



VCU

Virginia Commonwealth University
VCU Scholars Compass

Mathematics and Applied Mathematics
Publications

Dept. of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics

2014

Ideal Projections and Forcing Projections

Sean Cox

Virginia Commonwealth University, scox9@vcu.edu

Martin Zeman

University of California - Riverside

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/math_pubs



Part of the [Mathematics Commons](#)

© 2013, Association for Symbolic Logic. This is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in The Journal of Symbolic Logic, Volume 79, Issue 04, December 2014, pp 1247-1285. The final publication is available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2013.24>.

Downloaded from

http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/math_pubs/16

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Dept. of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mathematics and Applied Mathematics Publications by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact libcompass@vcu.edu.

1

IDEAL PROJECTIONS AND FORCING PROJECTIONS

2

SEAN COX AND MARTIN ZEMAN

ABSTRACT. It is well known that saturation of ideals is closely related to the “antichain-catching” phenomenon from Foreman-Magidor-Shelah [10]. We consider several antichain-catching properties that are weaker than saturation, and prove:

- (1) If \mathcal{I} is a normal ideal on ω_2 which satisfies *stationary antichain catching*, then there is an inner model with a Woodin cardinal;
- (2) For any $n \in \omega$, it is consistent relative to large cardinals that there is a normal ideal \mathcal{I} on ω_n which satisfies *projective antichain catching*, yet \mathcal{I} is not saturated (or even strong). This provides a negative answer to Open Question number 13 from Foreman’s chapter in the Handbook of Set Theory ([7]).

3

1. INTRODUCTION

4 The notions of *antichain catching* and *self-genericity* first appeared in Foreman-
 5 Magidor-Shelah [10] and were used extensively by Woodin in his stationary tower
 6 arguments (see [18] or [7]); these topics are explored in detail in [7]. We consider
 7 several properties of ideals on uncountable cardinals related to antichain catch-
 8 ing; these properties lie between saturation and precipitousness. For a normal
 9 ideal \mathcal{I} on a regular uncountable κ , the main property of interest—which we call
 10 *ProjectiveCatch*(\mathcal{I})—is equivalent¹ to the statement that there is a normal ideal
 11 $\mathcal{J} \subset \wp(P_\kappa(H_\theta))$ (where θ is large relative to \mathcal{I}) such that:

\mathcal{J} projects canonically to \mathcal{I} in the Rudin-Keisler sense, and
 the canonical Boolean homomorphism

$$(1) \quad h_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}} : \wp(\kappa)/\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \wp(P_\kappa(H_\theta))/\mathcal{J}$$

is a *regular embedding*.

12 In the case where the completeness of \mathcal{I} is at least ω_2 , we also consider the “starred
 13 version” *ProjectiveCatch**(\mathcal{I}), which additionally requires that the dual of the
 14 ideal \mathcal{J} from (1) concentrates on sets whose intersection with *ORD* is ω -closed.

15 In addition to *ProjectiveCatch*(\mathcal{I}), we also consider the stronger property *ClubCatch*(\mathcal{I})
 16 and the weaker property *StatCatch*(\mathcal{I}). The property *ClubCatch*(\mathcal{I}) is equiva-
 17 lent to saturation of \mathcal{I} (by Foreman [7]; see Theorem 3.2 below). The property
 18 *ProjectiveCatch*(\mathcal{I}) implies that \mathcal{I} is precipitous;² if \mathcal{I} is an ideal on ω_1 , then the
 19 converse also holds (see Theorem 3.8 below; we thank Ralf Schindler for pointing
 20 this out to us).


The authors thank Ralf Schindler for helpful discussions on this topic, and for his permission to include Theorem 3.8.

¹By Lemmas 3.4 and 3.11.

²And *StatCatch*(\mathcal{I}) implies there exists some $T \in \mathcal{I}^+$ such that $\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright T$ is precipitous.

- 1 Figure 1 summarizes the implications and non-implications among these concepts which are proved in the present paper.

FIGURE 1. Implications and non-implications



2

3 Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 below are the main results of the paper.

4 **Theorem 1.1.** *If there is an \mathcal{I} such that $\text{StatCatch}^*(\mathcal{I})$ holds, then there is an*
 5 *inner model with a Woodin cardinal.*

6 **Theorem 1.2.** *Suppose κ is δ -supercompact for some inaccessible $\delta > \kappa$. Let $\mu < \kappa$*
 7 *be regular. Then there is a forcing extension where $\kappa = \mu^+$, $\text{ProjectiveCatch}(\mathcal{I})$*
 8 *holds for some ideal \mathcal{I} on κ (and in fact the starred version $\text{ProjectiveCatch}^*(\mathcal{I})$*
 9 *holds in the case where $\mu > \omega$), yet \mathcal{I} is not a strong ideal;³ in particular, \mathcal{I} is not*
 10 *presaturated.*

11 One corollary of Theorem 1.2—see Section 5.5—is that for any regular uncount-
 12 able κ , we have a negative solution to the $n = 0$ case of Open Question number 13
 13 from Foreman [7], which asks:

14 **Question (Foreman).** *Suppose that \mathcal{J} is an ideal on $Z \subseteq \wp(\kappa^{+(n+1)})$, and \mathcal{I} is the*
 15 *projected ideal on the projection of Z to $Z' \subseteq \wp(\kappa^{+n})$. Suppose that the canonical*
 16 *homomorphism from $\wp(Z')/\mathcal{I}$ to $\wp(Z)/\mathcal{J}$ is a regular embedding. Is \mathcal{I} $\kappa^{+(n+1)}$ -*
 17 *saturated?*

18 Also, Theorem 1.1 and relative consistency results from [15] and [12]⁴ imply that,
 19 unlike the case for ideals on ω_1 , precipitousness of an ideal \mathcal{I} on ω_2 does *not* in
 20 general imply $\text{ProjectiveCatch}^*(\mathcal{I})$ (or even $\text{StatCatch}^*(\mathcal{I})$).

³An ideal \mathcal{I} is *strong* iff it is precipitous and $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ forces that the generic embedding sends μ to μ^{+V} , where μ is the completeness of \mathcal{I} . Every presaturated ideal on a successor cardinal μ is a strong ideal.

⁴where it was shown, respectively, that precipitousness of $NS \upharpoonright S_1^2$ can be forced from a model with a measurable cardinal and that precipitousness of $NS \upharpoonright \omega_2$ can be forced from a model with a measurable cardinal of Mitchell order two.

1 Claverie-Schindler [21] proved that if there is a strong ideal then there is an
 2 inner model with a Woodin cardinal; this improved the earlier result by Steel [22]
 3 which reached essentially the same conclusion from a presaturated ideal. Theorem
 4 1.2 shows that $StatCatch^*(\mathcal{I})$ —the assumption used in our Theorem 1.1—does *not*
 5 imply that \mathcal{I} is a strong ideal; so in particular our Theorem 1.1 is not a special case
 6 of the result from [21].

7 The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides background and notation;
 8 Section 3 introduces $StatCatch$ and $ClubCatch$ and proves some basic facts about
 9 them; Section 4 proves Theorem 1.1; Section 5 proves Theorem 1.2 and the negative
 10 solution to Foreman’s question; and Section 6 lists some open questions.

11 2. PRELIMINARIES

12 Unless otherwise indicated, all notation agrees with Foreman [7]. If κ is regular
 13 and $\mu \subseteq H$, then $[H]^{<\mu}$ will denote $\{M \subseteq H \mid |M| < \mu\}$ and $\wp_\mu(H)$ will denote
 14 $\{M \in [H]^{<\mu} \mid M \cap \mu \in \mu\}$.

15 **2.1. Ultrapowers.** We will use some basic facts about ultrapowers:

16 **Fact 2.1.** *Suppose V is a model of set theory, $Z \in V$ is a set, and $U \subset \wp(Z) \cap V$
 17 is an ultrafilter which is fine⁵ and normal with respect to functions from V ;⁶ we do
 18 **not** require that $U \in V$. Let $H := \bigcup Z$ and suppose H is transitive. Let $j_U : V \rightarrow U$
 19 $ult(V, U)$, and suppose the wellfounded part of $ult(V, U)$ has been transitivised. Also
 20 assume that each element of Z is extensional (so that it has a transitive collapse).
 21 Then:*

- 22 • $j_U''H \in ult(V, U)$ and is equal to $[id \upharpoonright Z]_U$;
- 23 • $j_U \upharpoonright H \in ult(V, U)$ and is equal to $[M \mapsto \sigma_M]_U$, where σ_M is the inverse of
 24 the transitive collapse map of M

25 The following fact is about projections of ultrafilters and the resulting commu-
 26 tative diagram of ultrapowers; for more details (and much greater generality) see
 27 section 4.4 of [7].

28 **Fact 2.2.** *Same assumptions as Fact 2.1. If $\bar{Z} \in V$ is another set such that
 29 $\bigcup \bar{Z} \subseteq \bigcup Z$ and the map $\pi : Z \rightarrow \bar{Z}$ is defined by $M \mapsto M \cap (\bigcup \bar{Z})$, then $\bar{U} :=$
 30 $\{\bar{A} \in V \cap \wp(\bar{Z}) \mid \pi^{-1} \upharpoonright \bar{A} \in U\}$ is an ultrafilter on $\wp(\bar{Z}) \cap V$ which is normal with
 31 respect to functions from V . Given any $f : \bar{Z} \rightarrow V$ (from V), let $F_f := f \circ \pi$.
 32 Then the map $k_{\bar{U}, U} : ult(V, \bar{U}) \rightarrow ult(V, U)$ defined by $[f]_{\bar{U}} \mapsto [F_f]_U$ is well-defined,
 33 elementary, and the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 V & \xrightarrow{\quad j_U \quad} & ult(V, U) \\
 & \searrow j_{\bar{U}} & \nearrow k_{\bar{U}, U} \\
 & & ult(V, \bar{U})
 \end{array}$$

34 We also remark:

⁵i.e. for every $a \in \bigcup Z$ the set $\{M \in Z \mid a \in M\}$ is an element of U .

⁶i.e. if $f : S \rightarrow V$ is a regressive function with $f \in V$ and $S \in U$, then f is constant on a set from U .

1 **Fact 2.3.** *Same assumptions as Fact 2.2. Set $\bar{H} := \bigcup \bar{Z}$. Assume that $\wp(\bar{Z}) \in M$*
 2 *for U -many M .⁷ For each such M let $\bar{Z}_M = \sigma_M^{-1}(\bar{Z})$ and set*

$$\bar{U}_M := \{\bar{a} \in H_M \cap \wp(\bar{Z}_M) \mid M \cap \bar{H} \in \sigma_M(\bar{a})\}$$

3 *Then $\bar{U} \in \text{ult}(V, U)$ and is equal to $[M \mapsto \bar{U}_M]_U$.*

4 **2.2. Ideals, ideal projections, and antichain catching.** Suppose Z is a set and
 5 $F \subset \wp(Z)$ is a filter. The *universe of F* ($\text{univ}(F)$) is the set Z , and the *support of*
 6 F ($\text{supp}(F)$) is the set $\bigcup Z$. For example: suppose $\mu \leq \theta$ are regular cardinals, let
 7 $Z := \wp_\mu(H_\theta)$ (note $\bigcup Z = H_\theta$), and let F be the collection of $D \subseteq Z$ which contain
 8 a club; then F is a normal filter with support H_θ . **For the remainder of the**
 9 **paper, filter will always refer to a normal,⁸ fine⁹ filter**; similarly *ideal* will
 10 refer to a normal, fine ideal. Note that fineness of a filter implies that the support
 11 can be computed from the filter (i.e. if \mathcal{F} is fine then $\text{supp}(\mathcal{F}) = \bigcup \bigcup \mathcal{F}$). If \mathcal{F} is a
 12 filter then $\check{\mathcal{F}}$ denotes its dual ideal; similarly if \mathcal{I} is an ideal then $\check{\mathcal{I}}$ denotes its dual
 13 filter. If Γ is a class, we say that a filter \mathcal{F} *concentrates on* Γ iff there is an $A \in \mathcal{F}$
 14 such that $A \subseteq \Gamma$; if \mathcal{I} is an ideal we say that \mathcal{I} *concentrates on* Γ iff its dual filter
 15 concentrates on Γ . A set $S \subseteq Z$ is \mathcal{I} -*positive* (written $S \in \mathcal{I}^+$) iff $S \notin \mathcal{I}$. If $S \in \mathcal{I}^+$
 16 then $\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright S$ denotes $\mathcal{I} \cap \wp(S)$. NS refers to the class of (weakly) nonstationary sets;
 17 that is, $A \in NS$ iff there exists an $F : [\bigcup A]^{<\omega} \rightarrow \bigcup A$ such that no element of
 18 A is closed under F ; in many natural contexts this coincides with the notion of
 19 generalized (non-)stationarity from Jech [14] (see [7] for more details on when these
 20 two notions coincide). Given a stationary set S , $NS \upharpoonright S$ denotes $NS \cap \wp(S)$.

Definition 2.4. *Suppose \mathcal{I}' is an ideal with support Z' , $\bigcup Z \subseteq \bigcup Z'$, and the*
*map $\pi_{Z', Z} : Z' \rightarrow \wp(\bigcup Z)$ is defined by $M' \mapsto M' \cap (\bigcup Z)$. The **canonical ideal***
projection of \mathcal{I}' to Z is

$$\{A \subseteq Z \mid \pi_{Z', Z}^{-1} \upharpoonright A \in \mathcal{I}'\}$$

21 **Example 2.5.** *Let $\lambda < \lambda'$ be uncountable cardinals, $Z' := \wp_{\omega_1}(H_{\lambda'})$, $Z :=$
 22 $\wp_{\omega_1}(H_\lambda)$, and $\mathcal{I}', \mathcal{I}$ be the collection of nonstationary subsets of Z', Z respectively.
 23 Note that $H_{\lambda'} = \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}') = \bigcup Z'$ and $H_\lambda = \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) = \bigcup Z$. Then \mathcal{I} is the
 24 canonical projection of \mathcal{I}' to $\wp_{\omega_1}(H_\lambda)$.*

25 **Example 2.6.** *Let \mathcal{I}' be as in Example 2.5. Let $Z := \omega_1$ and \mathcal{I} be the nonstationary
 26 ideal on ω_1 . Then \mathcal{I} is the canonical ideal projection of \mathcal{I}' to ω_1 . Note here that
 27 $\text{univ}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{support}(\mathcal{I}) = \omega_1$, which was not the case in Example 2.5)*

28 We caution that if $\mu \leq \lambda < \lambda'$, $\pi : \wp_\mu(H_{\lambda'}) \rightarrow \wp_\mu(H_\lambda)$ is the map $M \mapsto M \cap H_\lambda$,
 29 and $S' \subset \wp_\mu(H_{\lambda'})$ is stationary, then it is **not** true in general that the canonical
 30 projection of $NS \upharpoonright S'$ via π is equal to $NS \upharpoonright \pi''S'$; in fact this canonical projection
 31 of $NS \upharpoonright S'$ can even be the dual of an ultrafilter (see Fact 2.10 and Remark 2.11
 32 below, and Section 4.4 of [7]).

33 If \mathcal{I} is an ideal with universe Z , define an equivalence relation $\sim_{\mathcal{I}}$ on $\wp(Z)$ by
 34 $S \sim_{\mathcal{I}} T$ iff the symmetric difference of S with T is an element of \mathcal{I} . Define a relation
 35 $\leq_{\mathcal{I}}$ on $\wp(Z)$ by: $[S]_{\mathcal{I}} \leq_{\mathcal{I}} [T]_{\mathcal{I}}$ iff $S - T \in \mathcal{I}$; it is easy to check this is well-defined

⁷For example, if U is fine and $\bar{Z} = \wp_\kappa(H_{\bar{\lambda}})$ and $Z = \wp_\kappa(H_\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \gg \bar{\lambda}$.

⁸ F is normal iff for every regressive $g : Z \rightarrow V$ there is an $S \in F^+$ such that $g \upharpoonright S$ is constant.

⁹i.e. for every $b \in \text{supp}(F)$ there is an $A \in F$ such that $b \in M$ for all $M \in A$.

1 and that $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}} := (\wp(\text{univ}(\mathcal{I}))/\mathcal{I}, \leq_{\mathcal{I}})$ is a boolean algebra; $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is forcing equivalent
 2 to the non-separative poset (\mathcal{I}^+, \subset) .¹⁰

3 **Fact 2.7.** *If \mathcal{I} is a normal ideal on κ then $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is a κ^+ -complete boolean algebra.
 4 Namely, if $Z \subset \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is a set of size κ , then “the” diagonal union of Z does not
 5 depend (modulo $=_{\mathcal{I}}$) on the particular enumeration of Z used to form the diagonal
 6 union, and this diagonal union is the least upper bound of Z in $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$.*

7 If G is $(V, \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}})$ -generic then G is essentially an ultrafilter on $\wp(Z) \cap V$ which is
 8 normal with respect to functions from V (assuming \mathcal{I} is normal, as we do throughout
 9 the paper).

Fact 2.8. *If \mathcal{J} projects canonically to \mathcal{I} then the map*

$$h_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}} : \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$$

defined by

$$[S]_{\mathcal{I}} \mapsto [\{M \mid M \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) \in S\}]_{\mathcal{J}}$$

10 is a boolean homomorphism.

11 Suppose \mathcal{J} projects canonically to \mathcal{I} and that $G \subset \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is generic; we will often
 12 identify G with $\{S \mid [S]_{\mathcal{J}} \in G\}$. Now G is a normal V -ultrafilter, and the upward
 13 closure of $h_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}}^{-1}[G]$ is always a normal V -ultrafilter extending the dual of \mathcal{I} ; let
 14 $\text{proj}(G)$ denote this ultrafilter. However, $\text{proj}(G)$ is **not** necessarily generic for $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$;
 15 in other words, the map $h_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}}$ is not necessarily a regular embedding. The regularity
 16 of $h_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}}$ is the central issue of this paper, which we will return to in Section 3.

17 Burke [3], building on work of Foreman (in the special case where \mathcal{I} is maximal),
 18 shows that for *any* normal ideal \mathcal{I} and any sufficiently large regular Ω , there is
 19 a smallest normal ideal \mathcal{J} with support H_{Ω} such that \mathcal{I} is the canonical ideal
 20 projection of \mathcal{J} to $\text{supp}(\mathcal{I})$. Moreover, this \mathcal{J} is easy to describe: for an $M \prec$
 21 $(H_{\Omega}, \in, \{\mathcal{I}\})$, say that M is \mathcal{I} -good iff $M \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) \in C$ for every $C \in M \cap \check{\mathcal{I}}$; then
 22 the \mathcal{J} mentioned above is just the nonstationary ideal restricted to the collection
 23 of \mathcal{I} -good substructures of H_{Ω} (where Ω is sufficiently large relative to \mathcal{I}). We refer
 24 the reader to [7] for more information about the next few definitions and theorems.

25 **Definition 2.9.** *For a regular Ω and an ideal \mathcal{I} with transitive support, set:*

$$S_{\mathcal{I}, \Omega}^{\text{Good}} := \{M \prec (H_{\Omega}, \in, \{\mathcal{I}\}) \mid M \text{ is } \mathcal{I}\text{-good}\}$$

26 Define

$$(2) \quad \Omega(\mathcal{I}) := (2^{\text{univ}(\mathcal{I})})^+$$

27 $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{Good}}$ denotes $S_{\mathcal{I}, \Omega(\mathcal{I})}^{\text{Good}}$.

