardinal}"$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 1.2.* For  $\delta$  as in Lemma 1.1, since  $N \subseteq M$  and  $\sigma < \alpha_0$ , Lemma 1.1 shows that if  $x \subseteq \sigma$  and  $x \in N$  then  $x \in V[s_n^\delta]$  for some  $n \in \omega$ . Let  $f$  be as in Lemma 1.1. By the identification of  $V[s_n^\delta]$  with  $V[\prod_{\alpha \leq \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$ , view  $V[s_n^\delta]$  as  $V[G_\delta \upharpoonright f(\delta)] [\prod_{\alpha < \delta} G_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)]$ .

If  $\sigma = \kappa_\alpha$ , then  $\delta = \alpha + 1$  and  $P_\delta \upharpoonright f(\delta)$  is a supercompact Prikry ordering on  $P_{\kappa_\alpha}(f(\delta))$ . This means that  $V[G_\delta \upharpoonright f(\delta)] \models " \kappa_\alpha \text{ is a cardinal and } |\prod_{\beta < \delta} P_\beta \upharpoonright f(\beta)| < \kappa_\alpha"$ , so  $V[s_n^\delta] \models " \kappa_\alpha \text{ is a cardinal}"$ . Thus, no subset of  $\kappa_\alpha$  in  $N$  can code a collapsing map of  $\kappa_\alpha$ , i.e.,  $N \models " \kappa_\alpha \text{ is a cardinal}"$ . If  $\sigma = (\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$ , then  $\delta = \lambda$ , and  $P_\delta \upharpoonright f(\delta)$  is  $\text{Col}((\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+, f(\lambda))$ . Therefore, by the definition of  $P$  and  $f$ ,  $V[G_\lambda \upharpoonright f(\lambda)] \models " \sigma \text{ is a regular cardinal and for each } \alpha < \lambda, P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) \text{ is } \kappa(\alpha)\text{-c.c. for some } \kappa(\alpha) < \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha \text{ which depends on } P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)"$ , so by the definition of  $P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha)$ ,  $V[G_\lambda \upharpoonright f(\lambda)] \models " \text{All antichains in } \prod_{\alpha < \lambda} P_\alpha \upharpoonright f(\alpha) \text{ have size } \leq \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha"$ . This means that  $V[s_n^\delta] \models " \sigma \text{ is a cardinal}"$ . The exact same reasoning as before shows  $N \models " \sigma \text{ is a cardinal}"$ . This proves Lemma 1.2.  $\square$

**LEMMA 1.3.** *Every successor cardinal in  $N$  is either a  $\kappa_\alpha$  or a  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$  for some limit ordinal  $\lambda < \alpha_0$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 1.3.* Since  $N = R(\alpha_0)^M$ , it suffices to show that any successor cardinal  $\kappa^+$  in  $M$  below  $\alpha_0$  is either  $\kappa_\alpha$  or a  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$  for some limit  $\lambda < \alpha_0$ . To show this, we argue by contradiction. Assume  $\kappa^+$  is the least successor cardinal in  $M$  below  $\alpha_0$  which does not satisfy this property. Consider two cases.

*Case 1.*  $\kappa = (\delta^+)^M$  for some cardinal  $\delta < \alpha_0$ . By the leastness of  $\kappa^+$ ,  $\kappa$  is either a  $\kappa_\alpha$  or a  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$  for some limit  $\lambda < \alpha_0$ . If  $\kappa = \kappa_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha < \alpha_0$ , then by the definition of  $M$  for each  $n \in \omega$   $V[r_{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright (r_{\alpha+1}^n \cap \kappa_{\alpha+1})] \subseteq M$ . As in [1] and [3], by the fact that  $r_{\alpha+1}$  is generic for supercompact Prikry forcing on  $P_{\kappa_\alpha}(\kappa_{\alpha+1})$ ,  $V[r_{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright (r_{\alpha+1}^n \cap \kappa_{\alpha+1})] \models$  “There are no cardinals in the interval  $(\kappa_\alpha, (r_{\alpha+1}^n \cap \kappa_{\alpha+1}))$ ”. Since  $\langle (r_{\alpha+1}^n \cap \kappa_{\alpha+1}) : n \in \omega \rangle$  is cofinal in  $\kappa_{\alpha+1}$ ,  $M \models$  “There are no cardinals in the interval  $(\kappa_\alpha, \kappa_{\alpha+1})$ ”. By Lemma 1.2,  $M \models$  “ $\kappa_{\alpha+1}$  is a cardinal”, so  $M \models$  “ $\kappa_{\alpha+1} = \kappa_\alpha^+$ ”. If  $\kappa = (\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$  for some limit  $\lambda < \alpha_0$ , then again by the definition of  $M$  for each  $n \in \omega$   $V[r_\lambda \upharpoonright (r_\lambda^n \cap \kappa_\lambda)] \subseteq M$ . Since  $r_\lambda$  is generic for  $\text{Col}((\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+, \kappa_\lambda)$  and  $\langle r_\lambda^n \cap \kappa_\lambda : n \in \omega \rangle$  is cofinal in  $\kappa_\lambda$ ,  $V[r_\lambda \upharpoonright (r_\lambda^n \cap \kappa_\lambda)] \models$  “There are no cardinals in the interval  $((\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+, (r_\lambda^n \cap \kappa_\lambda))$ ” and  $M \models$  “There are no cardinals in the interval  $((\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+, \kappa_\lambda)$ ”. By Lemma 1.2,  $M \models$  “ $\kappa_\lambda$  is a cardinal”, so  $M \models$  “ $\kappa_\lambda = ((\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+)^+$ ”. Thus, if  $\kappa = (\delta^+)^M$  for some cardinal  $\delta < \alpha_0$ , then  $(\kappa^+)^M = \kappa_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha < \alpha_0$ .

*Case 2.*  $\kappa < \alpha_0$  is a limit cardinal in  $M$ . There must be unboundedly many  $\kappa_\alpha$ 's below  $\kappa$ , for if  $\sigma < \kappa$  is a bound on the  $\kappa_\alpha$ 's, then the cardinal (in  $V$  or  $M$ )  $(\sigma^{++})^M$  is below  $\kappa$  and is neither a  $\kappa_\alpha$  nor a  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$ , contradicting the leastness of  $\kappa^+$ . We can thus write, in  $V$ ,  $\kappa = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha$  for some  $\lambda < \alpha_0$ . By Lemma 1.2,  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$  remains a cardinal in  $M$ . Since  $V \subseteq M$ ,  $M \models$  “ $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+ = \kappa^+$ ”. Thus, if  $\kappa$  is a limit cardinal in  $M$  and  $\kappa < \alpha_0$ ,  $M \models$  “There is a limit ordinal  $\lambda < \alpha_0$  so that  $\kappa^+ = (\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^{+V}$ ”. This fact, together with Case 1, proves Lemma 1.3.  $\square$

**LEMMA 1.4.**  $N \models$  “ $\text{SP}(\omega)$ , for every  $\alpha < \alpha_0$ ,  $\text{SP}(\kappa_\alpha)$ , and for every limit ordinal  $\lambda < \alpha_0$ ,  $\text{SP}((\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+)$ ”.

*Proof of Lemma 1.4.* Let us first consider the cardinal  $\kappa_\alpha$ . Working in  $N$ , let  $X_n = \{x \subseteq \kappa_\alpha : x \text{ is definable using } \underline{s_n^{\alpha+1}}\}$ . By Lemma 1.1 and

the fact that  $N = R(\alpha_0)^M$ ,  $X_n \in V[s_n^{\alpha+1}]$ . The cardinality of  $X_n$  in  $V[s_n^{\alpha+1}]$  is some ordinal  $\delta < (r_{\alpha+1}^{n+1} \cap \kappa_{\alpha+1}) < \kappa_{\alpha+1}$ . Since in  $V[s_{n+1}^{\alpha+1}] \subseteq M$   $\delta$  is collapsed to  $\kappa_\alpha$  (this is shown by an argument similar to the ones given in [3] and [1], Lemma 1.3),  $\kappa_\alpha$  is a cardinal in  $V[s_{n+1}^{\alpha+1}]$ , and  $X_n \in V[s_{n+1}^{\alpha+1}]$  ( $V[s_n^{\alpha+1}] \subseteq V[s_{n+1}^{\alpha+1}]$ ),  $V[s_{n+1}^{\alpha+1}] \models “|X_n| = \kappa_\alpha”$ . Since any function which is a bijection between  $X_n$  and  $\kappa_\alpha$  must be an element of  $R(\alpha_0)^{V[s_{n+1}^{\alpha+1}]} \subseteq R(\alpha_0)^M = N$ ,  $N \models “|X_n| = \kappa_\alpha”$ . Finally, as Lemma 1.1 and the fact that  $N = R(\alpha_0)^M$  show that any  $x \subseteq \kappa_\alpha$  so that  $x \in N$  is in  $X_n$  for some  $n$ ,  $N \models \text{SP}(\kappa_\alpha)$ .

