

ON  $\omega$ -STRONGLY MEASURABLE CARDINALS

OMER BEN-NERIA AND YAIR HAYUT

ABSTRACT. We prove several consistency results concerning the notion of  $\omega$ -strongly measurable cardinal in HOD. In particular, we show that it is consistent, relative to a large cardinal hypothesis weaker than  $o(\kappa) = \kappa$ , that every successor of a regular cardinal is  $\omega$ -strongly measurable in HOD.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this work is to study the notion of  $\omega$ -strongly measurable cardinals in HOD, as a part of an attempt to understand the extent of which the inner model HOD can be “distant” from the set theoretic universe  $V$ . The notion of  $\omega$ -strongly measurable cardinals in HOD has been introduced by Woodin in his seminal work [12], and plays a key role in the study of Ultimate  $L$ , and the formulation of the HOD-Conjecture.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $\kappa$  be an uncountable regular cardinal, and  $S$  a stationary subset of  $\kappa$ . We say that  $\kappa$  is strongly measurable in HOD with respect to  $S$  if there exists some  $\eta < \kappa$  such that  $(2^\eta)^{\text{HOD}} < \kappa$  and there is no partition  $\langle S_\alpha \mid \alpha < \eta \rangle \in \text{HOD}$  of  $S$  into sets, all stationary sets in  $V$ . We say that  $\kappa$  is  $\omega$ -strongly measurable in HOD if it is strongly measurable in HOD with respect to the set  $S = \kappa \cap \text{Cof}(\omega)$ , and that it is strongly measurable in HOD if it is strongly measurable in HOD with respect to  $S = \kappa$ .

It is shown in [12] that if  $\kappa$  is an  $\omega$ -strongly measurable cardinal  $\kappa$  in HOD then there are stationary sets  $S \subseteq \kappa \cap \text{Cof}(\omega)$  for which the restriction of  $\text{CUB}_\kappa \upharpoonright S$  to HOD, forms a measure on  $\kappa$  in HOD. On the other hand, Woodin shows ([12]) that the existence of a class of regular cardinals which are not  $\omega$ -strongly measurable in HOD, together with the existence of a HOD-supercompact, implies that HOD satisfies many appealing approximation properties with respect to  $V$ . The results promote Woodin’s HOD-conjecture.

*Conjecture 1.2* (HOD conjecture, [12, Definition 191]). There is a proper class of regular uncountable cardinals  $\kappa$  which are not  $\omega$ -strongly measurable in HOD.

In light of the HOD-conjecture, it is natural to attempt forming models with as many as possible  $\omega$ -strongly measurable cardinals in HOD. Woodin

has established the consistency (relative to large cardinals) of models with up to three  $\omega$ -strong measurable cardinals (see [13, Remark 3.43]). The main purpose of this work is to prove that many strongly measurable cardinals can be obtained from relatively small large cardinal assumption of hyper-measurability.

**Theorem 1.3.** *It is consistent relative to the existence an inaccessible cardinal  $\theta$  for which  $\{o(\kappa) \mid \kappa < \theta\}$  is unbounded in  $\theta$ , that every successor of a regular cardinal is strongly measurable in HOD.*

Cummings, Friedman, and Golshani ([2]) have established the consistency of a model where  $(\alpha^+)^{\text{HOD}} < \alpha^+$  for every infinite cardinal  $\alpha$ . In [7, Theorem 2.2], Gitik and Merimovich prove that it is consistent relative to large cardinals that every regular uncountable cardinal is measurable in HOD. A similar result is obtained using a different technique in [1, Theorem 1.4]. Perhaps, more related to our work is [1, Theorem 1.3], in which a club of measurable cardinal in HOD is obtained from a large cardinal axiom weaker than  $o(\kappa) = \kappa$ .

In those models there are no  $\omega$ -strongly measurable successor cardinals.

We note that these results do not apply to models where there is an extendible cardinal  $\delta$  below  $\theta$ . The assumption of an extendible cardinal  $\delta$  in  $V$  derives a sharp dichotomy between HOD being close/far from  $V$ , as shown by Woodin's HOD-Dichotomy theorem ([12]).

**Theorem 1.4** (HOD Dichotomy, [14]). *If  $\delta$  is an extendible cardinal then one of the following holds.*

- (1) *Every cardinal  $\eta$  above  $\delta$  which is singular in  $V$ , is singular in HOD and  $(\eta^+)^{\text{HOD}} = \eta^+$ .*
- (2) *Every regular cardinal above  $\delta$  is  $\omega$ -strongly measurable in HOD.*

In the last part of this work, we prove a consistency result regarding strong measurability at successors of singular cardinals. Woodin ([12]) establishes the consistency of a successor of a singular cardinal  $\lambda$ , which is  $\omega$ -strong measurable cardinal in HOD, from the large cardinal assumption  $I_0$ . Here, we prove a weaker consistency result from a weaker large cardinal assumption.

**Theorem 1.5.** *Suppose that  $\kappa < \lambda$  are cardinals,  $\kappa$  is  $\lambda$ -supercompact and  $\lambda$  is measurable. Then, there is a generic extension in which  $\kappa$  is a singular cardinal of cofinality  $\omega$ , and  $\lambda = \kappa^+$  is strongly measurable in HOD with respect to  $S$ , for some stationary subset  $S \subseteq \lambda \cap \text{Cof}(\omega)$ .*

*A brief summary of this paper.* The rest of **this section** is devoted to reviewing preliminary results related to homogeneous forcings and their iterations, useful generalizations of the notion of  $\omega$ -strongly measurable cardinals in HOD, and homogeneous iterations for changing cofinalities. In the following sections, we gradually develop the forcing methods used to prove

our main results (Theorems 1.3 and 1.5): **In section 2** we show how to obtain a model where  $\omega_1$  is strongly measurable in HOD from the consistency assumption of a single measurable cardinal. The case of  $\kappa = \omega_1$  is different from the general case as it does not require incorporating posets for changing cofinalities. It can also be seen as a warm-up for the general case. **In section 3** we further develop the ideas from the previous section and combine them with a suitable iteration for changing cofinalities. As a result, we establish the consistency of an strongly measurable cardinal which is a successor of an arbitrary regular cardinal  $\lambda$ , from the large cardinal assumption of  $o(\kappa) = \lambda + 1$ . **In section 4** we introduce a method to construct a Prikry-type poset which is equivalent to the forcing from the previous section, and has a direct extension order that is  $\lambda$ -closed. **In section 5** we utilize this equivalent Prikry-type poset to form iterations of the single cardinal forcing, thus obtaining models with many strongly measurable cardinals. Finally, **in section 6** we prove our theorem concerning successors of singular cardinals. The results of this section do not depend on the other sections past our preliminaries.

**1.1. Preliminaries.** Our notations are mostly standard. We follow the Jerusalem forcing convention in which for two conditions  $p, p'$  in a poset  $\mathbb{P}$ , the fact  $p'$  is stronger (more informative) than  $p$  is denoted by  $p' \geq p$ .

**1.1.1. Homogeneity and HOD.** When dealing with HOD, we would like to modify the universe (via forcing) while not adding objects to HOD. The main method to obtain this is to force with posets which satisfy certain weak homogeneity property. The main results of this work will focus on the notion of cone homogeneous posets.

**Definition 1.6.** We say that a poset  $\mathbb{P}$  is **cone homogeneous** if for every  $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$  there are extensions  $p^*, q^*$  of  $p, q$  respectively, and a forcing isomorphism  $\varphi$  from the cone  $\mathbb{P}/p^*$  (i.e., of conditions extending  $p^*$ ) to the cone  $\mathbb{P}/q^*$ .

This notion can also be found under different names in the literature concerning weak forms of homogeneity. Our terminology follow [3] for the most part. It is easy to see that cone homogeneous posets satisfy most standard properties of homogeneous posets concerning ordinal definability sets. In particular, the following well-known result holds.

**Fact 1** ([9]). If  $\mathbb{P}$  is cone homogeneous and belongs to HOD, and  $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$  is generic over  $V$  then  $\text{HOD}^{V[G]} \subseteq \text{HOD}^V$ .

If  $\varphi$  is an isomorphism of two cones  $\mathbb{P}/p_0$  and  $\mathbb{P}/p_1$  and  $\sigma$  is a  $\mathbb{P}/p_0$  name, then by recursively applying  $\varphi$  we obtain a  $\mathbb{P}/p_1$ -name, which we denote by  $\sigma^\varphi$ .

Let  $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_\kappa$  where  $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  is an iteration of cone homogeneous posets  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  and moreover let us assume that all cone automorphisms of  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$

does not modify  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  or its order. For simplicity, we may assume that  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  and its order are ordinal definable.

Given two conditions  $\vec{p} = \langle p_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle, \vec{q} = \langle q_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  in  $\mathbb{P}$ , it is natural to try forming extensions  $\vec{p}^* = \langle p_\alpha^* \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \geq \vec{p}, \vec{q}^* = \langle q_\alpha^* \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle \geq \vec{q}$ , and an isomorphism  $\varphi : \mathbb{P}/\vec{p}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{P}/\vec{q}^*$  as follows:

By induction on  $\beta \leq \kappa$ , we attempt defining extensions  $\vec{p}^\beta = \langle p_\alpha^* \mid \alpha < \beta \rangle$  of  $\vec{p} \upharpoonright \beta$ , and  $\vec{q}^\beta = \langle q_\alpha^* \mid \alpha < \beta \rangle$  of  $\vec{q} \upharpoonright \beta$ , and an isomorphism  $\varphi_\beta : \mathbb{P}_\beta/\vec{p}^\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\beta/\vec{q}^\beta$ . Our inductive assumptions further include  $\vec{p}^{\beta_1} \upharpoonright \beta_0 = \vec{p}^{\beta_0}, \vec{q}^{\beta_1} \upharpoonright \beta_0 = \vec{q}^{\beta_0}$ , and  $\varphi_{\beta_1} \upharpoonright \mathbb{P}_{\beta_0}/\vec{p}^{\beta_0} = \varphi_{\beta_0}$ <sup>1</sup> for all  $\beta_0 < \beta_1$ .

For  $\beta = 0$ , where  $\mathbb{P}_0 = \{0_{\mathbb{P}_0}\}$  is a trivial forcing we take  $\varphi_0$  to be the identity. At a successor step, assuming  $\vec{p}^\beta, \vec{q}^\beta$  and  $\varphi_\beta$  have been defined, we have that  $\varphi_\beta(\vec{p}^\beta) = \vec{q}^\beta$  forces that  $p_\beta^{\varphi_\beta}$  and  $q_\beta$  are conditions of the cone homogeneous poset  $\mathbb{Q}_\beta$ . There are therefore  $\mathbb{P}_\beta$ -names  $p'_\beta$  and  $q'_\beta$  of extensions of  $p_\beta^{\varphi_\beta}$  and  $q_\beta$ , respectively, and a name of a cone isomorphism  $\psi_\beta : \mathbb{Q}_\beta/p'_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_\beta/q'_\beta$ . Let  $p_\beta^* = (p'_\beta)^{\varphi_\beta}$  and  $q_\beta^* = q'_\beta$ . Clearly,  $\vec{p}^\beta, \vec{q}^\beta$  force that  $p_\beta^*, q_\beta^*$  extend  $p_\beta, q_\beta$ , respectively. We set  $\vec{p}^{\beta+1} = \vec{p}^\beta \frown \langle p_\beta^* \rangle, \vec{q}^{\beta+1} = \vec{q}^\beta \frown \langle q_\beta^* \rangle$ , and define  $\varphi_{\beta+1} : \mathbb{P}_{\beta+1}/\vec{p}^{\beta+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\beta+1}/\vec{q}^{\beta+1}$  by mapping a condition  $\vec{r} = \vec{r} \upharpoonright \beta \frown \langle r_\beta \rangle \in \mathbb{P}_{\beta+1}/\vec{p}^{\beta+1}$  to

$$\varphi_{\beta+1}(\vec{r}) = \varphi_\beta(\vec{r} \upharpoonright \beta) \frown \langle \psi_\beta(r_\beta^{\varphi_\beta}) \rangle.$$

It is immediate from our assumption of  $\varphi_\beta$  and choice of  $\psi_\beta$  that  $\varphi_{\beta+1}$  is an isomorphism. Finally, for a limit ordinal  $\delta \leq \kappa$ ,  $\vec{p}^\delta$  (similarly  $\vec{q}^\delta$ ) is determined by the requirement  $\vec{p}^\delta \upharpoonright \beta = \vec{p}^\beta$  for all  $\beta < \delta$  (similarly for  $\vec{q}^\delta$ ), and  $\varphi_\delta$  by the requirement  $\varphi_\delta \upharpoonright \mathbb{P}_\beta/\vec{p}^\beta = \varphi_\beta$  for all  $\beta < \delta$ . See [3] for more detailed proof for the validity of this construction.

We conclude that for this construction to succeed the following conditions need to hold for all  $\alpha \leq \kappa$ : (i)  $\vec{p}^\beta, \vec{q}^\beta$  are well-defined conditions in  $\mathbb{P}_\beta$  which extend  $\vec{p} \upharpoonright \beta, \vec{q} \upharpoonright \beta$  respectively, and (ii)  $\varphi_\beta$  is a well-defined cone isomorphism.

If the construction succeeds throughout all stages  $\beta \leq \kappa$ , then the final conditions  $\vec{p}^* = \vec{p}^\kappa, \vec{q}^* = \vec{q}^\kappa$  and cone isomorphism  $\varphi = \varphi_\kappa$ , satisfy the required properties. It is easy to see that condition (i) and (ii) may only fail at limit stages  $\delta \leq \kappa$ , where the precise formation of the iteration (e.g., its support) may prevent  $\vec{p}^\delta$  to be a condition in  $\mathbb{P}_\delta$ . Similarly, the definition of the limit order  $\leq_{\mathbb{P}_\delta}$  might prevent the defined map  $\varphi_\delta$  to be an isomorphism.

This problem does not occur for finite iteration:

**Lemma 1.7** ([3]). *A finite iteration of ordinal definable cone homogeneous forcings is cone homogeneous.*

Since our proof of theorem 1.3 is based on a construction of a **Magidor Iteration**  $\mathbb{P} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \theta \rangle$  of Prikry-type forcings  $(\mathbb{Q}_\alpha, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}^*)$ ,

<sup>1</sup>i.e., the restriction  $\varphi_{\beta_1} \upharpoonright \mathbb{P}_{\beta_0}/\vec{p}^{\beta_0}$  is obtained by identifying conditions  $\vec{r}^{\beta_0} \in \mathbb{P}_{\beta_0}/\vec{p}^{\beta_0}$  with their extension  $\vec{r}^{\beta_1} = \vec{r}^{\beta_0} \frown (\vec{p}^{\beta_1} \upharpoonright_{[\beta_0, \beta_1)})$ .

we conclude this section with a description of a specific variant of cone homogeneity for the posets  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ , which guarantees that the Magidor iteration  $\mathbb{P}$  is cone-homogeneous as well. Conditions in the Magidor iteration  $\mathbb{P} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  of Prikry type posets  $\langle \mathbb{Q}_\alpha, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}^* \rangle$  are sequences  $\vec{p} = \langle p_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  which beyond the standard requirement of  $p \restriction \alpha \Vdash p_\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ , also satisfy that for all but finitely many ordinals  $\alpha < \kappa$ ,  $\vec{p} \restriction \alpha \Vdash p_\alpha \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}^* 0_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}$ . We note that in particular, the definition allows using full-support condition, as long as almost all components  $p_\alpha$  are direct extensions of the trivial conditions. Similarly for the definition of the ordering  $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ , we have that  $\vec{p}' \geq \vec{p}$  requires both that  $\vec{p}' \restriction \alpha \Vdash p'_\alpha \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha} p_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha$  and that for all but finitely many ordinals  $\alpha < \kappa$ ,  $\vec{p}' \restriction \alpha \Vdash p'_\alpha \geq^* p_\alpha$ . See [6] for a comprehensive description of the Magidor iteration style and its main properties.

**Lemma 1.8.** *Suppose that  $\mathbb{P} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  is a Magidor iteration of Prikry-type posets  $\langle \mathbb{Q}_\alpha, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}^* \rangle$  so that the following conditions hold for each  $\alpha < \kappa$ :*

- (i)  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}$  and  $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}^*$  are ordinal definable in  $V$ , and
- (ii) it is forced by  $0_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$  that for every two conditions  $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  there are  $p^* \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}^* p$  and  $q^* \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}^* q$  and a cone isomorphism  $\psi_\alpha : \mathbb{Q}_\alpha/p^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_\alpha/q^*$  which respects the direct extension order  $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}^*$ .

Then  $\mathbb{P}$  is cone homogeneous.

*Proof.* Let  $\vec{p}, \vec{q} \in \mathbb{P}$ , and  $(\vec{p}^\beta, \vec{q}^\beta, \varphi_\beta \mid \beta \leq \kappa)$  be the sequence obtained from the procedure described above. It suffices to verify inductively, that conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied by the sequence.