28 The following fact is proved in Proposition 4.20 of [7]:

29 **Fact 2.10.** *If \mathcal{I} is an ideal then $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{Good}}$ is stationary, and $NS \upharpoonright S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{Good}}$ projects to
 30 \mathcal{I} canonically and is the smallest such ideal (with universe $S_{\mathcal{I}, \Omega(\mathcal{I})}^{\text{Good}}$) which has this
 31 property.*

¹⁰The latter is non-separative because if $S \in \mathcal{I}^+$ and $T = S - \{x\}$ for some x , then typically
 $T \in \mathcal{I}^+$ yet every subset of T in \mathcal{I}^+ is still compatible with S in (\mathcal{I}^+, \subset) .

1 **Remark 2.11.** We caution that Fact 2.10 is quite special; it is **not** true in general
 2 that: if $S \subset S_{\mathcal{I}}^{Good}$ is stationary, then $NS \upharpoonright S$ projects canonically to $\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright \{M \cap$
 3 $supp(\mathcal{I}) \mid M \in S\}$.¹¹

4 **Definition 2.12.** $NS \upharpoonright S_{\mathcal{I}}^{Good}$ is called the conditional club filter relative to \mathcal{I} .

5 The following definitions go back to [10], and are explored in detail in [7].

6 **Definition 2.13.** Suppose \mathcal{I} is an ideal with support H and $M \prec (H_{\Omega}, \in, \{\mathcal{I}\})$ for
 7 a regular Ω .

8 • If \mathcal{A} is a maximal antichain in \mathcal{I}^+ , we say M catches \mathcal{A} iff there is an
 9 $S \in \mathcal{A} \cap M$ such that $M \cap H \in S$.

10 Given a substructure $M \prec (H_{\Omega}, \in, \{\mathcal{I}\})$ such that $M \cap supp(\mathcal{I}) \in univ(\mathcal{I})$,¹²
 11 let $\sigma_M : H_M \rightarrow M \prec H_{\Omega}$ be the inverse of the transitive collapse of M , let
 12 $Z := univ(\mathcal{I})$, $Z_M := \sigma_M^{-1}(Z)$, $\mathcal{I}_M := \sigma_M^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$, and

$$\mathcal{U}_M := \{a \in H_M \cap \wp(Z_M) \mid M \cap supp(\mathcal{I}) \in \sigma_M(a)\}$$

13 It is straightforward to check that \mathcal{U}_M is an ultrafilter on $H_M \cap \wp(Z_M)$ and is
 14 normal with respect to functions from H_M . Let $j_{\mathcal{U}_M} : H_M \rightarrow_{\mathcal{U}_M} ult(H_M, \mathcal{U}_M)$
 15 be the ultrapower embedding and define $k_M : ult(H_M, \mathcal{U}_M) \rightarrow H_{\Omega}$ by $[f]_{\mathcal{U}_M} \mapsto$
 16 $\sigma_M(f)(M \cap supp(\mathcal{I}))$. It is routine to show that k_M is well-defined, elementary,
 17 and $\sigma_M = k_M \circ j_{\mathcal{U}_M}$. M is called \mathcal{I} -self-generic iff \mathcal{U}_M is generic over H_M for the
 18 poset $\sigma_M^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}})$.

19 **Definition 2.14.** For a regular Ω and an ideal \mathcal{I} , set

$$S_{\mathcal{I}, \Omega}^{SelfGen} := \{M \prec (H_{\Omega}, \in, \{\mathcal{I}\}) \mid M \text{ is } \mathcal{I}\text{-self generic}\}$$

20

$$S_{\mathcal{I}, \Omega}^{SelfGen,*} := S_{\mathcal{I}, \Omega}^{SelfGen} \cap \{M \mid M \cap ORD \text{ is } \omega\text{-closed}\}$$

21

$S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen}$ and $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen,*}$ denote $S_{\mathcal{I}, \Omega(\mathcal{I})}^{SelfGen}$ and $S_{\mathcal{I}, \Omega(\mathcal{I})}^{SelfGen,*}$, respectively.¹³

22 Finally we recall the relationship between goodness, self-genericity, and antichain
 23 catching:

24 **Fact 2.15.** Suppose $\mathcal{I} \subset Z$ is an ideal. Fix any regular $\theta \gg |\wp(Z)|$ and $M \prec$
 25 $(H_{\theta}, \in, \{\mathcal{I}, Z\})$ with $M \cap supp(\mathcal{I}) \in Z$. Then:

26 • If M is \mathcal{I} -self generic then M is \mathcal{I} -good.

27 • The following are equivalent:

28 (1) M is \mathcal{I} -self generic

29 (2) M catches every maximal \mathcal{I} antichain which is an element of M .

30 Note that if \mathcal{I} is an ideal on ω_1 , then $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen,*} = \emptyset$ because elements of $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{Good}$
 31 cannot have ω -closed intersection with the ordinals.¹⁴

32 We recall the following definitions:

33 **Definition 2.16.** Let \mathcal{I} be a normal, fine ideal.

¹¹It might happen that there is a stationary $S \subset S_{\mathcal{I}}^{Good}$ and some $T \subset \{M \cap supp(\mathcal{I}) \mid M \in S\}$ such that $T \in \mathcal{I}^+$, yet $\{M \in S \mid M \cap supp(\mathcal{I}) \in T\}$ is nonstationary (though $\{M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^{Good} \mid M \cap supp(\mathcal{I}) \in T\}$ is stationary, by Fact 2.10).

¹²For example, if \mathcal{I} is an ideal on ω_1 this would just mean that $M \cap \omega_1 \in \omega_1$.

¹³Recall $\Omega(\mathcal{I})$ was defined in (2).

¹⁴Because if $M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^{Good}$ then in particular $M \cap \omega_1 \in \omega_1$, so $M \cap ORD$ cannot be ω -closed.

- 1 • \mathcal{I} is precipitous iff $\Vdash_{\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}}$ “ $\text{ult}(V, \dot{G})$ is wellfounded”.
- 2 • \mathcal{I} is saturated iff $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ has the $|H|^+$ -chain condition, where H is the support
- 3 of \mathcal{I} (so $\mathcal{I} \subset \wp(Z)$ where $H = \bigcup Z$).
- 4 • Suppose \mathcal{I} is an ideal on κ . \mathcal{I} is strong iff \mathcal{I} is precipitous and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}}$ “ $j_{\dot{G}}(\kappa) =$
- 5 κ^{+V} ”.

6 Saturation and precipitousness are properties which occur frequently in the

7 set theory literature. Strongness (of an ideal) was introduced in Baumgartner-

8 Taylor [2]; saturation (even presaturation) of \mathcal{I} implies that \mathcal{I} is a strong ideal.

9 Baumgartner and Taylor conjectured that a strong ideal on ω_1 has the same con-

10 sistency strength as a saturated ideal on ω_1 (namely, a Woodin cardinal). Their

11 conjecture was recently confirmed in Claverie-Schindler [4], where it was shown

12 that if there is a strong ideal on ω_1 then there is an inner model with a Woodin

13 cardinal. Shelah (see [23]) had shown that one could force over a model with a

14 Woodin cardinal to obtain a model where NS_{ω_1} is saturated (and thus strong). We

15 caution that strongness in the sense of Baumgartner-Taylor [2] is not to be confused

16 with the notion of κ being *ideally strong*, which was introduced in Claverie’s PhD

17 thesis and involves a sequence of ideals resembling an extender (the Claverie defini-

18 tion bears more resemblance to strong cardinals than does the Baumgartner-Taylor

19 definition).

2.3. **Duality Theorem.** We will use a special case of Foreman’s Duality Theorem ([7]). Suppose κ is regular and uncountable, \mathbb{Q} is a partial order, and \dot{U} is a \mathbb{Q} -name for a V -normal measure on κ . In V define $F(\dot{U})$ by:

$$S \in F(\dot{U}) \iff S \subseteq \kappa \text{ and } \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \check{S} \in \dot{U}$$

20 It is straightforward to check that $F(\dot{U})$ is a normal filter on κ . The following is

21 Proposition 7.13 of Foreman [7]:

Theorem 2.17. [Foreman] Suppose κ is a regular uncountable cardinal, \mathbb{Q} is a poset, and \dot{U} is a \mathbb{Q} -name for a V -normal ultrafilter on κ such that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{ult}(V, \dot{U}) \text{ is wellfounded}$$

22 Assume also that there are functions $f_{\mathbb{Q}}$, $(f_q)_{q \in \mathbb{Q}}$, and $f_{\dot{G}}$ with domain κ such that

23 whenever G is (V, \mathbb{Q}) -generic and $U := \dot{U}_G$ then:

- 24 • $j_U(f_{\mathbb{Q}})(\kappa) = \mathbb{Q}$
- 25 • $j_U(f_{\dot{G}})(\kappa) = G$
- 26 • For each $q \in \mathbb{Q}$: $j_U(f_q)(\kappa) = q$

Then the map

$$[S]_{F(\dot{U})} \mapsto \llbracket \check{S} \in \dot{U} \rrbracket_{RO(\mathbb{Q})}$$

is a dense embedding from $\mathbb{B}_{F(\dot{U})} \rightarrow RO(\mathbb{Q})$. Also the map

$$q \mapsto [S_q]_{\mathbb{B}_{F(\dot{U})}}$$

is a dense embedding from $\mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{F(\dot{U})}$, where

$$S_q := \{\xi < \kappa \mid f_q(\xi) \in f_{\dot{G}}(\xi)\}$$

1 $3. \text{Catch}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}), \text{StatCatch}(\mathcal{I}), \text{AND } \text{ClubCatch}(\mathcal{I})$

2 The following definitions each say that, in some sense, the set $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ is large
3 (recall $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ was defined in Definition 2.14):

4 **Definition 3.1.** *Let \mathcal{I} be a normal fine ideal. We say:*

- 5 • *ClubCatch*(\mathcal{I}) holds iff $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ is in the conditional club filter relative to
6 \mathcal{I} .¹⁵
- 7 • *ProjectiveCatch*(\mathcal{I}) holds iff $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ “is positive over every \mathcal{I} -positive
8 set”; that is, for every \mathcal{I} -positive set T , the set

$$S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}} \searrow T := \{M \mid M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}} \text{ and } M \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) \in T\}$$

9 is stationary.

- 10 • *StatCatch*(\mathcal{I}) holds iff $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ is (weakly) stationary.¹⁶

11 If the completeness of \mathcal{I} is at least ω_2 , define *ClubCatch**(\mathcal{I}), *StatCatch**(\mathcal{I}),
12 and *ProjectiveCatch**(\mathcal{I}) similarly, except using $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen},*}$ instead of $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$.

13 The following is just a reformulation of Lemma 3.46 of [7] to conform to the
14 terminology of this paper:

15 **Theorem 3.2.** \mathcal{I} is saturated \iff *ClubCatch*(\mathcal{I}) holds.

16 There is an important difference between *ProjectiveCatch*(\mathcal{I}) and *StatCatch*(\mathcal{I}).
17 *StatCatch*(\mathcal{I}) means that $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ is stationary; but by Remark 2.11, this does
18 **not** imply that $NS \upharpoonright S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ projects canonically to \mathcal{I} . However, if the stronger
19 *ProjectiveCatch*(\mathcal{I}) holds, then $NS \upharpoonright S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ **does** project canonically to \mathcal{I} .
20 This is due to a more general fact: suppose \mathcal{J} is an ideal which projects canonically
21 to \mathcal{I} , and that S is a \mathcal{J} -positive set. If S is projective over \mathcal{I} —i.e. $S \searrow T$ is
22 \mathcal{J} -positive for every \mathcal{I} -positive set T —then $\mathcal{J} \upharpoonright S$ projects canonically to \mathcal{I} .

23 Let us define:

24 **Definition 3.3.** *Suppose \mathcal{I} is a canonical ideal projection of some ideal \mathcal{J} (in the
25 sense of Definition 2.4). We say that \mathcal{J} catches \mathcal{I} and write $\text{catch}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I})$ iff:*

- 26 • *the support of \mathcal{J} contains $H_{\Omega(\mathcal{I})}$;*¹⁷ and
- 27 • $S_{\mathcal{I}, \text{supp}(\mathcal{J})}^{\text{SelfGen}} \in \check{\mathcal{J}}$; that is, there are \mathcal{J}^+ -many \mathcal{I} -self-generic structures.

28 Observe that the definition of *Catch*(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}) requires that the support of \mathcal{J} be
29 large relative to \mathcal{I} ; in particular $\text{catch}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$ can never hold.

30 **Lemma 3.4.** *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal. The following are equivalent:*

- 31 (1) *ProjectiveCatch*(\mathcal{I})
- 32 (2) *There exists an ideal \mathcal{J} such that $\text{Catch}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I})$ holds.*

33 *Proof.* First assume *ProjectiveCatch*(\mathcal{I}) holds and set $\mathcal{J} := NS \upharpoonright S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$. The
34 definition of *ProjectiveCatch*(\mathcal{I}) easily implies that *Catch*(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}) holds.

35 Now assume there exists an ideal \mathcal{J} such that *Catch*(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}) holds. Let $T \in \mathcal{I}^+$;
36 by definition of *Catch*(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}):

$$S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}} \searrow T = \{M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}} \mid M \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) \in T\} \in \mathcal{J}^+$$

¹⁵See Definition 2.12 for the meaning of conditional club filter relative to \mathcal{I} .

¹⁶See the introduction to Section 2.2 for the definition of weakly stationary.

¹⁷The cardinal $\Omega(\mathcal{I})$ is defined in (2).

1 Recall that by “ideal” we always mean a normal, fine ideal; this implies that every
 2 set in \mathcal{J}^+ is stationary. So in particular, $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen} \searrow T$ is stationary and the proof
 3 is finished. \square

4 There is a similar characterization of $ClubCatch(\mathcal{I})$:

5 **Lemma 3.5.** *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal. The following are equivalent:*

- 6 (1) $ClubCatch(\mathcal{I})$ (recall this is equivalent to saturation of \mathcal{I} by Theorem 3.2)
 7 (2) $Catch(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I})$ holds, where \mathcal{J} is the dual of the conditional club filter relative
 8 to \mathcal{I} .

9 The following is a well-known argument:

10 **Lemma 3.6.** *ProjectiveCatch(\mathcal{I}) implies that \mathcal{I} is precipitous. StatCatch(\mathcal{I})
 11 implies that there is some $T \in \mathcal{I}^+$ such that $\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright T$ is precipitous.*

12 *Proof.* First assume $ProjectiveCatch(\mathcal{I})$. Suppose for a contradiction that \mathcal{I} is not
 13 precipitous; then there is some $T \in \mathcal{I}^+$ which forces the \mathcal{I} -generic ultrapower to be
 14 illfounded. By definition of $ProjectiveCatch(\mathcal{I})$, $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen} \searrow T$ is stationary. Now
 15 $H_{(2^{univ(\mathcal{I})})^+}$ is correct about the fact that T forces an illfounded generic ultrapower.
 16 Fix an $M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen} \searrow T$ such that $M \prec (H_\theta, \in, \{\mathcal{I}, T\})$. As usual let $\sigma_M : H_M \rightarrow$
 17 H_θ be the inverse of the Mostowski collapse of M . Set $\bar{T} := \sigma_M^{-1}(T) = T \cap M$ and
 18 $\bar{\mathcal{I}} := \sigma_M^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$. By elementarity of σ_M , H_M believes that \bar{T} forces the $\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\mathcal{I}}}$ -generic
 19 ultrapower to be illfounded. But $M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen}$, so the H_M -ultrafilter derived from
 20 σ_M is $(H_M, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{\mathcal{I}}})$ -generic and $ult(H_M, U)$ is wellfounded. Note also that $\bar{T} \in U$
 21 (since $M \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) \in T = \sigma_M(\bar{T})$). Contradiction.

22 Now assume only that $StatCatch(\mathcal{I})$ holds; we want to show that there exists
 23 some $T \in \mathcal{I}^+$ such that $\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright T$ is precipitous. Suppose this failed; then $1 \Vdash_{\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}} \text{“the}$
 24 $\text{generic ultrapower is illfounded”}$. Pick any $M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen}$. Then H_M believes *all*
 25 generic ultrapowers are illfounded, contradicting that $ult(H_M, \mathcal{U}_M)$ is wellfounded
 26 and \mathcal{U}_M is generic over H_M . \square

27 The following lemma says that if $StatCatch$ holds on some restriction of \mathcal{I} then
 28 it holds on all of \mathcal{I} ; in some sense this makes $StatCatch$ much less interesting than
 29 $ProjectiveCatch$:

30 **Lemma 3.7.** *StatCatch(\mathcal{I}) holds \iff StatCatch($\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright S$) holds for some \mathcal{I} -
 31 positive S .*

32 *Proof.* To see the nontrivial direction: suppose $S \in \mathcal{I}^+$ and $StatCatch(\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright S)$
 33 holds. We show:

$$(3) \quad S_{\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright S}^{SelfGen} \cap \{M \mid M \prec (H_\theta, \in, \{\mathcal{I}, S\})\} \subseteq S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen}$$

34 Suppose M is a model from the left side and $A \in M$ is a maximal antichain for \mathcal{I} .
 35 Then M sees that A can be refined to a maximal antichain of the form $A_S \cup A_{S^c}$
 36 where A_S is a maximal antichain in $\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright S$ and A_{S^c} is a maximal antichain in
 37 $\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright S^c$.¹⁸ Since $M \in S_{\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright S}^{SelfGen}$ and $A_S \in M$ then there is some $T \in M \cap A_S$ such
 38 that $M \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright S) = M \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) \in T$. But then $M \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) \in T'$ where T' is

¹⁸This is just a basic fact about boolean algebras: if A is a maximal antichain and b is an element of the boolean algebra, then $\{a \in A \mid a \leq b\} \cup \{a \in A \mid a \leq b^c\}$ is also a maximal antichain.

1 the unique element of A above T ; note $T' \in M$. So we have shown that M catches
 2 all of its \mathcal{I} -maximal antichains. \square

3 We thank Ralf Schindler for giving us permission to include the following theorem
 4 and proof, which in particular implies that the converse of Lemma 3.6 holds for
 5 ideals on ω_1 . We discovered later that (unknown to Schindler) a special case of the
 6 theorem also essentially appeared in Ketchersid-Larson-Zapletal [17]:

7 **Theorem 3.8.** (*Schindler; Ketchersid-Larson-Zapletal [17]*) *Let \mathcal{I} be a normal*
 8 *ideal such that $\text{univ}(\mathcal{I})$ consists of countable sets.¹⁹ Then \mathcal{I} is precipitous if and*
 9 *only if $\text{ProjectiveCatch}(\mathcal{I})$ holds.*

10 *Proof.* Assume that \mathcal{I} is precipitous; the other direction (that $\text{ProjectiveCatch}(\mathcal{I})$
 11 implies precipitousness of \mathcal{I}) was already taken care of by Lemma 3.6. First we
 12 prove:

13 **Claim 3.9.** *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal such that $\text{univ}(\mathcal{I})$ consists of countable sets. Suppose*
 14 *H is a transitive set such that ${}^{<\omega}H \subset H$ (typically H will be a transitive ZF^-*
 15 *model), let $F : [H]^{<\omega} \rightarrow H$, and let ϕ be a function with domain ω such that*
 16 *$\text{range}(\phi) \in \text{univ}(\mathcal{I})$. Then there is a tree $T_{\phi, F, \mathcal{I}} \subseteq {}^{<\omega}H$ such that: $T_{\phi, F, \mathcal{I}}$ has an*
 17 *infinite branch iff there exists an $N \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ such that $N \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{range}(\phi)$*
 18 *and N is closed under F . Moreover the construction of the tree $T_{\phi, F, \mathcal{I}}$ is absolute*
 19 *between any transitive ZF^- models which have ϕ , F , and \mathcal{I} as elements.*

20 *Proof.* (of Claim) Set $x := \text{range}(\phi)$. Let $T_{\phi, F, \mathcal{I}}$ be the set of all sequences
 21 $\langle a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$ such that $n \in \omega$ and:

- 22 (1) $a_i \in H$ and a_i is finite, for each $i \leq n$
- 23 (2) $\phi(i) \in a_i$ for each $i \leq n$ (to ensure that a cofinal branch will contain x)
- 24 (3) $\text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) \cap (a_0 \cup a_1 \cup \dots \cup a_n) \subseteq x$ (to ensure that a branch will not contain
 25 any points in $\text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) - x$).
- 26 (4) For every $j < n$ and every $\vec{v} \in {}^{\leq j}(a_0 \cup a_1 \cup \dots \cup a_j)$: $F(\vec{v}) \in a_{j+1}$ (to ensure
 27 that the branch is closed under F)
- 28 (5) For each $i < n$: if a_i is a maximal \mathcal{I} -antichain then there exists a $S \in a_{i+1}$
 29 such that $x \in S$ and $S \in a_i$ (to ensure that the branch is \mathcal{I} -self generic)
- 30 (6) For all $i < n$: $a_0 \cup a_1 \cup \dots \cup a_i \subseteq a_{i+1}$ (to ensure that the union of nodes
 31 in the branch will include the witnesses built in by the previous bullets).