Turning now to the cardinal  $\delta_\lambda = (\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \kappa_\alpha)^+$ , we can again define in  $N$   $X_n = \{x \subseteq \delta_\lambda : x \text{ is definable using } \underline{s}_n^\lambda\}$ . As before, Lemma 1.1 implies that  $X_n \in V[s_n^\lambda]$ , and  $|X_n|$  in  $V[s_n^\lambda]$  is some  $\delta < (r_\lambda^{n+1} \cap \kappa_\lambda) < \kappa_\lambda$ . Again, since in  $V[s_{n+1}^\lambda] \subseteq M$   $\delta$  is collapsed to  $\delta_\lambda$  by the Lévy collapse map generated by  $r_\lambda \upharpoonright (r_\lambda^{n+1} \cap \kappa_\lambda)$ ,  $V[s_{n+1}^\lambda] \models “\delta_\lambda \text{ is a cardinal}”$ , and  $V[s_n^\lambda] \subseteq V[s_{n+1}^\lambda]$ ,  $V[s_{n+1}^\lambda]$  and  $M$  both satisfy “ $|X_n| = \delta_\lambda$ ”. Lemma 1.1, the fact that  $N = R(\alpha_0)^M$ , and the fact that  $R(\alpha_0)^{V[s_{n+1}^\lambda]} \subseteq R(\alpha_0)^M = N$  then again yield that  $N \models \text{SP}(\delta_\lambda)$ .

The proof of Lemma 1.4 is completed by noting that the argument for  $\text{SP}(\kappa_\alpha)$  works for  $\omega$  by letting  $\kappa_{-1} = \omega$ . □

LEMMA 1.5.  $N \models \text{ZF}$ .

*Proof of Lemma 1.5.* The proof that  $N \models \text{Replacement}$  will show that  $N \models \text{ZF}$ . We mimic the proof of Theorem 4.2 of [8]. If Replacement fails in  $N$ , then for some set  $X \in N$  there is a class function  $f$  on  $X$  such that  $f''X \notin N$ . Since  $N \models \text{Aussonderung}$ , we can assume without loss of generality that  $\text{range}(f) \subseteq \alpha_0$  and  $\text{range}(f)$  is unbounded in  $\alpha_0$ . Again without loss of generality we can assume that  $X = R(\alpha)$  for some  $\alpha < \alpha_0$ , and we fix  $\alpha$  the least such ordinal. This  $\alpha$  cannot be a limit ordinal, for if it were then we could construct a function  $f' : \alpha \rightarrow \alpha_0$  whose range was unbounded in  $\alpha_0$ . Since  $N \subseteq M$  and  $M \models \text{ZF}$ ,  $f' \in M$ , so  $M \models “\alpha_0 \text{ is singular}”$ . By Lemma 1.1a,  $f' \in V[s_n^\delta]$  for some  $\delta < \alpha_0$ . The model  $V[s_n^\delta]$  is obtained by forcing with a partial ordering  $Q$  so that  $|Q| < \alpha_0$ , so since  $V \models “\alpha_0 \text{ is inaccessible}”$ ,  $V^Q = V[s_n^\delta] \models “\alpha_0 \text{ is inaccessible}”$ , contradicting  $V[s_n^\delta] \models “\alpha_0 \text{ is singular}”$ . Thus,  $\alpha = \beta + 1$  for some  $\beta$ , and in  $M$  there is a function  $f : p(R(\beta)) = R(\alpha) \rightarrow \alpha_0$  whose range is unbounded in  $\alpha_0$ .

We make now the following

*Claim.* For each ordinal  $\gamma < \alpha_0$ ,  $R(\omega + \gamma)^N = R(\omega + \gamma)^M \subseteq R(\omega + \gamma)^{V[\prod_{\sigma < \gamma} G_\sigma]}$ .

*Proof of Claim.* Letting  $V[\prod_{\sigma < 0} G_\sigma] = V$ , the claim is true for  $\gamma = 0$  by the absoluteness of  $R(\omega)$ . If  $\gamma$  is a limit ordinal, then by hypothesis, for every  $\sigma < \gamma$ ,  $R(\omega + \sigma)^M \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta]}$ . It is also true that for every  $\sigma < \gamma$ ,  $V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta] \subseteq V[\prod_{\delta < \gamma} G_\delta]$ ; therefore, for every  $\sigma < \gamma$ ,

$$R(\omega + \sigma)^N = R(\omega + \sigma)^M \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta]} \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \gamma} G_\delta]},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{\sigma < \gamma} R(\omega + \sigma)^N &= \bigcup_{\sigma < \gamma} R(\omega + \sigma)^M = R(\omega + \gamma)^M \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma < \gamma} R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta]} \subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma < \gamma} R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \gamma} G_\delta]} \\ &= R(\omega + \gamma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \gamma} G_\delta]}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\gamma = \sigma + 1$  is a successor ordinal, then by hypothesis we have  $R(\omega + \sigma)^N = R(\omega + \sigma)^M \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta]}$ . Since  $|\prod_{\delta < \sigma} P_\delta| < \kappa_\sigma$ ,  $V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta] \models \text{“}\kappa_\sigma \text{ is inaccessible”}$ , so

$$V \left[ \prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta \right] \models \text{“} |R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta]}| < \kappa_\sigma \text{”}.$$

If  $x \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^M$  is a set in  $M$  then  $x$  can be viewed as a subset of  $\kappa_\sigma$  in the analogue of  $M$  constructed by forcing over  $V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta]$  with  $\prod_{\delta \in [\sigma, \alpha_0)} P_\delta$ . The analogue of Lemma 1.1a then implies that for some  $n$ ,  $x \in V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta][G_\sigma^n] \subseteq V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma+1} G_\delta]$ , i.e., that  $x \in V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma+1} G_\delta]$ . Thus, all subsets of  $R(\omega + \sigma)^M$  in  $M$  are elements of  $V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma+1} G_\delta]$ . Since

$$R(\omega + \sigma)^M \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma} G_\delta]} \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma+1} G_\delta]},$$

this immediately implies that

$$\begin{aligned} R(\omega + \sigma + 1)^M &= R(\omega + \gamma)^M = R(\omega + \gamma)^N \\ &\subseteq R(\omega + \sigma + 1)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \sigma+1} G_\delta]} = R(\omega + \gamma)^{V[\prod_{\delta < \gamma} G_\delta]}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Using the Claim and working in  $V[\prod_{\sigma < \gamma} G_\sigma]$  for the  $\gamma$  so that  $\omega + \gamma = \alpha$ , for  $\delta$  the cardinal  $< \alpha_0$  so that  $V[\prod_{\sigma < \gamma} G_\sigma] \models \text{“}|R(\alpha)^{V[\prod_{\sigma < \gamma} G_\sigma]}| = \delta$ ” we can get in the analogue of  $M$ ,  $M^*$ , obtained by forcing over  $V[\prod_{\sigma < \gamma} G_\sigma]$  with  $\prod_{\sigma \in [\gamma, \alpha_0)} P_\sigma$  a function  $g: \delta \rightarrow \alpha_0$  whose range is unbounded in  $\alpha_0$ . Since the analogue of Lemma 1.1a will be true about  $M^*$ ,  $\alpha_0$  will be a regular cardinal in  $M^*$ . (In  $V$ ,  $|\prod_{\sigma < \gamma} P_\sigma| < \alpha_0$ , and

any subset of  $\alpha_0$  in  $M^*$  will be in a generic extension of  $V[\prod_{\sigma < \gamma} G_\sigma]$  obtained by forcing with a partial ordering of cardinality  $< \alpha_0$ .) Since  $\alpha_0$  is thus both regular and singular in  $M^*$ , this contradiction establishes that  $N \models$  Replacement and proves Lemma 1.5.  $\square$

Lemmas 1.1–1.5 complete the proof of Theorem 1.