We note that in the successor step construction of  $p'_\beta, p_\beta^* = (p'_\beta)^{\varphi_\beta^{-1}}, q_\beta^* = q'_\beta$ , and  $\psi_\beta$ , we may assume from our assumptions above that  $p'_\beta \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^* p_\beta^{\varphi_\beta}$ ,  $q'_\beta \geq^* q_\beta$ , and that  $\psi_\beta$  is  $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^*$ -preserving. Since  $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^*$  is ordinal definable in  $V$ , then  $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^* = (\leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^*)^{\varphi_\beta^{-1}}$ , and therefore applying  $\varphi_\beta^{-1}$  shows that  $p_\beta^* \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^* p_\beta$ , and  $p \mapsto \psi_\beta(p^{\varphi_\beta})$  is forced to be  $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^*$ -preserving by  $\vec{p}^\beta$ . In particular, assuming  $\varphi_\beta$  is order preserving and  $\vec{r}^{\beta+1} \geq \vec{s}^{\beta+1} \in \mathbb{P}_{\beta+1}/\vec{p}^{\beta+1}$ ,  $\vec{r}^{\beta+1} = \vec{r}^\beta \frown \langle r_\beta \rangle$ ,  $\vec{s}^{\beta+1} = \vec{s}^\beta \frown \langle s_\beta \rangle$ , we have that if  $\vec{r}^\beta \Vdash r_\beta \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^* s_\beta$  then  $\varphi_\beta(\vec{r}^\beta) \Vdash \psi_\beta(r_\beta^{\varphi_\beta}) \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^* \psi_\beta(s_\beta^{\varphi_\beta}) = \varphi_{\beta+1}(\vec{s}^{\beta+1})_\beta$ . The same conclusion holds for  $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}$  which is also ordinal definable in  $V$ .

We conclude that, first,  $p_\beta^*, q_\beta^*$  are forced to be direct extensions of  $0_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}$  whenever  $p_\beta, q_\beta$  are, which in turn, implies that  $\vec{p}^\alpha, \vec{q}^\alpha$  are conditions of  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha \leq \kappa$ . Hence, (i) is satisfied. Second, for every  $\vec{r}^\alpha, \vec{s}^\alpha \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha/\vec{p}^\alpha$  and  $\beta < \alpha$ , if  $\vec{r}^\alpha \restriction \beta \Vdash r_\beta \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^* s_\beta$  then  $\varphi_\alpha(\vec{r}^\alpha) \restriction \beta \Vdash \varphi_\alpha(\vec{r}^\alpha)_\beta \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^* \varphi_\alpha(\vec{s}^\alpha)_\beta$ , and similarly, when replacing replacing  $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}^*$  with  $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}$ . It follows at once from this and the definition of the ordering  $\leq_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$  of the Magidor iteration that  $\varphi_\alpha$  is a cone isomorphism. Hence (ii) holds.  $\square$

1.1.2. *Variations of Strong Measurability.* We start with several observations concerning a natural generalization of the notion of  $\omega$ -strongly measurability.

**Definition 1.9.** Let  $S \subseteq \kappa$ ,  $S \in \text{HOD}$  stationary and  $\eta$  a cardinal in HOD.  $\kappa$  is  $(S, < \eta)$ -strongly measurable if there is no partition in HOD of  $S$  into  $\eta$  many disjoint stationary sets.  $\kappa$  is  $(S, \eta)$ -strongly measurable if it is  $(S, < (\eta^+)^{\text{HOD}})$ -strongly measurable.

Therefore a cardinal  $\kappa$  is  $\omega$ -strongly measurable if it is  $(S_\omega^\kappa, \eta)$ -strongly measurable for  $\eta$  such that  $(2^\eta)^{\text{HOD}} < \kappa$ .

**Theorem 1.10** (Woodin). *Let  $\eta < \kappa$  be a cardinal such that  $(2^\eta)^{\text{HOD}} < \kappa$ , and let us assume that there is an extendible cardinal  $\delta < \kappa$ . Then  $\kappa$  is  $(S, \eta)$ -strongly measurable for some  $S \in \text{HOD}$  stationary if and only if  $\kappa$  is  $\omega$ -strongly measurable.*

The next two results provide necessary and sufficient conditions for a cardinal  $\kappa$  to be  $\omega$ -strongly measurable in HOD. Both will guide us in devising the main forcing construction, which will be used to prove theorem 1.3.

**Lemma 1.11.** *Let  $\kappa$  be  $(S, < \kappa)$ -strongly measurable. Then  $S$  is contained in the regular cardinals of HOD, up to a non-stationary error.*

*Proof.* The proof follows the standard proof for Solovay's splitting theorem, in the case of non-Mahlo cardinal, as appear for example in [8].

Let  $S' \subseteq S$  be the set of all HOD-singular ordinals in  $S$  and suppose, towards a contradiction, that  $S'$  is stationary.

Let  $f: S' \rightarrow \kappa$  be the HOD-cofinality function, so  $f(\alpha) = \text{cf}^{\text{HOD}}(\alpha)$ . By the definition of  $S'$ ,  $f$  is regressive. By Fodor's Lemma, there is some  $\eta < \kappa$  such that  $S'' = f^{-1}(\{\eta\}) \subseteq S'$  is stationary. Pick in HOD, for every  $\alpha \in S''$  a cofinal sequence of order type  $\eta$ ,  $\langle \gamma_i^\alpha \mid i < \eta \rangle$ . It is impossible that for every  $i$ , there is a club (in  $V$ )  $D_i$  such that  $\gamma_i := \sup_{\alpha \in D_i} \gamma_i^\alpha < \kappa$ , since then, for  $\alpha \in S'' \cap \bigcap_{i < \eta} D_i$  above  $\sup_{i < \eta} \gamma_i < \kappa$ , we get that  $\gamma_i^\alpha$  is bounded below  $\alpha$  for all  $i < \eta$ .

Let  $i$  be the least ordinal for which there is no club on which the sequence  $\gamma_i^\alpha$  is bounded. Set for each  $\zeta < \kappa$ ,

$$S_\zeta = \{\alpha \in S'' \mid \gamma_i^\alpha = \zeta\}.$$

By our assumption on  $i$  and a standard pressing down argument, the set of  $\zeta < \kappa$  for which  $S_\zeta$  is stationary (in  $V$ ) is unbounded in  $\kappa$ . Since  $\kappa$  is regular,  $\{\zeta \mid S_\zeta \text{ is stationary}\}$  has size  $\kappa$ . The sequence of sets  $\langle S_\zeta \mid \zeta < \kappa \rangle$  is clearly in HOD. Moreover, the property of stationarity in  $\kappa$  is ordinal definable. It follows that the restriction of  $\langle S_\zeta \mid \zeta < \kappa \rangle$  to stationary sets is also in HOD. Thus, in HOD there is a decomposition of (a subset of)  $S$  into  $\kappa$  many disjoint stationary sets.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.12.** *Suppose that  $\kappa$  is an inaccessible cardinal in HOD and that the restriction of the club filter on  $\kappa$  to HOD is the intersection of  $\eta$  normal measures from HOD,  $\langle U_{\kappa,i} \mid i < \eta \rangle \in \text{HOD}$ , for some  $\eta < \kappa$ . Then  $\kappa$  is  $(\kappa, \eta)$ -strongly measurable.*

*Proof.* First, since  $\kappa$  is inaccessible in HOD and  $\eta < \kappa$ ,  $(2^\eta)^{\text{HOD}} < \kappa$ .

Let  $\langle T_\alpha \mid \alpha < (\eta^+)^{\text{HOD}} \rangle \in \text{HOD}$  be a decomposition of  $\kappa$  into stationary sets. By the assumption, for each  $\alpha$  there is a measure  $U_{\kappa,i}$  in HOD such that  $T_\alpha \in U_{\kappa,i}$ . Since the sets  $T_\alpha$  are pairwise disjoint, it is impossible for  $\alpha \neq \beta$  to belong to the same  $U_{\kappa,i}$ . Thus, we obtain an injective function from  $(\eta^+)^{\text{HOD}}$  to  $\eta$  in HOD—a contradiction.  $\square$

1.1.3. *Homogeneous change of cofinalities.* Our approach to constructing a model with an  $\omega$ -strongly measurable cardinal  $\kappa$ , is to force over a ground model  $V = \text{HOD}^V$  with a weakly homogeneous poset (i.e., therefore also cone-homogeneous) to form a generic extension  $V[G]$  with a cardinal  $\kappa$ , which satisfies the conditions of lemma 1.12. In light of lemma 1.11 above, we see that many regular cardinals in  $V$  need to change their cofinality in  $V[G]$ . The main challenge in that regard, it to change the cofinality of many cardinals with a weakly homogeneous forcing. Fortunately, such forcing has been constructed in [1], where the theory of non-stationary support iteration of Prikry-type forcings is developed, and employed to form a weakly-homogeneous variant of the Gitik iteration ([4]). We note that as opposed to an Easton-style version of the Gitik iteration, which has a strong chain condition (i.e.,  $\kappa$ .c.c when iterating up to a Mahlo cardinal  $\kappa$ ), the non-stationary support variant by Ben-Neria and Unger has a weaker, fusion-type property.

We briefly describe the construction of the non-stationary support iteration  $\mathbb{P}$  of iteration of Prikry-type forcings  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  from [1]. The iteration, which is based on the given coherent sequence of measures  $\langle U_{\alpha,\tau} \mid \alpha < \kappa, \tau < o^\mathcal{U}(\alpha) \rangle$  is non trivial at each  $\alpha < \kappa$ ,  $o^\mathcal{U}(\alpha) > 0$ . As this  $\alpha$ , the forcing  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  adds a cofinal closed unbounded set  $b_\alpha$  to  $\alpha$  of order-type  $\omega^{o(\alpha)}$  (the ordinal exponentiation). More specifically, given a  $V$ -generic filter  $G_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ , which adds clubs  $b_\beta$ , for  $\beta < \alpha$ ,  $o^\mathcal{U}(\beta) > 0$ , one considers finite sequence  $t = \langle \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{k-1} \rangle$  with the property that for every  $i < k-1$ , if  $o^\mathcal{U}(\nu_i) < o^\mathcal{U}(\nu_{i+1})$  then  $\nu_i \in b_{\nu_{i+1}}$  and  $b_{\nu_{i+1}} \cap \nu_i = b_{\nu_i}$ . Such sequences are called coherent (with respect to  $G_\alpha$ ). If  $\rho$  is an ordinal so that  $o(\nu_i) < \rho$  for all  $i < k$  then we say  $t$  is  $\rho$ -coherent. Otherwise, we denote by  $t \upharpoonright \rho$  to be the sub-sequence of  $\nu_i \in t$  so that  $o(\nu_i) < \rho$ .

Working at  $V[G_\alpha]$ , one constructs posets  $\mathbb{Q}_{\alpha,\tau}$ ,  $\tau \leq o^\mathcal{U}(\alpha)$ , and simultaneously shows by induction on  $\tau \leq o^\mathcal{U}(\alpha)$  that for each  $\tau$ -coherent sequence  $t$ ,  $U_{\alpha,\tau} \in \mathcal{U}$  extends to  $U_{\alpha,\tau}(t)$ . We have  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha^0$  is the trivial poset, and given that the measures  $U_{\alpha,\tau'}(t)$ , have been defined for every  $\tau' < \tau$  and  $t$   $\tau'$ -coherent, the forcing  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha^\tau$  consists of pairs  $q = \langle t, T \rangle$  where  $t$  is  $\tau$ -coherent,  $T \subseteq [\alpha]^{<\omega}$  is a tree whose stem is  $\emptyset$  and for every  $s \in T$ ,

$\text{succ}_T(s) := \{\mu < \kappa \mid s \frown \langle \mu \rangle \in T\} \in \bigcap_{\tau' < \tau} U_{\alpha, \tau'}(t \frown s \upharpoonright \tau')$ . Direct extensions and end extensions of  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha^\tau$  are defined as usual.  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha^\tau$  is a Prikry type forcing whose direct extension is  $\alpha$ -closed. With  $\mathbb{Q}_{\alpha, \tau}$  determined we consider the  $V$ -ultrapower by  $U_{\alpha, \tau}$ , by taking  $j_{\alpha, \tau} : V \rightarrow M_{\alpha, \tau} \cong \text{Ult}(V, U_{\alpha, \tau})$ , and define for each  $\tau$ -coherent sequence  $t$  a  $V[G_\alpha]$  measure  $U_{\alpha, \tau}(t)$  by  $X = \dot{X}_{G_\alpha} \in U_{\alpha, \tau}(t)$  if there exist  $p \in G_\alpha$  and a valid tree  $T$  such that

$$p \frown \langle t, T \rangle \frown j_{\alpha, \tau}(p) \setminus (\alpha + 1) \Vdash_{j_{\alpha, \tau}(\mathbb{P})} \check{\alpha} \in j_{\alpha, \tau}(\dot{X}).$$

**Fact 2.**

- (1) For each  $\alpha$  such that  $\delta^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha) > 0$ ,  $b_\alpha$  is a cofinal sequence at  $\alpha$  of order type  $\omega^{\delta^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha)}$  (ordinal exponentiation).
- (2) For each  $\alpha \leq \kappa$ ,  $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha, \leq, \leq^*)$  is a Prikry-type forcing.
- (3) For every  $\gamma < \alpha \leq \kappa$ , the quotient  $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha / \mathbb{P}_\gamma, \leq, \leq^*)$  is a Prikry-type forcing whose direct extension order  $\leq^*$  is  $\gamma$ -closed. In particular, the quotient  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha / \mathbb{P}_\gamma$  does not add new bounded subsets to  $\gamma$ .
- (4) The iteration  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha / \mathbb{P}_\beta$  is weakly homogeneous.



2.  $\omega_1$  IS STRONGLY MEASURABLE FROM ONE MEASURABLE CARDINAL

Suppose that  $\kappa$  is a measurable cardinal in a model  $V$  and  $U$  is a normal measure on  $\kappa$ . Force with Levy collapse poset  $\text{Coll}(\omega, < \kappa)$  over  $V$ . Let  $H$  be a  $V$ -generic filter.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Work in  $V[H]$  and fix some regular cardinal  $\theta > \kappa^+$ . There exists a stationary set of structures  $M \prec H_\theta$  of size  $|M| < \kappa$ , with the property that  $\sup(M \cap \kappa) \in A$  for every  $A \in U \cap M$ .*

*Proof.* Fix any  $f : H_\theta^{<\omega} \rightarrow H_\theta$  in  $V[H]$ . We would like to show that there exists some  $M \subseteq H_\theta$  which is closed under  $f$  and satisfies the conditions in the statement of the lemma. Let  $f' : (H_\theta^V)^{<\omega} \rightarrow H_\theta^V$  be a generating function for the restriction of  $H_\theta^V$  under  $f$ . Namely, if  $M' \subseteq H_\theta^V$  is closed under  $f'$  then  $M' = M \cap H_\theta^V$  for some  $M \subseteq H_\theta$  which is closed under  $f$ . Since  $U \subseteq H_\theta^V$ , it is therefore sufficient to prove that there exists some  $M' \subseteq H_\theta^V$  which is closed under  $f'$  and satisfies  $|M'| < \kappa$  and  $\sup(M' \cap \kappa) \in A$  for all  $A \in M' \cap U$ .

Suppose towards contradiction that such  $M'$  does not exist. Let  $\check{f}$  be a  $\text{Coll}(\omega, < \kappa)$  name for  $f'$  and  $p \in H$  be a condition forcing this statement. Since  $\text{Coll}(\omega, < \kappa)$  is  $\kappa$ .c.c there exists a function  $F'$  in  $V$ ,  $F' : (H_\theta^V)^{<\omega} \rightarrow (H_\theta^V)^{<\kappa}$  such that  $0_{\text{Coll}(\omega, < \kappa)} \Vdash \check{f}(x) \in F'(x)$  for all  $x \in (H_\theta^V)^{<\omega}$ . Working in  $V$ , take an elementary substructure  $N \prec H_\theta^V$  satisfying  $F'[N] \subseteq N$ ,  $N^{<\kappa} \subseteq N$ ,  $|N| = \kappa$ ,  $\kappa \in N$ . Let  $j : V \rightarrow W \cong \text{Ult}(V, U)$  be the ultrapower embedding induced by  $U$ . Consider the structure  $M' = j''N \prec j(H_\theta^V)$ .  $M' \in W$ , is closed under  $j(F')$ . It follows that  $0_{j(\text{Coll}(\omega, < \kappa))}$  forces  $M'$  to be closed under  $j(\check{f})$ , and therefore  $j(p)$  forces the same. Finally,  $M' \cap j(\kappa) = \kappa$  and for every  $A \in M' \cap j(U)$ ,  $A = j(\check{A})$  for some  $\check{A} \in U$  and therefore  $\kappa \in A$ . This contradicts our choice of  $p \in H$  and elementary of  $j$ .  $\square$

**Definition 2.2.** Working in the collapse extension  $V[H]$ , let  $\mathbb{C}_U$  be the poset consisting of pairs  $x = \langle c, A \rangle$ , where  $c \subseteq \kappa$  is a bounded closed subset of  $\kappa$  and  $A \in U$ . The condition  $x' = \langle c', A' \rangle$  extends  $x$  if  $c'$  is an end extension of  $c$ ,  $A' \subseteq A$ , and  $c' \setminus c \subseteq A$ .

It is clear that if  $x = \langle c, A \rangle$  and  $x' = \langle c', A' \rangle$  are two conditions with the same bounded closed set  $c = c'$  then  $x, x'$  are compatible. Since  $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$  in  $V[H]$  then  $\mathbb{C}_U$  satisfies  $\kappa^+$ .c.c ( $\aleph_2^{V[H]}$ .c.c). The forcing  $\mathbb{C}_U$  adds a fast club to  $U$ .<sup>2</sup>

**Proposition 2.3.**  $\mathbb{C}_U$  is  $\kappa$ -distributive.

*Proof.* Since  $\kappa = \aleph_1$  in  $V[H]$ , we need to check that the intersection of a countable family  $\{D_n \mid n < \omega\}$  of dense open subsets of  $\mathbb{C}_U$  is dense. Pick some regular cardinal  $\theta > \kappa^+$  such that  $\mathbb{C}_U, \{D_n \mid n < \omega\} \in H_\theta$ . By lemma 2.1, for every condition  $x \in \mathbb{C}_U$  there exists an elementary substructure

<sup>2</sup>See [11] for an additional application of this poset.