32 Clearly $T_{\phi, F, \mathcal{I}}$ is a tree. It is straightforward to prove the claim now. \square

33 We now return to the proof of Theorem 3.8. Set $Z := \text{univ}(\mathcal{I})$. Let $\theta \gg |Z|$,
 34 $F : [H_\theta]^{<\omega} \rightarrow H_\theta$, and $T \in \mathcal{I}^+$ be arbitrary. We need to find an $N \in [H_\theta]^\omega$ such
 35 that N is closed under F , N is \mathcal{I} -self generic, and $N \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) \in T$. Let $G \subset \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ be
 36 generic with $T \in G$, and $j : V \rightarrow_G \text{ult}(V, G)$ the well-founded generic ultrapower.
 37 Set $\mathcal{I}' := j(\mathcal{I})$, $H' := j(H_\theta)$, and $F' := j(F)$. By elementarity of \mathcal{J} , it suffices
 38 to show that $\text{ult}(V, G)$ believes there is an \mathcal{I}' -good, self-generic $N \in [H']^\omega$ which
 39 is closed under F' and such that $N \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}') \in j_G(T)$. Now WLOG $\text{supp}(\mathcal{I})$ is
 40 transitive and so $x := j_G'' \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}) = [\text{id} \upharpoonright Z]_G$ is countable in $\text{ult}(V, G)$ (since we are
 41 assuming that Z consists only of countable sets); fix some $\phi \in \text{ult}(V, G)$ such that
 42 $\phi : \omega \rightarrow x$ is a bijection. Note also that since $T \in G$, that $x \in j_G(T)$. By Claim
 43 3.9 it suffices to prove that the tree $T_{\phi, F', \mathcal{I}'}$ has an infinite branch in $\text{ult}(V, G)$;

¹⁹For example, if \mathcal{I} is a normal ideal on ω_1 , or if \mathcal{I} is a normal ideal on $[H_\theta]^\omega$.

1 and since $ult(V, G)$ is wellfounded, it in turn suffices to prove that $T_{\phi, F', \mathcal{I}'}$ has an
 2 infinite branch in $V[G]$. Set $N := j''H_\theta^V \in V[G]$. It is easily checked, using Los
 3 Theorem, that N is \mathcal{I}' -self-generic,²⁰ is closed under F' , and $N \cap supp(\mathcal{I}') = x$.
 4 Then by Claim 3.9, $T_{\phi, F', \mathcal{I}'}$ has an infinite branch in $V[G]$. \square

5 Theorem 3.8 gives a nice characterization of precipitousness for NS_{ω_1} .²¹

Corollary 3.10. *Let $\mathcal{I} := NS_{\omega_1}$. Then:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} \text{ is precipitous} &\iff S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen} \text{ is projective stationary} \\ \mathcal{I} \text{ is somewhere precipitous} &\iff S_{\mathcal{I}}^{SelfGen} \text{ is stationary} \end{aligned}$$

6 The following (which essentially appears in [7]) is a standard application of Los'
 7 Theorem; it says that if $catch(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I})$ holds then generics for $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$ project canonically
 8 to generics for $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$, and that this projection is an element of the generic ultrapower
 9 of V by \mathcal{J} .

10 **Lemma 3.11.** *Suppose \mathcal{J} projects canonically to \mathcal{I} and that $H_{\Omega(\mathcal{I})} \subseteq supp(\mathcal{J})$.
 11 Let $h_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}} : \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$ be the canonical boolean homomorphism from Fact 2.8. Then
 12 the following are equivalent:*

- 13 (1) $catch(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I})$;
- 14 (2) Whenever G is $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$ -generic, then $\bar{U} := h_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}}^{-1}[G]$ is $(V, \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}})$ -generic.
- 15 (3) $h_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}}$ is a regular embedding.

16 *Proof.* The equivalence of item 1 with item 2 is a standard application of Los'
 17 Theorem, using Facts 2.1 and 2.3. The equivalence of item 2 with item 3 is a
 18 standard forcing fact. \square

19 **Corollary 3.12.** *Suppose \mathcal{J}_2 projects canonically to \mathcal{J}_1 , and that \mathcal{J}_1 projects canonically
 20 to \mathcal{J}_0 . Let $h_{i,j} : \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}_j}$ be the canonical boolean homomorphism (for
 21 $i \leq j$); note these maps commute. If $Catch(\mathcal{J}_2, \mathcal{J}_0)$ holds then $h_{0,2}$ and $h_{0,1}$ are
 22 each regular embeddings.*

23 *Proof.* That $h_{0,2}$ is a regular embedding follows from Lemma 3.11 (where \mathcal{J}_2 plays
 24 the role of \mathcal{J} and \mathcal{J}_0 plays the role of \mathcal{I}). This, in turn, abstractly implies that
 25 $h_{0,1}$ is a regular embedding (if f and g are boolean homomorphisms and $f \circ g$ is a
 26 regular embedding, then g is also a regular embedding). \square

27 Finally a brief remark about the relationship between $StatCatch(\mathcal{I})$ and the
 28 Forcing Axiom for $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$; roughly, $StatCatch(\mathcal{I})$ is the requirement that the Forcing
 29 Axiom for $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ holds in a very nice way. For a poset \mathbb{P} , $FA_{\mu}(\mathbb{P})$ means that for every
 30 μ -sized collection \mathcal{D} of dense subsets of \mathbb{P} , there is a filter on \mathbb{P} which meets every
 31 element of \mathcal{D} . Note that $FA_{\mu}(\mathbb{P})$ is trivially true if $\mu = \omega$.

32 **Lemma 3.13.** *Suppose \mathcal{I} is an ideal on μ^+ where μ is regular. Then:*

$$(4) \quad StatCatch(\mathcal{I}) \implies FA_{\mu}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}})$$

²⁰Because G is the ultrafilter derived from the transitive collapse of N and is generic over H_θ
 for $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$.

²¹Note the \Leftarrow directions of Corollary 3.10 are due to Lemma 3.6.

1 *Proof.* Suppose $\text{StatCatch}(\mathcal{I})$ holds, and let \mathcal{D} be a μ -sized collection of dense
 2 subsets of $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$. Pick any $M \prec (H_\theta, \in, \{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{D}\})$ such that $M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ and $\mu \subset M$.
 3 Since $M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{SelfGen}}$ then the filter $g := \{T \in M \cap \wp(\mu^+) \mid M \cap \mu \in T\}$ is $(M, \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}})$ -
 4 generic (i.e. $g \cap D \cap M \neq \emptyset$ for each dense $D \in M$). Since $\mu \subset M$ and $\mathcal{D} \in M$,
 5 then $\mathcal{D} \subset M$ and so in particular $g \cap D \cap M \neq \emptyset$ for each $D \in \mathcal{D}$. \square

6 **Remark 3.14.** *Starting from just one measurable cardinal, Jech-Magidor-Mitchell-*
 7 *Prikry [15] proved that one can force $\mathbb{B}_{NS \upharpoonright S_1^2}$ to have a σ -closed dense subset. Since*
 8 *$FA_{\omega_1}(\sigma\text{-closed})$ is a theorem of ZFC, then $FA_{\omega_1}(\mathbb{B}_{NS \upharpoonright S_1^2})$ holds in their model.²²*
 9 *Combined with Theorem 1.1 of the current paper, it follows that the existence of*
 10 *an ideal \mathcal{I} on ω_2 such that $\text{StatCatch}^*(\mathcal{I})$ holds is much stronger (in consistency*
 11 *strength) than the existence of an ideal \mathcal{I} on ω_2 such that $FA_{\omega_1}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}})$ holds.*

12 4. LOWER CONSISTENCY BOUND OF $\text{StatCatch}^*(\mathcal{I})$

13 In the following we focus on ideals on ω_2 . Given a cardinal Ω and a structure
 14 $M \subseteq H_\Omega$, write

- 15 • $\alpha_M = M \cap \omega_2$, and
- 16 • $\tilde{\tau}_M = \sup(M \cap \omega_3)$.

17 We will focus on situations where $\alpha_M \in \omega_2$ and $\tilde{\tau}_M \in \omega_3$.

18 **Theorem 4.1.** *Let \mathcal{I} be a normal fine ideal on ω_2 concentrating on $\omega_2 \cap \text{cof}(\omega_1)$*
 19 *and for sufficiently large Ω let*

$S_{\mathcal{I}}^*$ = the set of all $M \prec H_\Omega$ satisfying the following requirements

- (a) M is self-generic with respect to \mathcal{I} .
- (b) $\alpha_M \in \omega_2$ and $\tilde{\tau}_M \in \omega_3$.
- (c) $\text{cf}(\alpha_M), \text{cf}(\tilde{\tau}_M) > \omega$.

20 *If $S_{\mathcal{I}}^*$ is stationary then there is a proper class inner model with a Woodin cardinal.*

21 **Proof.** Assume there is no proper class inner model with a Woodin cardinal. We
 22 will use the core model theory as developed in [22]. In particular, we will assume
 23 that there is a measurable cardinal in \mathbf{V} in order to simplify the situation.

24 As usual, instead of \mathbf{K} we will work with a soundness witness W for $\mathbf{K} \parallel \omega_3$.
 25 Thus, W is a thick proper class extender model, and $\mathbf{K} \parallel \omega_3$ is contained in the
 26 Σ_1^W -hull of any thick class in W . We will make a substantial use of the following
 27 observation from [4].

- (5) If U is generic for $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}}$ over \mathbf{V} and $M = \text{Ult}(V, U)$ is well-founded
 then W and $j(W)$ agree on the cardinal successor of ω_2 .

28 We briefly sketch the proof of this fact. The point is that since $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is a small forcing,
 29 W is still thick in $\mathbf{V}[U]$ and witnesses the soundness of $(\mathbf{K} \parallel \omega_3)^{\mathbf{V}}$. And since j
 30 is the ultrapower map associated with $\text{Ult}(\mathbf{V}, U)$, also $j(W)$ is thick. Now W has the
 31 definability and hull property up to ω_2 , so the same is true of $j(W)$ as the critical
 32 point of j is ω_2 . All of the above implies that W and $j(W)$ coiterate to a common

²²Moreover the measurable cardinal is optimal; if \mathcal{I} is an ideal such that $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ has a σ -closed dense subset, then \mathcal{I} is precipitous, which implies there is an inner model with a measurable cardinal. In fact Gitik-Shelah [13] showed that if $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is a proper poset then \mathcal{I} is precipitous; and Balcar-Franek [1] showed that if $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is ω_1 -preserving then \mathcal{I} is somewhere precipitous.

1 proper class extender model with no truncations on either side, and the critical
2 point on the main branches of both sides of the coiteration are at least ω_2 .

3 For each $M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^*$ let H_M be the transitive collapse of M , $\sigma_M : H_M \rightarrow H_\Omega$ be
4 the inverse to the Mostowski collapsing isomorphism, W_M be the collapse of $W \parallel \Omega$,
5 and $\tau_M = \alpha_M^{+\tilde{W}_M}$ where α_M was introduced above. We also write τ for ω_2^{+W} . We
6 note that by Theorem in [4], $\tau = \omega_3$. We will not need this fact, but we bring it to
7 the attention as this fact is responsible for the need of our additional assumption
8 that $\tilde{\tau}_M$ has uncountable cofinality.

9 Let U_M be the H_M -ultrafilter derived from the map $\sigma_M : H_M \rightarrow H_\Omega$. By
10 our assumption on the self-genericity of M with respect to \mathcal{I} , the ultrafilter U_M
11 is generic over H_M for the poset $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}}^M = \sigma_M^{-1}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}})$. Let $\tilde{H}_M = \text{Ult}(H_M, U_M)$ and
12 $j_M : H_M \rightarrow \tilde{H}_M$ be the associated ultrapower map. We have $\text{cr}(j_M) = \alpha_M$.
13 Finally let $k_M : \tilde{H}_M \rightarrow H_\Omega$ be the factor map between σ_M and j_M , that is,
14 $k_M : [f]_{U_M} \mapsto \sigma_M(f)(\alpha_M)$. Since $\alpha_M = (\omega_1^{\mathbf{V}})^{+H_M}$ we have $j_M(\alpha_M) = (\omega_1^{\mathbf{V}})^{+\tilde{H}_M}$,
15 and since $k_M \upharpoonright (\alpha_M + 1) = \text{id} \upharpoonright (\alpha_M + 1)$ the critical point of k_M is at least $j_M(\alpha_M)$.
16 Write λ_M for $j_M(\alpha_M)$.

17 The statement in (5) can be expressed as a statement in the forcing language for
18 $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}}$ in parameters $W, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}}$ and ω_2 . (Here we actually replace W with its sufficiently
19 long initial segment, in order that the parameter is an element of H_Ω .) By the
20 elementarity of j_M , the same statement in the forcing language for $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}}^M$ holds in H_M
21 at parameters $W_M, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}}^M$ and α_M . Since U_M is generic for $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}}^M$ over H_M , the models
22 W_M and $\tilde{W}_M = j_M(W_M)$ agree on the cardinal successor of α_M , so $\alpha_M^{+\tilde{W}_M} = \tau_M$.
23 By the condensation properties of extender models we have $W_M \parallel \tau_M = \tilde{W}_M \parallel \tau_M$,
24 so in particular the models W_M, \tilde{W}_M have same subsets of α_M . This in turn implies
25 that α_M is inaccessible in W_M and hence λ_M is inaccessible in \tilde{W}_M . (More is true,
26 see for instance [4], but we will not need more in our argument.) Now since k_M is
27 the identity on λ_M the ordinal λ_M is a limit cardinal in W , $\alpha_M^{+W} = k(\tau_M) = \tau_M$,
28 and $W \parallel \tau_M = \tilde{W}_M \parallel \tau_M = W_M \parallel \tau_M$. Let F_M be the W_M -extender at (α_M, λ_M)
29 derived from σ_M . Then F_M is actually a W -extender, that is, it measures all sets
30 in $\mathcal{P}(\alpha_M) \cap W$. We prove

$$(6) \quad F_M \in W.$$

31 This will yield a contradiction as follows. Since $k_M \upharpoonright \lambda_M$ is the identity, F_M is
32 also the extender at (α_M, λ_M) derived from j_M . The ultrapower map associated
33 with $\text{Ult}(W_M, F_M)$ agrees with j_M on $W_M \parallel \tau_M = W \parallel \tau_M$, so $H_{\lambda_M}^W = H_{\lambda_M}^{\tilde{W}_M} \subseteq$
34 $\text{Ult}(W_M \parallel \tau_M, F_M) = \text{Ult}(W \parallel \tau_M, F_M)$. This says that F_M is a superstrong exten-
35 der in W , which is impossible.

36 To see (6), we prove that for all but nonstationarily many structures $M \in S_{\mathcal{I}}^*$
37 the following holds.

$$(7) \quad \text{The phalanx } (W, \text{Ult}(W, F_M), \lambda_M) \text{ is iterable.}$$

38 Here it is understood that wellfoundedness is part of the definition of iterability. The
39 conclusion (6) then follows from the core model theory folklore that any extender
40 that coheres to W and satisfies (7) is actually on the W -sequence. This is an
41 instance of theorem 8.6 in [22]. That F_M coheres to W follows from the facts
42 F_M coheres to \tilde{W}_M , $\text{cr}(k) \geq \lambda_M$, and from the condensation properties of extender
43 models which imply that the extender sequences of \tilde{W}_M and W agree up to $\lambda_M^{+\tilde{W}_M} =$
44 $j_M(\tau_M)$. The proof of (7) is a straightforward adaptation of the frequent extension

1 argument from [19] or its more specified instance in [20], and we will sketch the
2 essentials of this adaptiaon below.

3 Let us recall the following terminology. Given two phalanxes (P, Q, λ) and
4 (P', Q', λ') we say that a pair of maps (ρ, σ) is an embedding of (P, Q, λ) into
5 (P', Q', λ') if and only if $\rho : P \rightarrow P'$ and $\sigma : Q \rightarrow Q'$ are Σ_0 -preserving and
6 cardinal-preserving embeddings such that $\rho \upharpoonright \lambda = \sigma \upharpoonright \lambda$, $\sigma''\lambda \subseteq \lambda'$, and $\sigma(\lambda) \geq \lambda'$.
7 In our argument below we will only make use of Σ_0 -embeddings, as we will only
8 be concerned with Σ_0 -iterability. A straightforward copying construction yields
9 the following: If P, P are 1-small premeice, (ρ, σ) is an embedding of the phalanx
10 (P, Q, λ) into (P', Q', λ') , and \mathcal{T} is an iteration tree on (P, Q, λ) then \mathcal{T} can be
11 copied onto an iteration tree \mathcal{T}' on (P, Q, λ) via (ρ, σ) (of course, we only consider
12 normal trees here). Thus, if (P', Q', λ') is iterable, then so is (P, Q, λ) .

13 Instead of (7) we actually prove a stronger statement that for all but non-
14 stationarily many $M \in S_{\mathcal{T}}^*$ the phalanx

$$(8) \quad (W, \text{Ult}(W, G_M), \omega_2) \text{ is iterable}$$

15 where G_M is the W_M -extender at (α_M, ω_2) derived from σ_M . So assume for a
16 contradiction that there is a stationary set $S \subseteq S_{\mathcal{T}}^*$ such that for all $M \in S$ the
17 conclusion (8) fails, and let \mathcal{T}_M be an iteration tree on $(W, \text{Ult}(W, G), \omega_2)$ that
18 witnesses the failure of iterability. Let ζ be large enough so that for each $M \in S$ the
19 failure of iterability is already witnessed by $N = W \parallel \zeta$, that is, when we view \mathcal{T}_M
20 as an iteration tree on $(N, \text{Ult}(N_M, G_M), \omega_2)$ then either \mathcal{T}_M has a last ill-founded
21 model or \mathcal{T}_M is of limit length and does not have a cofinal well-founded branch.
22 Also, pick ζ to be a successor cardinal in W in order to simplify the calculations.

23 Let θ be a large regular cardinal such that the entire situation described above
24 takes place in H_θ , and for each $M \in S$ let $Z_M \prec H_\theta$ be a countable elementary
25 substructure such that $G_M, \mathcal{T}_M \in Z_M$. Fix the following notation.