We turn now to the proof of Theorem 2. For convenience, we restate the theorem here.

**THEOREM 2.**  $\text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \text{GCH} + \text{There exists a cardinal } \kappa \text{ which is } 2^{2^{[\kappa^+ \omega]^{< \omega}}} \text{ supercompact}) \Rightarrow \text{Con}(\text{ZF} + \text{For every limit ordinal } \lambda, \text{SP}(\aleph_\lambda) + \text{For every successor ordinal } \alpha \text{ of the form } \alpha = 3n, 3n + 1, \lambda + 3n, \text{ or } \lambda + 3n + 2 \text{ where } \lambda \text{ is a limit ordinal and } n \in \omega, \text{SP}(\aleph_\alpha)).$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Let  $V \models$  “ZFC +  $\kappa$  is  $\lambda_0$  supercompact for  $\lambda_0 = 2^{2^{[\kappa^+ \omega]^{< \omega}}}$ ”, and let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a normal measure on  $P_\kappa(\lambda_0)$ . The proof of Theorem 2 will use a modification of the models  $N_A$  described in [8] and [2]. The construction of the model  $M$  which will witness the conclusions of Theorem 2, as in [8] and [2], will use supercompact Radin forcing. We describe the forcing conditions below.

Let  $j: V \rightarrow \hat{M}$  be the elementary embedding associated with  $\mathcal{U}$ , where  $\hat{M}$  is an inner model so that  $\hat{M}^{\lambda_0} \subseteq \hat{M}$ . Using the embedding  $j$ , we define a Radin sequence of measures  $\mu_{< \kappa^+} = \langle \mu_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+ \rangle$  on  $R(\kappa^+ \omega)$  by  $\mu_0(x) = 1$  iff  $\langle j(\beta) : \beta < \kappa^+ \omega \rangle \in j(x)$ , and for  $0 < \alpha < \kappa^+$ ,  $\mu_\alpha(x) = 1$  iff  $\langle \mu_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle \in j(x)$ .  $R_{< \kappa^+}$  is supercompact Radin forcing defined using  $\mu_{< \kappa^+}$ , i.e.,  $R_{< \kappa^+}$  consists of all finite sequences of the form  $\langle \langle p_1, u_1, C_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle p_n, u_n, C_n \rangle, \langle \mu_{< \kappa^+}, C \rangle \rangle$  with the following properties:

1. For  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ ,  $p_i \subsetneq p_j$ .
2. For  $i \leq n$ ,  $p_i \cap \kappa$  is an inaccessible cardinal.
3.  $\bar{p}_i = (p_i \cap \kappa)^{+ \omega}$ .
4. For  $i \leq n$ ,  $u_i$  is a Radin sequence of measures on  $R(\bar{p}_i)$  with  $(u_i)_0$  a supercompact measure on  $P_{p_i \cap \kappa}(\bar{p}_i)$ .
5.  $C_i$  is a sequence of measure 1 sets for  $u_i$ .
6.  $C$  is a sequence of measure 1 sets for  $\mu_{< \kappa^+}$ .
7. For each  $p \in (C)_0$ , where  $(C)_0$  is the coordinate of  $C$  so that  $(C)_0 \in \mu_0$ ,  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n p_i \subsetneq p$ .
8. For each  $p \in (C)_0$ ,  $\bar{p} = (p \cap \kappa)^{+ \omega}$ .

Properties (1) and (7) both follow from the fact that  $\mu_0$  is a supercompact measure on  $P_\kappa(\lambda_0)$ . Properties (4), (5), and (6) are all

standard properties of Radin forcing. Properties (2), (3), and (8) all follow since  $\mu_0$  is generated by  $j$  or, equivalently, by  $\mathcal{U} \upharpoonright \kappa^{+\omega}$ , so we can assume that each  $p_i$  and each  $p \in (C)_0$  is an element of  $\{p \in P_\kappa(\lambda_0) : p \cap \kappa \text{ is an inaccessible cardinal and } \overline{p \cap \kappa^{+\omega}} = (p \cap \kappa)^{+\omega}\} \upharpoonright \kappa^{+\omega}$ .

If  $\pi_0 = \langle \langle p_1, u_1, C_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle p_n, u_n, C_n \rangle, \langle \mu_{<\kappa^+}, C \rangle \rangle$  and  $\pi_1 = \langle \langle q_1, v_1, D_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle q_m, v_m, D_m \rangle, \langle \mu_{<\kappa^+}, D \rangle \rangle$  then  $\pi_1 \Vdash \pi_0$  if the following conditions hold.

1. For each  $\langle p_j, u_j, C_j \rangle$  which appears in  $\pi_0$  there is a  $\langle q_i, v_i, D_i \rangle$  which appears in  $\pi_1$  so that  $\langle q_i, v_i \rangle = \langle p_j, u_j \rangle$  and  $D_i \subseteq C_j$ .
2.  $D \subseteq C$ .
3.  $n \leq m$ .
4. If  $\langle q_i, v_i, D_i \rangle$  does not appear in  $\pi_0$ , let  $\langle p_j, u_j, C_j \rangle$  (or  $\langle \mu_{<\kappa^+}, C \rangle$ ) be the first element of  $\pi_0$  so that  $p_j \cap \kappa > q_i \cap \kappa$ . Then
  - (a)  $q_i$  is order isomorphic to some  $q \in (C_j)_0$ .
  - (b) There exists an  $\alpha < \gamma_j$ , where  $\gamma_j$  is the length of  $u_j$ , so that  $v_i$  is isomorphic “in a natural way” to an ultrafilter sequence  $v \in (C_j)_\alpha$ .
  - (c) For  $\beta_i$  the length of  $v_i$ , there is a function  $f: \beta_i \rightarrow \gamma_j$  so that for  $\beta < \beta_i$ ,  $(D_i)_\beta$  is a set of ultrafilter sequences so that for some subset  $(D_i)'_\beta$  of  $(C_j)_{f(\beta)}$ , each ultrafilter sequence in  $(D_i)_\beta$  is isomorphic “in a natural way” to an ultrafilter sequence in  $(D_i)'_\beta$ .

For a further explanation of the above ordering (including what “in a natural way” means) or other facts about supercompact Radin forcing, see [8], [2], or [4].

We now define a partial ordering  $P$  by

$$P = R_{<\kappa^+} \times \prod_{\{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha < \beta < \kappa \text{ and } \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ are inaccessible}\}} \text{Col}(\alpha^{+(\omega+1)}, \beta) \\ \times \prod_{\{(\omega, \alpha) : \alpha < \kappa \text{ is inaccessible}\}} \text{Col}(\omega, \alpha)$$

ordered componentwise. Let  $G$  be  $V$ -generic on  $P$ . The model  $M$  for Theorem 2 will be a submodel of  $V[G]$  and will be a modification of the model  $N_A$  as described in [8] and [2]. We describe this model in more detail below.

Let  $G_0$  be the projection of  $G$  onto  $R_{<\kappa^+}$ . For any condition  $\pi = \langle \langle p_1, u_1, C_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle p_n, u_n, C_n \rangle, \langle \mu_{<\kappa^+}, C \rangle \rangle \in R_{<\kappa^+}$ , in analogy with supercompact Prikry forcing call  $\langle p_1, \dots, p_n \rangle$  the  $p$ -part of  $\pi$ . Let  $R = \{p : \exists \pi \in G_0 [p \in p\text{-part}(\pi)]\}$  and let  $R_l = \{p : p \in R \text{ and } p \text{ is a}$

limit point of  $R$ }. We define three sets  $E_0$ ,  $E_1$ , and  $E_2$  by  $E_0 = \{\alpha: \text{For some } \pi \in G_0 \text{ and some } p \in p\text{-part}(\pi), p \cap \kappa = \alpha\}$ ,  $E_1 = \{\alpha: \alpha \text{ is a limit point of } E_0\}$ , and  $E_2 = E_1 \cup \{\beta: \exists \alpha \in E_1[\beta = \alpha^{+\omega} \text{ or } \beta = \alpha^{+(\omega+1)}]\} \cup \{\omega\}$ . Let  $\langle \alpha_\nu: \nu < \kappa \rangle$  be the continuous increasing enumeration of  $E_2$ , and let  $\nu = \nu' + n$  for some  $n \in \omega$ . Sets  $C_i^m(\alpha_\nu)$  for  $m \in \omega$  are then defined in the following manner.