$M \prec H_\theta$  of size  $|M| = \aleph_0$ , with  $x, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{C}_U, \{D_n \mid n < \omega\} \in M$  and further satisfies that  $\sup(M \cap \kappa) \in A$  for every  $A \in M \cap \kappa$ . Denote  $\sup(M \cap \kappa)$  by  $\alpha$  and pick a cofinal sequence  $\langle \alpha_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$  in  $\alpha$ . We can construct an increasing sequence of extensions  $\langle x_n \mid n < \omega \rangle \subseteq M$  of  $x$ ,  $x_n = \langle c_n, A_n \rangle$  such that  $x_{n+1} \in D_n$  and  $\max(c_n) \geq \alpha_n$  for every  $n < \omega$ . Since  $x_n = \langle c_n, A_n \rangle \in M$  then  $\alpha \in A_n$  for all  $n < \omega$ . It follows that  $x^* = \langle \{\alpha\} \cup (\bigcup_n c_n), \bigcap_n A_n \rangle$  is a condition in  $\mathbb{C}_U$ , which is clearly an upper bound of  $\langle x_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ . We conclude that there exists  $x^*$  extending our given condition  $x$  such that  $x^* \in \bigcap_n D_n$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.**  $\mathbb{C}_U$  is cone homogeneous.

*Proof.* Let  $x_1 = \langle c_1, A_1 \rangle$ ,  $x_2 = \langle c_2, A_2 \rangle$  be two conditions of  $\mathbb{C}_U$ . Take  $\nu \in A_1 \cap A_2$  above  $\max(c_1), \max(c_2)$  and consider the extensions  $y_1 = \langle c_1 \cup \{\nu\}, (A_1 \cap A_2) \setminus (\nu + 1) \rangle$ ,  $y_2 = \langle c_2 \cup \{\nu\}, (A_1 \cap A_2) \setminus (\nu + 1) \rangle$  of  $x_1$ . Define a cone isomorphism  $\sigma : \mathbb{C}_U/y_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_U/y_2$  by

$$\sigma(\langle c, A \rangle) = \langle c_2 \cup (c \setminus \nu), A \rangle$$

$\sigma$  is clearly order preserving map onto  $\mathbb{C}_U/y_2$ , and has an order preserving inverse which is given by

$$\sigma^{-1}(\langle c, A \rangle) = \langle c_1 \cup (c \setminus \nu), A \rangle$$

$\square$

**Theorem 2.5.** Suppose  $C \subseteq \mathbb{C}_U$  is a  $V[H]$ -generic filter. Then  $\kappa = \aleph_1^{V[H * C]}$  is strongly measurable in  $V[H * C]$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 1.7,  $\text{Coll}(\omega, < \kappa) * \mathbb{C}_U$  is cone homogeneous, and therefore  $\text{HOD}^{V[H * C]} \subseteq V$ . It is clear from the definition of  $\mathbb{C}_U$  that for every subset  $S \subseteq \kappa$  in  $V$ ,  $S$  is stationary in  $V[H * C]$  if and only if  $S \in U$ . It follows that closed unbounded filter on  $\kappa = \aleph_1^{V[H * C]}$  in  $V[H * C]$  is a HOD-ultrafilter. Therefore  $\kappa$  is strongly measurable in  $V[H * C]$ .  $\square$

## 3. STRONGLY MEASURABLE SUCCESSOR OF A REGULAR CARDINAL

Suppose that  $\lambda < \kappa$  are two cardinals such that  $\lambda$  is regular and  $\kappa$  is measurable with  $o(\kappa) = \lambda + 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{U} = \langle U_{\alpha, \tau} \mid \lambda < \alpha \leq \kappa, \tau < o^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha) \rangle$  be a coherent sequence of normal measures with  $o^{\mathcal{U}}(\kappa) = \lambda$ .

Let  $\mathbb{P} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  be the homogeneous iteration of subsection 1.1.3.

*Remark 3.1.* We note that it follows at once from the definition of  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  that for every  $V$ -set  $A \in \bigcap_{i < o^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha)} U_{\alpha, i}$  contains a tail of the cofinal sequence  $b_\alpha$ . This is because every condition  $q = \langle t, T \rangle \in \mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  has a direct extension  $q^A = \langle t, T^A \rangle$  of  $q$ , which satisfies that  $\text{succ}_T(s) \subseteq A$  for all  $s \in T$ .

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$  be a  $V$ -generic filter and  $H \subseteq \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  be the Levy collapse generic over  $V[G]$ . Working in  $V[G * H]$  we consider the filter  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$  generated by the  $V$ -sets of  $\bigcap_{i \leq \lambda} U_{\kappa, i}$ .

$$\mathcal{F}_\kappa = \{A \subseteq \kappa \mid \exists B \in \bigcap_{i \leq \lambda} U_{\kappa, i}, B \subseteq A\}$$

Equivalently,  $A \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa$  iff there is  $B \in \bigcap_{i \leq \lambda} U_{\kappa, i}$  such that  $B \subseteq^* A$ .

**Lemma 3.3.**  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$  is a  $\kappa$ -complete filter in  $V[G * H]$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\langle A_\nu \mid \nu < \beta \rangle \in V[G * H]$  is a sequence of  $\beta < \kappa$  many sets of  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$ . We would like to show that  $\bigcap_{\nu < \beta} A_\nu$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$ . We may assume that  $A_\nu \in \bigcap_{i \leq \lambda} U_{\kappa, i}$  for all  $\nu < \beta$ .

In order to prove the claim, we move from  $V[G * H]$  to  $V[G]$ , and then to  $V$ . Working in  $V[G]$ , let  $\tilde{A}_\nu$  be a  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ -name for the  $V$ -set  $A_\nu \in \bigcap_{i \leq \lambda} U_{\kappa, i}$ . Since  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  satisfies  $\kappa$ .c.c, there exists a family of  $V$ -sets  $X_\nu \subseteq \bigcap_{i \leq \lambda} U_{\kappa, i}$ ,  $X_\nu \in V[G]$ , such that it is forced that  $A_\nu \in X_\nu$ . Let  $p \in G$  be a condition forcing the above. Moving back to  $V$ , [1, Lemma 3.6] guarantees that there exists some  $q \in G$  and a sequence of sets  $\langle Y_\nu \mid \nu < \beta \rangle$  in  $V$ , so that for each  $\nu < \beta$ ,  $Y_\nu \subseteq \bigcap_{i \leq \lambda} U_{\kappa, i}$  has size  $|Y_\nu| < \kappa$ , and  $q$  forces that  $X_\nu \subseteq Y_\nu$ . For each  $\nu$ , let  $A'_\nu = \bigcap Y_\nu$ , and  $A' = \bigcap_{\nu < \beta} A'_\nu$ . Since  $U_{\kappa, i}$  is  $\kappa$ -complete for all  $i < \omega$ , we have in  $V[G * H]$  that  $A' \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa$  and  $A' \subseteq \bigcap_{\nu < \beta} A_\nu$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3.4.* A similar argument shows that  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$  is normal.

**Lemma 3.5.** Working in  $V[G * H]$ , for any regular cardinal  $\theta > \kappa^+$  and  $\tau \leq \lambda$ , there exists a stationary set of structures  $M \prec H_\theta$  with  $\text{sup}(M \cap \kappa) = \alpha$  which satisfy

- (i)  $M^{< \tau} \subseteq M$ ;
- (ii)  $o^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha) = \tau$ ;
- (iii)  $\alpha \in \bigcap (\mathcal{F}_\kappa \cap M)$  and moreover  $b_\alpha \subseteq^* A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa \cap M$ .

*Proof.* Fix a function  $f: [H_\theta]^{< \omega} \rightarrow H_\theta$  in  $V[G * H]$ . Back in the ground model  $V$ , let  $f'$  be a  $\mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ -name for  $f$ . Since  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  is  $\kappa$ .c.c,

and therefore there exists a  $\mathbb{P}$ -name function  $\tilde{F}': [H_\theta^V]^{<\omega} \rightarrow [H_\theta^V]^{<\kappa}$  such that  $f'(x)$  is forced to be a member of  $\tilde{F}'(x)$  for every  $x \in H_\theta^V$ .

Before turning to prove the statement of the lemma, let us consider our ability to approximate  $\tilde{F}'$  in  $V$ . Let  $N \prec H_\theta^V$  be an elementary substructure of size  $\kappa$  with  $N^{<\kappa} \subseteq N$  and  $\mathbb{P}, \tilde{F}' \in N$ . By a standard argument concerning capturing dense open sets in Prikry-type forcings and fat-trees (e.g., see [6]) for every dense open set  $D$  of  $\mathbb{P}$ ,  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  there exists a direct extension  $p^* \geq^* p$  which reduces capturing  $D$  to a bounded condition in  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$  for some  $\mu < \kappa$ . Moreover, given  $\nu < \kappa$  we can also make  $p^* \geq^* p$  to agree with  $p$  up to  $\nu + 1$  (i.e.,  $p^* \upharpoonright \nu + 1 = p \upharpoonright \nu + 1$ ) in which case  $\mu > \nu$ . Given an initial condition  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ , we can list the dense open sets in  $N$ ,  $\langle D_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$ , and form an increasing sequence of direct extensions of  $p$ ,  $\langle p^i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$ , together with a closed unbounded set  $C^* = \langle \nu_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$  such that for every successor ordinal  $i = i' + 1$ ,  $p^i \in N$  reduces the dense set  $D_i$  of  $\mathbb{P}$  to a bounded dense set  $D'_i$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_i}$  for some  $\nu_i < \mu_i < \kappa$ , and  $p^i \upharpoonright \nu_i + 1 = p^{i'} \upharpoonright \nu_i + 1$ . By a standard argument concerning non-stationary support iterations (e.g., see [1, Lemma 2.2]), the sequence of direct extension  $\langle p^i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$  has an upper bound  $p^* \geq^* p$ . It follows that for every  $\mathbb{P}$ -name  $\sigma \in N$  of a element of  $H_\theta^V$ , then there exists some  $\mu < \kappa$  and  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ -name  $\sigma' \in N$  such that  $p^* \Vdash \sigma = \sigma'$ . In particular, for each such name  $\sigma$ ,  $p^*$  forces it can take at most  $\kappa$  many values in  $H_\theta^V$ , all of which are in  $N$  by elementarity of  $N$  in  $H_\theta$  and the fact  $\kappa + 1 \subseteq N$ . Let  $j_\tau : V \rightarrow M_\tau$  be the ultrapower embedding by  $U_{\kappa, \tau}$  and  $M' = j_\tau \text{``} N \prec j_\tau(H_\theta^V)$ ,  $M' \in M_\tau$ . We claim that  $j_\tau(p^*)$  forces that  $M'$  is closed under  $j(F')$ . Indeed if  $G^* \subseteq j_\tau(\mathbb{P})$  is  $M_\tau$ -generic with  $j_\tau(p^*) \in G^*$  then for each  $\mu < \kappa$ ,  $G_\mu^* = \{p \upharpoonright \mu \mid p \in G^*\}$  is a  $V$ -generic filter for  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ . For every  $y = j_\tau(\sigma)_{G^*} \in M' \cap j_\tau(H_\theta^V)$  and  $F^* = j_\tau(F')_{G^*}$ ,  $F^*(y) = j_\tau(F)(j_\tau(\sigma))_{G^*}$  is the  $G^*$ -generic interpretation of the  $j_\tau(\mathbb{P})$ -name  $j_\tau(F(\sigma))$ . As  $p^*$  forces  $\tilde{F}'(\sigma) = \sigma'$  for some  $\sigma' \in N$  which is a  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ -name for some  $\mu < \kappa$ , we see that  $j_\tau(p^*)$  forces  $j_\tau(\tilde{F}'(\sigma)) = j_\tau(\sigma')$ , where  $j_\tau(\sigma')$  is a  $j_\tau(\mathbb{P}_\mu) = \mathbb{P}_\mu$ -name. If  $q = G_\mu^*$  and  $z \in N \cap H_\theta^V$  are such that  $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\mu} \sigma' = \check{z}$  then  $j_\tau(q) = q \Vdash j_\tau(\sigma') = j_\tau(z)$ . We conclude that  $F^*(y) = z \in M'$ .

We now return to prove the statement of the lemma. It is sufficient to prove that in  $V[G]$  there exists some  $M' \subseteq H_\theta^V$  which is closed under  $F'$  and satisfies requirements (i)-(iii). Suppose otherwise, and let  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  be a condition which forces that there are no such structures  $M'$ . By a standard density argument there are  $N \prec H_\theta^V$  and  $p^* \in G$  as above, with  $p^* \geq^* p$ . It follows from the findings above that  $j_\tau(p^*)$  forces that  $M' = j_\tau \text{``} N$  is closed under  $j_\tau(F')$ . It is now clear that  $M'$  satisfies condition (ii) as  $o^{j_\tau(\mathcal{U})}(\kappa) = \tau$  and  $M' \cap j_\tau(\kappa) = \kappa$ . Condition (i) holds as well, since  $j(\mathbb{P}_\kappa)/\mathbb{P}_\kappa$  does not introduce new  $<\tau$ -sequences to  $j_\tau \text{``} N$ . Therefore, to obtain a contradiction it remains to verify  $j_\tau(p^*)$  forces  $M'$  satisfies condition (iii). For every  $A \in M' \cap j_\tau(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$  there is some  $B \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa$  such that  $A = j_\tau(B)$ . In particular,  $A \cap \kappa = B \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa \subseteq \bigcap_{i < \tau} U_{\kappa, i}$  it follows from remark 3.1 that for

every generic filter  $G^* \subseteq j_\tau(\mathbb{P})$  over  $M_\tau$ , if  $b_\kappa$  is the  $G^*$ -induced  $\mathbb{Q}_\kappa^\tau$  cofinal generic sequence, then almost contained in  $B = A \cap \kappa$ .  $\square$

To produce a model where  $\kappa$  is  $\omega$ -strongly measurable, we will force over  $V[G * H]$  to add a closed unbounded set  $C \subseteq \kappa$  which is almost contained in every set  $A \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa$ .

**Definition 3.6.** Working in a  $V$ -generic extension  $V[G * H]$  by  $G * H \subseteq \mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ , we define the forcing  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ . Conditions  $x \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  are pairs  $x = \langle c, A \rangle$  where  $c$  is a closed and bounded subset of  $\kappa$  and  $A \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa$ . A condition  $x' = \langle c', A' \rangle \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  extends  $x$  (denoted  $x' \geq x$ ) if

- (i)  $c' \cap \max(c) = c$ ,
- (ii)  $A' \subseteq A$ , and
- (iii)  $c' \setminus c \subseteq A$ .

For conditions  $x = \langle c, A \rangle \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  we will frequently denote  $c$  and  $A$  by  $c^x$  and  $A^x$  respectively. It is clear that if  $R \subseteq \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  is generic then the union  $C = \bigcup \{c^x \mid x \in R\}$  is a closed and unbounded subset of  $\kappa$  which is almost contained in every  $A \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$  is a filter, the forcing  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  is  $\kappa$ -centered and therefore satisfies  $\kappa^+$ .c.c.

**Proposition 3.7.**  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  is  $\kappa$ -distributive.

*Proof.* Since  $\kappa = \lambda^+$  in  $V[G * H]$ , we need to check that the intersection of every set  $\{D_i \mid i < \lambda\}$  of  $\lambda$ -many dense open subsets of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  is dense. Pick some regular cardinal  $\theta > \kappa^+$  such that  $\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}, \{D_i \mid i < \lambda\} \in H_\theta$ . By Lemma 3.5, for every condition  $x \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$  there exists an elementary substructure  $M \prec H_\theta$  with  $x, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}, \{D_i \mid i < \lambda\} \in M$  and which further satisfies (i)  $M^{< \lambda} \subseteq M$ ; (ii)  $\sup(M \cap \kappa) = \alpha$  has  $\delta^{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha) = \lambda$ ; and (iii)  $\alpha \in A$  and  $b_\alpha$  is almost contained in  $A$  for every  $A \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa \cap M$ . Let  $\langle \alpha_i \mid i < \lambda \rangle$  be an increasing enumeration of  $b_\alpha$ . We construct an increasing sequence of extensions  $\langle x_j \mid j < \lambda \rangle$  of  $x$ , together with an increasing subsequence  $\langle \alpha_{i_j} \mid j < \lambda \rangle$  of  $b_\alpha$  such that  $x_{j+1} \in D_j$  for every  $j < \lambda$ , and  $\{\alpha\} \cup \{\alpha_{i_j} \mid j > j^*\} \subseteq A^{x_{j^*}}$  for all  $j^* < \lambda$ . For notational simplicity, denote  $x$  by  $x_{-1}$ . Given a condition  $x_j \in M$  with a suitable  $\alpha_j$  as above, we take  $x_{j+1} \in D_{j+1}$  to be an extension of  $x_j$  with  $\max(c^{x_{j+1}}) > \alpha_{i_j}$ . Having  $A^{x_{j+1}} \in M \cap \mathcal{F}_\kappa$  we know that  $\alpha \in A^{x_{j+1}}$  and that there exist some  $i' > i_j$  such that  $\{\alpha_i \mid i > i'\} \subseteq A^{x_{j+1}}$ . Take  $i_{j+1} < \lambda$  to be the minimal such  $i' > i_j$ . It remains to show that the construction goes through at limit stages  $\delta \leq \lambda$ . Given  $\langle x_j \mid j < \delta \rangle$  we define  $i_\delta = \sup_{j < \delta} \alpha_{i_j}$ . It is clear from our construction at successor steps that  $\alpha_{i_\delta} = \sup_{j < \delta} \max(c^{x_j})$  and  $\alpha_{i_\delta} \in A^{x_j}$  for every  $j < \delta$ . It follows that the condition  $x_\delta = \langle \{\alpha_\delta\} \cup \bigcup_{j < \delta} c^{x_j}, \bigcap_{j < \delta} A^{x_j} \rangle$  satisfies the desirable conditions. Moreover if  $\delta < \lambda$  then  $x_\delta \in M$  since  $M$  is closed under its  $< \lambda$ -sequences.