- 26 • H_M^Z is the transitive collapse of Z_M and $\rho_M : H_M^Z \rightarrow H_\theta$ is the inverse to
- 27 the Mostowski collapsing isomorphism.
- 28 • $\bar{N}_M, \bar{\mathcal{T}}_M, \bar{G}_M, \bar{\alpha}_M, \bar{\tau}_M, \bar{\delta}_M$ are the inverse images of $N, \mathcal{T}_M, G_M, \alpha_M, \tau_M, \omega_2$
- 29 under ρ_M .

30 Inside the structure H_M^Z the tree $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_M$ witnesses the non-iterability of the phalanx
31 $(\bar{N}_M, \text{Ult}(\bar{N}_M, \bar{G}_M), \bar{\delta}_M)$. Since all premeice we work with are 1-small, the argument
32 from the proof of Lemma 2.4(b) in [22] shows that $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$ witnesses the non-iterability
33 of $(\bar{N}_M, \text{Ult}(\bar{N}_M, \bar{G}_M), \bar{\delta}_M)$ in the sense of \mathbf{V} .

34 Recall that $\tau = \omega_2^{+W}$ and $\bar{\tau}_M = \sup(\sigma_M''\tau_M)$. Let S' be the set of all $M' \prec H_\theta$
35 such that $M' \cap H_\Omega \in S$. Then S' is a stationary set, and so is $S_1 = \{M' \cap H_\Omega \mid$
36 $M' \in S'\}$. Given a model $M \in S_1$ we show that there is a set $a \in M$ such that
37 $Y_M = \sigma_M''(Z \cap W \parallel \tau_M) \subseteq a \subseteq M$. Obviously Y_M is a countable subset of $W \parallel \bar{\tau}_M$
38 and $\bar{\tau}_M \leq \tau$. If $\tau < \omega_3$ then there is a surjection $f : \omega_2 \rightarrow W \parallel \tau$ such that
39 $f \in M$. Otherwise we use our assumption that $\bar{\tau}_M$ has uncountable cofinality, so
40 $\sup(Y_M) < \bar{\tau}_M$. In this case pick any $\tau' \in M \cap \omega_3$ such that $\tau' > \sup(Y_M)$; then
41 again there is some surjection $f : \omega_2 \rightarrow W \parallel \tau'$ such that $f \in M$. (See our comments
42 at the beginning of the proof. The case $\tau < \omega_3$ is actually vacuous, but we chose
43 to include it here in order to demonstrate that the argument does not rely on the
44 knowledge that $\omega_2^{+\mathbf{K}} = \omega_3$.) Since $Y_M \subseteq M$ is countable and α_M has uncountable
45 cofinality there is some $\beta < \alpha_M$ such that $Y_M \subseteq f''\beta$. Letting $a = f''\beta$, it is clear

1 that a satisfies the above requirements. Notice also that the conclusion $a \subseteq M$
 2 follows immediately from the facts that $a \in M$, $\text{card}(a) = \omega_1$, and $\omega_1 + 1 \subseteq M$.

3 Working in H_θ , assume $M \in S_1$ is of the form $M' \cap H_\Omega$ for some $M' \in S'$.
 4 Then, letting a be as in the previous paragraph, the set M witnesses the existential
 5 quantifier in the following statement.

$$H_\theta \models (\exists v \in S)(a \in v).$$

6 Since $M' \prec H_\theta$, there is some $\bar{M} \in S$ such that $a \in \bar{M}$. The last sentence in the
 7 previous paragraph applied to \bar{M} in place of M yields $a \subseteq \bar{M}$. Thus, $Y_M \subseteq \bar{M}$.
 8 It follows that there is a regressive map $g : S_1 \rightarrow S$ such that $Y_M \subseteq g(M)$ for all
 9 $M \in S_1$. Press down and obtain a stationary $S^* \subseteq S_1$ and a structure $M^* \in S$
 10 such that $g(M) = M^*$ for all $M \in S^*$. We thus have the following: The structure
 11 M^* is an element of S , the set $S^* \subseteq S$ is stationary, and $Y_M \subseteq M^* \subseteq M$ whenever
 12 $M \in S^*$. In the following we write α^* for α_{M^*} .

13 Given two structures $M, M' \in S$ such that $M \in M'$ there is a partial elementary
 14 map $\sigma_{M, M'} = \sigma_{M'}^{-1} \circ \sigma_M$ from M into M' . For $M \in S^*$ let

$$\tau_M^* = \text{sup}((\sigma_{M^*, M}^{-1} \circ \rho_M)'' \bar{\tau}_M).$$

15 By the construction of M^* the map

$$\sigma_{M^*, M}^{-1} \circ \rho_M \upharpoonright (\bar{N}_M \upharpoonright \bar{\tau}_M) : \bar{N}_M \upharpoonright \bar{\tau}_M \rightarrow W_{M^*} \upharpoonright \tau_M^*$$

16 is total. (Recall that $R \upharpoonright \beta$ denotes the initial segment of R of height β without the
 17 extender E_β^R as its top predicate, whereas $R \parallel \beta$ denotes the corresponding initial
 18 segment with E_β^R as a top predicate.) Moreover, this map is Σ_0 -preserving and
 19 cofinal. We can now apply the argument in the proof of the interpolation lemma
 20 (see [24], Lemma 3.6.10) to construct a premouse N_M^* such that $W_{M^*} \upharpoonright \tau_M^* \triangleleft N_M^*$ and
 21 $\tau_M^* = (\alpha^*)^{+N_M^*}$, along with Σ_0 -preserving maps $\sigma_M^* : \bar{N}_M \rightarrow N_M^*$ and $\sigma'_M : N_M^* \rightarrow$
 22 N such that σ_M^* extends $\sigma_{M^*, M}^{-1} \circ \rho_M \upharpoonright (\bar{N}_M \upharpoonright \bar{\tau}_M)$, σ'_M extends $\sigma_{M^*, M} \upharpoonright (W_{M^*} \upharpoonright \tau_M^*)$,
 23 and $\sigma'_M \circ \sigma_M^* = \rho_M$. Let us merely mention here that N_M^* is the ultrapower of \bar{N}_M
 24 using the map $\sigma_{M^*, M}^{-1} \circ \rho_M \upharpoonright (\bar{N}_M \parallel \bar{\tau}_M)$, and σ'_M is the corresponding factor map.
 25 Here all premisses are passive ZFC^- -models, so N_M^* is a premouse, and both σ_M^* and
 26 σ'_M are actually fully elementary. Also, the map σ'_M , when viewed as a map from
 27 N_M^* into W , is Σ_0 -preserving.

28 Given a phalanx (W, Q, α^*) and a premouse (possibly a proper class one) Q' , we
 29 write $Q' <_S Q$ if and only if there is a normal iteration tree on (W, Q, α^*) such that
 30 Q' is an initial segment of the last model M_∞^T of \mathcal{T} , and one of the following holds.

- 31 (a) W is on the main branch of \mathcal{T} .
- 32 (b) Q is on the main branch of \mathcal{T} and there is a truncation on this main branch.
- 33 (c) Q is on the main branch of \mathcal{T} , there is no truncation on this main branch,
 34 and Q' is a proper initial segment of M_∞^T .

35 We will make heavy use of the following essential result; see [19], Lemma 3.2 or [20],
 36 proof of Theorem 3.4.

(9) The relation $<_S$ is well-founded below W .

37 That is, if we let $Q_0 = W$ then any sequence of models Q_n such that $Q_{n+1} <_S Q_n$
 38 is finite. Let us just stress that the conclusion in (9) may not be true for a general
 39 extender model W , but it is based, in a crucial way, on the fact that W is a
 40 soundness witness for an initial segment of \mathbf{K} which is embeddable into \mathbf{K}^c .

1 Our initial assumption (precisely the fact that $M^* \in S$) guarantees that the
 2 phalanx $(W, \text{Ult}(W, G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$ is not iterable. By (9) fix an $<_S$ -minimal premouse Q
 3 below W with respect to $<_S$ witnessing the non-iterability of $(W, \text{Ult}(Q, G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$.
 4 That is, following hold.

- 5 (a) (W, Q, α^*) is iterable and $(W, \text{Ult}(Q, G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$ is not iterable.
 6 (b) If $Q' <_S Q$ then $(W, \text{Ult}(Q', G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$ is iterable.

7 Notice that Q is a set size model, as the non-iterability of a proper class model is
 8 witnessed by some if its proper initial segments.

9 By the construction of M^* , N_M^* and the maps σ_M^* , σ'_M , for every $a \in [\bar{\delta}_M]^{<\omega}$ and
 10 every $x \in [\bar{\alpha}_M]^{|a|}$ the following are equivalent for any $M \in S^*$.

- 11 • $x \in (\bar{G}_M)_a$.
 12 • $\rho_M(x) \in (G_M)_{\rho_M(a)}$.
 13 • $\rho_M(a) \in \sigma_M(\rho_M(x))$.
 14 • $\rho_M(a) \in \sigma_{M^*}(\sigma_M^*(x))$.
 15 • $\sigma_M^*(x) \in (G_{M^*})_{\rho_M(a)}$.

16 The usual copying argument then yields that $\rho'_M : [a, f]_{\bar{G}_M} \mapsto [\rho_M(a), \sigma_M^*(f)]_{G_{M^*}}$ is
 17 a Σ_0 -preserving cardinal-preserving embedding from $\text{Ult}(\bar{N}_M, \bar{G}_M)$ into $\text{Ult}(N_M^*, G_{M^*})$;
 18 moreover $\rho'_M \upharpoonright \bar{\delta}_M = \rho_M \upharpoonright \bar{\delta}_M$ and $\rho'_M \circ \pi_{\bar{G}_M} = \pi_{G_{M^*}} \circ \sigma_M^*$ where $\pi_{\bar{G}_M}$ and $\pi_{G_{M^*}}$ are
 19 the corresponding ultrapower embeddings. Note also that $\rho'_M(\bar{\delta}_M) = \omega_2$. It follows
 20 that the pair (ρ_M, ρ'_M) is an embedding of the phalanx $(\bar{N}_M, \text{Ult}(\bar{N}_M, \bar{G}_M), \bar{\delta}_M)$
 21 into $(W, \text{Ult}(N_M^*, G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$. This proves:

(10) The phalanx $(W, \text{Ult}(N_M^*, G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$ is not iterable.

22 Notice also that the phalanx (W, N_M^*, α^*) is iterable, because the pair (id, σ'_M) is
 23 an embedding of (W, N_M^*, α^*) into W .

24 The following reflection argument shows that the extender G_{M^*} can be replaced
 25 with an extender with shorter support; this will be needed below. Let θ' be large
 26 enough such that in $H_{\theta'}$ there is an iteration tree \mathcal{R} witnessing the non-iterability
 27 of the phalanx $(W \parallel \tilde{\zeta}, \text{Ult}(Q, G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$ for a suitable $\tilde{\zeta}$. Pick some countable ele-
 28 mentary substructure X of $H_{\theta'}$ such that $\mathcal{R} \in X$; let H be the transitive collapse
 29 of X and $\sigma : H \rightarrow H_{\theta'}$ be the inverse to the Mostowski collapsing isomorphism.
 30 Then $\mathcal{R}' = \sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{R})$ witnesses the non-iterability of the phalanx $(W', \text{Ult}(Q', G'), \beta')$
 31 where $\sigma(W', Q', \beta') = (W \parallel \tilde{\zeta}, Q, \omega_2)$, again by the proof of Lemma 2.4(b) in [22].
 32 Pick $M \in S^*$ such that $\alpha_M > \sup(X \cap \omega_2)$, and let $G = G_{M^*} \upharpoonright \alpha_M$. By the
 33 construction of the map σ'_M and by our choice of Q , the restriction of G to sets
 34 in Q agrees with the Q -extender derived from the map σ'_M . Since $x \in G'_a$ im-
 35 plies $\sigma(a) \in G_{\sigma(a)}$ for all $a \in [\beta']^{<\omega}$ and $x \in \mathcal{P}([\alpha']^{|a|}) \cap Q$ where $\alpha' = \sigma^{-1}(\alpha^*)$,
 36 the map $\sigma' : [a, f]_{G'} \mapsto [\sigma(a), \sigma(f)]_G$ maps $\text{Ult}(Q', G')$ into $\text{Ult}(Q, G)$ elementarily,
 37 $\sigma' \upharpoonright \beta' = \sigma \upharpoonright \beta' \subseteq \alpha_M$, and $\sigma'(\beta') = \pi_G(\alpha^*) \geq \alpha_M$; here of course π_G is the ultra-
 38 power embdding associated with $\text{Ult}(Q, G)$. The pair (σ, σ') is thus an embedding
 39 of the phalanx $(W', \text{Ult}(Q', G'), \beta')$ into $(W \parallel \tilde{\zeta}, \text{Ult}(Q, G), \alpha_M)$, witnessing that

(11) The phalanx $(W, \text{Ult}(Q, G), \alpha_M)$ is not iterable.

40 From now on the proof follows very closely the final argument in [19]. We work
 41 with M and Q picked above. Let $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ be the pair of iteration trees coming
 42 from the terminal coiteration on of (W, Q, α^*) against (W, N_M^*, α^*) where \mathcal{U} is on
 43 (W, Q, α^*) and \mathcal{V} is on (W, N_M^*, α^*) . The extender model W is thick as it is a

1 soundness witness for an initial segment of \mathbf{K} , so W cannot be on the main branch
 2 on both sides of both trees.

3 We first argue that Q must be on the main branch $b^{\mathcal{U}}$ of \mathcal{U} . Otherwise $M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}} <_S Q$,
 4 and N_M^* is on the main branch $b^{\mathcal{V}}$ of \mathcal{V} . By the $<_S$ -minimality of Q the phalanx
 5 $(W, \text{Ult}(M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}}, G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$ must be iterable. As W is thick there is no truncation on
 6 $b^{\mathcal{V}}$ and $M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}} \leq M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}$. The critical point of the iteration map $\pi_{b^{\mathcal{V}}}$ along the main
 7 branch of \mathcal{V} is at least α^* , so the map $k : \text{Ult}(N_M^*, G_{M^*}) \rightarrow \text{Ult}(M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}}, G_{M^*})$ defined
 8 by $k : [a, f]_{G_{M^*}} \mapsto [a, \pi_{b^{\mathcal{V}}}(f) \upharpoonright [\alpha^*]^{|\alpha|}]_{G_{M^*}}$ is an elementary embedding with critical
 9 point strictly above ω_2 , witnessing that the pair (id, k) is an embedding of the
 10 phalanx $(W, \text{Ult}(N_M^*, G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$ into $(W, \text{Ult}(M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}}, G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$. As we proved above
 11 that the former phalanx is not iterable, this shows that the latter phalanx cannot
 12 be iterable either, a contradiction.

13 Recall again that the pair (id, σ'_M) is an embdding of the phalanx (W, N_M^*, α^*)
 14 into W . Let \mathcal{V}' be the iteration tree on W obtained by copying \mathcal{V} via the pair
 15 (id, σ'_M) , and let $\sigma_\infty : M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}'}$ be the map between the last models of \mathcal{V} and
 16 \mathcal{V}' . Obviously \mathcal{V}' is a normal iteration tree on W with iteration indices strictly
 17 above α_M . By the agreement between the copy maps, $\sigma_\infty \upharpoonright \nu = \sigma'_M \upharpoonright \nu$ where ν is
 18 the first iteration index used in \mathcal{V} . In particular, σ_∞ agrees with σ'_M on all sets in
 19 $\mathcal{P}([\alpha^*]^{<\omega}) \cap N_M^* \parallel \nu$.

20 We next show that either there is a truncation on $b^{\mathcal{U}}$ or $M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}}$ is a proper ini-
 21 tial segment of $M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}$. Otherwise $M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}} \leq M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}}$ and we have the iteration map $\pi_{b^{\mathcal{U}}} :$
 22 $Q \rightarrow M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}$ along the main branch of \mathcal{U} . The critical poin of $\pi_{b^{\mathcal{U}}}$ is at least α^* ,
 23 so $\mathcal{P}([\alpha^*]^{<\omega}) \cap Q = \mathcal{P}([\alpha^*]^{<\omega}) \cap M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}$. As pointed out above, the extender G re-
 24 stricted to the sets in Q agrees with the Q -extender derived from σ'_M , so the same
 25 also holds when we replace Q with $M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}$ and σ'_M with σ_∞ . Let $W_\infty = \sigma_\infty(M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}})$.
 26 Standard arguments then show that the map $k : \text{Ult}(M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}, G) \rightarrow W_\infty$ defined by
 27 $k : [a, f]_G \mapsto \sigma_\infty(f)(a)$ is a Σ_0 -preserving cardinal preserving embedding with crit-
 28 ical point stritly above α_M . (We of course let $W_\infty = M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}'}$ if $M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}} = M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}'}$.) It
 29 follows that the pair (id, k) is an embedding of the phalanx $(W, \text{Ult}(M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}, G), \alpha_M)$
 30 into (W, W_∞, α_M) . Now W_∞ is an initial segment of the last model on the normal
 31 iteration tree \mathcal{V}' on W with indices strictly above α_M , and W , being a sound-
 32 ness witness for an initial segment of \mathbf{K} , is embeddable into \mathbf{K}^c . It follows that
 33 the phalanx (W, W_∞, α_M) can be embedded into a \mathbf{K}^c -generated phalanx which
 34 is iterable by Theorem 6.9 in [22]. Hence (W, W_∞, α_M) is also iterable, and so is
 35 $(W, \text{Ult}(M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}, G), \alpha_M)$. On the other hand, an argument similar to the one above in
 36 the proof that Q is on the main branch of \mathcal{U} shows that, letting $k : \text{Ult}(Q, G) \rightarrow$
 37 $\text{Ult}(M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}, G)$ be the map defined by $k : [a, f]_G \mapsto [a, \pi_{b^{\mathcal{U}}}(f) \upharpoonright [\alpha^*]^{|\alpha|}]_G$, the pair
 38 (id, k) is an embedding of $(W, \text{Ult}(Q, G), \alpha_M)$ into $(W, \text{Ult}(M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}, G), \alpha_M)$. As we
 39 have seen that $(W, \text{Ult}(Q, G), \alpha_M)$ is not iterable, neither is $(W, \text{Ult}(M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}, G), \alpha_M)$.
 40 This is a contradiction.

41 To summarize, we arrived at the conclusion that Q is on the main branch of \mathcal{U} ,
 42 and either there is a truncation on the main branch $b^{\mathcal{U}}$ or $M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}}$ is a proper initial seg-
 43 ment of $M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}}$. This means that $M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}} <_S Q$, hence the phalanx $(W, \text{Ult}(M_\infty^{\mathcal{V}}, G_{M^*}), \omega_2)$
 44 must be iterable by the mininality of Q . On the other hand, we have seen in (10)
 45 that this phalanx is not iterable, which yields our final contradiction. \square

5. FORCING MODELS OF *ProjectiveCatch*

In this section we investigate variations of the Kunen and Magidor constructions of saturated ideals from huge and almost-huge cardinals; in particular, what happens when their large cardinal assumptions are significantly weakened (roughly, weakened to slightly more than a supercompact cardinal). We ultimately prove that, starting from a κ which is δ -supercompact for some inaccessible $\delta > \kappa$, we can produce models of *ProjectiveCatch*(I) (where I is non-strong) on any successor of a regular cardinal (See Theorem 5.37).

5.1. Towers of supercompactness measures. First a few basic facts about towers of supercompactness measures (see e.g. Kanamori [16] for more details). Note that the definition of tower below allows for the possibility that the height of the tower is a successor ordinal; this is done in order to keep a uniform terminology for some of the later theorems.