1.  $\nu' = \nu \neq 0$  and  $n = 0$ . Let  $p(\alpha_\nu)$  be the element  $p$  of  $R$  such that  $p \cap \kappa = \alpha_\nu$ , and let  $h_{p(\alpha_\nu)}: p(\alpha_\nu) \rightarrow \overline{p(\alpha_\nu)}$  be the order isomorphism between  $p(\alpha_\nu)$  and  $\overline{p(\alpha_\nu)}$ .  $C_1^m(\alpha_\nu) = \{h_{p(\alpha_\nu)}'' p \cap \alpha_\nu^{+m}: p \in R_l, p \subseteq p(\alpha_\nu), \text{ and } h_{p(\alpha_\nu)}^{-1}(\alpha_\nu^{+m}) \in p\}$ .

2.  $\nu' = 0$  and  $n = 3k + 1$ . Let  $C_2^m(\alpha_\nu) = \{h_{p(\alpha_\nu)}'' p \cap \alpha_\nu^{+m}: p \in R, \text{ and if } k \geq 1, p(\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)+1}) \subsetneq p \subseteq p(\alpha_\nu)\}$ .

3.  $\nu'$  is a limit ordinal and for  $k > 0$ ,  $n = 3k$ . Let  $C_3^m(\alpha_\nu) = \{h_{p(\alpha_\nu)}'' p \cap \alpha_\nu^{+m}: p \in R \text{ and } p(\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)}) \subsetneq p \subseteq p(\alpha_\nu)\}$ .

4.  $\nu' = 0$  and  $n = 3k$ . Let  $r_{3k+1} = \langle r_{3k+1}^m: m \in \omega \rangle$  be the  $\omega$  sequence generated by  $G_0$  which codes a cofinal sequence through each cardinal in the interval  $[\alpha_{3k+1}, \alpha_{3k+1}^{+\omega}]$ . (Note that since  $\mu_{<\kappa^+}$  has length  $\kappa^+$  the cofinal sequence through each cardinal in the interval  $[\alpha_{3k+1}, \alpha_{3k+1}^{+\omega}]$  and the Radin sequences  $C_i^m(\alpha_\nu)$  discussed in 1, 2, and 3 above will all have length  $\omega$ .) Let  $H(\alpha_{3k}, \alpha_{3k+1})$  be the projection of  $G$  onto  $\text{Col}(\alpha_{3k}, \alpha_{3k+1})$ . Then  $C_4^m(\alpha_\nu) = H(\alpha_{3k}, \alpha_{3k+1}) \upharpoonright (r_{3k+1}^m \cap \alpha_{3k+1})$ .

5.  $\nu'$  is a limit ordinal and  $n = 3k + 2$ . Let  $r_{\nu'+3k+3} = \langle r_{\nu'+3k+3}^m: m \in \omega \rangle$  be the  $\omega$  sequence generated by  $G_0$  which codes a cofinal  $\omega$  sequence through each cardinal in the interval  $[\alpha_{\nu'+3k+3}, \alpha_{\nu'+3k+3}^{+\omega}]$ . Let  $H(\alpha_{\nu'+3k+2}, \alpha_{\nu'+3k+3})$  be the projection of  $G$  onto  $\text{Col}(\alpha_{\nu'+3k+2}, \alpha_{\nu'+3k+3})$ . Then

$$C_5^m(\alpha_\nu) = H(\alpha_{\nu'+3k+2}, \alpha_{\nu'+3k+3}) \upharpoonright (r_{\nu'+3k+3}^m \cap \alpha_{\nu'+3k+3}).$$

Intuitively,  $M$  is  $R(\kappa)$  of the least model of ZF extending  $V$  which contains, for each  $\beta < \kappa$  and each  $m < \omega$ ,  $\prod_{\nu \leq \beta} C_i^m(\alpha_\nu)$ , where  $i$  takes on the values 1 through 5 depending upon which of the above categories  $\nu$  is and  $C_i^m(\alpha_\nu) = \{\emptyset\}$  if  $\nu$  is not in any of categories 1 through 5. As with Theorem 1, the uniform manner in which the collapsing maps have been placed into  $M$  will ensure that the desired cardinals remain cardinals in  $M$  and satisfy the Specker property.

To define  $M$  more precisely, it is necessary to define canonical names  $\underline{\alpha}_\nu$  for the  $\alpha_\nu$ 's and canonical names  $\underline{C}_i^m(\nu)$  for the sets  $C_i^m(\alpha_\nu)$ . Recall that if  $\alpha_\nu \in E_1$  it is possible to decide  $\overline{p(\alpha_\nu)}$  (and hence  $\overline{p(\alpha_\nu)}$ ) by writing  $\omega \cdot \nu = \omega^{\sigma_0} \cdot n_0 + \omega^{\sigma_1} \cdot n_1 + \dots + \omega^{\sigma_k} \cdot n_k$  (where  $\sigma_0 > \sigma_1 > \dots > \sigma_k > 0$  are ordinals,  $n_0, \dots, n_k$  are integers, and  $+$ ,  $\cdot$ , and exponentia-



tion are as in ordinal arithmetic), letting  $\pi = \langle \langle p_{ij}, u_{ij}, D_{ij} \rangle_{i \leq k, 1 \leq j, \leq n_i}, \langle \mu_{<\kappa^+}, D \rangle \rangle$  be such that  $\min(p_{i1} \cap \kappa, \omega^{\text{length}(u_{i1})}) = \sigma_i$  and  $\text{length}(u_{ij}) = \min(p_{i1} \cap \kappa, \text{length}(u_{i1}))$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n_i$  and letting  $p(\alpha_\nu)$  be  $p_{k n_k}$ . Further  $D_\nu = \{r \in P : r \upharpoonright R_{<\kappa^+}$  extends a condition  $\pi$  of the above form} is a dense open subset of  $P$ , and any element of  $D_\nu$ , besides determining  $\alpha_\nu$ , determines in addition  $\alpha_\nu^{+\omega}$  and  $\alpha_\nu^{+(\omega+1)}$ . Then for any  $\alpha_\nu \in E_2$ ,  $\underline{\alpha}_\nu$  is the name of the  $\alpha_\nu$  determined by any element of  $D_\nu \cap G$ ; in the notation of [8], for  $\alpha_\nu \in E_1$ ,  $\underline{\alpha}_\nu = \{\langle r, \check{\alpha}_\nu(r) \rangle : r \in D_\nu\}$ , where  $\alpha_\nu(r)$  is the  $\alpha_\nu$  determined by the condition  $r$ . For  $\alpha_\nu$  so that  $\alpha_\nu = \beta_\gamma^{+\omega}$  or  $\alpha_\nu = \beta_\gamma^{+(\omega+1)}$ , where  $\beta_\gamma \in E_1$ ,  $\underline{\alpha}_\nu = \{\langle r, \check{\beta}_\gamma^\zeta(r) \rangle : r \in D_\nu\}$ , where  $\zeta = \omega$  or  $\omega + 1$  depending on whether  $\alpha_\nu = \beta_\gamma^{+\omega}$  or  $\alpha_\nu = \beta_\gamma^{+(\omega+1)}$ ,  $\gamma$  is the (unique) ordinal so that  $\alpha_\nu = \beta_\gamma^{+\zeta}$ , and  $\beta_\gamma(r)$  is the  $\beta_\gamma$  determined by the condition  $r$ .