Since the limit construction goes through at stage  $\lambda$  as well (although not producing a condition in  $M$ ), the limit condition  $x_\lambda$  is an extension of  $x$ , and belongs to  $\bigcap_{j < \lambda} D_j$ .  $\square$

The argument of the proof of lemma 2.4 for  $\mathbb{C}_U$  applies to  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  as well.

**Lemma 3.8.**  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  is cone homogeneous.

**Theorem 3.9.**  $\kappa$  is strongly measurable in HOD of a forcing extension by  $\mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $G(\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  be a generic filter over  $V[G * H]$ . We may identify  $G(\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa})$  with its derived generic closed and unbounded set

$$C = \bigcup \{c \mid \exists A \langle c, A \rangle \in G(\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa})\}.$$

By a standard density argument we have that for every set  $X \subseteq \kappa$  in  $V$ , if  $X \notin U_{\kappa, \tau}$  for all  $\tau \leq \lambda$  then  $|C \cap X| < \kappa$ .

We conclude that for  $X \subseteq \kappa$  in  $V$  to be stationary in  $V[G * H * C]$  it must belong to  $U_{\kappa, \tau}$  for some  $\tau \leq \lambda$ . It follows that if  $\langle S_i \mid i < \eta \rangle \subseteq V$  is a partition of  $\kappa$  into disjoint sets which are stationary in  $V[G * H * C]$  then  $|\eta| \leq \lambda$ . Moreover, since  $\kappa$  is inaccessible in  $V$  we have  $(2^\eta)^V < \kappa$ .

Finally, we know that each poset  $\mathbb{P}$ ,  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ , and  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  is forced in turn to be cone homogeneous and clearly definable using parameters from the ground model. Therefore  $\mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  is cone homogeneous, and therefore  $\text{HOD}^{V[G * H * C]} \subseteq V$ . The claim follows.  $\square$

The result in this section is weaker than the result of section 2, since the club filter is not an ultrafilter in HOD.

**Question 3.10.** Is it consistent that the club filter restricted to  $S_\omega^\lambda$  is an ultrafilter in HOD for a regular cardinal  $\lambda > \aleph_1$ ?

By the general behaviour of covering arguments, it is possible that the consistency strength of  $\omega_2$  being  $\omega$ -strongly measurable in HOD should be lower than the same property for other successor of a regular cardinal.

**Question 3.11.** What is the consistency strength of  $\omega_2$  being  $\omega$ -strongly measurable in HOD?

4. EMBEDDING  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  IN SUITABLE PRIKRY-TYPE FORCINGS

The method of the previous section can be iterated finitely many times in order to get finitely many successive  $\omega$ -strongly measurable cardinals. In order to get a global result (or even just infinitely many  $\omega$ -strongly measurables) we need to have a preservation of distributivity under iterations.

This is, in general, a difficult task. One way to obtain this is by shifting our goal from preserving distributivity into preserving the Prikry Property. There are several ways to iterate Prikry type forcings and preserve the Prikry Property as well as the closure properties of the direct extension. Thus, embedding the distributive forcings into a Prikry type forcing can be used in order to get a suitable distributivity of the iteration. Usually, in order to achieve this, some strong compactness assumption is made that enables one to embed any sufficiently distributive forcing into a Prikry type forcing.

Our goal is to embed  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  into a Prikry type forcing without increasing our large cardinal hypothesis from  $o(\kappa) = \lambda + 1$ . For this, our approach follows the finer technique, introduced by Gitik in [5].

The rest of this section is organized as follows: after reviewing the basic construction and properties of the tree Prikry-type forcings  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa,\tau}^*$ ,  $\tau \leq o^{\mathcal{M}}(\kappa)$  which construct the iteration  $\mathbb{P}$ , we introduce a filter-based variant  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa,\tau}^*$  to be forced over a generic extension  $V[G * H]$  by  $\mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  extension  $V[G * H]$  of  $V$ , where  $\kappa = \lambda^+$  is no longer measurable. Then, we use the posets  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa,\tau}^*$ ,  $\tau \leq \lambda$ . Using the filter based variant  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa,\tau}^*$ , we introduce a forcing equivalent  $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  with a dense Prikry-type sub-forcing  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  whose direct extension order is  $\lambda$ -closed. In the following Section 5, we will see that the posets  $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  can be iterated on different cardinals to construct models with many  $\omega$ -strongly measurable cardinals.

**4.1. The forcing  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa,\tau}^*$ .** We turn back to consider our forcing scenario with  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$  over  $V[G * H]$ , where  $G \subseteq \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_\kappa$  is generic over  $V$ , and  $H \subseteq \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  is generic over  $V[G]$ . Recall that  $o^{\mathcal{M}}(\kappa) = \lambda + 1$  and that each measure  $U_{\kappa,\tau}$ ,  $\tau \leq \lambda$  in  $V$ , extends in  $V[G]$  to  $U_{\kappa,\tau}(t)$ , where  $t$  is  $\tau$ -coherent. For each such  $\tau \leq \lambda$  and  $t$ , let  $j_{\kappa,\tau,t} : V[G] \rightarrow M_{\kappa,\tau,t}$  be the ultrapower embedding of  $V[G]$  by  $U_{\kappa,\tau}(t)$ .

Moving to the further collapse extension  $V[G * H]$  of  $V[G]$ ,  $\kappa$  is no longer measurable. Let  $F_{\kappa,\tau}(t)$  denote the filter generated by  $U_{\kappa,\tau}(t)$  on  $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  and  $F_{\kappa,\tau}(t)^+$  denote the poset on  $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{V[G]}$  of  $F_{\kappa,\tau}(t)$  positive sets where a set  $A$  is stronger than  $B$  if  $A \setminus B$  belongs to the dual ideal of  $F_{\kappa,\tau}(t)$ .

By further forcing with the collapse quotient

$$\mathbb{R}_\tau = \text{Coll}(\lambda, < j_{\kappa,\tau,t}(\kappa)) / H \cong \text{Coll}(\lambda, [\kappa, j_{\kappa,\tau,t}(\kappa)]),$$

over  $V[G * H]$ , producing a generic filter  $H_\tau^* \subseteq \text{Coll}(\lambda, < j_{\kappa,\tau,t}(\kappa))$ , with  $H_\tau^* \upharpoonright \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) = H$ , the elementary embedding  $j_{\kappa,\tau,t}$  extends into

$$j_{\kappa,\tau,t}^* : V[G * H] \rightarrow M_{\kappa,\tau,t}[H_\tau^*].$$

In turn, the embedding  $j_{\kappa,\tau,t}^*$  generates a  $V[G * H]$  ultrafilter  $U_{\kappa,\tau}(t)^* \subseteq F_{\kappa,\tau}(t)^+$ , which is a  $F_{\kappa,\tau}(t)^+$ -generic ultrafilter over  $V[G * H]$ , by standard arguments connecting forcing with positive sets and generic ultrapowers. Since the poset  $\mathbb{R}_\tau = \text{Coll}(\lambda, < j_{\kappa,\tau,t}(\kappa))/H$  is  $\lambda$ -closed in  $V[G * H]$ , we have that  $F_{\kappa,\tau}(t)^+$  has a  $\lambda$ -closed dense sub-forcing  $D_{\kappa,\tau,t}$ .

It would be useful for our purposes to work with a concrete description of the sets in  $D_{\kappa,\tau,t}$ . We proceed to introduce the relevant notions.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$  be a generic filter over  $V$ . For each cardinal  $\nu < \kappa$  with  $\mathcal{d}^\mu(\nu) > 0$ , let  $b_\nu$  be the  $G$ -induced generic cofinal sequence in  $\nu$ .

- (1) Recall that every finite coherent sequence  $t = \langle \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{k-1} \rangle \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$  in  $V[G]$ , has an assigned a closed unbounded set  $b_t = \cup_{i < k} (b_{\nu_i} \cup \{\nu_i\})$ . For a coherent sequence  $t$  and a finite set of ordinals  $s \in [\min(t)]^{<\omega}$ , we define  $\pi^s(t) = \min(b_t \setminus (\max(s) + 1))$ . When  $t = \langle \nu \rangle$  has a single element, we will often abuse this definition and write  $\pi^s(\nu)$  for  $\pi^s(\langle \nu \rangle)$ .

Standard arguments show that for every  $\eta$ , the function

$$\pi_\eta^s(\nu) = \min(\{\mu \in b_\nu \setminus (\max(s) + 1) \mid \mathcal{d}^\mu(\mu) = \eta\})$$

defines a Rudin-Keisler projection from  $U_{\kappa,\tau}(s)$  to  $U_{\kappa,\eta}(s)$ , for all  $\tau > \eta$ . In particular  $\pi^s = \pi_0^s : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$  is a Rudin-Keisler projection of  $U_{\kappa,\tau}(s)$  to its normal projected measure  $U_{\kappa,0}(s)$ , for every  $\tau \geq 0$ .

- (2) Let  $T \subseteq [\kappa]^{<\omega}$  a tree,  $t \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ , and  $Q : T \rightarrow \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  be a function. We say that  $Q$  is  $(T, t)$ -**suitable** if for every  $s \in T$  we have

- $Q(s) \in \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ , and
- for every  $s' \in T_s$ ,  $Q(s') \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi_0^{t \frown s}(s') = Q(s)$ .

For every  $s \in T$  we define  $Q_s$  to be the induced function on  $T_s = \{r \in [\kappa]^{<\omega} \mid s \frown r \in T\}$ , given by

$$Q_s(r) = Q(s \frown r).$$

- (3) Suppose that  $H \subseteq \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  is generic over  $V[G]$ ,  $T, Q \in V[G]$  as above, and let  $A = \text{succ}_T(\emptyset)$ . We define in  $V[G][H]$  the set  $Q$ -generic restriction of  $A$  with respect to  $H$ , to be the set  $A_Q^H = \{\nu \in A \mid Q(\nu) \in H\}$ .

Let  $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$  be generic over  $V$  and  $H \subseteq \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  be a generic over  $V[G]$ . In  $V[G]$ , for all  $\tau \leq \lambda$  and  $t \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ , the function  $\pi^t = \pi_0^t$  represents  $\kappa$  in the ultrapower by  $U_{\kappa,\tau}(t)$ . It is therefore immediate from our definition of  $D_{\kappa,\tau,t} \subseteq F_{\kappa,\tau}(t)^+$  that sets in  $D_{\kappa,\tau,t}$  are of the form as  $A_r^H = \{\nu \in A \mid r(\nu) \in H\}$  where  $A \in U_{\kappa,\tau}(t)$ , and  $r : A \rightarrow \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  satisfying  $r(\nu) \in \text{Coll}(\lambda, [\pi^t(\nu), \kappa))$  for all  $\nu \in A$ .<sup>3</sup> Moreover, we see that if  $Q$  is a  $\langle t, q \rangle$ -suitable with  $q \in H$ , and  $r$  is given by  $r(\nu) \setminus q$ , then  $A_r^H = A_Q^H$ .

<sup>3</sup>i.e.,  $\text{dom}(r(\nu)) \subseteq \lambda \times \kappa \setminus \pi^t(\nu)$ .



We use these facts to introduce a variant of Gitik's forcing  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}$  in  $V[G * H]$ . The following poset  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  will collapse cardinals up to  $\kappa^+$  to  $\lambda$  and add a cofinal Magidor sequence  $b_\kappa$  of length  $\omega^\tau$  to  $\kappa$ , which diagonalizes the filter  $\bigcap_{\tau' < \tau} U_{\kappa, \tau'}$  (i.e.,  $b_\kappa$  is almost contained in each filter set).

**Definition 4.2.** In  $V[G * H]$  the forcing  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  consists of all  $(t, T, Q) \in V[G]$  such that:

- (1)  $t$  is a  $\tau$ -coherent finite sequence of ordinals below  $\kappa$ ,
- (2)  $T$  is a tree of  $\tau$ -coherent finite sequences with stem  $t$ ,
- (3)  $Q$  is a  $(T, t)$ -suitable function,
- (4)  $Q(\emptyset) \in H$ , and
- (5) For every  $s, s' \in T$ , if  $b_{t \smallfrown s} = b_{t \smallfrown s'}$  then  $Q(s) = Q(s')$ .

As in  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}$ , we identify two conditions  $(t, T, Q), (t', T, Q) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$ , whenever  $b_t = b_{t'}$ .

The **direct extension** ordering of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  naturally extends the direct extension ordering of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}$ . Namely, for two conditions  $(t, T, Q), (t^*, T^*, Q^*)$  of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$ , we have  $(t, T, Q) \leq^* (t^*, T^*, Q^*)$  if  $(t, T) \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}}^* (t^*, T^*)$  and  $Q^*(s) \geq Q(s)$  for every  $s \in T^*$ .

We observe that the direct extension order  $\leq^*$  is  $\lambda$ -closed in  $V[G * H]$ . For this, note that it is immediate from the definition above that the partial order  $\tilde{\leq} \in V[G]$ , obtained from  $\leq^*$  by removing the requirement  $Q(\emptyset) \in H$ , belongs to  $V[G]$  and is clearly  $\lambda$ -closed in both  $V[G]$  and  $V[G * H]$  (note that the two generic extensions agree on sequences of length  $< \lambda$ ). Then, as  $\leq^*$  is equivalent to the restriction of  $\tilde{\leq}$  to a  $\lambda$ -closed set  $(H)$ , then it remains  $\lambda$ -closed in  $V[G * H]$ .

The **end-extension** ordering of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  is based the restriction of the end-extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}$  to the  $Q$ -generic restriction of  $T$  with respect to  $H$ . Namely, for a condition  $p = (t, T, Q)$ , **the only values  $\nu \in \text{succ}_T(\emptyset)$  which are allowed to be used when taking a one-point extension, are  $\nu \in \text{succ}_T(\emptyset)_Q^H$ .**<sup>4</sup> In this case, the resulting one-point extension is defined to be  $p \hat{\smallfrown} \langle \nu \rangle = (t \cup \{\nu\}, T_{\langle \nu \rangle}, Q_{\langle \nu \rangle})$ . In general, for a sequence  $r = \langle \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{k-1} \rangle \in T$ , the end extension of  $p$  by  $r$ , denoted  $p \hat{\smallfrown} r$ , is the one obtained by taking a sequence of one-point extensions by  $\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{k-1}$ , in turn.

We note that although  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  depends on the collapse generic  $H$ , and is fully defined only in  $V[G * H]$ , we still have that  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^* \subseteq V[G]$ . Moreover, dropping the requirement  $Q(\emptyset) \in H$  in the definition of conditions  $p = (t, T, Q) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  allow us to examine conditions  $(t, T, Q)$  and evaluate possible direct extensions and one-point extensions in  $V[G]$ . For example, working in  $V[G]$ , we can consider possible one-point extensions  $p \hat{\smallfrown} \langle \nu \rangle$  of a condition  $p = (t, T, Q)$  by an arbitrary  $\nu \in \text{succ}_T(\emptyset)$ . Although eventually, in  $V[G * H]$ ,

<sup>4</sup>I.e.,  $\nu \in A_Q^H$  for  $A = \text{succ}_T(\emptyset)$ .

$p$  will be a valid condition only if  $Q(\emptyset) \in H$ , and  $p \frown \langle \nu \rangle$  will form valid extensions of  $p$  only for a  $D_{\kappa, \tau, t}$ -positive set of ordinals  $\nu \in \text{succ}_T(\emptyset)$ , it is still possible to decide certain properties of such extensions on a measure one set of  $U_{\kappa, \tau}(t)$  in  $V[G]$ . This approach of arguing from  $V[G]$  about the poset  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  in  $V[G * H]$  plays a significant role in our proof below, showing that  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  satisfies the Prikry Property.

The coherency requirements in definition 4.2 allow us to obtain a natural amalgamation property, similar to the one satisfied by the  $V[G]$  poset  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Work in  $V[G]$ . Let  $p = (t, T, Q)$ , forced to be a condition in  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  by  $q = Q(\emptyset)$ , and  $A = \text{succ}_T(\emptyset)$ . For each  $\eta < \tau$ , denote*

$$A(\eta) = A \cap \{\nu \in A \mid o^\mathcal{U}(\nu) = \eta\} \in U_{\kappa, \eta}(t).$$

*Suppose that there are  $\bar{\eta} < \tau$ , a set  $A'(\bar{\eta}) \subseteq A(\bar{\eta})$  with  $A'(\bar{\eta}) \in U_{\kappa, \bar{\eta}}(t)$ , and a sequence of conditions  $\langle (t \cup \{\nu\}, T^\nu, Q^\nu) \mid \nu \in A'(\bar{\eta}) \rangle$ , such that  $(t \cup \{\nu\}, T^\nu, Q^\nu)$  is a direct extension of  $p \frown \langle \nu \rangle$  for all  $\nu \in A'(\bar{\eta})$ . Then there exists a direct extension  $p^* \geq^* p$ ,  $p^* = (t, T^*, Q^*)$ , such that the set  $\{(t \frown \langle \nu \rangle, T^\nu, Q^\nu) \mid \nu \in A'(\bar{\eta})\}$  is forced by  $Q^*(\emptyset)$  to be predense above  $p^*$ .*

*Remark 4.4.* In the proof of the lemma we make use of several construction arguments involving trees  $T$  associated to conditions  $(t, T)$  in the poset  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}$  from [4]. We list these arguments and refer the reader to [4] for proofs.