Definition 5.1. *Let δ be an ordinal. A sequence $\vec{U} = \langle U_\gamma \mid \gamma < \delta \rangle$ is called a $P_\kappa(-)$ -tower of height δ iff:*

- (1) *For each $\gamma < \delta$: U_γ is a normal measure on $P_\kappa(\gamma)$*
- (2) *For each $\gamma < \gamma'$: U_γ is the projection of $U_{\gamma'}$ to γ .*

If \vec{U} is a $P_\kappa(-)$ -tower of height δ , there is a natural directed system and direct limit map $j_{\vec{U}} : V \rightarrow_{\vec{U}} \text{ult}(V, \vec{U})$.

Remark 5.2. *If the height of \vec{U} is a successor ordinal $\beta + 1$, then the ultrapower by \vec{U} is just the same as the ultrapower by the largest measure on the sequence; i.e. the ultrapower by U_β .*

Definition 5.3. *A $P_\kappa(-)$ -tower \vec{U} of height δ is called an almost huge tower iff δ is inaccessible and $j_{\vec{U}}(\kappa) = \delta$.*

We list some basic facts about towers; more details can be found in Kanamori [16].

Fact 5.4. *Suppose \vec{U} is a $P_\kappa(-)$ tower of height δ . Then*

- (1) *$\kappa = \text{crit}(j_{\vec{U}})$, $j_{\vec{U}}(\kappa) \geq \delta$, and $\text{ult}(V, \vec{U})$ is closed under $< \text{cf}(\delta)$ -sequences (so in particular is wellfounded if $\text{cf}(\delta) > \omega$).*
- (2) *If $\delta = \text{lh}(\vec{U})$ is inaccessible, then the following are equivalent:*
 - *$j_{\vec{U}}$ is an almost huge embedding*
 - *$j_{\vec{U}}(\kappa) = \delta$*
- (3) *If δ is inaccessible then $j_{\vec{U}} \text{``} H_\delta \in H_{\delta+}$.*
- (4) *If U is a normal measure on $P_\kappa(\delta)$ for some inaccessible $\delta > \kappa$, then the projections of U to $P_\kappa(\lambda)$ (for $\lambda < \delta$) form a tower of height δ . If δ is, for example, the least inaccessible or least weakly compact cardinal above κ , then this tower will **not** be an almost huge tower (i.e. $j_{\vec{U}}(\kappa) > \delta$).*
- (5) *If $j : V \rightarrow N$ is some almost huge embedding with critical point κ such that $j(\kappa) = \delta$, then there is an almost huge tower \vec{U} of height δ and a map $k : \text{ult}(V, \vec{U}) \rightarrow N$ such that $k \circ j_{\vec{U}} = j$.*
- (6) *If δ is regular then $j_{\vec{U}}$ is continuous at δ .²³*

²³To see this: let $\eta < j_{\vec{U}}(\delta)$, and let $\lambda < \delta$ be such that $\eta \in \text{range}(k_{\lambda, \infty})$. Now δ is a fixed point of the map j_{U_λ} ; so $k_{\lambda, \infty}^{-1}(\eta) < \delta$. So pick any $\zeta \in (k_{\lambda, \infty}^{-1}(\eta), \delta)$; then $j_{\vec{U}}(\zeta) \in (\eta, j_{\vec{U}}(\delta))$.

1 (7) If \vec{U} is almost huge and δ is Mahlo, then for almost every inaccessible $\gamma < \delta$,
 2 the system $\vec{U} \upharpoonright \gamma$ is almost huge.

3 (8) If \vec{U}' is a strict end-extension of \vec{U} then there is a natural map $k := k_{\vec{U}, \vec{U}'} : N_{\vec{U}} \rightarrow N_{\vec{U}'}$, such that $j_{\vec{U}'} = k \circ j_{\vec{U}}$. Let $\delta := ht(\vec{U})$; if δ is inaccessible then:

$$(12) \quad crit(k) \in \{\delta, \delta^{+N_{\vec{U}}}\}$$

5 Furthermore for any $\gamma < \delta$ and any $F : P_\kappa(\gamma) \rightarrow V$:

$$(13) \quad k(j_{\vec{U}}(F)(j_{\vec{U}} \text{``}\gamma)) = j_{\vec{U}'}(F)(j_{\vec{U}'} \text{``}\gamma)$$

6 *Proof.* These facts are well-known, and we refer the reader to Kanamori [16]. Item
 7 8 is very important for this paper, so we provide a brief explanation. It is straight-
 8 forward to see (by examining the directed systems for \vec{U} and \vec{U}') that $crit(k) \geq \delta$.
 9 Moreover, since \vec{U} has height $> \delta$, then $N_{\vec{U}'}$ computes δ^+ correctly, whereas $N_{\vec{U}}$
 10 does not (by item 3). This implies that $crit(k) \leq \delta^{+N_{\vec{U}'}}$. Since $crit(k)$ must be an
 11 $N_{\vec{U}'}$ -cardinal, this leaves δ and $\delta^{+N_{\vec{U}'}}$ as the only possibilities for $crit(k)$. Each of
 12 these possibilities occur in nature.²⁴

13 To see (13): fix some $\gamma < \delta$ and note that

$$|j_{\vec{U}} \text{``}\gamma|^{N_{\vec{U}'}} = \gamma$$

14 which is $< crit(k)$ by (12). So $k(j_{\vec{U}} \text{``}\gamma) = k \text{``}(j_{\vec{U}} \text{``}\gamma)$. Then

$$k(j_{\vec{U}}(F)(j_{\vec{U}} \text{``}\gamma)) = k(j_{\vec{U}}(F))(k(j_{\vec{U}} \text{``}\gamma)) = j_{\vec{U}'}(F)(k \text{``}(j_{\vec{U}} \text{``}\gamma)) = j_{\vec{U}'}(F)(j_{\vec{U}'} \text{``}\gamma)$$

15

□

16 **5.2. Review of regular embeddings.** For a suborder \mathbb{R} of a partial order \mathbb{P} , we
 17 say that \mathbb{R} is a *regular suborder* of \mathbb{P} iff $\leq_{\mathbb{R}}$ agrees with $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$, $\perp_{\mathbb{R}}$ agrees with $\perp_{\mathbb{P}}$,
 18 and every maximal antichain in \mathbb{R} is a maximal antichain in \mathbb{P} . It is well-known
 19 that this is equivalent to a Σ_0 statement about \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{P} . Namely, given $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and
 20 $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we say that r is a pseudoprojection of p on \mathbb{R} iff $r' \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} p$ for every $r' \leq_{\mathbb{R}} r$.
 21 Then:

22 **Fact 5.5.** *For a suborder \mathbb{R} of \mathbb{P} , the following are equivalent:*

- 23 (1) \mathbb{R} is a regular suborder of \mathbb{P} .
 24 (2) For every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ there exists an $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that r is a pseudoprojection of
 25 p on \mathbb{R} .

26 *In particular, the statement “ \mathbb{R} is a regular suborder of \mathbb{P} ” is Σ_0 and thus absolute
 27 across transitive ZF^- models.*

28 The following convention will justify the notation in Theorem 5.12 and else-
 29 where.²⁵

²⁴For example, if \vec{U}' is almost huge of height δ' , then $crit(k_{\vec{U}' \upharpoonright \delta, \vec{U}'}) = \delta$ for almost every strong
 limit $\delta < \delta'$. On the other hand, if δ is the first inaccessible above κ and \vec{U}' is a tower of height
 $\delta' > \delta$, then $k_{\vec{U}' \upharpoonright \delta, \vec{U}'}$ fixes δ (because $N_{\vec{U}'}$ models “ δ is the least inaccessible above κ ”) and so
 $crit(k_{\vec{U}' \upharpoonright \delta, \vec{U}'})$ must be $\delta^{+N_{\vec{U}'}}$.

²⁵In Theorem 5.12 we have a regular embedding ι whose range is contained in $RO^N(j(\mathbb{P}))$
 for some separative partial order $j(\mathbb{P})$. Fact 5.6 justifies dropping the RO^N part when forming
 quotients.

1 **Fact 5.6.** *Suppose \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{P} are partial orders and \mathbb{R} is a regular suborder of \mathbb{P} . Suppose*
 2 *D is a dense subset of \mathbb{P} . Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}$ be generic. In $V[G]$ define $\frac{\mathbb{P}}{G} := \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid p \parallel_{\mathbb{P}} G\}$*
 3 *and $\frac{D}{G} := \{p \in D \mid p \parallel_{\mathbb{P}} G\}$ (here $p \parallel_{\mathbb{P}} G$ means that p is \mathbb{P} -compatible with each*
 4 *member of G). Then $\frac{D}{G}$ is a dense subset of $\frac{\mathbb{P}}{G}$.*

5 *Proof.* Let $p \in \frac{\mathbb{P}}{G}$. Let \tilde{G} be a $(V[G], \frac{\mathbb{P}}{G})$ -generic such that $p \in \tilde{G}$; it is standard
 6 that $G \subset \tilde{G}$ and that \tilde{G} is (V, \mathbb{P}) -generic. This implies that \tilde{G} meets the set $D \cap p \downarrow_{\mathbb{P}}$
 7 (because that set is dense below p and $p \in \tilde{G}$). Pick any $d \in \tilde{G} \cap D \cap p \downarrow_{\mathbb{P}}$. Then
 8 d , being in $\tilde{G} \supset G'$, is compatible with each member of G' . Thus d is an element
 9 of $\frac{D}{G}$ and $d \leq p$. \square

10 We also use:

Fact 5.7. *Suppose \mathbb{P} is a poset, $\dot{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\dot{\mathbb{R}}$ are \mathbb{P} -names for posets, \dot{e} is a \mathbb{P} -name,*
and

$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{e}$ *is a regular embedding from $\dot{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow \dot{\mathbb{R}}$*

Define $\ell : \mathbb{P} * \dot{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P} * \dot{\mathbb{R}}$ by

$$(p, \dot{q}) \mapsto (p, \dot{e}(\dot{q}))$$

11 *Then ℓ is a regular embedding.*

12 *Proof.* It is easy to see that ℓ is \leq and \perp -preserving. To see regularity: let (p, \dot{r})
 13 be an element of $\mathbb{P} * \dot{\mathbb{R}}$. Then p forces that \dot{r} has a pseudoprojection via \dot{e} ; so let $\dot{q}_{\dot{r}}$
 14 be a name for this pseudoprojection. Now check that $(p, \dot{q}_{\dot{r}})$ is a pseudoprojection
 15 of (p, \dot{r}) via ℓ : let $(p', \dot{q}') \leq (p, \dot{q}_{\dot{r}})$. We need to show that $\ell(p', \dot{q}') = (p', \dot{e}(\dot{q}'))$ is
 16 compatible with (p, \dot{r}) . Let g be generic for \mathbb{P} with $p' \in g$, let $r := (\dot{r})_g$, $q_r := (\dot{q}_{\dot{r}})_g$,
 17 $q' := (\dot{q}')_g$, and $e := \dot{e}_g$. In $V[g]$, since $q' \leq q_r$ and q_r is a pseudoprojection of r via
 18 e , then $e(q')$ is compatible with r , as witnessed by some t . Then $(p', \dot{e}(\dot{q}'))$ witnesses
 19 that $\ell(p', \dot{q}') = (p', \dot{e}(\dot{q}'))$ is compatible with (p, \dot{r}) . \square

20 **5.3. Generalization of Magidor's argument, and Duality.** Building on ear-
 21 lier work of Kunen and Laver (who used huge cardinals to produce saturated ideals
 22 on successor cardinals), Magidor proved that if $\mu < \kappa$ is a regular cardinal and
 23 \vec{U} is an almost huge $P_{\kappa}(-)$ -tower of height δ , then letting \mathbb{P} be the appropriate
 24 $< \mu$ -closed Kunen collapse which turns κ into μ^+ , there is a saturated ideal on κ
 25 in the model $V^{\mathbb{P} * \text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta)}$. Recall that saturation of \mathcal{I} is equivalent to $\text{ClubCatch}(\mathcal{I})$.

26 We aim to salvage much of the Magidor argument in the case where \vec{U} is not
 27 necessarily almost huge. This serves several ends; it will enable us to:

- 28 (1) force instances of $\text{ProjectiveCatch}(\mathcal{I})$ for ideals on any successor cardinal
 29 from much weaker large cardinal assumptions than those used to force in-
 30 stances of $\text{ClubCatch}(\mathcal{I})$ (i.e. saturation of \mathcal{I}). Namely: whereas the only
 31 known models of saturated ideals on ω_2 start with almost huge embed-
 32 dings, we will produce a model of $\text{ProjectiveCatch}(\mathcal{I})$ for an ideal \mathcal{I} on
 33 ω_2 , starting from only a κ which is supercompact up to (and including) an
 34 inaccessible.
- 35 (2) Provide a general theory of ideals obtained from tower embeddings where
 36 the height of the tower is turned into a successor cardinal

37 **The following assumptions are fixed for the remainder of the paper.**

1 **HYP 1.** \vec{U} is a $P_\kappa(-)$ -tower of inaccessible height δ , and $j : V \rightarrow_{\vec{U}} N$ is the
2 ultrapower embedding.

3 **HYP 2.** $\mathbb{P} \subset V_\kappa$ is a κ -cc poset, μ is a regular cardinal below κ which remains a
4 cardinal in $V^\mathbb{P}$, and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \kappa = \mu^+$. If \vec{U} is **not** almost huge, we also require that \mathbb{P} is
5 $< \mu$ -distributive

6 **HYP 3.** In N there is a regular embedding $\iota : \mathbb{P} * \text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta) \rightarrow \text{RO}^N(j(\mathbb{P}))$ such
7 that ι is the identity on \mathbb{P} .²⁶

8 **HYP 4.** $G * H$ is a $(V, \mathbb{P} * \text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta))$ -generic.

9 If \vec{U} is almost huge, then the standard example of such a \mathbb{P} is the universal
10 $< \mu$ -closed Kunen collapse obtained via an amalgamated forcing; see Cummings [6]
11 for details. If \vec{U} is not almost huge—i.e. if $j(\kappa) > \delta$ —then one could still use the
12 $< \mu$ -closed universal Kunen collapse; but in this case $\mathbb{P} := \text{Col}(\mu, < \kappa)$ would also
13 work, since in that case $\text{Col}(\mu, < \kappa) * \text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta)$ is a $< \mu$ -closed poset of size
14 $< j(\kappa)$, and $j(\kappa)$ is inaccessible in N ; so by standard absorption techniques of Levy
15 collapses, N would have an ι as in HYP 3. For some of the later theorems dealing
16 with *ProjectiveCatch* we will place additional requirements on the poset \mathbb{P} and the
17 regular embedding ι .²⁷

18 **Theorem 5.8.** Suppose \hat{G} is $(V[G][H], j(\mathbb{P})/\iota \text{“} G * H \text{”})$ -generic. Then in $V[\hat{G}]$
19 there is an \hat{H} which is $(N[\hat{G}], \text{Col}^{N[\hat{G}]}(j(\kappa), < j(\delta)))$ -generic and an elementary
20 embedding

$$\tilde{j}_{\hat{G}} : V[G][H] \rightarrow N[\hat{G}][\hat{H}]$$

21 which extends j .

22 **Remark 5.9.** Theorem 5.8 is a slight improvement over the existing literature
23 because:

- 24 (1) \vec{U} is not required to be almost huge.
25 (2) The \hat{H} constructed in $V[\hat{G}]$ is really an $(N[\hat{G}], \text{Col}^{N[\hat{G}]}(j(\kappa), < j(\delta)))$ -generic
26 object containing \hat{j} “ H ”.²⁸ In the authors’ view, this makes the subsequent
27 “duality” computations conceptually simpler than the arguments in [11], [7],
28 and [8]. In those papers, instead of finding an $\hat{H} \in V[\hat{G}]$ as in Theorem
29 5.8, a so-called “pseudo-generic tower” of conditions from $\text{Col}^{N[\hat{G}]}(j(\kappa), < j(\delta))$
30 is defined in $V[\hat{G}]$ in a way which decided enough of the generic
31 embeddings—embeddings which they view as appearing in $V[\hat{G}]^{\text{Col}^{N[\hat{G}]}(j(\kappa), < j(\delta))}$
32 but not necessarily in $V[\hat{G}]$ —in order to define a $V[G][H]$ -normal ideal and
33 compute its corresponding boolean algebra. However, both arguments ulti-
34 mately provide liftings of embeddings in some small generic extension of
35 $V[G][H]$.

²⁶More precisely: we require that $\iota(p, 1) = p$ for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$.

²⁷Namely we will eventually add the following additional requirements (which are superfluous in the case where \vec{U} is almost huge, i.e. when $j(\kappa) = \delta$). We will require that $\text{range}(\iota) \subset j(\mathbb{P}) \cap (H_{\delta^+})^N$, that $j(\mathbb{P}) \cap (H_{\delta^+})^N$ is regular in $j(\mathbb{P})$, and that V believes any generic for $j(\mathbb{P}) \cap (H_{\delta^+})^N$ will be extendable to an N -generic for $j(\mathbb{P})$. These additional requirements do hold for the examples of \mathbb{P} given above.

²⁸where $\hat{j} : V[G] \rightarrow N[\hat{G}]$ is the intermediate lifting which exists because $j \text{“} G \subset \hat{G}$.

1 Theorem 5.8 does not quite seem to suffice for our applications in Section 5.4,
 2 so we prove a more general version (Theorem 5.12) below. The generalized version
 3 uses the following technical definition:

4 **Definition 5.10.** *Given a transitive model W of ZFC, we will say that W resem-*
 5 *bles $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\iota}{}^{G*H}$ iff :*

- 6 (1) *j is definable in W and there is some $\hat{g} \in W$ which is $(N[G][H], j(\mathbb{P})/\iota{}^{G*H})$ -*
 7 *generic (though \hat{g} is not necessarily $(V[G][H], j(\mathbb{P})/\iota{}^{G*H})$ -generic).*
 8 (2) *If \vec{U} is almost huge then $N[\hat{g}]$ is $< \delta$ -closed from the point of view of W .*
 9 (3) *If \vec{U} is not almost huge then $N[\hat{g}]$ is $< \mu$ -closed from the point of view of*
 10 *W .*

11 *We will say that such a \hat{g} witnesses the resemblance of W to $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\iota}{}^{G*H}$.*

12 **Remark 5.11.** *If \hat{G} is $(V[G][H], j(\mathbb{P})/\iota{}^{G*H})$ -generic,²⁹ then \hat{G} witnesses that*
 13 *$W := V[\hat{G}]$ resembles $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\iota}{}^{G*H}$ in the sense of Definition 5.10. Thus Theorem*
 14 *5.8 is a special case of Theorem 5.12.*

15 *Proof.* If \vec{U} is almost huge then $j(\mathbb{P})$ is δ -cc in V , and standard arguments show
 16 that $N[\hat{G}]$ is $< \delta$ -closed from the point of view of $V[\hat{G}]$.