The canonical names  $\underline{C}_i^m(\nu)$  for the sets  $C_i^m(\alpha_\nu)$  are defined in a manner so as to be invariant under the appropriate group of automorphisms. Specifically, there are five cases to consider. We again write  $\nu = \nu' + n$ , and in analogy to [8] and [2], assume without loss of generality that for any  $\alpha_\nu \in E_1$ ,  $D_\nu$  determines  $\alpha_{\nu-1}$  (if  $\nu - 1$  exists),  $\alpha_\nu$ ,  $\alpha_{\nu+1} = \alpha_\nu^{+\omega}$ ,  $\alpha_{\nu+2} = \alpha_\nu^{+(\omega+1)}$ , and  $\alpha_{\nu+3}$ .

1.  $\nu' = \nu \neq 0$  and  $n = 0$ .  $\underline{C}_1^m(\nu)$  is then the name for  $\{h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}'' p \cap \alpha_\nu^{+m} : \exists r \in P[r \in D_\nu \cap G, p \in p\text{-part}(r \upharpoonright R_{<\kappa^+}), p \subseteq p(\alpha_\nu)(r), p \in R_l \upharpoonright r, \text{ and } h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}^{-1}(\alpha_\nu^{+m}) \in p]\}$  where  $p(\alpha_\nu)(r)$  and  $h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}$  are the  $p(\alpha_\nu)$  and  $h_{p(\alpha_\nu)}$  determined by the condition  $r$  and  $R_l \upharpoonright r$  is the portion of  $R_l$  determined by  $r$ . Note that this definition is unambiguous, since for any  $r$  and  $r'$  so that  $r, r' \in D_\nu \cap G$ ,  $p(\alpha_\nu)(r) = p(\alpha_\nu)(r')$ . In the notation of [8],  $\underline{C}_1^m(\nu) = \{\langle r, (\check{r} \upharpoonright R_{<\kappa^+}) \upharpoonright (\alpha_\nu(r), \alpha_\nu^{+m}(r)) \rangle : r \in D_\nu\}$ , where for  $r \in P$ ,  $\pi = r \upharpoonright R_{<\kappa^+}$ ,  $\pi \upharpoonright (\alpha_\nu(r), \alpha_\nu^{+m}(r)) = \{h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}'' p \cap \alpha_\nu^{+m} : p \in p\text{-part}(\pi), p \subseteq p(\alpha_\nu)(r), p \in R_l \upharpoonright \pi, \text{ and } h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}^{-1}(\alpha_\nu^{+m}) \in p\}$ .

2.  $\nu' = 0$  and  $n = 3k + 1$ . We have assumed without loss of generality that for  $k \geq 1$ ,  $D_\nu$  determines  $\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)+1}$ .  $\underline{C}_2^m(\nu)$  is then the name for  $\{h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}'' p \cap \alpha_\nu^{+m} : \exists r \in P[r \in D_\nu \cap G, p \in p\text{-part}(r \upharpoonright R_{<\kappa^+}), p(\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)+1}) \subseteq p \subseteq p(\alpha_{\nu'+3k+1}), p \in R \upharpoonright r, \text{ and } h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}^{-1}(\alpha_\nu^{+m}) \in p]\}$ , where  $R \upharpoonright r$  is the portion of  $R$  determined by  $r$ . The unambiguity of this definition again follows from the fact that for  $r, r' \in D_\nu \cap G$ ,  $p(\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)+1})(r) = p(\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)+1})(r')$  and  $p(\alpha_{\nu'+3k+1})(r) = p(\alpha_{\nu'+3k+1})(r')$ . In the notation of [8],  $\underline{C}_2^m(\nu) = \{\langle r, (\check{r} \upharpoonright R_{<\kappa^+}) \upharpoonright (\alpha_\nu(r), \alpha_\nu^{+m}(r)) \rangle : r \in D_\nu\}$ , where this time for  $r \in P$ ,

$\pi = r \upharpoonright R_{<\kappa^+}$ ,  $\pi \upharpoonright (\alpha_\nu(r), \alpha_\nu^{+m}(r)) = \{h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}''p \cap \alpha_\nu^{+m} : p \in p\text{-part}(\pi), p \in R \upharpoonright \pi, p(\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)+1})(r) \subseteq p \subseteq p(\alpha_{\nu'+3k+1})(r), \text{ and } h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}^{-1}(\alpha_\nu^{+m}) \in p\}$ . For  $k = 0$ , the definition of  $\underline{C_2^m(\nu)}$  is the same as just stated, dropping the proviso that

$$p(\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)+1})(r) \subseteq p \subseteq p(\alpha_{\nu'+3k+1})(r)$$

and

$$p(\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)+1}) \subseteq p \subseteq p(\alpha_{\nu'+3k+1}).$$

3.  $\nu'$  is a limit ordinal and for  $k > 0$ ,  $n = 3k$ . Again assume without loss of generality that  $D_\nu$  determines  $\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)}$ .  $\underline{C_3^m(\nu)}$  is then the name for  $\{h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}''p \cap \alpha_\nu^{+m} : \exists r \in P[r \in D_\nu \cap G, p \in p\text{-part}(r \upharpoonright R_{<\kappa^+}), p(\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)}) \subseteq p \subseteq p(\alpha_{\nu'+3k}), p \in R \upharpoonright r, \text{ and } h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}^{-1}(\alpha_\nu^{+m}) \in p]\}$ . In the notation of [8],  $\underline{C_3^m(\nu)} = \{ \langle r, (\check{r} \upharpoonright R_{<\kappa^+}) \upharpoonright (\alpha_\nu(r), \alpha_\nu^{+m}(r)) \rangle : r \in D_\nu \}$ , where for  $r \in P$ ,  $\pi = r \upharpoonright R_{<\kappa^+}$ ,  $\pi \upharpoonright (\alpha_\nu(r), \alpha_\nu^{+m}(r)) = \{h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}''p \cap \alpha_\nu^{+m} : p \in p\text{-part}(\pi), p \in R \upharpoonright \pi, p(\alpha_{\nu'+3(k-1)})(r) \subseteq p \subseteq p(\alpha_{\nu'+3k})(r), \text{ and } h_{p(\alpha_\nu)(r)}^{-1}(\alpha_\nu^{+m}) \in p\}$ .

4.  $\nu' = 0$  and  $n = 3k$ . Let  $r_{3k+1}^{0,m}$  be the canonical name for the  $m$ th element of  $C_2^0(\alpha_{3k+1})$ ,  $r_{3k+1}^{0,m}$ , defined using  $C_2^0(3k+1)$ .  $\underline{C_4^m(\nu)}$  is then the name for  $\{p \upharpoonright r_{3k+1}^{0,m} : \exists q \in P[q \in D_{\nu+1} \cap G, p \in q \upharpoonright \text{Col}(\alpha_\nu(q), \alpha_{\nu+1}(q))]\}$ . In the notation of [8],

$$\underline{C_4^m(\nu)} = \{ \langle q, (\check{q} \upharpoonright \text{Col}(\alpha_\nu(q), \alpha_{\nu+1}(q))) \upharpoonright r_{3k+1}^{0,m} \rangle : q \in D_{\nu+1} \}.$$

5.  $\nu'$  is a limit ordinal and  $n = 3k+2$ . Let  $r_{\nu'+3k+3}^{0,m}$  be the canonical name for the  $m$ th element of  $C_3^0(\alpha_{\nu'+3k+3})$ ,  $r_{\nu'+3k+3}^{0,m}$ , defined using  $C_3^0(\nu'+3k+3)$ .  $\underline{C_5^m(\nu)}$  is then the name for  $\{p \upharpoonright r_{\nu'+3k+3}^{0,m} : \exists q \in P[q \in D_{\nu+1} \cap G, p \in q \upharpoonright \text{Col}(\alpha_\nu(q), \alpha_{\nu+1}(q))]\}$ . In the notation of [8],  $\underline{C_5^m(\nu)} = \{ \langle q, (\check{q} \upharpoonright \text{Col}(\alpha_\nu(q), \alpha_{\nu+1}(q))) \upharpoonright r_{\nu'+3k+3}^{0,m} \rangle : q \in D_{\nu+1} \}$ .