For a finite sequence  $s$ , we write  $o(s) = \max(\{o(\nu) \mid \nu \in s\})$ .

- (1) Suppose that  $(t, T)$  is a condition of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}$  and  $A'(\eta) \subseteq \text{succ}_T(\emptyset)$  belongs to  $U_{\kappa, \eta}(t)$  for some  $\eta < \tau$ . Then there exists a subtree  $T'$  of  $T$ , so that  $(t, T') \in \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}$  is a direct extension of  $(t, T)$ , and

$$\{\nu \in \text{succ}_{T'}(\emptyset) \mid o(\nu) = \eta\} \subseteq A'(\eta)$$

Similarly, for every  $s \in T$  and  $A'_s(\eta) \subseteq \text{succ}_T(s)$  which belongs to  $U_{\kappa, \eta}(t \frown s)$  then is a direct extension  $(t, T')$  of  $(t, T)$ , which only requires shrinking the tree  $T$  above  $s$  (i.e., shrinking  $T_s$ ) and in particular  $s \in T'$ , such that so that  $\{\nu \in \text{succ}_{T'}(s) \mid o(\nu) = \eta\} \subseteq A'_s(\eta)$ .

Furthermore, this construction can be naturally combined over different values  $s \in T$ . Namely given a family  $\{A'_s(\eta) \mid s \in T\}$  of sets as above, we can apply the same procedure, level by level, to the tree  $T$ , and obtain a subtree  $T' \subseteq T$  with the property that  $(t, T') \in \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}$  and for every  $s \in T'$ ,

$$\{\nu \in \text{succ}_{T'}(s) \mid o(\nu) = \eta\} \subseteq A'_s(\eta)$$

- (2) For a condition  $(t, T)$ ,  $s \in T$ , and  $\eta < \tau$ , there exists a direct extension  $(t, T') \geq^* (t, T)$ , which only requires shrinking the tree

$T$  above  $s$  such that for all  $s' \in T$  which end extends  $s$ , if there exists  $\nu \in b_{s'} \setminus b_s$  such that  $o(\nu) = \eta$ ,<sup>5</sup> then  $\nu' = \pi_\eta^{t \frown s}(s')$  (the minimal such  $\nu$ ) belongs to  $\text{succ}_{T'}(s)$ . Repeating this construction, level by level, produces a direct extension  $(t, T')$  of  $(t, T)$  satisfying that for every  $s \in T'$  and  $s' \in T'$  which extends  $s$ , then  $\nu' = \pi_\eta^{t \frown s}(s') \in \text{succ}_{T'}(s) \cap \{\nu < \kappa \mid o(\nu) = \eta\}$ .

We note that if  $s \in T'$  satisfies that  $o(\mu) < \eta$  for all  $\mu \in s$ , then for every  $\mu \in \text{succ}_{T'}(s)$  with  $o(\mu) \geq \eta$ , we have  $\pi_\eta^{t \frown s}(\mu) = \pi_\eta^t(s \frown \mu)$ , which by our assumption of  $T'$  (applied to  $s' = s \frown \langle \mu \rangle$ ) implies that  $\pi_\eta^t(s \frown \mu) \in \text{succ}_{T'}(\emptyset)$ . It follows that  $\text{succ}_{T'}(s) \cap \{\nu \mid o(\nu) = \eta\} \subseteq \text{succ}_{T'}(\emptyset) \cap \{\nu \mid o(\nu) = \eta\}$ . Since the former set belongs to  $U_{\kappa, \eta}(t \frown s)$  we conclude that  $\text{succ}_{T'}(\emptyset) \cap \{\nu \mid o(\nu) = \eta\} \in U_{\kappa, \eta}(t \frown s)$  as well. The same consideration applies to any  $s \in T'$  and  $s' \in T'$  which extends  $s$ , and for which  $o(\nu) < \eta$  for every  $\nu \in s' \setminus s$ , and implies that  $\text{succ}_{T'}(s) \cap \{\nu \mid o(\nu) = \eta\} \in U_{\kappa, \eta}(t \frown s')$ .

- (3) Let  $(t, T')$  be a condition as in the previous clause. There exists a direct extension  $(t, T^*)$  of  $(t, T')$  such that for every  $s' \in T^*$  for which  $\nu' = \pi_\eta^{t \frown s'}(s') \in b_{s'} \setminus b_t$  is defined, not only that  $\nu' \in \text{succ}_{T^*}(\emptyset) \cap \{\nu \mid o(\nu) = \eta\}$ , but further, there is some  $s'' \in T^*$  which extends  $\langle \nu' \rangle$  such that  $b_{t \frown s''} = b_{t \frown s'}$  and  $T_{s''}^* \subseteq T_{s'}^*$ . We note that the last implies  $\{(t \cup \{\nu\}, T_{\langle \nu \rangle}^*) \mid \nu \in \text{succ}_{T^*}(\emptyset), o(\nu) = \eta\}$  is predense above  $(t, T^*)$ .

We turn to the proof of Lemma 4.3.

*Proof.* (Lemma 4.3)

For  $s \in T$  define  $o(s) = \max(\{o(\nu) \mid \nu \in s\})$ , and for a tree  $T \subseteq [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ , and  $\eta$ ,  $T(< \eta) = \{s \in T \mid o(s) < \eta\}$ . Let  $p = (t, T, Q)$ ,  $A'(\bar{\eta})$ , and  $\langle (t \cup \{\nu\}, T^\nu, Q^\nu) \mid \nu \in A'(\bar{\eta}) \rangle$ , as in the statement of the Lemma. By part (1) of Remark 4.4 above, we may assume (by reducing to a suitable sub-tree) that  $\text{succ}_T(\emptyset) \cap \{\nu \mid o(\nu) = \bar{\eta}\} \subseteq A'(\bar{\eta})$ . Furthermore, by part (2) of the remark, we may further assume that  $A'(\bar{\eta}) \in U_{\kappa, \bar{\eta}}(t \frown s)$  for every  $s \in T$  with  $o(s) < \bar{\eta}$ .

Recall that for each sequence  $s \in T$ ,  $o(s) < \bar{\eta}$ , the function  $\pi^{t \frown s}(\nu)$  is a normal projection of  $U_{\kappa, \bar{\eta}}(t \frown s)$  to  $U_{\kappa, 0}(t \frown s)$ . Since  $Q^\nu(\emptyset) \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi^{t \frown s}(\nu)$  is bounded in  $\pi^{t \frown s}(\nu)$ ,<sup>6</sup> we can press down on its value, and find a subset  $A'_s(\bar{\eta}) \in U_{\kappa, \beta\eta}(t \frown s)$  of  $A'(\bar{\eta})$ , and a collapse condition  $Q'(s)$  such that  $Q^\nu(\emptyset) \upharpoonright \pi^{t \frown s}(\nu) = Q'(s)$  for all  $\nu \in A'_s(\bar{\eta})$ .

By applying the construction arguments of Remark 4.4, we may find direct extension  $(t, T')$  of  $(t, T)$  having both properties from parts (1),(2) of the

<sup>5</sup>this is equivalent to the existence of  $\mu \in s' \setminus s$  such that  $o(\mu) \geq \eta$ .

<sup>6</sup>i.e.,  $Q^\nu(\emptyset) \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi^{t \frown s}(\nu) \in V_{\pi^{t \frown s}(\nu)}$  and  $\pi^{t \frown s}(\nu)$  is an inaccessible cardinal

remark, where (1) is applied with respect to the sets  $A'_s(\bar{\eta})$ ,  $s \in T'$ ,  $o(s) < \bar{\eta}$ , given by the pressing down process above, by which  $Q'(s)$  is defined. We note that, as mentioned at the end of part (2) of the remark, for every  $s' \in T'(< \bar{\eta}) = \{s \in T' \mid o(s) < \bar{\eta}\}$  which end extends  $s$ ,

$$\text{succ}_{T'}(s) \cap \{\nu \mid o(\nu) = \bar{\eta}\} \in U_{\kappa, \bar{\eta}}(t \frown s').$$

Moreover, since

$$\text{succ}_{T'}(s) \cap \{\nu \mid o(\nu) = \bar{\eta}\} \subseteq A'_s(\bar{\eta})$$

we conclude that

$A'_s(\bar{\eta}) \in U_{\kappa, \bar{\eta}}(s')$ . It follows that  $A'_s(\bar{\eta}) \cap A'_{s'}(\bar{\eta}) \neq \emptyset$ , which in turn, implies that

$$Q'(s) = Q'(s') \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi^{t \frown s}(s')$$

(as witnessed by  $Q^\nu(\emptyset)$  for any  $\nu \in A'_s(\bar{\eta}) \cap A'_{s'}(\bar{\eta})$ ).

Finally, we form a subtree  $T''$  of  $T'$  by intersecting  $T'_{\langle \nu \rangle}$  with  $T^\nu$ , for each  $\nu \in \text{succ}_{T'}(\emptyset) \cap \{\nu \mid o(\nu) = \bar{\eta}\} \subseteq A'(\bar{\eta})$ . Moreover, by appealing to part (3) of the previous remark, we can find a direct extension  $(t, T^*)$  of  $(t, T'')$  which further satisfies that for every  $s \in T^*$  for which  $\nu_s := \pi_{\bar{\eta}}^t(s) \in b_s \setminus b_t$  is defined,  $\nu_s \in \text{succ}_{T^*}(\emptyset) \cap \{\nu \mid o(\nu) = \bar{\eta}\}$  and there exists some  $s' \in T^*$  which end extends  $\langle \nu_s \rangle$ , such that  $b_{t \frown s'} = b_{t \frown s}$  and  $T_s^* \subseteq T_{s'}^*$ . Let  $\bar{s} = s' \setminus \nu_s + 1$ . We note that since  $T^*_{\langle \nu_s \rangle} \subseteq T^{\nu_s} = \text{dom}(Q^{\nu_s})$ , then  $Q^{\nu_s}(\bar{s})$  is defined. Moreover, since  $(t \cup \{\nu_s\}, T^{\nu_s}, Q^{\nu_s})$  is assumed to be a condition in  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$ , then the value  $Q^{\nu_s}(\bar{s})$  does not depend on the choice of a sequence  $s'$  and its associated subsequence  $\bar{s} \in T^{\nu_s}$  satisfying  $b_{t \frown \langle \nu_s \rangle \frown \bar{s}} = b_{t \frown s'} = b_{t \frown s}$ .

We turn to define the function  $Q^*$  on  $T^*$ . We follow the convention from the last paragraph, where for  $s \in T^*$  with  $o(s) \geq \bar{\eta}$ , we denote  $\nu_s = \pi_{\bar{\eta}}^t(s)$ . We set

$$Q^*(s) = \begin{cases} Q^{\nu_s}(\bar{s}) & \text{if } o(s) \geq \bar{\eta}, \bar{s} \in T^{\nu_s} \text{ satisfies } b_{t \frown \langle \nu_s \rangle \frown \bar{s}} = b_{t \frown s} \\ Q'(s) & \text{if } o(s) < \bar{\eta} \end{cases}$$

We claim that  $Q^*(\emptyset)$  forces that  $(t, T^*, Q^*)$  is a condition extending  $(t, T, Q)$ . We show first that  $Q^*(\emptyset)$  forces  $(t, T^*, Q^*)$  is a condition of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$ , which requires verifying the first three conditions in the definition of the poset. Conditions (i), (ii) are clearly satisfied as  $(t, T^*) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}$ . To verify condition (iii), we need to check that for every  $s, s' \in T^*$ , if  $s'$  extends  $s$  then  $Q^*(s) = Q^*(s') \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi^{t \frown s}(s')$ . The verification breaks down to three cases.

**Case I:** If  $o(s), o(s') < \bar{\eta}$ , then  $s, s' \in T^*(< \bar{\eta})$  and, as described above, the result is an immediate consequence of the fact  $s' \in T'(< \bar{\eta})$  end extends  $s$ .

**Case II:** If  $o(s) < \bar{\eta}$  and  $o(s') \geq \bar{\eta}$  then  $\nu' = \pi_{\bar{\eta}}^{t \frown s}(s') \in A'_s(\bar{\eta})$ . As  $\pi^{t \frown s}(s') = \pi^{t \frown s}(\nu')$  and  $(t \cup \{\nu'\}, T^\nu, Q^\nu) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$ , it follows that

$$Q^*(s') \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi^{t \frown s}(s') = Q^{\nu'}(\bar{s}') \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi^{t \frown s}(s') = Q^{\nu'}(\emptyset) \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi^{t \frown s}(\nu') = Q'(s) = Q^*(s)$$

**Case III:** If  $o(s) \geq \bar{\eta}$  then there exists some  $\bar{s} \in T_{\nu_s}^* \subseteq T^{\nu_s}$  such that  $b_{t \smallfrown \langle \nu_s \rangle \smallfrown \bar{s}} = b_{t \smallfrown s}$  and  $T_s^* \subseteq T_{\langle \nu_s \rangle \smallfrown \bar{s}}^*$ . In particular,  $Q^*(s) = Q^*(\bar{s})$  and  $s' \in T_{\langle \nu_s \rangle \smallfrown \bar{s}}^* \subseteq T_{\bar{s}}^{\nu_s}$ . Since  $Q^{\nu_s}$  is  $(t \cup \{\nu_s\}, T^{\nu_s})$  coherent, we conclude that

$$Q^*(s') \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi^{t \smallfrown s}(s') = Q^{\nu_s}(s') \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi^{t \smallfrown s}(s') = Q^{\nu'}(\bar{s}) = Q^*(s)$$

This concludes the proof that  $p^* = (t, T^*, Q^*)$  satisfies the property (iii) of the definition of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$ , and thus, that  $Q^*(\emptyset) \in \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  forces it is a condition of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$ . It is immediate from its definition that  $p^*$  is a direct extension of  $p$ . Finally, our choice of the tree  $T^*$  above, obtain from  $T'$  using fact (3) from Remark 4.4 above, implies at once that  $Q^*(\emptyset)$  forces  $\{(t \smallfrown \langle \nu \rangle, T^\nu, Q^\nu) \mid \nu \in A'(\bar{\eta})\}$  to be predense above  $p^*$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.**  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  satisfies the Prikry Property.

*Proof.* Suppose otherwise. Working in  $V[G * H]$ , let  $(t, T, Q)$ ,  $\sigma$  be condition and statement of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$ , respectively, such that no direct extension of  $(t, T, Q)$  decides  $\sigma$ . Back in  $V[G]$ , let  $q \in H$  be a condition which forces this statement about  $(t, T, Q)$  and  $\sigma$ . For notational simplicity, we make the assumption that  $t = \emptyset$ . The proof for an arbitrary sequence  $t$  is similar.

Let  $A = \text{succ}_T(\emptyset)$ . We may assume that  $q \in V_{\mu_0}$ , where  $\mu_0 = \min(\{\pi_0^\emptyset(\nu) \mid \nu \in A\})$ . For each  $\nu \in A$ , we choose a condition  $q(\nu) \in \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ , extending  $q \cup Q(\nu)$ , which decides the  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  statement of whether there exists a direct extension  $p^\nu = (\langle \nu \rangle, T^\nu, Q^\nu)$  of  $p \smallfrown \langle \nu \rangle$  which decides  $\sigma$ , and if so, whether  $p^\nu$  forces  $\sigma$  or  $\neg\sigma$ . Let  $A^0$  be the sets of  $\nu \in A$  for which  $q(\nu)$  forces  $p^\nu$  exists, and “ $p^\nu \Vdash \sigma$ ”. Similarly, let  $A^1 \subseteq A$  consists of  $\nu$  such that  $q(\nu)$  forces  $p^\nu$  exists, and “ $p^\nu \Vdash \neg\sigma$ ”, and  $A^2 = A \setminus (A^0 \uplus A^1)$ . The proof splits now into three main cases:

**Case 0:** There exists some  $\bar{\eta} < \tau$  such that  $A^0 \in U_{\kappa, \bar{\eta}}(\emptyset)$ .

For each  $\nu \in A^0$  we split  $q(\nu) \geq q \cup Q(\nu)$  into  $q_{\text{low}}(\nu) = q(\nu) \upharpoonright \lambda \times \pi_0^\emptyset(\nu) \in \text{Coll}(\lambda, \pi_0^\emptyset(\nu))$  and  $q_{\text{high}}(\nu) = q(\nu) \upharpoonright \lambda \times [\pi_0^\emptyset(\nu), \kappa)$ . Since  $\pi_0^\emptyset$  projects  $U_{\kappa, \bar{\eta}}(\emptyset)$  to its normal projection  $U_{\kappa, 0}(\emptyset)$ , we can find a measure one set  $A^*(\bar{\eta}) \subseteq A^0$ ,  $A^*(\bar{\eta}) \in U_{\kappa, \bar{\eta}}(\emptyset)$ , such that for some  $q^* \in \text{Coll}(\lambda, \pi_0^\emptyset(\nu))$ ,  $q_{\text{low}}(\nu) = q^*$  for all  $\nu \in A^*(\bar{\eta})$ . By lemma 4.3 above, there exists a direct extension  $p^* = (\emptyset, T^*, Q^*)$  of  $p$ , such that the family of conditions  $\{p^\nu \mid \nu \in A^0\}$  is predense above  $p^*$ . We can update  $Q^*$  to a function  $\bar{Q}$  as in the proof of the lemma, so that  $\bar{Q}(\nu) = Q^*(\nu) \cup q_{\text{high}}(\nu)$  for all  $\nu \in A^*(\bar{\eta})$ . Let  $\bar{p} = (\emptyset, T^*, \bar{Q})$ . It is straightforward to verify from our construction that  $q^*$  forces in  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  that  $\bar{p}$  forces  $\sigma$ , which contradicts the fact that  $q^* \geq q$  and our assumption of  $q$ .