17 If \vec{U} is not almost huge then the $< \mu$ -distributivity requirement on in the Back-
 18 ground Hypotheses from page 21 imply that $N[\hat{G}]$ will be $< \mu$ -closed from the point
 19 of view of $V[\hat{G}]$. \square

20 For expository purposes, **uppercase letters will be reserved for filters**
 21 **which are generic over $V[G][H]$, whereas lowercase letters are allowed**
 22 **to be merely generic over N or extensions of N . Also “hats” will typi-**
 23 **cally indicate that the filter is on the j -image of posets.** In later sections
 24 we will be compelled to work with some $\hat{g} \in V[\hat{G}]$ which may not be generic over
 25 $V[G][H]$, so we state the following theorem in its full generality:

26 **Theorem 5.12.** *Suppose W resembles $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\iota}{}^{G*H}$ (in the sense of Definition*
 27 *5.10) and let $\hat{g} \in W$ witness this resemblance. Then in W there is an \hat{h} which*
 28 *is $(N[\hat{g}], Col^{N[\hat{g}]}(j(\kappa), < j(\delta)))$ -generic and an elementary embedding*

$$\tilde{j}_{\hat{g}} : V[G][H] \rightarrow N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$$

29 *which extends j .*

Proof. (of Theorem 5.12) We work inside W for the entire proof. Note that $G*H$
 is the pointwise preimage of \hat{g} via ι . Then $G*H \in N[\hat{g}]$, since \hat{g} and ι are elements
 of $N[\hat{g}]$. Also our assumptions on ι guarantee that

$$j{}^{G} \subset \hat{g}$$

and thus there is an elementary

$$\hat{j} : V[G] \rightarrow N[\hat{g}]$$

30 which extends j .

31 For each ordinal $\gamma < \delta$ let $H|\gamma$ denote $H \cap Col(\kappa, < \gamma)$ and set

$$m_{\gamma}^H := \bigcup (\hat{j}{}^{H|\gamma})$$

²⁹Recall that even though the range of ι may not be literally contained in $j(\mathbb{P})$, Fact 5.6 allows
 us to write $j(\mathbb{P})/\iota{}^{G*H}$ instead of the more cumbersome $RO^N(j(\mathbb{P}))/\iota{}^{G*H}$.

1 Since $G * H \in N[\hat{g}]$ and $j \upharpoonright V_\gamma$ is an element of N for every $\gamma < \delta$, it follows that:

$$(14) \quad \forall \gamma < \delta \hat{j} \upharpoonright V_\gamma[G] \in N[\hat{g}] \text{ and } m_\gamma^H \in N[\hat{g}]$$

2 For any $p \in H \upharpoonright \gamma$, $|p|^{V[G]} < \kappa$ (by definition of the Levy collapse) and $\kappa = \text{crit}(\hat{j})$,
3 so

$$(15) \quad (\forall \gamma < \delta)(\forall p \in H \upharpoonright \gamma)(\hat{j}(p) = \hat{j}''p \text{ and } |\hat{j}(p)|^{N[\hat{g}]} < \kappa)$$

4 It follows that $|m_\gamma^H|^{N[\hat{g}]} = |\bigcup(\hat{j}''H \upharpoonright \gamma)|^{N[\hat{g}]} \leq |\gamma|^{N[\hat{g}]} |\kappa|^{N[\hat{g}]} < \hat{j}(\kappa)$. So

$$(16) \quad (\forall \gamma < \delta)(m_\gamma^H \in \text{Col}^{N[\hat{g}]}(j(\kappa), < j(\gamma)))$$

5 **Claim 5.13.** For each $\gamma < \delta$: $\text{dom}(m_\gamma^H) = \kappa \times j''\gamma$. Moreover, for any $\gamma < \gamma' < \delta$:

$$(17) \quad m_{\gamma'}^H \upharpoonright (j(\kappa) \times j(\gamma)) = m_{\gamma'}^H \upharpoonright (\kappa \times j''\gamma) = m_\gamma^H$$

6 *Proof.* These follow straightforwardly from (15). \square

7 Note that $\langle m_\gamma^H \mid \gamma < \delta \rangle$ is a descending sequence. It has the following important
8 property:

9 **Claim 5.14.** For any $\gamma < \delta$ and any $r \in \text{Col}^{N[\hat{g}]}(j(\kappa), < j(\gamma))$ such that $r \leq m_\gamma^H$:
10 for every $\gamma' \in [\gamma, \delta)$: r is compatible with $m_{\gamma'}^H$ in $\text{Col}^{N[\hat{g}]}(j(\kappa), < j(\gamma'))$.

11 *Proof.* This follows immediately from Claim 5.13. \square

12 **Claim 5.15.** $N[\hat{g}]$ is closed under $< \text{cf}^W(\delta)$ sequences from W . Moreover:

- 13 • If \vec{U} is not almost huge then $|\delta| = \text{cf}(\delta) = \mu$ from the point of view of both
14 W and $N[\hat{g}]$.
- 15 • If \vec{U} is almost huge then δ is regular from the point of view of both W and
16 $N[\hat{g}]$.

17 *Proof.* Suppose first that \vec{U} is not almost huge; i.e. $j_{\vec{U}}(\kappa) > \delta$. Then $|\delta|^{N[\hat{g}]} =$
18 $\text{cf}^{N[\hat{g}]}(\delta) = \mu$. By Definition 5.10, $N[\hat{g}]$ and W have the same $< \mu$ sequences. So
19 $\text{cf}^W(\delta) = \text{cf}^{N[\hat{g}]}(\delta)$.

20 If \vec{U} is almost huge then $\delta = j_{\vec{U}}(\kappa)$ is regular in N and thus in $N[\hat{g}]$. By Definition
21 5.10, $N[\hat{g}]$ is closed under $< \delta$ sequences from W , so δ is regular in W as well. \square

22 For each $\eta \leq j(\delta)$ let $\mathbb{R}_{< \eta} := \text{Col}^{N[\hat{g}]}(j(\kappa), < \eta)$. In $N[\hat{g}]$ let

$$\mathcal{A} := \{A \subset \mathbb{R}_{< j(\delta)} \mid A \text{ is a maximal antichain}\}$$

23 Since $j(\delta)$ is inaccessible in $N[\hat{g}]$ then $|\mathcal{A}|^{N[\hat{g}]} = j(\delta)$. For each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ let $D_A :=$
24 $\{r \in \mathbb{R}_{< j(\delta)} \mid \exists a \in A \ r \leq a\}$; now set $\mathcal{D} := \{D_A \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\}$. So $\mathcal{D} \in N[\hat{g}]$ is, in $N[\hat{g}]$,
25 a $j(\delta)$ -sized collection of all the relevant dense subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{< j(\delta)}$ (“relevant” in the
26 sense that for a filter to be $(N[\hat{g}], \mathbb{R}_{< j(\delta)})$ -generic, it suffices that the filter meets
27 each element of \mathcal{D}).

28 Also, since $j(\delta)$ is inaccessible in $N[\hat{g}]$ then $N[\hat{g}]$ believes that $\text{Col}^{N[\hat{g}]}(j(\kappa), <$
29 $j(\delta))$ has the $j(\delta)$ -cc, so:

$$(18)$$

$$\forall D \in \mathcal{D} \ U_D := \{\eta < j(\delta) \mid D \cap \mathbb{R}_{< \eta} \text{ is dense in } \mathbb{R}_{< \eta}\} \text{ is unbounded (in fact club) in } j(\delta)$$

30 Using the following facts:

- 31 • $j(\delta) \in [\delta, \delta^{+V}]$;³⁰

³⁰by item 3 of Fact 5.4

- 1 • $\delta \leq j(\kappa)$;
- 2 • $j(\mathbb{P})$ adds a surjection from μ onto every ordinal $< j(\kappa)$;
- 3 • j is continuous at δ ,³¹ and
- 4 • j is definable in W (by definition of resemblance),

5 it follows that:

$$(19) \quad \lambda := |j(\delta)|^W = |\delta|^W = cf^W(\delta) = cf^W(j(\delta))$$

6 Recall we are working in W . We now construct a descending sequence $\langle r_i \mid i < \lambda \rangle$
7 in $\mathbb{R}_{< j(\delta)}$ which will generate a $(N[\hat{g}], \mathbb{R}_{< j(\delta)})$ -generic filter which contains $\hat{j}^{\text{``}}H$; note
8 that, in order for the filter generated by \vec{r} to contain $\hat{j}^{\text{``}}H$ as a subset, it will suffice
9 to arrange that m_γ^H is in the filter generated by \vec{r} for cofinally many $\gamma < \delta$.

10 Let $\langle D_k \mid k < \lambda \rangle$ enumerate \mathcal{D} . Recursively construct a descending sequence
11 $\langle r_k \mid k < \lambda \rangle$ in $\mathbb{R}_{< j(\delta)}$ and an increasing (not necessarily continuous) sequence
12 $\langle \eta_k \mid k < \lambda \rangle$ of ordinals in $j(\delta)$ as follows. We maintain the following induction
13 hypotheses:

$$(20) \quad r_k \in D_k \cap \mathbb{R}_{< j(j^{-1}\eta_k)}$$

$$(21) \quad r_k \leq m_{j^{-1}\eta_k}^H$$

14 **Base step:**

- 15 • Using (18), let η_0 be some ordinal $< j(\delta)$ such that $D_0 \cap \mathbb{R}_{< \eta_0}$ is dense in
16 $\mathbb{R}_{< \eta_0}$.
- 17 • Observe that $m_{j^{-1}\eta_0}^H \in \mathbb{R}_{< \sup(j(j^{-1}\eta_0))} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{< \eta_0}$. Let r_0 be some condition
18 in $D_0 \cap \mathbb{R}_{< \eta_0}$ such that $r_0 \leq m_{j^{-1}\eta_0}$.

19 **Successor Step:** Suppose $k < \lambda$ and $\langle r_i \mid i \leq k \rangle$ and $\langle \eta_i \mid i \leq k \rangle$ have been defined.

- 20 • Using (18), let η_{k+1} be some ordinal $< j(\delta)$ such that $D_{k+1} \cap \mathbb{R}_{< \eta_{k+1}}$ is
21 dense in $\mathbb{R}_{< \eta_{k+1}}$ and such that $\eta_{k+1} > \sup(\{\eta_i \mid i \leq k\})$.³²
- 22 • By (20), (21), and Claim 5.14, r_k and $m_{j^{-1}\eta_{k+1}}^H$ are compatible in $\mathbb{R}_{< \eta_{k+1}}$;
23 let r_{k+1} be a condition in $D_{k+1} \cap \mathbb{R}_{< \eta_{k+1}}$ below both of them. Clearly the
24 inductive hypothesis (21) is maintained. Also $j(j^{-1}\eta_{k+1}) \geq \eta_{k+1}$ so the
25 induction hypothesis (20) is also maintained.

26 **Limit Case:** Suppose k is a limit ordinal $< \lambda$ and that $\langle r_\ell \mid \ell < k \rangle$ and $\langle \eta_\ell \mid \ell < k \rangle$
27 have been constructed. Note that by Claim 5.15, these sequences are each elements
28 of $N[\hat{g}]$. Set $r := \bigcup_{\ell < k} r_\ell$ and $\beta := \sup_{\ell < k} j(j^{-1}\eta_\ell)$. Then by the induction
29 hypotheses (20) and (21):

$$(22a) \quad r \in \mathbb{R}_{< \beta}, \text{ so } \text{dom}(r) \subset j(\kappa) \times \beta$$

$$(22b) \quad r \supseteq \bigcup_{\ell < k} m_{j^{-1}\eta_\ell}^H$$

30 Using (18), let η_k be some ordinal $< j(\delta)$ such that $D_k \cap \mathbb{R}_{< \eta_k}$ is dense in $\mathbb{R}_{< \eta_k}$
31 and such that $\eta_k > \sup\{\eta_\ell \mid \ell < k\}$. Note that $m_{j^{-1}\eta_k}^H \upharpoonright j(\kappa) \times \beta = \bigcup_{\ell < k} m_{j^{-1}\eta_\ell}$;

³¹by item 6 of fact 5.4

³²Note this supremum is $< j(\delta)$ because $k < \lambda$.

1 this fact combined with (22a) and (22b) imply that r is compatible with m_{j^{-1}, η_k}^H .
 2 Let r_k be some condition in $D_k \cap \mathbb{R}_{< \eta_k}$ which is below both r and m_{j^{-1}, η_k}^H .
 3 This completes the construction of the sequences \vec{r} and $\vec{\eta}$. Note that $\langle \eta_k \mid k < \lambda \rangle$
 4 will automatically be cofinal in $j(\delta)$, since for every $\zeta < j(\delta)$ there is some $D \in \mathcal{D}$
 5 such that no $r \in D$ is an element of $\mathbb{R}_{< \zeta}$.³³ This, along with (21), guarantees that
 6 the upward closure of \vec{r} contains every m_γ^H . Thus the upward closure of \vec{r} contains
 7 $\hat{j}^{\text{“}H}$.
 8 □

9 There is some freedom in Theorem 5.12 (depending on the enumeration of the
 10 dense sets in the proof), so for each \hat{g} we just fix one lifting:

11 **Definition 5.16.** *Given a W and a $\hat{g} \in W$ as in the hypotheses of Theorem 5.12,*
 12 *we fix some $\hat{h}_{\hat{g}}$ and $\tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}$ as given by the conclusion of Theorem 5.12. We will often*
 13 *refer to $\tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}$ as “the” lifting given by Theorem 5.12.*

14 **Definition 5.17.** *Suppose $\gamma < \delta$ and $F \in V$ is some function with domain $P_\kappa(\gamma)$.*
 15 *In $V[G][H]$ pick any ϕ which is a surjection from $\kappa \rightarrow_{\text{onto}} \gamma$, and define $f_{F, \phi} : \kappa \rightarrow$
 16 $V[G][H]$ by:*

$$\xi \mapsto F(\phi^{\text{“}}\xi)$$

17 *for any ξ where this is defined.*

18 **Lemma 5.18.** *Let $\gamma < \delta$ and $F \in V$ be any function with domain $P_\kappa(\gamma)$. Set*
 19 *$z := j(F)(j^{\text{“}}\gamma)$. Let $\phi \in V[G][H]$ be any surjection from $\kappa \rightarrow_{\text{onto}} \gamma$ and let $f_{F, \phi}$ be*
 20 *as defined in Definition 5.17.*

21 *Then for any model W which resembles $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\nu}{}^{\text{“}G^*H}$ (in the sense of Definition*
 22 *5.10) and any $\hat{g} \in W$ which witnesses this resemblance, if $\tilde{j} = \tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}$ is the embedding*
 23 *given by Theorem 5.12, then:*

$$z = \tilde{j}(f_{F, \phi})(\kappa)$$

24 *Proof.* Fix such a model W and a $\hat{g} \in W$, and let $\tilde{j} := \tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}$ be the lifting of j . It is
 25 easy to see that $\tilde{j}(\phi)^{\text{“}}\kappa = j^{\text{“}}\gamma$. So:

$$\tilde{j}(f_{F, \phi})(\kappa) = f_{\tilde{j}(F), \tilde{j}(\phi)}(\kappa) = \tilde{j}(F)(\tilde{j}(\phi)^{\text{“}}\kappa) = \tilde{j}(F)(j^{\text{“}}\gamma) = j(F)(j^{\text{“}}\gamma) = z$$

26 □

27 **Definition 5.19.** *Let $z \in N$. Pick any representation $z = j(F)(j^{\text{“}}\gamma)$ of z . In*
 28 *$V[G][H]$ pick any surjection $\phi : \kappa \rightarrow_{\text{onto}} \gamma$ and set $f_z := f_{F, \phi}$.*

29 Note that by Lemma 5.18, the choice of F and ϕ in the definition of f_z will
 30 not matter in terms of $\tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}(f_z)(\kappa)$ (where $\hat{g} \in W$ and W is any model resembling
 31 $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\nu}{}^{\text{“}G^*H}$ in the sense of Definition 5.10). The following lemma is used in the
 32 next section:

33 **Lemma 5.20.** *Suppose \vec{U}' is an end extension of \vec{U} and $k : N_{\vec{U}'} \rightarrow N_{\vec{U}}$ is the*
 34 *function given by Fact 5.4; let $j' : V \rightarrow_{\vec{U}'}, N_{\vec{U}'}$ be the ultrapower embedding. Suppose*
 35 *$\tilde{j}' : V[G][H] \rightarrow N_{\vec{U}'}, [\hat{g}'][\hat{h}']$ is an elementary embedding which extends j' . Then for*
 36 *every $z \in N$:*

$$(23) \quad \tilde{j}'(f_z)(\kappa) = k(z)$$

³³e.g. let E be the dense set $\{r \in \mathbb{R}_{< j(\delta)} \mid \zeta \in \text{proj}_1(\text{dom}(r))\}$, let A be a maximal antichain in E ; then $A \in \mathcal{A}$ so D_A is the desired element of \mathcal{D} .

1 where f_z is the function in $V[G][H]$ as defined in Definition 5.19.

2 *Proof.* Say $z = j(F_z)(j''\gamma)$ and let $\phi_\gamma \in V[G][H]$ be a bijection from $\kappa \rightarrow \gamma$. Note
3 that since the critical point of \tilde{j}' is κ then $\tilde{j}'(\phi_\gamma)''\kappa = \tilde{j}'''\gamma$, and so:

$$(24) \quad \tilde{j}'(f_z)(\kappa) = \tilde{j}'(F_z)(\tilde{j}'(\phi_\gamma)''\kappa) = j'(F_z)(j''\gamma) = k(j(F_z)(j''\gamma)) = k(z)$$

4 where the second equality uses the fact that $j' \subset \tilde{j}'$ and the next-to-last equation
5 is by item 8 of Fact 5.4. \square

6 In particular, if $k(z) = z$ then the function f_z —although it is defined according
7 to the map $j_{\bar{U}}$ —will also represent z in ultrapowers derived from liftings of the map
8 j' .

9 We also see that the tower embedding by \bar{U} is turned into a simple ultrapower
10 embedding by a measure on κ :

11 **Corollary 5.21.** *Let W resemble $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\iota''G*H}$ as witnessed by $\hat{g} \in W$, and let
12 $\tilde{j} := \tilde{j}_{\hat{g}} : V[G][H] \rightarrow N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$ be the embedding given by Theorem 5.12. Then \tilde{j} is
13 an ultrapower embedding by its derived measure on κ ; i.e.*

$$N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}] = \{\tilde{j}(f)(\kappa) \mid f \in V[G][H] \cap {}^\kappa V[G][H]\}$$

14 *Moreover, for any $b \in N[G][H]$ there is a function $f_b \in V[G][H]$ that will always
15 represent b in any such ultrapower; i.e. whenever W and $\hat{g} \in W$ are as above then
16 it will always be the case that $b = \tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}(f_b)(\kappa)$.*

17 *Proof.* Consider an arbitrary element $(j(F)(j''\gamma))_{\hat{g}*\hat{h}}$ of $N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$, where $F : P_\kappa(\gamma)$
18 maps into the $\mathbb{P} * Col(\kappa, < \delta)$ names. In $V[G][H]$ pick any surjection $\phi : \kappa \rightarrow_{\text{onto}} \gamma$
19 and define the function $h_F : \kappa \rightarrow V[G][H]$ by:

$$\xi \mapsto (F(\phi''\xi))_{G*H}$$

20 Note that $\tilde{j}(G * H) = \hat{g} * \hat{h}$ by elementarity of \tilde{j} . Also $\tilde{j}(\phi)''\kappa = j''\gamma$ and so

$$\tilde{j}(h_F)(\kappa) = (h_{\tilde{j}(F)})^{N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]}(\kappa) = (\tilde{j}(F)(\tilde{j}(\phi)''\kappa))_{\tilde{j}(G*H)} = (j(F)(j''\gamma))_{\hat{g}*\hat{h}}$$

21 Thus our arbitrary element of $N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$ has the correct form.

22 To see the “moreover” part of the corollary: let $b \in N[G][H]$, say $b = (j(F)(j''\gamma))_{G*H}$
23 and let $\phi \in V[G][H]$ be a bijection from $\kappa \rightarrow \gamma$. Recall the regular embedding
24 $\iota : \mathbb{P} * Col(\kappa, < \delta) \rightarrow j(\mathbb{P})$ is assumed to be an element of N ; let $f_\iota \in V[G][H]$ as
25 defined in Definition 5.19. In $V[G][H]$ define a function $f_b : \kappa \rightarrow V[G][H]$ by

$$(25) \quad \xi \mapsto (F(\phi''\xi))_{f_\iota(\xi)^{-1}G}$$

Then if W resembles $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\iota''G*H}$ as witnessed by some \hat{g} , then letting $\tilde{j} := \tilde{j}_{\hat{g}*\hat{h}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{j}(f_b)(\kappa) &= (f_{\tilde{j}(b)})^{N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]}(\kappa) = (\tilde{j}(F)(\tilde{j}(\phi)''\kappa))_{\tilde{j}(f_\iota(\kappa)^{-1}\tilde{j}(G)} \\ &= (j(F)(j''\gamma))_{\tilde{j}(f_\iota(\kappa)^{-1}\tilde{j}(G)} = (j(F)(j''\gamma))_{\iota^{-1}\tilde{j}(G)} = (j(F)(j''\gamma))_{\iota^{-1}\hat{g}} \\ &= (j(F)(j''\gamma))_{\iota^{-1}\tilde{j}(G)} = (j(F)(j''\gamma))_{G*H} = b \end{aligned}$$

26 \square

27 The following definition is how we define an ideal in $V[G][H]$ using some poset
28 whose forcing extension resembles $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\iota''G*H}$. Of course the most natural example
29 of such a poset is $\frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{\iota''G*H}$, but we will need a more general definition for the following
30 section.