Using the canonical names  $\underline{C_i^m(\nu)}$ , define for fixed  $m$  the canonical names  $\underline{E_\nu^m}$ ,  $\nu < \kappa$ , as the name for  $(\prod_{\beta \leq \nu} \underline{C_i^m(\beta)})$ , where  $i$  takes on the values 1 through 5 depending upon in which of the categories  $\beta$  is, and where  $\underline{C_i^m(\beta)}$  is a term for  $\{\emptyset\}$  if  $\beta$  is in none of these five categories. Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the group of automorphisms of [8], and let  $\underline{C(G)} = \bigcup_{m \in \omega} (\bigcup_{\nu < \kappa} (\bigcup_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}} \{\pi(\underline{E_\nu^m})\}))$ , where for each  $\pi \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\pi(\underline{E_\nu^m})$  is found by taking the action of  $\pi$  on each component of  $\underline{E_\nu^m}$ ,  $\underline{C_i^m(\beta)}$ , for  $\beta \leq \nu$ .  $\underline{C(G)} = \bigcup_{m \in \omega} (\bigcup_{\nu < \kappa} (\bigcup_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}} \{i_G(\pi(\underline{E_\nu^m}))\})) = i_G(\underline{C(G)})$ .  $M$  is then the set of all sets of rank  $< \kappa$  of the model consisting of all sets which are hereditarily  $V$  definable from  $\underline{C(G)}$ , i.e.,  $M = R(\kappa)^{\text{HVD}(\underline{C(G)})}$ .

By the definition of  $M$ , we know that for any set  $x \subseteq \alpha_\nu$  in  $M$ ,  $\alpha_\nu$  arbitrary, a term  $\tau$  for  $x$  can be found which mentions only finitely many of the  $E_\nu^m$ . By letting  $m_0$  be the sup of all of the  $m$ 's appearing in  $\tau$ , and letting  $\nu_0$  be the sup of all of the  $\nu$ 's appearing in  $\tau$ ,  $\tau$  can be rewritten using a term  $\tau'$  which mentions only  $E_{\nu_0}^{m_0}$ . The following weak analogue of Theorem 3.2.11 of [8] then holds: For any  $x \subseteq \alpha_\nu$  (or indeed, any ordinal  $\delta \in M$ ) as just mentioned,  $x \in V[\langle \alpha_\beta : \beta \leq \nu_0 \rangle, E_{\nu_0}^{m_0}]$ . Then, using again the arguments of Theorem 3.2.11 of [8], together with the fact that the subsets of  $\alpha_\nu$  in  $V[\langle \alpha_\beta : \beta \leq \nu_0 \rangle, E_{\nu_0}^{m_0}]$  are the same as the subsets of  $\alpha_\nu$  in  $V[\langle \alpha_\beta : \beta \leq \nu \rangle, E_\nu^{m_0}]$  (since as in Lemma 1.1, the part of the forcing above  $\nu$  which determines the portion of  $E_{\nu_0}^{m_0}$  above  $\nu$ ,  $F_{\nu_0}^{m_0} = \langle C_\beta^{m_0} : \nu < \beta \leq \nu_0 \rangle$ , can be taken as a full support iteration of partial orderings which satisfy the Prikry property of short enough length (the length is short enough since the full Radin forcing has length  $\kappa^+$ , so any ordinal in the Radin sequence will be singular) so that the result of [7] again can be applied to show that  $V[\langle \alpha_\beta : \nu < \beta \leq \nu_0 \rangle, F_{\nu_0}^{m_0}]$  contains the same subsets of  $\alpha_\nu$  as  $V$ , so any new subsets of  $\alpha_\nu$  come from  $V[\langle \alpha_\beta : \beta \leq \nu \rangle, \langle C_\beta^{m_0} : \beta \leq \nu \rangle]$ ) we have that for any  $x \subseteq \alpha_\nu$  with  $x \in M$ ,  $x \in V[\langle \alpha_\beta : \beta \leq \nu \rangle, E_\nu^{m_0}]$ . This fact will be the key fact used in completing the proof of Theorem 2.

LEMMA 2.1. *Each  $\alpha_\nu$  is a cardinal in  $M$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 2.1.* By the preceding remarks, for any  $x \subseteq \alpha_\nu$  with  $x \in M$  there is some  $m \in \omega$  so that  $x \in V[\langle \alpha_\beta : \beta \leq \nu \rangle, E_\nu^m]$ . Since  $\langle \alpha_\beta : \beta \leq \nu \rangle$  is a Radin sequence together with the  $\omega$ th and  $\omega + 1$ st successors of each element of the sequence,  $\alpha_\nu$  remains a cardinal in  $V[\langle \alpha_\beta : \beta \leq \nu \rangle]$ .

Assume now that  $\nu$  is a successor ordinal. Write  $E_\nu^m = \prod_{\beta < \nu} C_\beta^m \times C_\nu^m$ . If  $\alpha_\nu$  is an element of the Radin sequence, then  $C_\nu^m$  is generated by a supercompact Radin ordering which, because the length of the original Radin sequence of measures is  $\kappa^+$ , is isomorphic to a supercompact Prikry ordering. It is therefore the case that  $\alpha_\nu$  is a cardinal in  $V[C_\nu^m]$ . The partial ordering which generates  $\langle \langle \alpha_\beta : \beta < \nu \rangle, \prod_{\beta < \nu} C_\beta^m \rangle$  has cardinality  $< \alpha_\nu$  by GCH; hence,  $\alpha_\nu$  is a cardinal in

$$V[C_\nu^m][\langle \alpha_\beta : \beta < \nu \rangle, \prod_{\beta < \nu} C_\beta^m] = V[\langle \alpha_\beta : \beta \leq \nu \rangle, E_\nu^m].$$

If  $\alpha_\nu$  is the  $\omega + 1$ st successor of an element of the Radin sequence, then  $C_\nu^m$  is generated by a Lévy collapse ordering, so it is again the

case that  $\alpha_\nu$  is a cardinal in  $V[C_\nu^m]$ . The same argument as stated in the next to last sentence can be applied again to show that  $\alpha_\nu$  is a cardinal in  $V[\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \nu\rangle, E_\nu^m]$ . If  $\alpha_\nu$  is the  $\omega$ th successor of an element of the Radin sequence, then  $\langle\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \nu\rangle, E_\nu^m\rangle$  is generated by a partial ordering of cardinality  $< \alpha_\nu$  by GCH, so again,  $\alpha_\nu$  is a cardinal in  $V[\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \nu\rangle, E_\nu^m]$ .

If  $\nu$  is a limit ordinal, assume that  $\alpha_\nu$  is not a cardinal in  $V[\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \nu\rangle, E_\nu^m]$ . There must then be a subset of  $\alpha_{\beta_0}$  for  $\beta_0 < \nu$  which codes this fact. This subset of  $\alpha_{\beta_0}$  is an element of  $V[\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \beta_0\rangle, E_{\beta_0}^{m'}]$  for some  $m' \in \omega$ . By GCH, the set  $\langle\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \beta_0\rangle, E_{\beta_0}^{m'}\rangle$  is generated by a partial ordering of cardinality  $< \alpha_\nu$ , an impossibility. Thus, for any value of  $\nu$ , no subset  $x \subseteq \alpha_\nu$  can code a function  $f$  so that for any  $m$  having the property that  $x \in V[\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \nu\rangle, E_\nu^m]$   $f$  witnesses that  $\alpha_\nu$  is not a cardinal. This means that  $\alpha_\nu$  is a cardinal in  $M$ .  $\square$

LEMMA 2.2.  $M \models \langle\langle\alpha_\nu: \nu \in \text{Ord}^M\rangle = \langle\aleph_\nu: \nu \in \text{Ord}^M\rangle$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.2.* By the fact that all  $E_\nu^m$  code collapse maps, the definition of the sequence  $\langle\alpha_\nu: \nu < \kappa\rangle$ , and the definition of  $M$ , it is inductively the case that  $M \models \langle\forall \nu [\alpha_\nu \leq \aleph_\nu]\rangle$ . Since each  $\alpha_\nu$  is a cardinal in  $M$ , this immediately yields that  $M \models \langle\forall \nu [\alpha_\nu = \aleph_\nu]\rangle$ .  $\square$