**Case 1:** There exists some  $\bar{\eta} < \tau$  such that  $A^1 \in U_{\kappa, \bar{\eta}}(\emptyset)$ .

The argument for this case is similar to the previous one, and leads to an extension  $q^* \geq q$  in  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ , and a direct extension  $\bar{p} \geq^* p$ , such that  $q^*$  forces  $\bar{p} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*} \neg \sigma$ . Contradiction.

**Case 2:**  $A^2 \in \bigcap_{\eta < \tau} U_{\kappa, \eta}(\emptyset)$ .

Building on the notation of case 0 above, let  $A^2(0) \in U_{\kappa, 0}(\emptyset)$  be a subset of  $A^2$  and  $q_0^* \in \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  such that  $q_{\text{low}}(\nu) = q_0^*$  for all  $\nu \in A^2(0)$ . Let  $p' = (\emptyset, T', Q')$  be a direct extension of  $p$  such that  $Q'(\nu) = Q(\nu) \cup q_{\text{high}}(\nu)$ , for all  $\nu \in A^2(0)$ . Let  $\bar{A}^2$  be the set of all  $\nu \in A^2$  for which the value  $q_0^*$  forces there is no direct extension  $p' \geq^* p' \hat{\wedge} \nu$  which decides  $\sigma$ . Note that  $\bar{A}^2$  must also belong to  $\bigcap_{\eta < \tau} U_{\kappa, \eta}(\emptyset)$ , since otherwise, there exists some  $\eta < \tau$  and a set  $A^*(\eta) \subseteq \bar{A}^2$  such that there is some  $q^*(\nu) \geq q_0^*$ , which forces some direct extension of  $p' \hat{\wedge} \nu$  to decide  $\sigma$ . This, in turn would allow us to repeat the construction of one of the previous cases 0/1, to show that there is some direct extension  $q^* \geq^* q_0^*$  which forces some direct extension  $p^*$  of  $p'$  to force either  $\sigma$  or  $\neg \sigma$ , contradicting the choice of  $q_0^*$ .

Denoting  $p' = (\emptyset, T', Q')$  by  $p^0$ , and  $q$  by  $q^0$ , let  $q^1 = q_0^*$  and  $p^1 \geq^* p^0$  be the direct extension obtained by shrinking  $T$  to points in  $\bar{A}^2$ . Deonte  $p^1 = (\emptyset, T^1, Q^1)$ . It follows from the construction that  $q^1$  forces that for all  $\nu \in \text{succ}_{T^1}(\emptyset)$ ,  $p^1 \hat{\wedge} \langle \nu \rangle$  does not have a direct extension in  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  which decides  $\sigma$ .

Next, we move up to the second level of the tree. For each  $\mu \in \text{succ}_{T^1}(\emptyset)$ , we can repeat the above analysis with respect to  $q(\mu) = q^1 \cup Q^1(\mu)$  and  $p^1 \hat{\wedge} \mu = (\langle \mu \rangle, T_{\langle \mu \rangle}^1, Q_{\langle \mu \rangle}^1)$ . We now split  $A = \text{succ}_{T^1}(\emptyset)$  again into three sets,  $A^0, A^1, A^2$  based on whether the analysis for  $q(\mu)$ ,  $p^1 \hat{\wedge} \mu$ , has produced an extension  $q^*(\mu)$  which forces some direct extension  $\bar{p}^1 \geq^* p^1$  to decide  $\sigma$  ( $A^0$  and  $A^1$  for forcing  $\sigma$  and  $\neg \sigma$ , respectively), or not. The construction above shows that if  $A^0$  or  $A^1$  belong to  $U_{\kappa, \eta}(\emptyset)$  for some  $\eta < \tau$  then there exists some  $q^* \geq q^1$  which forces that  $p^1$  has a direct extension which decides  $\sigma$ . Contradicting our assumptions. It follows that  $A^2 \in \bigcap_{\eta < \tau} U_{\kappa, \eta}(\emptyset)$ . Repeating the construction of Case 2 for every  $\mu \in A^2$ , we can find a condition  $q^*(\mu) \geq q^1(\mu)$ ,  $q^*(\mu) \in \text{Coll}(\lambda, \pi_0^\emptyset(\mu))$ , and a direct extension  $p_\nu^* = (\langle \mu \rangle, T_\mu^*, Q_\mu^1)$  of  $p^1 \hat{\wedge} \nu$ , such that  $q^*(\mu)$  forces there is no direct extension of  $p_\mu^* \hat{\wedge} \nu$  which decides  $\sigma$ , for any  $\nu \in \text{succ}_{T_\mu^*}(\emptyset)$ . Again, by the argument of Case 2 above, we can press down on  $q^*(\mu)$  to find a single extension  $q^2$  of  $q^1$  and a direct extension  $p^2 = (\emptyset, T^2, Q^2)$  of  $p^1$ , such that  $q^2$  forces that for any pair  $\langle \nu_0, \nu_1 \rangle \in T^2$ ,  $p_{\langle \nu_0, \nu_1 \rangle}^2$  does not have a direct extension which decides  $\sigma$ .

The construction is now repeated level by level, for all  $n < \omega$ . This produces sequences of extensions  $q = q^0 \leq q^1 \leq \dots \leq q^n \dots$  in  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  and  $p = p^0 \leq^* p^1 \leq^* \dots \leq^* p^n \dots$  in  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$ , such that for each  $n < \omega$ , writing

$p^n = (\emptyset, T^n, Q^n)$ , we have that  $q^n$  forces that for all sequences  $s \in T^n$  of length  $|s| \leq n$ ,  $p^n \frown s$  does not have a direct extension which decides  $\sigma$ . Finally, let  $q^\omega \in \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  be an union of all  $q^n$ ,  $n < \omega$ , and  $p^* \in \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$  be a direct extension of  $p^n$  for all  $n < \omega$ . Writing  $p^* = (\emptyset, T^*, Q^*)$ , it follows from the construction that  $p^\omega$  forces that for no  $s \in T^*$  such that  $p^* \frown s$  has a direct extension which decides  $\sigma$ . This is of course an absurd.  $\square$

We conclude that  $(\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*, \leq, \leq^*)$  is a Prikry type forcing whose direct extension order  $\leq^*$  is  $\lambda$ -closed. In particular, it does not add new bounded subsets to  $\tau$ . Moreover, like  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa}^\tau$ ,  $(\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*, \leq)$  introduces a generic club  $b_\kappa^\tau \subseteq \kappa$  of order-type  $\text{ot}(b_\kappa^\tau) = \omega^\tau$ . Finally, since  $U_{\kappa, \tau'} \subseteq F_{\kappa, \tau'}(t)$  is clearly contained in  $D_{\kappa, \tau', t}$  for every coherent sequence  $t$ , it follows from a standard density argument that if  $b_\kappa^\tau$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \tau}^*$ -generic sequence over  $V[G * H]$ , then for every  $V$ -set  $A \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa$  there exists some  $\beta < \kappa$  such that  $b_\kappa^\tau \setminus \beta \subseteq A$ .

**4.2. The forcing  $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ .** Our goal now is to introduce a poset  $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  which is equivalent to  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ , and further has a dense subforcing  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$ , which is of Prikry-type, and its direct extension order is  $\lambda$ -closed.

We first introduce the poset  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$ , obtained from  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^*$  and  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ .

Recall that  $G * H$  is  $V$  generic for  $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{M} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ . Working in  $V[G * H]$  we consider the two-step iterations  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^* * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  consisting of conditions  $(q, \underline{x})$  so that  $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^*} \underline{x} \in \check{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ . Note that when forcing with  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  over a  $V[G * H]$ -generic extension by  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^*$ , we require that the bounded closed sets  $c \subseteq \kappa$  in the conditions  $x = \langle c, A \rangle \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  are actually ground model sets, from  $V[G * H]$ . In particular, for every condition  $(q, \underline{x})$  there exists an extension  $q' \geq q$  and a pair  $x \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  so that  $q' \Vdash x = \check{x}$ .

Let  $b_\kappa^\lambda \subseteq \kappa$  be a  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^*$  generic club in  $\kappa$ . We know that  $\text{ot}(b_\kappa^\lambda) = \lambda$  and that  $b_\kappa^\lambda$  is almost contained in every set  $A \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa$ . Working in a  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^*$  generic extension  $V[G * H * b_\kappa^\lambda]$  of  $V[G * H]$  we see that for every condition  $x = \langle c, A \rangle$  in  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  there exists some  $\beta \in A \setminus (\max c + 1)$  such that  $x' = \langle c', A \rangle$ , with  $c' = c \cup \{\beta\}$ , extends  $x$  and satisfies that  $b_\kappa^\lambda \setminus (\max c' + 1) \subseteq A$ .

**Definition 4.6** ( $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^\lambda$ ).

Working in a  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^*$  generic extension  $V[G * H * b_\kappa^\lambda]$  of  $V[G * H]$ , let  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^\lambda$  denote the subset of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ , consisting of conditions  $x' = \langle c', A' \rangle$  so that  $\max(c') \in b_\kappa^\lambda$ , and  $b_\kappa^\lambda \setminus (\max(c') + 1) \subseteq A'$ .

It follows from the above that  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^\lambda$  is a dense subset of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ . Since  $b_\kappa^\lambda \subseteq \kappa$  is closed of order-type  $\lambda = \text{cf}(\kappa)^{V[G * H * b_\kappa^\lambda]}$ , and no bounded subsets of  $\kappa$  are introduced by  $b_\kappa^\lambda$ , it follows that the restriction of the  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  order to  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^\lambda$  is  $\lambda$ -closed.

With this observation, we move back to  $V[G * H]$  to define the poset  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$ .

**Definition 4.7** ( $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$ ).

Let  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  be the two step iteration  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^* = \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^* * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^\lambda$ . We define the direct extension ordering  $\leq^*$  of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  to be the extension of the usual direct extension order of  $\mathbb{Q}_\kappa^\lambda$  with the standard order on the second  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^\lambda$  component.

It follows from the above that  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  is a dense sub-forcing of  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^* * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  which satisfies the Prikry property, and its direct extension order is  $\lambda$ -closed. Note that for every dense subset  $D$  of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  and a condition  $(q, \check{x}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  there exists a direct extension  $(q^*, \check{x}^*) \geq^* (q, \check{x})$  such that  $q^* \Vdash \check{x}^* \in \check{D}$ .

Similarly, it is clear that the set of conditions  $(q', \check{x}') \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$ , for which the second component is a canonical name  $\check{x}'$  of a condition  $x' \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ , is dense in  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$ . The map  $(q', \check{x}') \mapsto x'$  defined on this dense set naturally induces a forcing projection  $\pi$  from  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  to the boolean completion of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ .

Next, we follow Gitik's machinery from [6], to form a Prikry-type forcing notion  $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  which is equivalent to  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ , from  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$ .

**Definition 4.8** ( $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ ).

We define a Prikry-type forcing notion  $(\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}, \leq', \leq^*)$  as follows.

- $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa} = \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$ ,
- the partial ordering  $\leq'$  is defined by  $p' \geq' p$  if  $\pi(p') \geq \pi(p)$ , and
- $\leq^*$  is taken to be the same direct extension order of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$

It is immediate from the definition that  $(\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}, \leq')$  is equivalent as a forcing notion to  $(\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}, \leq)$  and that the direct extension order  $\leq^*$  of  $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  is  $\lambda$ -closed.

To show that  $(\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}, \leq', \leq^*)$  satisfies the Prikry Property, it suffices to verify that for every statement  $\sigma$  in the forcing language of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$  and every condition  $p \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ , there is a direct extension  $p^* \geq^* p$  such that  $\pi(p^*)$  decides  $\sigma$ . Indeed, defining  $D_0 = \{p' \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^* \mid \pi(p') \Vdash \sigma\}$  and  $D_1 = \{p' \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^* \mid \pi(p') \Vdash \neg\sigma\}$ , it is clear that  $D_0 \cup D_1$  is dense in  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  and that a generic filter  $G^*$  of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  will have a nontrivial intersection with exactly one of the two sets. Let  $\sigma^* : G^* \cap D_0 \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $\sigma^*$  is a statement for the forcing language of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$ . Moreover, it is clear from our construction that for a condition  $p^* \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  which decides  $\sigma^*$  we have that  $p^* \Vdash \sigma^*$  implies that  $\pi(p^*) \Vdash \sigma$ , and  $p^* \Vdash \neg\sigma^*$  implies that  $\pi(p^*) \Vdash \neg\sigma$ . Since  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  satisfies the Prikry Property every condition  $p$  has a direct extension  $p^* \geq^* p$  which decides  $\sigma^*$ .

We note that similarly to  $\mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ , the forcing  $\mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  is cone homogeneous. In most applications of homogeneity, moving to an equivalent forcing does not change the main properties of its iterations. However, in order to obtain a cone homogeneous iteration of Prikry type posets of the form  $\mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ , following the arguments of section 1.1.1, we would like to verify that this posets meets the assumptions of Lemma 1.8.



**Lemma 4.9.** *Denote  $\mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  by  $\mathbb{W}$ , and its regular and direct extension orders by  $\leq_{\mathbb{W}}$  and  $\leq_{\mathbb{W}}^*$  respectively.*

*For every  $w_0, w_1 \in \mathbb{W}$  there are direct extensions  $w_0^*, w_1^*$  of  $w_0, w_1$  respectively, and a cone isomorphism  $\varphi: \mathbb{W}/w_0^* \rightarrow \mathbb{W}/w_1^*$  which respects the direct extension order  $\leq_{\mathbb{W}}^*$ .*

We observe that assuming the coherent sequence  $\mathcal{U}$  (by which  $\mathbb{W} = \mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^*$  is defined) is ordinal definable in  $V$ , then the statement of the lemma guarantees that  $\mathbb{W}$  satisfies the requirements of the iterated poset  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  from lemma 1.8 above. We now turn to the proof.

*Proof.* Let  $w_0 = \langle p_0, c_0, \langle q_0, x_0 \rangle \rangle$  and  $w_1 = \langle p_1, c_1, \langle q_1, x_1 \rangle \rangle$ , where  $q_0 = \langle t_0, T_0, Q_0 \rangle$  and  $q_1 = \langle t_1, T_1, Q_1 \rangle$  belong to  $\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^*$ .

By [1, Theorem 4.6] applied to the iteration  $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}$ , there are direct extensions  $\langle p_0^*, (t_0, T) \rangle$  of  $\langle p_0, (t_0, T_0) \rangle$ , and  $\langle p_1^*, (t_1, T) \rangle$  of  $\langle p_1, (t_1, T_1) \rangle$ , with a common top tree  $T$ , and a cone isomorphism  $\psi$  from the cones of  $\langle p_0^*, (t_0, T) \rangle$  and  $\langle p_1^*, (t_1, T) \rangle$ . We record here that the map  $\psi$  constructed in the proof of [1, Theorem 4.6] satisfies two additional properties: First, it does not make any changes to the  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$ -trees  $S$  appearing in conditions  $p \frown \langle s, S \rangle \in \mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}$ . Second, it respects the direct extension order of  $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}$ .

Next, we move to examine the Levy collapse condition and suitable functions in  $\mathbb{W}$  conditions. Since the collapsing forcing  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  is evaluated in the generic extension by  $\mathbb{P}$ ,  $\psi$  naturally acts also on the  $\mathbb{P}$ -names  $c_0$  and  $Q_0$  appearing in  $w_0$ . As usual, we denote the resulting names by  $c_0^\psi$  and  $Q_0^\psi$ . Let  $\tau_\emptyset$  be a  $\mathbb{P}$ -name of an automorphism of the Levy collapse poset which maps an extension  $c'_0$  of  $c_0^\psi$  to an extension  $c'_1$  of  $c_1$ , and define  $c_0^* = (c'_0)^{\psi^{-1}}$ . Note that since  $c_i$  forces  $Q_i(\emptyset) \in \underline{H}$ , we may extend  $Q_0(\emptyset), Q_1(\emptyset)$  to  $Q_0^*(\emptyset), Q_1^*(\emptyset)$  so that  $c_i = Q_i^*(\emptyset)$  for  $i = 0, 1$ . Next, for each  $s \in T$  and  $i = 0, 1$ , define  $\text{dom}_1(Q_i(s)) = \{\alpha < \kappa \mid Q_i(s) \upharpoonright \lambda \times \{\alpha\} \neq \emptyset\}$  and  $\rho_s^i = \sup(\text{dom}_1(Q_i(s)))$ . Set  $\rho_s = \max(\rho_s^0, \rho_s^1)$ . By moving to a direct extension tree  $T^*$  of  $T$ , we may assume that for every  $s \in T^*$  and  $\nu \in \text{succ}_{T^*}(s)$ ,  $\pi_0^{t \frown s i}(\nu) > \rho_s$  for both  $i = 0, 1$ . This leaves enough “room” between conditions  $Q_i(s), Q_i(s \frown \langle \nu \rangle)$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ , to define automorphisms taking an extension of  $Q_0^*(s)$  to an extension  $Q_1^*(s)$  of  $Q_1(s)$ , without conflicting with  $Q_i(s \frown \langle \nu \rangle)$   $i = 0, 1$ . We can therefore define by an induction on the lexicographic order  $<_{lex}$  on  $T^*$  (where two sequences are compared from their top elements down) automorphisms  $\tau_s$ ,  $s \in T^*$ , of  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ , and collapse extensions  $Q_i^*(s) \geq Q_i(s)$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ , with the following properties: For all  $s \in T^*$ ,

- $\tau_s$  is supported in  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \rho_s)$ ,<sup>7</sup>
- $\tau_s((Q_0^*)^\psi(s)) = Q_1^*(s)$ ,
- If  $s' \in T_s^*$  then  $\tau_{s'} \upharpoonright \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \pi_0^{t \frown s}(s)) = \tau_s$ ,
- If  $\bar{s} \in T^*$  and  $b_{t_0 \frown s} = b_{t_0 \frown \bar{s}}$  then  $\tau_s = \tau_{\bar{s}}$ .