1 **Definition 5.22.** Suppose $\mathbb{R} \in V[G][H]$ is a poset such that $V[G][H]^{\mathbb{R}}$ resembles
2 $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/i^*G*H}$ in the sense of Definition 5.10; let \dot{g} be a \mathbb{R} -name witnessing this fact.
3 In $V[G][H]$ define $F_{\dot{g}} \subset P^{V[G][H]}(\kappa)$ by: $S \in F_{\dot{g}}$ iff $\kappa \in \tilde{j}_{\dot{g}_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}}(S)$ for every $G_{\mathbb{R}}$
4 which is $(V[G][H], \mathbb{R})$ -generic;³⁴ i.e.

$$(26) \quad S \in F_{\dot{g}} \iff \llbracket \kappa \in \tilde{j}_{\dot{g}}(S) \rrbracket_{ro(\mathbb{R})} = 1_{\mathbb{R}}$$

5 It is routine to see that $F_{\dot{g}}$ is a normal filter on κ . We will use $\mathbb{B}_{F_{\dot{g}}}$ to denote the
6 boolean algebra $P^{V[G][H]}(\kappa)/F_{\dot{g}}$.

7 We will need the following ad-hoc definition. Note the special case of the follow-
8 ing definition where $\mathbb{R} = \frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G*H}$; unfortunately this special case would not suffice
9 for the arguments in the next section, so we must state the general version:

10 **Definition 5.23.** Given a poset $\mathbb{R} \in V[G][H]$, we will say that \mathbb{R} is *nice* iff $\mathbb{R} \in$
11 $N[G][H]$, \mathbb{R} is a regular suborder of $\frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G*H}$, and there is some \mathbb{R} -name \dot{g} , some
12 $b \in N[G][H]$, and some formula ϕ such that $1_{\mathbb{R}}$ forces (over $V[G][H]$) that:

- 13 (1) \dot{g} witnesses the resemblance of $V[G][H]^{\mathbb{R}}$ to $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/i^*G*H}$.
- 14 (2) $\dot{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is an element of $N[\dot{g}][\dot{h}]$ and is definable there via the formula ϕ and
15 parameters \dot{g} , b (i.e. $\dot{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the unique element y such that $N[\dot{g}][\dot{h}] \models$
16 $\phi(y, \dot{g}, \dot{b})$).

17 We will say that \dot{g} , b , and ϕ witness the niceness of \mathbb{R} .

18 The following lemma gives a sufficient condition to apply Foreman's Duality
19 Theorem.

20 **Lemma 5.24.** Suppose $\mathbb{R} \in V[G][H]$ is nice, as witnessed by \dot{g} , b , and ϕ (as in Def-
21 inition 5.23). Then in $V[G][H]$ there are functions $f_{\frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G*H}}$, $f_{\dot{g}}$, $(f_p)_{p \in \frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G*H}}$, f_{G*H} ,
22 $f_{\mathbb{R}}$, $(f_r)_{r \in \mathbb{R}}$, and $f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}$, each with domain κ , such that whenever $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ is $(V[G][H], \mathbb{R})$ -
23 generic then letting $\hat{g} := \dot{g}_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}$:

- 24 (1) $\tilde{j}(f_{\frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G*H}})(\kappa) = \frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G*H}$
- 25 (2) $\tilde{j}(f_{\dot{g}})(\kappa) = \dot{g}$
- 26 (3) $\tilde{j}(f_p)(\kappa) = p$ for each $p \in \frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G*H}$
- 27 (4) $\tilde{j}(f_{G*H})(\kappa) = G * H$
- 28 (5) $\tilde{j}(f_{\mathbb{R}})(\kappa) = \mathbb{R}$
- 29 (6) $\tilde{j}(f_r)(\kappa) = r$ for each $r \in \mathbb{R}$
- 30 (7) $\tilde{j}(f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}})(\kappa) = G_{\mathbb{R}}$

31 *Proof.* The existence of the functions $f_{\frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G*H}}$, $(f_p)_{p \in \frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G*H}}$, f_{G*H} , $f_{\mathbb{R}}$, and $(f_r)_{r \in \mathbb{R}}$
32 are guaranteed by the “moreover” part of Corollary 5.21, since the relevant objects
33 are elements of $N[G][H]$ (recall part of the definition of niceness of \mathbb{R} is that $\mathbb{R} \in$
34 $N[G][H]$). The function $f_{\dot{g}}$ is defined to be the constant function with value \dot{g} ; then
35 for any lifting \tilde{j} , the function $\tilde{j}(f_{\dot{g}})$ is the constant function with value $\tilde{j}(\dot{g}) = \hat{g}$
36 (so in particular $\tilde{j}(f_{\dot{g}})(\kappa) = \hat{g}$).

37 To define the function $f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}$. Let $f_b \in V[G][H]$ be the function given by the
38 “moreover” part of Corollary 5.21, and let $f_{\dot{g}}$ be as defined in the previous para-
39 graph. In $V[G][H]$ define $f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}} : \kappa \rightarrow V[G][H]$ by sending ξ to the unique y such that

³⁴here we are implicitly fixing a \mathbb{R} -name for a particular lifting $\tilde{j}_{\dot{g}}$ as in Definition 5.16.

1 $\phi(y, f_b(\xi), f_{\hat{g}}(\xi))$. Then for any $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ which is $(V[G][H], \mathbb{R})$ -generic, letting $\hat{g} := \dot{g}_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}$
 2 and $\tilde{j} := \tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}$ be the lifting of j , then by elementarity, $\tilde{j}(f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}})(\kappa)$ is the unique element
 3 of $N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$ such that $N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}] \models \phi(y, \tilde{j}(f_b)(\kappa), \tilde{j}(f_{\hat{g}})(\kappa))$; i.e. the unique y such that
 4 $N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}] \models \phi(y, b, \hat{g})$. Of course this unique element is, by assumption, $G_{\mathbb{R}}$. \square

5 **Corollary 5.25.** *Assume $\mathbb{R} \in V[G][H]$ is nice, as witnessed by \hat{g} , b , and ϕ . Let*
 6 *$F_{\hat{g}}$ be the filter from Definition 5.22. Let $\tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}$ be the \mathbb{R} -name for the embedding from*
 7 *Definition 5.16.*

8 *Then in $V[G][H]$ the map $\pi : \mathbb{B}_{F_{\hat{g}}} \rightarrow RO(\mathbb{R})$ defined by*

$$[S]_{F_{\hat{g}}} \mapsto \llbracket \kappa \in \tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}(S) \rrbracket_{RO(\mathbb{R})}$$

9 *is a dense embedding.*

10 *There is also a natural dense embedding in the other direction: for each $r \in \mathbb{R}$*
 11 *define*

$$(27) \quad S_r := \{\xi < \kappa \mid f_r(\xi) \in f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}(\xi)\}$$

12 *where f_r and $f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}$ are the functions given by Lemma 5.24. Then the map σ defined*
 13 *by $r \mapsto [S_r]_{F_{\hat{g}}}$ is a dense embedding from $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{F_{\hat{g}}}$.*

14 *Proof.* This follows directly from Foreman's Theorem 2.17 (viewing $V[G][H]$ as the
 15 ground model) and the existence of the functions $f_{\mathbb{R}}$, $(f_r)_{r \in \mathbb{R}}$, and $f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}$ from Lemma
 16 5.24. \square

17 Note that in the context of Corollary 5.25, the dense embedding $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{F_{\hat{g}}}$
 18 can be used (inside $V[G][H]$) to characterize self-genericity as follows: for any
 19 $M \prec (H_{\theta}, \in, \{\sigma, F_{\hat{g}}, \mathbb{R}\})$ with $\alpha_M := M \cap \kappa \in \kappa$:

$$(28) \quad M \in S_{F_{\hat{g}}}^{SelfGen} \iff \\
 W := \{S_r \mid r \in M \cap \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \alpha_M \in S_r\} \text{ generates a } (M, \mathbb{B}_{F_{\hat{g}}})\text{-generic} \iff \\
 \sigma^{-1}W \text{ is } (M, \mathbb{R})\text{-generic} \iff \\
 \{r \in M \cap \mathbb{R} \mid f_r(\alpha_M) \in f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}(\alpha_M)\} \text{ is } (M, \mathbb{R})\text{-generic}$$

20 **Corollary 5.26.** *Assume $\mathbb{R} \in V[G][H]$ is nice, as witnessed by \hat{g} (and e). Then*
 21 *the following are equivalent:*

- 22 (1) $F_{\hat{g}}$ is saturated
- 23 (2) $F_{\hat{g}}$ is strong
- 24 (3) $\mathbb{B}_{F_{\hat{g}}}$ preserves κ^+
- 25 (4) \vec{U} is almost huge

26 *(In particular, this holds when $\mathbb{R} = \frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G^*H}$ and \hat{g} is the canonical name for the*
 27 *$\frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G^*H}$ -generic object.)*

28 *Proof.* If \vec{U} is almost huge, then $\frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G^*H}$ has the $\delta = \kappa^{+V[G][H]\text{-cc}}$ (from the point
 29 of view of $V[G][H]$). By the assumed regularity of $e : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G^*H}$ (from Definition
 30 5.23), then \mathbb{R} also has the δ -cc. Then the dense embedding from $\mathbb{B}_{F_{\hat{g}}} \rightarrow RO(\mathbb{R})$
 31 given by Corollary 5.25 guarantees that $\mathbb{B}_{F_{\hat{g}}}$ also has the δ -cc; so $F_{\hat{g}}$ is saturated.

1 Now suppose \vec{U} was **not** almost huge; then

$$(29) \quad j(\kappa) > \delta$$

2 By Corollary 5.25, generic ultrapowers of $V[G][H]$ by $\mathbb{B}_{F_{\hat{g}}}$ are exactly those liftings
 3 of j of the form $\tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}$ where $\hat{g} = (\hat{g})_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}$ for some $(V[G][H], \mathbb{R})$ -generic $G_{\mathbb{R}}$. In particular,
 4 by (29), such liftings always send κ strictly above $\delta = \kappa^{+V[G][H]}$. So $F_{\hat{g}}$ is not a
 5 strong filter in this case. \square

6 We will also use the following Lemma 5.27, which is simply a supercompact varia-
 7 tion of Kunen's original construction of a saturated ideal from a huge cardinal. The
 8 proof of Lemma 5.27 is much simpler than the proof of Theorem 5.12 because of the
 9 presence of strong master conditions. Both Theorem 5.12 and Lemma 5.27 provide
 10 generic elementary embeddings with domain $V^{\mathbb{P} * Col(\kappa, < \delta)}$. The main difference is
 11 that in Theorem 5.12, δ was exactly the height of the tower whose embedding we
 12 were trying to lift; whereas in Lemma 5.27, δ is strictly smaller than the height of
 13 the tower whose embedding we are trying to lift.

14 For uniformity we still keep the hypotheses in our Background Hypotheses from
 15 page 21, though most of them are irrelevant to this lemma. Namely, we only
 16 consider the objects $\delta = lh(\vec{U})$, \mathbb{P} , and $G * H$ from those hypotheses.

17 **Lemma 5.27.** *Suppose \vec{U}' is a $P_{\kappa}(-)$ -tower of height strictly greater than δ .³⁵ Let*
 18 *$j' : V \rightarrow \vec{U}'$, N' be the ultrapower.*

19 *Assume there is some $r \in N'$ such that*

$$r : \mathbb{P} * Col(\kappa, < \delta) \rightarrow RO^{N'}(j'(\mathbb{P}))$$

20 *is a regular embedding and is the identity on \mathbb{P} .*³⁶

21 *Let \hat{G}' be $(V[G][H], \frac{j'(\mathbb{P})}{r * G * H})$ -generic (recall $G * H$ was fixed in the Background*
 22 *Hypotheses on page 21).*

23 *Let $\hat{j}' : V[G] \rightarrow N'[\hat{G}']$ be the lifting of j' which exists because $j' \text{``} G \subset \hat{G}'$. Then:*

$$(30) \quad \hat{j}' \text{``} H \in N'[\hat{G}']$$

24 *and*

$$(31) \quad m'_H := \bigcup \hat{j}' \text{``} H \in Col^{N'[\hat{G}']}(j'(\kappa), < j'(\delta))$$

25 *It follows that if \hat{H}' is a $(V[\hat{G}'], Col^{N'[\hat{G}']}(j'(\kappa), < j'(\delta)))$ -generic which has m'_H*
 26 *as an element, then in $V[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$ the map \hat{j}' can be lifted to an elementary*

$$\tilde{j}' : V[G][H] \rightarrow N'[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$$

27 *Finally:*

$$(32) \quad \forall Z \in (H_{\delta^+})^{V[G][H]} : \tilde{j}' \text{``} Z \in N'[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$$

28 *Proof.* First note that N' is closed under δ sequences, so $j' \upharpoonright W \in N'$ for any
 29 $W \in H_{\delta^+}^V$. Second, $G * H$ is computed from \hat{G}' via the map r and $r \in N'$, so
 30 $G * H \in N'[\hat{G}']$. From this it follows that, letting \hat{j}' denote the intermediate lifting
 31 from $V[G] \rightarrow N'[\hat{G}']$:

$$(33) \quad \hat{j}' \upharpoonright W[G] \in N'[\hat{G}'] \text{ for any } W \in H_{\delta^+}^V$$

³⁵Recall we allow the possibility that $height(\vec{U}') = \delta + 1$, so that \vec{U}' is essentially a single normal measure on $P_{\kappa}(\delta)$.

³⁶More precisely: we require that $r(p, 1) = p$ for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$.

- 1 Then (30) follows immediately. To see (31): each $s \in H$ has size $\leq \mu$, so $\hat{j}'(s) = \hat{j}' \smallfrown s$.
 2 Thus $|\hat{j}'(s)| < \kappa$ for each $s \in H$ and so in $N'[\hat{G}']$:

$$|m'_H| = |\bigcup \hat{j}' \smallfrown H| = |\delta| \cdot |\kappa| = |\delta| < j'(\kappa)$$

- 3 (the last inequality is because $\delta < lh(\vec{U}')$). So m'_H has the right size in $N'[\hat{G}']$ to
 4 be a condition in the Levy collapse $Col(j'(\kappa), < j'(\delta))$. It is easily checked that
 5 m'_H is a function of the right form to be in this Levy Collapse.

- 6 Now let \hat{H}' be $(V[\hat{G}'], Col^{N'[\hat{G}']}(j'(\kappa), < j'(\delta))$ -generic with $m'_H \in \hat{H}'$. Then
 7 $\hat{j}' \smallfrown H \subset \hat{H}'$ so \hat{j}' can be extended to the map \tilde{j}' as claimed. The map $\tilde{j}' \upharpoonright W[G][H]$
 8 will be an element of $N'[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$ for any $W \in H_{\delta^+}$. This completes the proof. \square

9 5.4. Interpolating posets and *ProjectiveCatch* from supercompact towers.

10 Recall we are still assuming the Background Hypotheses from page 21. Suppose
 11 $\mathbb{R} \in V[G][H]$ is any poset and \hat{g} is a \mathbb{R} -name as in the assumptions of Lemma
 12 5.24; for example, \mathbb{R} could just be $\frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G * H}$ and \hat{g} could be the canonical name for
 13 the $\frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{i^*G * H}$ -generic object. Let $F := F_{\hat{g}}$ be the ideal on κ (in $V[G][H]$) defined in
 14 Definition 5.22. Recall from Corollary 5.26 that F is saturated $\iff F$ is strong
 15 $\iff \vec{U}$ is almost huge. Therefore, if we want to obtain a situation where $V[G][H] \models$
 16 “*ProjectiveCatch*(F) holds and F is not strong” then we must necessarily assume
 17 \vec{U} is not almost huge. There is another reason for working with non-almost huge
 18 \vec{U} : we would like to show that the large cardinal upper bound for *ProjectiveCatch*
 19 for ideals on ω_2 is significantly weaker than an almost huge cardinal (which is the
 20 best known upper bound for a saturated or even presaturated ideal on ω_2).

21 So assume \vec{U} is not almost huge. In $V[G][H]$ consider some algebra $\mathcal{A} =$
 22 $(H_\theta[G][H], \dots)$. We would like to find, in $V[G][H]$, an F -self-generic substructure
 23 of \mathcal{A} . The idea is to take a generic ultrapower $\tilde{j} : V[G][H] \rightarrow N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$ (recall
 24 by Corollary 5.25 that all generic ultrapowers of $V[G][H]$ by F are of this form)
 25 and find a $\tilde{j}(F)$ -self-generic structure in $N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$.