LEMMA 3.3. *If  $\alpha_\nu$  is an element of the Radin sequence, or if  $\alpha_\nu$  is the  $\omega+1$ st successor of an element of the Radin sequence, then  $M \models \text{SP}(\aleph_\nu)$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 2.3.* Working in  $M$ , for  $\alpha_\nu$  as above, let  $X_n = \{x \subseteq \alpha_\nu: x \text{ is definable using } E_\nu^n\}$ . By our earlier remarks,  $X_n \in V[\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \nu\rangle, E_\nu^n] \subseteq V[\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \nu\rangle, E_\nu^{n+1}]$ , and each  $x \subseteq \alpha_\nu$  so that  $x \in M$  is an element of  $X_n$  for some  $n$ . As in Lemma 1.4,  $V[\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \nu\rangle, E_\nu^{n+1}] \models \langle|X_n| = \alpha_\nu\rangle$ , i.e.,  $V[\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \nu\rangle, E_\nu^{n+1}]$  contains a bijection  $f$  between  $X_n$  and  $\alpha_\nu$ . This bijection  $f$  is such that

$$f \in R(\kappa)^{V[\langle\alpha_\beta: \beta \leq \nu\rangle, E_\nu^{n+1}]} \subseteq R(\kappa)^{\text{HVD}(C(G))} = M, \quad \text{so } M \models \langle|X_n| = \alpha_\nu\rangle.$$

Thus, as in Lemma 1.4,  $M \models \langle\bigcup_{n \in \omega} X_n = 2^{\alpha_\nu} \text{ and for each } n, |X_n| = \alpha_\nu\rangle$ , i.e.,  $M \models \text{SP}(\alpha_\nu)$ .  $\square$

It inductively follows, by the definition of  $M$  and Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, that the  $\alpha_\nu$ 's as in the statement of Lemma 2.3 become the required  $\aleph_\nu$ 's of the statement of Theorem 2.

As with Theorem 1 and in analogy with the model  $N_A$  of [8] and [2],  $M$  will satisfy all of the axioms of ZF with the possible exception

of Replacement. Thus, the following lemma will complete the proof of Theorem 2.

LEMMA 2.4.  $M \models \text{ZF}$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.4.* The proof of Lemma 2.4 is analogous to the proofs of Lemma 1.5 and Theorem 4.2 of [8]. If Replacement fails in  $M$ , then for some set  $X \in M$  there is a class function  $f$  on  $X$  such that  $f''X \notin M$ . As before, we can assume that  $X = R(\beta)$  for some  $\beta < \kappa$  and  $\text{range}(f) \subseteq \kappa$  with  $\text{range}(f)$  unbounded in  $\kappa$ . If  $\beta$  is the minimal such ordinal, then again,  $\beta$  must be a successor ordinal, for if  $\beta$  were a limit ordinal, then we could construct a function  $f': \beta \rightarrow \kappa$  whose range was unbounded in  $\kappa$ . Since  $M \subseteq \text{HVD}(C(G))$  and  $\text{HVD}(C(G)) \models \text{ZF}$ ,  $f' \in \text{HVD}(C(G))$ . By our earlier remarks, for some  $m \in \omega$  and  $\nu < \kappa$ ,  $f' \in V[\langle \alpha_\gamma: \gamma \leq \nu \rangle, E_\nu^m]$ . Since  $\langle \langle \alpha_\gamma: \gamma \leq \nu \rangle, E_\nu^m \rangle$  is generated by a partial ordering of cardinality  $< \kappa$  and  $\kappa$  is inaccessible in  $V$ ,  $V[\langle \alpha_\gamma: \gamma \leq \nu \rangle, E_\nu^m] \models \text{“}\kappa \text{ is inaccessible”}$ , a contradiction to the fact that we have just shown  $V[\langle \alpha_\gamma: \gamma \leq \nu \rangle, E_\nu^m] \models \text{“}\kappa \text{ is singular”}$ . Thus,  $\beta = \delta + 1$  for some  $\delta$ , and in  $\text{HVD}(C(G))$  there is a function  $f: p(R(\delta)) = R(\beta) \rightarrow \kappa$  whose range is unbounded in  $\kappa$ .

Define now, for  $\nu < \kappa$ ,  $\underline{E}_\nu$  as a term for the product of the full collapse maps for the relevant elements of the sequence  $\langle \alpha_\beta: \beta < \kappa \rangle$ ; in other words,  $\underline{E}_\nu$  is a term for  $\prod_{\beta < \nu} C_i(\beta)$ , where as before,  $C_i(\beta)$  is a term for  $\{\emptyset\}$  for the appropriate values of  $\beta$ , and for those values of  $\beta$  for which  $C_i(\beta)$  is not a term for  $\{\emptyset\}$ ,  $C_i(\beta)$  is as in the definition of  $C_i^m(\beta)$  except that full and not partial collapse maps are taken. Using this definition, we make now the following

*Claim.* For each ordinal  $\gamma < \kappa$ ,

$$R(\omega + \gamma)^M = R(\omega + \gamma)^{\text{HVD}(C(G))} \subseteq R(\omega + \gamma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta: \delta \leq \gamma + n(\gamma) \rangle, E_{\gamma + n(\gamma)}]}$$

for some  $n(\gamma) \in \omega$ .

*Proof of Claim.* Since  $R(\omega)$  is absolute, the claim is true for  $\gamma = 0$ . If  $\gamma$  is a limit ordinal, then by hypothesis, for every  $\sigma < \gamma$ ,  $R(\omega + \sigma)^M \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta: \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}]}$ . It is also true that for every  $\sigma < \gamma$ ,  $V[\langle \alpha_\delta: \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}] \subseteq V[\langle \alpha_\delta: \delta \leq \gamma \rangle, E_\gamma]$ ; therefore, for every  $\sigma < \gamma$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} R(\omega + \sigma)^M &= R(\omega + \sigma)^{\text{HVD}(C(G))} \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta: \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}]} \\ &\subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta: \delta \leq \gamma \rangle, E_\gamma]}, \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{\sigma < \gamma} R(\omega + \sigma)^M &= \bigcup_{\sigma < \gamma} R(\omega + \sigma)^{\text{HVD}(C(G))} \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma < \gamma} R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}]} \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma < \gamma} R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \gamma \rangle, E_\gamma]} = R(\omega + \gamma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \gamma \rangle, E_\gamma]}, \end{aligned}$$

note that  $n(\gamma) = 0$ .

If  $\gamma = \sigma + 1$  is a successor ordinal, then by hypothesis we have  $R(\omega + \sigma)^M = R(\omega + \sigma)^{\text{HVD}(C(G))} \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}]}$ . For  $Q$  the partial ordering which generates  $\langle \langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)} \rangle$ , we can find some  $m \in \omega$  such that  $\alpha_{\sigma + n(\sigma) + m}$  is inaccessible and  $|Q| < \alpha_{\sigma + n(\sigma) + m}$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} &V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}] \\ &= \text{“}|R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}]}| < \alpha_{\sigma + n(\sigma) + m}”}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $x \subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^M$  is a set in  $M$  then  $x$  can be viewed as a subset of  $\alpha_{\sigma + n(\sigma) + m}$  in the analogue of  $M$  constructed by forcing over  $V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}]$  with the partial ordering consisting of the cartesian product of the portion of the Radin forcing  $R_{<\kappa^+}$  above  $\alpha_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}$  with

$$\prod_{\{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha_{\sigma + n(\sigma)} < \alpha < \beta < \kappa \text{ and } \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ are inaccessible}\}} \text{Col}(\alpha^{+(\omega+1)}, \beta).$$