<sup>7</sup>I.e., for every  $p \in \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ , if  $p = p_0 \cup p_1$  where  $p_0 = p \upharpoonright \lambda \times \rho_s$ , then  $\tau_s(p) = \tau_s(p_0) \cup p_1$ .

Let  $\bar{\mathbb{W}} = \mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^*$  be the initial forcing iteration of  $\mathbb{W} = \mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^* = \mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * (\mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}^* * \mathbb{C}_\kappa^\lambda)$ . Let  $w_0 \upharpoonright \bar{\mathbb{W}} = \langle p_0, c_0, \langle t_0, T_0, Q_0 \rangle \rangle$  and  $w_1 \upharpoonright \bar{\mathbb{W}} = \langle p_1, c_1, \langle t_1, T_1, Q_1 \rangle \rangle$  be the restrictions of  $w_0, w_1$  to  $\bar{\mathbb{W}}$  and consider their direct extensions  $\bar{w}_0, \bar{w}_1$  in  $\bar{\mathbb{W}}$ , defined by  $\bar{w}_i = \langle p_0^*, c_0^*, \langle t_0, T^*, Q_0^* \rangle \rangle$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ .

Our choice of cone isomorphism  $\psi$  for  $\mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}_{\kappa, \lambda}$  together with the collection of Levy-Collapse automorphisms  $\vec{\tau} = \{\tau_s\}_{s \in T^*}$ , naturally induce a function  $\bar{\varphi}$  on the cone  $\bar{\mathbb{W}}/\bar{w}_0$ , defined as follows.

For a condition  $\bar{w} = \langle p, c, \langle s, S, Q \rangle \rangle$ , we set  $\bar{\varphi}(\bar{w}) = \langle p', c', \langle s', S, Q' \rangle \rangle$  to be defined by

$$\langle p', \langle s', S \rangle \rangle = \psi(\langle p', \langle s, S \rangle \rangle), \quad c' = \tau_s(c^\psi), \quad Q'(s') = \tau_{s \frown s'}(Q(s'))$$

We claim that  $\langle p', c', \langle s', S, Q' \rangle \rangle$  is a condition in  $\bar{\mathbb{W}}$ . First, it immediate from our choice of  $p, c$  that  $\langle p', c' \rangle \in \mathbb{P} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ . It therefore remains to verify that  $\langle s', S, Q' \rangle$  is (forced by  $\langle p', c' \rangle$ ) to be a condition in  $\mathbb{Q}_{\lambda, < \kappa}^*$ . The fact that  $\langle s', S, Q' \rangle$  satisfies requirements (1) and (2) of definition 4.2 is immediate. To verify the coherency requirement (3) of definition 4.2, we note that  $Q'$  is forced by  $p'$  to be  $(s, S)$ -suitable. Indeed, it follow from our choice of  $\tau_{s'}$  that its support is bounded below the projection  $\pi_0^{s \frown s'}(\nu)$ , for any  $\nu \in \text{succ}_{T^*}(s')$ . Property (4) follows from the fact that the statement “ $c \Vdash_{\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)} Q(\emptyset) \in \underline{H}$ ” is forced by  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ , which implies that  $\tau_\emptyset(c^\psi) \Vdash \tau_\emptyset(Q(\emptyset)^\psi) \in \tau_\emptyset(\underline{H}^\psi)$  is forced by  $p'$ . This, combined with definition of  $c'$  and  $Q'$ , and the fact that the name  $\underline{H}$  is a fixed point of both  $\tau_\emptyset$  and  $\psi$ , guarantees requirement (4) is satisfied. Next, the fact  $(s', S, Q')$  satisfies requirement (5) of definition 4.2 follows from a similar argument to the previous one, plus the fact  $(s, S, Q)$  satisfies property (5) together with the last property listed above for  $\{\tau_s\}_{s \in T}$ . Having verified that  $\langle p', c', \langle s', S, Q' \rangle \rangle$  is a condition in  $\bar{\mathbb{W}}$  it is straightforward to check that it extends  $\bar{w}_1$  and thus  $\bar{\varphi}: \bar{\mathbb{W}}/\bar{w}_0 \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{W}}/\bar{w}_1$  is a well defined function. In order to show that it is cone isomorphism we need to show that it preserves order.

Let us remark that the automorphism  $\psi$  modifies the values of  $b_s$  for  $s \in T^*$  by changing the value of their initial segments. Since those initial segments do not affect the definition of  $\tau_{b_s}$ , we will ignore it and write always  $b_s$  instead  $b_s^\psi$ .

Let  $\bar{w}_1 = \langle p_1, c_1, \langle s_1, S_1, Q_1 \rangle \rangle, \bar{w}_2 = \langle p_2, c_2, \langle s_2, S_2, Q_2 \rangle \rangle$  be pair of conditions in the cone above  $\bar{w}_0$ . We need to show that  $\bar{\varphi}(\bar{w}_1) \leq \bar{\varphi}(\bar{w}_2)$  if and only if  $\bar{w}_1 \leq \bar{w}_2$ .

For direct extensions, this is clear, as the tree  $S_1$  does not move under  $\bar{\varphi}$ . Let us assume that  $\bar{w}_2$  is a one-point extension of  $\bar{w}_1$ , by the point  $\langle \nu \rangle$ . By moving to a dense subset,  $c_2 \geq c_1, Q_1(\langle \nu \rangle)$  and  $b_{s_2} = b_{s_1 \frown \langle \nu \rangle}$ . Let us apply  $\bar{\varphi}$  on  $\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2$ . The trees  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  do not move, so we must verify that  $\langle \nu \rangle$  is still a legitimate choice for an one-point extension of  $\bar{\varphi}(\bar{w}_1)$ . Indeed,  $\tau_{b_{s_2}}(c_2)$  is (by the definition of  $\tau_{b_{s_2}}$ ) stronger than  $\tau_{\langle \nu \rangle}(Q_1(\langle \nu \rangle))$ . Thus, we conclude

that  $\bar{\varphi}(\bar{w}_2)$  is an one-point extension of  $\bar{\varphi}(\bar{w}_1)$  by  $\langle \nu \rangle$ . The other direction is the same.

Finally, to obtain a desirable cone isomorphism  $\varphi$  for  $\mathbb{W} = \bar{\mathbb{W}} * \mathbb{C}_\kappa^\lambda$ , it remains to extend  $\bar{\varphi}$  to the final additional components  $\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1$  of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^\lambda$ . The proof Lemma 3.8 shows that there are  $\bar{\mathbb{W}}$ -names  $\underline{y}'_0, \underline{y}'_1$  of extensions of  $\underline{x}_0^{\bar{\varphi}}, \underline{x}_1^{\bar{\varphi}}$  respectively, and a name of a cone isomorphism  $\sigma: \mathbb{C}_\kappa^\lambda/\underline{y}'_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_\kappa^\lambda/\underline{y}'_1$ . Accordingly, we set  $\underline{y}_0 = (\underline{y}'_0)^{\bar{\varphi}^{-1}}$  and define direct extensions  $w_0^* \geq^* w_0, w_1^* \geq^* w_1$  and a map  $\varphi: \mathbb{W}/w_0^* \rightarrow \mathbb{W}/w_1^*$  by  $w_i^* = \bar{w}_i \hat{\smallfrown} \underline{y}_i$  and

$$\varphi(\langle \bar{w}, \underline{y} \rangle) = \langle \bar{\varphi}(\bar{w}), \sigma(\underline{y}^{\bar{\varphi}}) \rangle.$$

The fact  $w_0^*, w_1^*, \varphi$  satisfy the result stated in the lemma is an immediate consequence of the fact  $\bar{w}_0, \bar{w}_1, \bar{\varphi}$  satisfy similar properties for  $\bar{\mathbb{W}}$  and our choice of  $\varphi, \underline{y}_0, \underline{y}_1$ .  $\square$

5. MANY  $\omega$ -STRONGLY MEASURABLE CARDINALS

Suppose that  $\mathcal{U}$  is a coherent sequence of normal measures so that  $\lambda < \kappa$  are regular cardinals and  $o^{\mathcal{U}}(\kappa) = \lambda + 1$  and that the first measure in  $\mathcal{U}$  is on a cardinal strictly greater than  $\lambda$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{U}}$  be the nonstationary support iteration of Prikry/Magidor forcing from [1], and  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^{\mathcal{U}}$  be the  $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{U}} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ -name of the associated diagonalizing club forcing for the filter  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}} = \bigcap_{\tau \leq \lambda} U_{\kappa, \lambda}$  on  $\kappa$ . As shown in the previous section, there exists a  $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{U}} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$ -name of a Prikry-type forcing notion  $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^{\mathcal{U}}$ , which is equivalent to  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ , and its direct extension order is  $\lambda$ -closed.

**Definition 5.1.** Denote the poset  $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{U}} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \bar{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}^{\mathcal{U}}$  by  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{U}]$ .

We have shown in the previous section that  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{U}]$  is a cone homogeneous poset which is equivalent as a forcing notion to the iteration  $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{U}} * \text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa) * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_\kappa}$ . By theorem 3.9 we conclude that  $\kappa$  is strongly measurable in HOD of a generic extension by  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{U}]$ .

In what follows, we would like to view  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{U}]$  as a Prikry-type forcing whose direct extension order is  $\lambda$ -closed. This is easily possible since  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{U}]$  is an iteration of three posets, each of which can be seen as a Prikry-forcing whose direct extension order is  $\lambda$ -closed (for  $\text{Coll}(\lambda, < \kappa)$  we identify the direct extension order with the standard order of the poset).

We finally turn to prove our main result.

*Proof.* (Theorem 1.3)

To simplify our arguments, we work over a minimal Mitchell model  $V = L[\mathcal{U}]$  with a coherent sequence of measures  $\mathcal{U}$  witnessing the assumed large cardinal assumption. Therefore  $\theta$  is the least inaccessible cardinal in  $V$  for which  $\{o(\kappa) \mid \kappa < \theta\}$  is unbounded in  $\theta$ . We note that all normal measures in this model appear on the main sequence  $\mathcal{U}$ , in particular,  $o(\kappa) = o^{\mathcal{U}}(\kappa)$  for all  $\kappa$ . We also record here that by Mitchell Covering Theorem and the fact  $\theta$  is not measurable, there is no generic extension of  $V = L[\mathcal{U}]$  which preserves the cardinals below  $\theta$  and changes the cofinality of  $\theta$ . Similarly, the Mitchell Covering Theorem guarantee that generic extensions of  $V = L[\mathcal{U}]$  satisfy the Weak Covering Lemma with respect to  $V$ , which implies that successors of singular cardinals cannot be collapsed.

Let  $\langle \kappa_\alpha \mid \alpha < \theta \rangle$  be an increasing sequence of cardinals below  $\theta$ , which satisfies the following conditions:

- (1)  $\kappa_0 = \omega$ ,  $\kappa_1$  is the least measurable,
- (2) for a limit ordinal  $\alpha$ ,  $\kappa_\alpha = (\sup_{\beta < \alpha} \kappa_\beta)^+$ ,
- (3) for a successor ordinal  $\alpha$  let  $\kappa_{\alpha+1}$  is the least cardinal such that  $o^{\mathcal{U}^\alpha}(\kappa_{\alpha+1}) = \kappa_\alpha + 1$ , for the coherent sequence of measures  $\mathcal{U}^\alpha = \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright_{(\kappa_\alpha, \kappa_{\alpha+1}]}$ . In particular, we have that the first measure of  $\mathcal{U}^\alpha$  has critical point  $> \kappa_\alpha$ .

We define by induction on  $\alpha < \theta$  a Magidor iteration  $\mathbb{P} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \theta \rangle$  of Prikry type forcings. Our description of the Magidor style iteration follows Gitik's handbook chapter ([6]). We recall that conditions are sequence of the form  $\langle q_\alpha \mid \alpha < \theta \rangle$  where only finitely many coordinates are not a direct extension of the weakest condition  $0_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}$ . Let  $\mathbb{Q}_0$  be  $\text{Coll}(\omega, < \kappa_1) * \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{F}_{\kappa_1}}^*$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa_1}$  is the filter generated from the normal measure on  $\kappa_1$ . For  $\alpha > 0$ , we define  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha = \mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{U}^\alpha]$ .

The coherent sequence  $\mathcal{U}^\alpha$  from  $L[\mathcal{U}]$  uniquely extends in a generic extension by  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ , and can therefore be used to force with  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{U}^\alpha]$ . This is because as  $L[\mathcal{U}]$  satisfies the GCH, we have that  $|\mathbb{P}_\alpha| < \kappa_\alpha$  and all measures of  $\mathcal{U}^\alpha$  are assumed to have critical points strictly above  $\kappa_\alpha$ . It is clear from our definitions that  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  satisfies the Prikry Property, that its direct extension order is  $\kappa_\alpha$ -closed, and that  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  is forced to be cone homogeneous.

By the general theory of Magidor iteration of Prikry type posets, the iteration  $\mathbb{P}_\theta/\mathbb{P}_1$  also satisfy the Prikry Property. Moreover, for every  $\alpha < \theta$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_\theta/\mathbb{P}_\alpha$  has the Prikry Property in the generic extension by  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ , and its direct extension order is  $\kappa_\alpha$ -closed (see [6] for details).

**Claim 5.2.** *Every bounded subset of  $\kappa_\alpha$  is introduced by  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ . Moreover, in the generic extension by  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ ,  $\kappa_\alpha$  is a regular cardinal for all  $\alpha < \theta$ .*

*Proof.* The first assertion is an immediate consequence of the fact  $\mathbb{P}_\theta/\mathbb{P}_\alpha$  satisfies the Prikry Property and its direct extension order is  $\kappa_\alpha$  closed. It follows that in order to show that all cardinal  $\kappa_\alpha$  remain regular in a generic extension by  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , it suffices to show that  $\kappa_\alpha$  remains regular in the intermediate generic extension by  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ . We prove the last assertion by induction on  $\alpha < \theta$ .

For a limit ordinal  $\alpha$ , the assertion follows from the fact that the generic extension by  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$  satisfies the Weak Covering property with respect to the ground model  $V = L[\mathcal{U}]$ . Indeed,  $\kappa_\alpha = (\sup_{\beta < \alpha} \kappa_\beta)^+$  cannot be collapsed without collapsing a tail of the cardinals  $\kappa_\beta$ ,  $\beta < \alpha$ , which would contradict our inductive assumption.

Suppose now that  $\alpha$  is a successor ordinal. Then the forcing  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$  naturally breaks into two parts  $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \cong \mathbb{P}_{\alpha-1} * \mathbb{Q}_{\alpha-1}$ . The size of  $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha-1}$  is  $(2^{\kappa_{\alpha-1}})^V < \kappa_\alpha$ , and cannot singularize  $\kappa_\alpha$ . The second poset  $\mathbb{Q}_{\alpha-1}$  does not collapse  $\kappa_\alpha$  by the Proposition 3.7. Note that in order to apply the result of Proposition 3.7 we use our inductive hypothesis that  $\kappa_{\alpha-1}$  remain regular in a generic extension by  $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha-1}$ .  $\square$

**Claim 5.3.** *In the generic extension  $\theta$  is regular.*

*Proof.* This follows from the Mitchell Covering Theorem and the smallness assumption of  $\theta$ , as was mentioned at the beginning of the proof.  $\square$

**Claim 5.4.**  *$\mathbb{P}$  is cone homogeneous.*

*Proof.* It suffices to verify conditions (i),(ii) of Lemma 1.8 hold for every  $\alpha < \kappa$ . (i) holds for  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha = \mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{U} \upharpoonright_{(\kappa_\alpha, \kappa_{\alpha+1}]}]$  since  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}^*$  are clearly definable in  $V = L[\mathcal{U}]$  from  $\mathcal{U}$ ,  $\kappa_\alpha$ , and  $\kappa_{\alpha+1}$ . The fact  $(\mathbb{Q}_\alpha, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}, \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}^*)$  is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.9.  $\square$

Let  $G_\theta \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\theta$  be a generic filter over  $V$ . We conclude that  $\text{HOD}^{V[G_\theta]} \subseteq V$ .<sup>8</sup> Moreover, for each  $\alpha < \kappa$ , the  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{U}^\alpha]$  generic filter induced by  $G_\theta$  guarantees that  $\kappa_{\alpha+1} = (\kappa_\alpha^+)^{V[G_\theta]}$  and that  $\kappa_\alpha$  is strongly measurable in  $\text{HOD}^{V[G_\theta]}$ . It follows that all successors of regular cardinals below  $\theta$  in  $V[G_\theta]$  are strongly measurable in  $\text{HOD}$ . Since  $\theta$  remains strongly inaccessible in  $V[G_\theta]$  and all the relevant witnessing objects clearly belong to  $V_\theta^{V[G_\theta]}$ , we conclude that in  $V_\theta^{V[G_\theta]}$ , all successors of regular cardinals are strongly measurable.  $\square$

---

<sup>8</sup>As a matter of fact  $\text{HOD}^{V[G_\theta]} = V$  since  $V = L[\mathcal{U}]$  is ordinal definable in  $V[G_\theta]$ . We will not use this fact here.