An analogue of our remarks before Lemma 2.1 which takes into account that the successor of an element in the sequence  $\langle \alpha_\nu : \nu < \kappa \rangle$  is not necessarily an inaccessible cardinal yields that  $x \in V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}] [\langle \alpha_\delta : \sigma + n(\sigma) < \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) + m \rangle, \langle C_i(\delta) : \sigma + n(\sigma) < \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) + m \rangle] [\langle \alpha_\delta : \sigma + n(\sigma) + m < \delta \leq \beta \rangle, \langle C_i^k(\delta) : \sigma + n(\sigma) + m < \delta \leq \beta \rangle]$  where  $\beta < \kappa$  and  $k \in \omega$ . As in our remarks before Lemma 2.1, the subsets of  $\alpha_{\sigma + n(\sigma) + m}$  in this model are the same as those in  $V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) + m \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma) + m}]$ , i.e.,  $x \in V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}] [\langle \alpha_\delta : \sigma + n(\sigma) < \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) + m \rangle, \langle C_i(\delta) : \sigma + n(\sigma) < \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) + m \rangle] = V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) + m \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma) + m}]$ . Thus, all subsets of  $R(\omega + \sigma)^M$  in  $M$  are elements of  $V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) + m \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma) + m}]$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} R(\omega + \sigma)^M &\subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma)}]} \\ &\subseteq R(\omega + \sigma)^{V[\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) + m \rangle, E_{\sigma + n(\sigma) + m}]} \end{aligned}$$

this immediately yields that

$$\begin{aligned} R(\omega + \sigma + 1)^M &= R(\omega + \gamma)^M = R(\omega + \gamma)^{\text{HVD}(C(G))} \\ &\subseteq R(\omega + \sigma + 1)^{V[(\alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \sigma + n(\sigma) + m), E_{\sigma + n(\sigma) + m}]} \\ &= R(\omega + \gamma)^{V[(\alpha_\delta : \delta \leq \gamma + n(\gamma)), E_{\gamma + n(\gamma)}]}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Using the Claim and working in  $V[(\alpha_\sigma : \sigma \leq \gamma + n(\gamma)), E_{\gamma + n(\gamma)}]$  for the  $\gamma$  so that  $\omega + \gamma = \beta$ , for  $\delta$  the cardinal  $< \kappa$  so that

$$V[(\alpha_\sigma : \sigma \leq \gamma + n(\gamma)), E_{\gamma + n(\gamma)}] \models \text{“}|R(\beta)^{V[(\alpha_\sigma : \sigma \leq \gamma + n(\gamma)), E_{\gamma + n(\gamma)}]}| = \delta\text{”}$$

we can get in the analogue of  $M$ ,  $M^*$ , obtained by forcing over  $V[(\alpha_\sigma : \sigma \leq \gamma + n(\gamma)), E_{\gamma + n(\gamma)}]$  with the partial ordering consisting of the cartesian product of the portion of the Radin forcing  $R_{<\kappa^+}$  above  $\alpha_{\gamma + n(\gamma)}$  with

$$\prod_{\{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha_{\gamma + n(\gamma)} < \alpha < \beta < \kappa \text{ and } \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ are inaccessible}\}} \text{Col}(\alpha^{+(\omega+1)}, \beta)$$

a function  $g : \delta \rightarrow \kappa$  whose range is unbounded in  $\kappa$ . Since the same analogue of Lemma 2.1 that was true in the preceding paragraph will be true about  $M^*$ ,  $\kappa$  will be a regular cardinal in  $M^*$ . (In  $V$ , the partial ordering which generates  $\langle (\alpha_\sigma : \sigma \leq \gamma + n(\gamma)), E_{\gamma + n(\gamma)} \rangle$  has cardinality  $< \kappa$ , and any subset of  $\kappa$  in  $M^*$  will be in a generic extension of  $V[(\alpha_\sigma : \sigma \leq \gamma + n(\gamma)), E_{\gamma + n(\gamma)}]$  obtained by forcing with a partial ordering of cardinality  $< \kappa$ .) Since  $\kappa$  is thus both regular and singular in  $M^*$ , this contradiction establishes that  $M \models$  Replacement and proves Lemma 2.4. □

Lemmas 2.1–2.4 complete the proof of Theorem 2.

In conclusion, we remark that the assumption of GCH shows that for all cardinals  $\delta$  in the preceding models for which  $\text{SP}(\delta)$  is false,  $2^\delta$  can be written as a countable union of sets of cardinality  $\delta^+$ .

### REFERENCES

[1] A. Apter, *An AD-like model*, J. Symbolic Logic, **50**(2) (1985), 531–543.  
 [2] ———, *Some results on consecutive large cardinals II: Applications of Radin forcing*, Israel J. Math., **52**(4) (1985), 273–292.  
 [3] ———, *Successors of singular cardinals and measurability*, Advances in Math., **55**(3) (1985), 228–241.  
 [4] A. Apter and J. Henle, *Large cardinal structures below  $\aleph_\omega$* , J. Symbolic Logic, **51**(3) (1986), 591–603.

- [5] E. Bull and E. Kleinberg, *A consistent consequence of AD*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **247**(1) (1979), 211–226.
- [6] M. Gitik, *All uncountable cardinals can be singular*, Israel J. Math., **35**(1), (1980), 61–88.
- [7] ———, *Changing cofinalities and the non-stationary ideal*, to appear.
- [8] ———, *Regular cardinals in models of ZF*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **290**(1) (1985), 41–68.
- [9] A. Lévy, *Definability in Axiomatic Set Theory I* in: Y. Bar-Hillel ed., *Logic, Methodology, and the Philosophy of Science*, North-Holland Publishing Co., 1965, 127–151.
- [10] A. Lévy and R. Solovay, *Measurable cardinals and the continuum hypothesis*, Israel J. Math., **5**(4) (1967), 234–248.
- [11] T. Menas, *A combinatorial property of  $P_\kappa(\lambda)$* , J. Symbolic Logic, **41**(1) (1976), 225–233.
- [12] NESTS, *A modest proposal*, in preparation.
- [13] E. Specker, *Zur Axiomatik der Mengenlehre*, Z. Math. Logik, **3**(3) (1957), 173–210.

Received April 27, 1987. The first author would like to thank the Rutgers University Research Council for a FASP research grant which partially supported this work. In addition, the first author would like to thank the second author and his family for the hospitality shown him when he was in Israel doing the research which led to this paper.

BARUCH COLLEGE OF CUNY  
NEW YORK, NY 10010

AND

TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY  
TEL AVIV, ISRAEL





# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

## EDITORS

V. S. VARADARAJAN  
(Managing Editor)  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

HERBERT CLEMENS  
University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

R. FINN  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

HERMANN FLASCHKA  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ 85721

RAMESH A. GANGOLLI  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195

VAUGHAN F. R. JONES  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

ROBION KIRBY  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

C. C. MOORE  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

HAROLD STARK  
University of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

R. ARENS

E. F. BECKENBACH  
(1906-1982)

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

## SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO  
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY  
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII  
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO  
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

---

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

---

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of the manuscript. However, you may use them in the displayed equations. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. In particular it should contain no bibliographic references. Please propose a heading for the odd numbered pages of less than 35 characters. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. 39. Supply name and address of author to whom proofs should be sent. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

There are page-charges associated with articles appearing in the Pacific Journal of Mathematics. These charges are expected to be paid by the author's University, Government Agency or Company. If the author or authors do not have access to such Institutional support these charges are waived. Single authors will receive 50 free reprints; joint authors will receive a total of 100 free reprints. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

---

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$190.00 a year (5 Vols., 10 issues). Special rate: \$95.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for numbers issued in the last three calendar years, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924, U.S.A. Old back numbers obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

---

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics at P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924 (ISSN 0030-8730) publishes 5 volumes per year. Application to mail at Second-class postage rates is pending at Carmel Valley, California, and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Copyright © 1988 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics

<b>P. D. Allenby and M. Sears</b> , Extension of flows via discontinuous functions .....	209
<b>Arthur William Apter and Moti Gitik</b> , Some results on Specker's problem .....	227
<b>Shiu-Yuen Cheng and Johan Tysk</b> , An index characterization of the catenoid and index bounds for minimal surfaces in $\mathbf{R}^4$ .....	251
<b>Mikihiro Hayashi and Mitsuru Nakai</b> , Point separation by bounded analytic functions of a covering Riemann surface .....	261
<b>Charles Philip Lanski</b> , Differential identities, Lie ideals, and Posner's theorems .....	275
<b>Erich Miersemann</b> , Asymptotic expansion at a corner for the capillary problem .....	299
<b>Dietrich W. Paul</b> , Theory of bounded groups and their bounded cohomology .....	313
<b>Ibrahim Salama</b> , Topological entropy and recurrence of countable chains .....	325
<b>Zbigniew Slodkowski</b> , Pseudoconvex classes of functions. I. Pseudoconcave and pseudoconvex sets .....	343
<b>Alfons Van Daele</b> , $K$ -theory for graded Banach algebras. II .....	377
<b>Edwin Wolf</b> , Functions in $R^2(E)$ and points of the fine interior .....	393