## 6. STRONG MEASURABILITY AT SUCCESSORS OF SINGULARS

Suppose that in  $V = \text{HOD}^V$ ,  $\kappa$  is a supercompact cardinal and  $\lambda > \kappa$  is a measurable cardinal with a normal measure  $\mathcal{U}$ . We would like to construct a cone homogeneous poset over  $V$  which will collapse  $\lambda$  to be the successor of  $\kappa$ , change the cofinality of  $\kappa$  to  $\omega$ , and add a closed unbounded subset of  $\lambda$  whose restriction to the set of  $\{\alpha < \lambda \mid \alpha \text{ is regular in } V\}$  is almost contained in every set  $A \in \mathcal{U}$ .

It is natural to attempt obtaining this result by starting with an indestructible supercompact cardinal  $\kappa$ , and forcing with a Levy collapse of  $\lambda$  to  $\kappa^+$  followed by a Prikry forcing at  $\kappa$  and a club forcing at  $\lambda$ . The difficulty with this approach is in its second step, where the choice of the measure on  $\kappa$  depends on the generic filter for the Levy collapse and might lead to a Prikry generic sequence which will introduce to HOD information about the collapse of  $\lambda$  to  $\kappa^+$ , and in particular prevent from HOD to witness that  $\lambda$  is a measurable cardinal.

Instead, our approach will be based on recent use of the supercompact extender based forcing, introduced by Merimovich ([10]). Given a supercompact cardinal  $\kappa$ , we derive a  $(\kappa, \lambda)$ -supercompact extender  $E$  from a supercompact embedding  $j: V \rightarrow M$  for which  ${}^\lambda M \subseteq M$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}_E$  be the supercompact extender based forcing associated to the extender  $E$  of [10]. This forcing preserves  $\lambda$  and singularizes all the regular cardinals in the interval  $[\kappa, \lambda)$ . We will follow the definitions and notations of [10].

In [7], Gitik and Merimovich show that this forcing is weakly homogeneous (and therefore cone homogeneous), Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a normal measure on  $\lambda$  in the ground model. We would like to force a club to diagonalize  $\mathcal{U}$  relative to the set of  $V$ -regular cardinals below  $\lambda$ . Note that the ordinals of uncountable cofinality below  $\lambda$  in the extender based forcing extension are of measure zero in  $\mathcal{U}$ . Therefore, our club shooting poset has to allow  $V$ -singular ordinals as well. Moreover, since the set of previous inaccessible cardinals below  $\lambda$  does not reflect at its complement, it is impossible for the generic club to avoid ground model singular cardinals of countable cofinality. Thus, we restrict our club forcing poset to diagonalize  $\mathcal{U}$  only relative to the set of the regular cardinals in  $V$ . To make this precise, we denote by  $\text{Sing}$  the set of all ground model singular cardinals below  $\lambda$ , and define  $\bar{\mathcal{U}} = \{\text{Sing} \cup A \mid A \in \mathcal{U}\}$ . We will therefore force with the poset  $\mathbb{C}_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}}$ , consisting of pairs  $(c, B)$  where  $c \subseteq \lambda$  is a closed bounded set and  $B \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}$ . The extension order is as in the previous section.

We start by recalling a fundamental and useful fact, which lies in the heart of the proof of the Prikry Property of  $\mathbb{P}_E$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $M$  be an elementary submodel of  $H_\chi$  for some large  $\chi$  such that  $M \cap \lambda = \delta \in \lambda$  and  $M^{<\delta} \subseteq M$ . Let  $p \in M \cap \mathbb{P}_E$ .*

Then, there is a condition  $f^* \in \mathbb{P}_E^*$  which is  $M$ -generic (namely, it belongs to every dense open subset of  $\mathbb{P}_E^*$  in  $M$ ) and  $\text{dom } f^* = M \cap \lambda$ . Moreover, if  $p^* = \langle f^*, A \rangle$  is a condition in  $\mathbb{P}_E$ , then there is  $A^* \subseteq A$ ,  $E(f^*)$ -large such that  $A^* \subseteq M$  and  $D \in M$  is a dense open subset of  $\mathbb{P}_E$  then there is a natural number  $n$  such that for every  $\langle \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \rangle \in (A^*)^n$ ,  $p_{\langle \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \rangle}^* \in D$ .

*Proof.* The first claim follows from the closure of  $\mathbb{P}_E^*$ . Let us focus in the second part.

Let  $f^*$  be as in the lemma. Let  $D \in M$  be dense open. For each  $\langle \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \rangle \in M$  and for each  $g \in \mathbb{P}_E^* \cap M$ , we can ask whether there is a condition  $q \in D$  of the form  $\langle h, B \rangle \in D$  such that  $h \geq^* g_{\langle \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \rangle}$ . The set of conditions that decide this statement is dense open and definable in  $M$  and thus  $f^*$  decide whether there is such extension or not (for each possible  $\langle \nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1} \rangle$ ). Let  $D_{\vec{\nu}}$  be this set and let us split it into two parts  $D_{\vec{\nu}}^0 \cup D_{\vec{\nu}}^1$  according to the decision, where conditions in  $D_{\vec{\nu}}^0$  are direct extensions that enter  $D$  after the non-direct extension.

Let  $p^* = \langle f^*, A \rangle$ . Since a typical point  $\nu$  in a measure one tree  $A$ , associate with the measures  $E(f^*)$  is contained in  $M$  and has size  $|\nu| < \kappa$ , we may assume that  $A \subseteq M$ . There is an extension  $q \geq p^*$  in  $D$ . By the definition of the order of  $\mathbb{P}_E$ ,  $q$  is obtained by taking first some Prikry extension and then a direct extension, and therefore the Prikry extension is done using some  $\vec{\nu} \in M$ . Thus, for this specific Prikry extension,  $f^* \in D_{\vec{\nu}}^0$ . We conclude that already  $p_{\vec{\nu}}^* \in D$ .

We can now shrink  $A$  in order to stabilize the length of the extensions that enter  $D$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.2.**  $\bar{U}$  extends to a  $\lambda$ -complete filter in the generic extension by  $\mathbb{P}_E$ .

*Proof.* Assume that this is not the case. Since  $\kappa$  is singular, the closure of  $\bar{U}$  must drop to some cardinal  $\rho < \kappa$ . Let  $\langle \underline{A}_i \mid i < \rho \rangle$  be a sequence of names of elements in  $\bar{U}$  which are forced to have non-measure one intersection.

Using the strong Prikry property, we can find a sequence of direct extensions  $p_i$ , and natural numbers  $n_i$  such that any  $n_i$ -length Prikry extension of  $p_i$  decides the value of  $\underline{A}_i$ . Since there are fewer than  $\lambda$  many such extensions, we can find a set  $B_i \in \bar{U}$  such that  $p_i \Vdash B_i \subseteq \underline{A}_i$ . In particular,  $p_\rho \Vdash \bigcap B_i \subseteq \bigcap \underline{A}_i$ , but  $\bigcap B_i \in \bar{U}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.3.**  $\mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}$  is  $\lambda$ -distributive in the generic extension by  $\mathbb{P}_E$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\kappa$  is singular in the extension by  $\mathbb{P}_E$ , it is enough to show that the forcing  $\mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}$  is  $\rho$ -distributive for every  $\rho < \kappa$ .

We first work in  $V$ . Let  $\vec{D} = \langle D_i \mid i < \rho \rangle$  be a sequence of  $\mathbb{P}_E$  names for dense open subsets of  $\mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}$ ,  $\rho < \kappa$ . Let  $\langle p, q \rangle$  be a condition in  $\mathbb{P}_E * \mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}$ . Let us define a continuous sequence of models  $\langle M_i \mid i < \rho \rangle$  such that:

- $\vec{D}, \mathbb{P}_E, \mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}} \in M_0$ .



- $M_i \prec H_\chi$  for some large  $\chi$ ,  $M_i \cap \lambda = \delta_i \in \lambda$ .
- $M_i \in M_{i+1}^{<\delta_{i+1}} \subseteq M_{i+1}$  and  $\delta_{i+1} \in \bigcap \{A \in \mathcal{U} \cap M_{i+1}\}$ .
- For non-zero limit ordinal  $i$ ,  $M_i = \bigcup_{j < i} M_j$ .

This chain of models can be easily obtained using the same argument as in Lemma 2.1 (only the successor steps are non-trivial).

Next, let us pick by induction, for each  $i < \rho$ , an  $M_i$ -generic condition  $f_i^* \in \mathbb{P}_E^*$  such that  $f_i^* \in M_{i+1}$ , and  $f_i^* \subseteq f_j^*$  for  $i < j$ . We will define a sequence of names  $q_i$  and a sequence of conditions  $p_i$  such that:

- $p_i = \langle f_i^*, A_i \rangle$ .
- $p_i \Vdash q_{i+1} \in \bar{D}_i$ .
- The sequence of conditions  $p_i$  is  $\leq^*$  increasing. Let  $p_\rho$  be their limit.
- $p_\rho$  forces that the conditions  $q_i$  are increasing and they have a limit  $q_\rho$ .

In  $M_{i+1}$ , let  $D'_i$  be the dense open set in  $\mathbb{P}_E$  of all extensions of  $p_i$  that forces for some condition  $q = (c^q, B^q) \geq q_i$  to be in  $D_i$  (and decide its maximum and its large set  $B^q$  from  $\bar{U}$ ). By applying lemma 6.1 inside  $M_{i+1}$ , we conclude that there is an  $E(f_i^*)$ -large tree  $A_i \subseteq M_i$  and a natural number  $n_i$  such that for the condition  $p_i = \langle f_i^*, A_i \rangle$ , for every  $\bar{v} \in (A_i)^{n_i}$ ,  $(p_i)_{\bar{v}} \in D'_i$ . In particular, it picks a condition  $q_{i+1, \bar{v}} \geq q_i$  from  $\mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}$  is going to be in  $M_{i+1}$  and in particular, it is going to be bounded below  $\delta_{i+1}$  and its large set belongs to  $\bar{U} \cap M_{i+1}$ .

Note that the collection of all  $n$ -step extensions of a fixed condition in  $\mathbb{P}_E$  is always a maximal antichain above this condition and thus, we can define  $q'_{i+1}$  to be equal to  $q_{i+1, \bar{v}}$  below  $(p_i)_{\bar{v}}$ , and trivial below any condition which is incompatible with  $p_i$ . Finally, we define  $q_{i+1}$  to be the extension of  $q'_{i+1}$  by the single ordinal  $\delta_{i+1}$ . By the construction, this is indeed an extension, as  $\delta_{i+1} \in B$  for all  $B \in \bar{U} \cap M_{i+1}$ .

At limit steps, we define  $q_i$  to be the limit of previous conditions. This is possible, since the filter  $\bar{U}$  is still  $\lambda$ -complete and since the maximal element of the closed set in  $q_j$  is forced to be  $\delta_j$  and therefore, the maximal element of  $q_i$  is  $\delta_i$  which is singular strong limit cardinal in the limit case.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let  $B' \in \mathcal{U}$ . Then  $B'$  is stationary in  $\mathbb{P}_E * \mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be a name for a club. We show that every condition  $q \in \mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}$  has an extension which forces that  $C \cap B' \neq \emptyset$ . Working in  $V$ , let  $M \prec H_\chi$ , such that  $M \cap \lambda = \delta$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_E, \mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}, C, q, B' \in M$ , and  $\delta \in B'$  is inaccessible. Moreover, let us assume that  $M$  is obtained as a union of a chain of models of length  $\delta$ ,  $M_i$ , such that  $M_i \cap \lambda = \delta_i$  and  $M_{i+1}^{<\delta_{i+1}} \subseteq M_{i+1}$  and  $\delta_{i+1} \in \bigcap (\mathcal{U} \cap M_{i+1})$ .

For each  $i$ , let  $f_i^*$  be  $M_i$ -generic for  $\mathbb{P}_E^*$ , such that  $f_i^* \subseteq f_j^*$  for  $i < j$ . Let  $f^* = \bigcup f_i^*$ .

Let  $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}_E$  be a generic filter that contains a condition  $p^* = \langle f^*, A \rangle$ ,  $A \subseteq M$ . In  $V[G]$ ,  $\text{cf } \delta = \omega$ . Let  $\langle \delta_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$  be a cofinal sequence in  $\delta$ . For each  $n$ , for sufficiently large  $\xi < \delta$ ,  $M_i$  contains the dense set of conditions in

$\mathbb{P}_E$  that decides on some condition  $q \in \mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}$  that forces some ordinal  $\gamma_n \geq \delta_n$  to be in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Following the same arguments as in the previous lemma, we can define a condition  $q_n$  by going over some maximal antichain. The maximum of the closed set of  $q_n$  is always  $\delta_{n+1}$ . Finally, the sequence of conditions  $q_n^G$  has an upper bound, by attaching  $\delta$  on top of the union. Let  $q_\omega$  be the upper bound. Clearly,  $q_\omega$  forces  $\delta \in \mathcal{C}$ , as wanted.  $\square$

Finally, the following proposition finishes the proof of theorem 1.5.

**Proposition 6.5.** *Let  $\kappa$  be  $\lambda$ -supercompact, where  $\lambda$  is measurable. Then, there is a generic extension in which  $\text{cf } \kappa = \omega$ ,  $\kappa$  is a cardinal,  $\lambda = \kappa^+$  and it is  $((S_{reg}^\lambda)^V, 1)$ -strongly measurable cardinal.*

We can now finish the proof of theorem 1.5.

*Proof.* (Theorem 1.5)

The iteration  $\mathbb{P}_E * \mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}$  is cone homogeneous as an iteration of two cone homogeneous, ordinal definable forcing notions. Since  $\mathbb{P}_E$  preserve cardinals below  $\kappa$  and  $\geq \lambda$  and  $\mathbb{C}_{\bar{U}}$  preserves cardinals, the result follows. The set  $S_{reg}^\lambda$  is stationary by Lemma 6.4.  $\square$

The result that we obtain for the successor of a singular cardinal is weaker than the result for a successor of a regular cardinal. The reason is that in order to get the closed unbounded filter to be sets from the intersection of some ground model normal measures we will have to obtain a situation in which the regular cardinals between the supercompact cardinal  $\kappa$  and the measurable cardinal  $\lambda$  are going to change cofinalities into values which differ from the cofinality of  $\kappa$  in the generic extension. This is also the reason that such a method cannot work for getting  $\omega$ -strongly measurable successor of a singular cardinal of uncountable cofinality.

We remark that Woodin in [12], proved that it is consistent relative to the large cardinal axiom  $I0$  that a successor of a singular cardinal is  $\omega$ -strongly measurable.

**Question 6.6.** Is it consistent that there is an  $\omega$ -strongly measurable cardinal  $\lambda^+$ , where  $\text{cf } \lambda > \omega$  is a limit cardinal?

**Question 6.7.** Is it consistent that there is a cardinal  $\lambda^+$ , where  $\text{cf } \lambda > \omega$  is a limit cardinal and  $(S_{reg}^{\lambda^+})^{\text{HOD}}$  contains a club in  $V$ ?

## REFERENCES

1. Omer Ben-Neria and Spencer Unger, *Homogeneous changes in cofinalities with applications to HOD*, Journal of Mathematical Logic **17** (2017), no. 2, 1750007.
2. James Cummings, Sy David Friedman, and Mohammad Golshani, *Collapsing the cardinals of HOD*, J. Math. Log. **15** (2015), no. 2, 1550007, 32. MR 3447936
3. Natasha Dobrinen and Sy-David Friedman, *Homogeneous iteration and measure one covering relative to HOD*, Arch. Math. Logic **47** (2008), no. 7-8, 711–718. MR 2448954
4. Moti Gitik, *Changing cofinalities and the nonstationary ideal*, Israel J. Math. **56** (1986), no. 3, 280–314. MR 882254
5. ———, *On closed unbounded sets consisting of former regulars*, J. Symbolic Logic **64** (1999), no. 1, 1–12. MR 1683890
6. ———, *Prikry-type forcings*, Handbook of set theory. Vols. 1, 2, 3, Springer, Dordrecht, 2010, pp. 1351–1447. MR 2768695
7. Moti Gitik and Carmi Merimovich, *Some applications of supercompact extender based forcings to HOD*, J. Symb. Log. **83** (2018), no. 2, 461–476. MR 3835073
8. Thomas Jech, *Set theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003, The third millennium edition, revised and expanded. MR 1940513
9. Azriel Lévy, *Definability in axiomatic set theory. I*, Logic, Methodology and Philos. Sci. (Proc. 1964 Internat. Congr.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1965, pp. 127–151. MR 0205827
10. Carmi Merimovich, *Supercompact extender based Prikry forcing*, Arch. Math. Logic **50** (2011), no. 5-6, 591–602. MR 2805299
11. Assaf Rinot, *A cofinality-preserving small forcing may introduce a special aronszajn tree*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **48** (2009), no. 8, 817.
12. W. Hugh Woodin, *Suitable extender models I*, J. Math. Log. **10** (2010), no. 1-2, 101–339. MR 2802084
13. ———, *In search of ultimate-L: The 19th midrasha mathematicae lectures*, The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic **23** (2017), no. 1, 1–109.
14. W. Hugh Woodin, Jacob Davis, and Daniel Rodríguez, *The HOD dichotomy*, Appalachian set theory 2006–2012, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 406, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2013, pp. 397–418. MR 3821636

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, JERUSALEM 91904, ISRAEL

*E-mail address:* omer.bn@mail.huji.ac.il

KURT GÖDEL RESEARCH CENTER, AUGASSE 2-6, UZA 2, UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, VIENNA 1090

*E-mail address:* yair.hayut@mail.huji.ac.il