26 First we briefly describe the most natural attempt—namely, considering $Sk^{\tilde{j}(\mathcal{A})}(j''\gamma)$
 27 for some $\gamma < \delta$ —and show why such a structure *cannot* be $\tilde{j}(F)$ -generic in the case
 28 where \vec{U} is not almost huge. So assume \vec{U} is not almost huge; this implies that, in
 29 $V[G][H]$, there is some \mathbb{R} -name ψ for a surjection from $\mu \rightarrow_{\text{onto}} \delta$. Fix a $\gamma < \delta$ and
 30 WLOG assume \mathcal{A} extends $(H_\theta, \in, \{\hat{h}, \mathbb{R}\})$. Suppose toward a contradiction that
 31 $M' := Sk^{\tilde{j}(\mathcal{A})}(j''\gamma)$ were $\tilde{j}(F)$ -self-generic in $N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$. Then $M' \cap j(\kappa) = \kappa$, and
 32 by (28) and elementarity of \tilde{j} , $N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$ believes that the following set is $(M', \tilde{j}(\mathbb{R}))$ -
 33 generic:

$$(34) \quad K' := \{r' \in M' \cap \tilde{j}(\mathbb{R}) \mid f_{r'}^{N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]}(\kappa) \in f_{\tilde{G}_{\tilde{j}(\mathbb{R})}}^{N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]}(\kappa)\}$$

Note that $M' = \tilde{j}[Sk^{\mathcal{A}}(\gamma)]$; in particular $K' \subset \text{range}(\tilde{j})$ and so:

$$\begin{aligned} K' &= \{\tilde{j}(r) \mid r \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } f_{\tilde{j}(r)}^{N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]}(\kappa) \in f_{\tilde{G}_{\tilde{j}(\mathbb{R})}}^{N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]}(\kappa)\} \cap M' \\ &= \{\tilde{j}(r) \mid r \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \tilde{j}(f_r)(\kappa) \in \tilde{j}(f_{\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{R}}})(\kappa)\} \cap M' \\ &= \{\tilde{j}(r) \mid r \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } r \in G_{\mathbb{R}}\} \cap M' \\ &= \tilde{j}[G_{\mathbb{R}}] \cap \tilde{j}[Sk^{\mathcal{A}}(\gamma)] \end{aligned}$$

Since K' is $(\tilde{j}[Sk^A(\gamma)], \tilde{j}(\mathbb{R}))$ -generic, then $G_{\mathbb{R}} \cap Sk^A(\gamma)$ is $(Sk^A(\gamma), \mathbb{R})$ -generic. Since $\psi \in Sk^A(\gamma)$, $\text{dom}(\psi) = \mu < \gamma \subset Sk^A(\gamma)$, and $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ is $(Sk^A(\gamma), \mathbb{R})$ -generic, it follows that $\delta = \text{range}(\psi) \subset Sk^A(\gamma)$. But this is a contradiction, since

$$|Sk^A(\gamma)|^{V[G][H]} = |\gamma|^{V[G][H]} < \delta$$

1 We will instead find self-generic structures as follows. We know by Corollary
 2 5.25 that if $\tilde{j} : V[G][H] \rightarrow N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$ is the lifting from Definition 5.16, that the
 3 derived ultrafilter on κ is $(V[G][H], \mathbb{B}_F)$ -generic. This implies that $\tilde{j}{}^{\ast}W$ is a $\tilde{j}(F)$ -
 4 self-generic structure (from the point of view of $V[\hat{G}]$), where $W \in V[G][H]$ is any
 5 transitive ZF^- model with $F \in W$ and $P(\kappa) \subset W$. However, due to the limited
 6 closure of N , the object $\tilde{j}{}^{\ast}W$ is not an element of $N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$, so it is not clear if
 7 $N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$ has any $\tilde{j}(F)$ -self-generic structures; thus it is not clear if $V[G][H]$ has any
 8 F -self-generic structures.

9 The idea for dealing with this issue is to assume there is a tower \vec{U}' which properly
 10 end-extends \vec{U} , and somehow use the lifting \tilde{j}' of the stronger embedding $j' : V \rightarrow \vec{U}'$,
 11 N' given by Lemma 5.27 to obtain $\tilde{j}'(F)$ -self-generic structures inside $N'[\hat{g}'][\hat{H}']$,³⁷
 12 whose existence can then be pulled back to $V[G][H]$ via the elementarity of \tilde{j}' . More
 13 precisely, we would like to show that the ultrafilter on $P^{V[G][H]}(\kappa)$ derived from \tilde{j}' is
 14 generic for \mathbb{B}_F , because this would guarantee that $\tilde{j}'{}^{\ast}W$ is $\tilde{j}'(F)$ -self-generic (where
 15 W is as in the previous paragraph); and then, due to the high degree of closure of
 16 N' , the object $\tilde{j}'{}^{\ast}W$ would be an element of $N'[\hat{g}'][\hat{H}']$ and thus we could pull back
 17 via \tilde{j}' to get the existence of F -self-generic structures inside $V[G][H]$.

18 Showing that the ultrafilter derived from \tilde{j}' is generic for \mathbb{B}_F seems to require
 19 some sort of interpolation between the poset $j(\mathbb{P})$ and $j'(\mathbb{P})$. If \vec{U} is almost huge,
 20 then $j(\mathbb{P})$ is an initial segment of $j'(\mathbb{P})$ and the interpolation is straightforward;
 21 namely, the map $k : N \rightarrow N'$ can be lifted to the relevant generic extensions;
 22 this was the key to the construction in [11] of layered ideals. However, in our
 23 situation where \vec{U} is not almost huge, k **cannot** be lifted to have domain $N^{j(\mathbb{P})}$,
 24 because $\text{crit}(k) \in \{\delta, \delta^{+N}\}$ is not even a cardinal in $N^{j(\mathbb{P})}$.³⁸ The following definition
 25 provides a way around this issue.

26 **Definition 5.28.** Working in V , suppose \vec{U}' is a proper end-extension of \vec{U} . Let
 27 $j' : V \rightarrow \vec{U}'$, N' and $k : N \rightarrow N'$ be the map from Fact 5.4.

28 Let \mathbb{Q} be a partial order. We will say that \mathbb{Q} **interpolates** $j(\mathbb{P})$ and $j'(\mathbb{P})$ with
 29 respect to ι iff:

- 30 (1) $\mathbb{Q} \in N$ and is a subset of $(H_{\delta^+})^N$; in our application below it will actually
 31 be an element of $(H_{\delta^+})^N$.
- 32 (2) \mathbb{Q} is a regular suborder of $RO^N(j(\mathbb{P}))$.
- 33 (3) The map ι from Hypothesis 3 on page 21 maps regularly into $RO^N(\mathbb{Q})$.
- 34 (4) Whenever $G * H$ is $\mathbb{P} * \text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta)$ -generic, letting $\mathbb{R} := \frac{\mathbb{Q}}{\iota^{\ast}G * H}$ (note this
 35 quotient makes sense by requirement 3 and Fact 5.6) then there is some
 36 \mathbb{R} -name \hat{g} such that:
 37 (a) \hat{g} witnesses that $V[G][H]^{\mathbb{R}}$ resembles $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\iota^{\ast}G * H}$
 38 (b) $1_{\mathbb{R}}$ forces that $\dot{G}_{\mathbb{R}} = \hat{g} \cap \mathbb{R}$

³⁷Where \hat{H}' is generic for $\tilde{j}'(\text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta))$, as in Lemma 5.27.

³⁸Because $j(\kappa)$ is the cardinal successor of μ in $N^{j(\mathbb{P})}$.

1 (5) $k \upharpoonright \mathbb{Q}$ is an element of N' and maps \mathbb{Q} regularly into $RO^{N'}(j'(\mathbb{P}))$. Note
2 this is the only clause of the definition which mentions j' or N' .

3 **Remark 5.29.** If \vec{U} is almost huge and $\mathbb{P} \subset V_\kappa$ is κ -cc, then for any end-extension
4 \vec{U}' of \vec{U} , the poset $j(\mathbb{P})$ interpolates itself with $j'(\mathbb{P})$ with respect to the map ι . The
5 main interest in interpolating posets is when \vec{U} is not almost huge.

6 **Lemma 5.30.** Suppose \mathbb{Q} interpolates $j(\mathbb{P})$ and $j'(\mathbb{P})$ with respect to ι . Then:

- 7 (1) $N \models$ “ \mathbb{Q} has the $\text{crit}(k)$ -cc”
8 (2) If $\text{crit}(k) = \delta^{+N}$ then $k \upharpoonright \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}$.
9 (3) $k \circ \iota$ maps $\mathbb{P} * \text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta)$ regularly into $RO^{N'}(j'(\mathbb{P}))$ and is the identity on
10 \mathbb{P} ; so the hypotheses of Lemma 5.27 are satisfied.

11 *Proof.* If \mathbb{Q} did not have the $\text{crit}(k)$ -cc in N , then there would be a maximal
12 antichain $A \subset \mathbb{Q}$ in N of N -size $\text{crit}(k)$; thus $k(A) \supsetneq k \upharpoonright A$. Then $k(A)$ would be a
13 maximal antichain in $j'(\mathbb{P})$ properly containing $k \upharpoonright A$, contradicting the assumption
14 that k maps \mathbb{Q} regularly into $j'(\mathbb{P})$.

15 If $\text{crit}(k) = \delta^{+N}$ then, since we assume $\mathbb{Q} \subset (H_{\delta^+})^N$, $k \upharpoonright \mathbb{Q} = \text{id}$.

16 Item 3 just follows from the assumption that ι is the identity on \mathbb{P} , that $\mathbb{P} * \text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta) \subset V_\delta$, and that $\text{crit}(k) \geq \delta$ (by Fact 5.4). \square

18 The “starred” version of the function $f_{G_\mathbb{R}}$ and the set S_r appearing in the fol-
19 lowing lemma will turn out to be equivalent (modulo the relevant filter) to the
20 unstarred versions from Lemma 5.24 and Corollary 5.25 (respectively). The pur-
21 pose of introducing the starred versions is that they are more easily amenable to
22 the elementarity arguments in Lemma 5.33 and Corollary 5.34 below.

23 **Lemma 5.31.** Suppose \mathbb{Q} interpolates $j(\mathbb{P})$ and $j'(\mathbb{P})$ with respect to ι . Let $G * H$
24 be $(V, \mathbb{P} * \text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta))$ -generic and $\mathbb{R} = \frac{\mathbb{Q}}{\iota^N G * H}$. Then \mathbb{R} is nice (in the sense of
25 Definition 5.23).

26 Furthermore, the function $f_{G_\mathbb{R}}^*$ defined by:

$$(35) \quad \xi \mapsto G \cap f_{\mathbb{Q}}(\xi)$$

27 is $F_{\hat{g}}$ -equivalent to the function $f_{G_\mathbb{R}}$ from Lemma 5.24 (they both always represent
28 $G_\mathbb{R}$ in generic ultrapowers using $F_{\hat{g}}$).

29 Finally, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$(36) \quad S_r^* := \{\xi < \kappa \mid f_r(\xi) \in f_{G_\mathbb{R}}^*(\xi)\}$$

30 Then $[S_r^*]_{F_{\hat{g}}} = [S_r]_{F_{\hat{g}}}$, where S_r is the set defined in (27).

31 *Proof.* Since \mathbb{Q} and ι are elements of N , then $\mathbb{R} \in N[G][H]$. Moreover, by require-
32 ment 4 in Definition 5.28, whenever $G_\mathbb{R}$ is $(V[G][H], \mathbb{R})$ -generic then $G_\mathbb{R} = \hat{g} \cap \mathbb{R}$
33 (so in $V[G][H]$ the triple \hat{g} , \mathbb{R} , and ϕ witness niceness of \mathbb{R} , where $\phi(y, u, v)$ is the
34 formula $y = u \cap v$).

35 To see that $f_{G_\mathbb{R}}^*$ and $f_{G_\mathbb{R}}$ always represent the same object—namely $G_\mathbb{R}$ —in
36 generic ultrapowers by $F_{\hat{g}}$ —let $G_\mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary $(V[G][H], \mathbb{R} = \frac{\mathbb{Q}}{\iota^N G * H})$ -generic,
37 $\hat{g} := \dot{g}_{G_\mathbb{R}}$, and $\tilde{j} := \tilde{j}_{\hat{g}}$. Then

$$(37) \quad \tilde{j}(f_{G_\mathbb{R}}^*)(\kappa) = \hat{g} \cap \tilde{j}(f_{\mathbb{Q}})(\kappa) = \hat{g} \cap \mathbb{Q}$$

38 Also, \hat{g} is a filter for $\frac{j(\mathbb{P})}{\iota^N G * H}$; this means that each element of \hat{g} is $j(\mathbb{P})$ -compatible
39 with each element of $\iota^N G * H$. Since $\perp_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\perp_{j(\mathbb{P})}$ agree and since ι maps into $\text{RO}(\mathbb{Q})$

1 (by requirements 2 and 3 of Definition 5.28, respectively), then each element of $\hat{g} \cap \mathbb{Q}$
 2 is \mathbb{Q} -compatible with each element of $\iota'' G * H$. It follows that

$$(38) \quad \hat{g} \cap \mathbb{Q} = \hat{g} \cap \frac{\mathbb{Q}}{\iota'' G * H} = \hat{g} \cap \mathbb{R} = G_{\mathbb{R}}$$

3 Combining (38) with (37) yields

$$(39) \quad \tilde{j}(f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}^*)(\kappa) = G_{\mathbb{R}}$$

4 Finally, $[S_r^*]_{F_{\hat{g}}} = [S_r]_{F_{\hat{g}}}$ follows from the definitions of S_r , S_r^* and the fact that
 5 $f_r =_{F_{\hat{g}}} f_r^*$. \square

6 **Corollary 5.32.** *If the hypotheses of Lemma 5.31 hold, then the map*

$$(40) \quad r \mapsto [S_r^*]_{F_{\hat{g}}}$$

7 *is a dense embedding from $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{F_{\hat{g}}}$.*

8 *In other words, the statement of Corollary 5.25 still holds when the set S_r from*
 9 *(27) is replaced by the set S_r^* from (36).*

10 **Lemma 5.33.** *Suppose \mathbb{Q} interpolates $j(\mathbb{P})$ and $j'(\mathbb{P})$ with respect to ι . Let $G * H$
 11 be $(V, \mathbb{P} * \text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta))$ -generic and set $\mathbb{R} := \frac{\mathbb{Q}}{\iota'' G * H}$.*

12 *Let $r := k \circ \iota$. Then*

$$(41) \quad k \text{ maps } \mathbb{R} = \frac{\mathbb{Q}}{\iota'' G * H} \text{ regularly into } \frac{j'(\mathbb{P})}{(k \circ \iota)'' G * H}$$

13 *Let $f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}^*$ be the function defined in the statement of Lemma 5.31. Suppose $\tilde{j}' : V[G][H] \rightarrow N'[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$ is some elementary embedding which extends j' and such
 14 that:
 15*

$$(42) \quad \tilde{j}'(G) = \hat{G}'$$

For each $b \in N$ let f_b be the function in $V[G][H]$ given by Definition 5.19.³⁹ Define $G_{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{Q} \cap k^{-1} \hat{G}'$. Then:

(43) *If \hat{G}' is $(V, j'(\mathbb{P}))$ -generic then $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ is $(V[G][H], \mathbb{R})$ -generic*

$$(44) \quad \tilde{j}'(f_b)(\kappa) = k(b) \text{ for all } b \in N$$

$$(45) \quad \tilde{j}'(f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}^*)(\kappa) = \hat{G}' \cap k(\mathbb{Q})$$

*Moreover, if we also assume $\mathbb{Q} \in (H_{\delta^+})^N$ and $\text{crit}(k) = \delta^{+N}$ then $k(\mathbb{Q}) = k''\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}$
 and*

$$(46) \quad G_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{Q} \cap \hat{G}'$$

$$(47) \quad \tilde{j}'(f_r)(\kappa) = r \text{ for all } r \in \mathbb{R} \text{ (Note } \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{Q} \subset N)$$

$$(48) \quad \tilde{j}'(f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}^*)(\kappa) = G_{\mathbb{R}}$$

16 *Proof.* The statement (43) follows from (41), which in turn follows from require-
 17 ments 3 and 5 of Definition 5.28. Equation (44) follows from Lemma 5.20.

18 Since the function $f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}^*$ is defined (in $V[G][H]$) by

$$(49) \quad \xi \mapsto f_{\hat{g}}(\xi) \cap f_{\mathbb{Q}}(\xi) = G \cap f_{\mathbb{Q}}(\xi)$$

³⁹Note that even though f_b is defined even for $b \in N[G][H]$ by Corollary 5.21, the expression $k(b)$ will only make sense for $b \in N$ because, as remarked above, k cannot be extended to have domain $N[G][H]$ in the case that \tilde{U} is not almost huge.

1 then by (42) and elementarity of \tilde{j}' :

$$(50) \quad \tilde{j}'(f_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}^*)(\kappa) = \hat{G}' \cap \tilde{j}'(f_{\mathbb{Q}})(\kappa) = \hat{G}' \cap k(\mathbb{Q})$$

2 where the last equation is by Lemma 5.20 (note \mathbb{Q} is an element of N). This proves
3 (45).

4 Finally, suppose we also assume that $k(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q}$ and $k \upharpoonright \mathbb{Q} = id$. Then clearly
5 (44) implies (47), and moreover

$$(51) \quad \hat{G}' \cap k(\mathbb{Q}) = \hat{G}' \cap \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q} \cap k^{-1} \hat{G}'$$

6 This, combined with (43), implies (46). Also (50) and (51) imply (48). \square

7 The following corollary is the key point of interpolating posets; it essentially says
8 that liftings by j and liftings by j' yield the same ultrafilters on $\wp^{V[G][H]}(\kappa)$:

9 **Corollary 5.34.** *Suppose \mathbb{Q} interpolates $j(\mathbb{P})$ and $j'(\mathbb{P})$ with respect to ι and that*

$$(52) \quad \mathbb{Q} \in (H_{\delta^+})^N \text{ and } \text{crit}(k) = \delta^{+N}$$

10 *Let $G * H$ be $(V, \mathbb{P} * \text{Col}(\kappa, < \delta))$ -generic and $\mathbb{R} := \frac{\mathbb{Q}}{\iota^* G * H}$. For each $r \in \mathbb{R}$ let S_r^*
11 *be the subset of κ defined in (36).**

12 *Let:*

- 13 • $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ be $(V[G][H], \mathbb{R})$ -generic
- 14 • $\hat{g} := \dot{g}_{G_{\mathbb{R}}}$ (where \dot{g} is the \mathbb{R} -name witnessing resemblance of $V[G][H]^{\mathbb{R}}$ to
15 $V^{j(\mathbb{P})/\iota^* G * H}$)
- 16 • $\tilde{j} := \tilde{j}_{\hat{g}} : V[G][H] \rightarrow N[\hat{g}][\hat{h}]$ be the lifting as in Definition 5.16
- 17 • \hat{G}' be $(V[G][H][G_{\mathbb{R}}], \frac{j'(\mathbb{P})/\iota^* G * H}{G_{\mathbb{R}}})$ -generic (note \mathbb{R} is a regular subalgebra of
18 $j'(\mathbb{P})/\iota^* G * H$ by assumption (52) and Lemma 5.30)
- 19 • \hat{H}' be $(V[\hat{G}'], \text{Col}^{N'[\hat{G}']}(j'(\kappa), < j'(\delta)))$ -generic with $\bigcup \hat{j}' \hat{H} \in \hat{H}'$, and in
20 $V[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$ let $\tilde{j}' : V[G][H] \rightarrow N'[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$ be the lifting of j' given by Lemma
21 5.27.

22 *Then for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$:*

$$(53) \quad \kappa \in \tilde{j}(S_r^*) \iff r \in G_{\mathbb{R}} \iff \kappa \in \tilde{j}'(S_r^*)$$

23 *It follows that the ultrafilter on $P^{V[G][H]}(\kappa)$ derived from \tilde{j} is the same as the ul-
24 *trafilter derived from \tilde{j}' and, furthermore, this ultrafilter is $(V[G][H], \mathbb{B}_{F_{\hat{g}}})$ -generic.**

25 *Proof.* Corollary 5.32 implies that $r \in G_{\mathbb{R}} \iff \kappa \in \tilde{j}(S_r^*)$. Items (47) and (48) of
26 Lemma 5.33 imply that $r \in G_{\mathbb{R}} \iff \kappa \in \tilde{j}'(S_r^*)$. \square

27 Finally we give examples of interpolating posets.

28 **Lemma 5.35.** *Suppose $\mathbb{P} = \text{Col}(\mu, < \kappa)$. Let $\mathbb{Q} := \text{Col}(\mu, < \delta + 1)$.⁴⁰*

29 *Then:*

- 30 (1) *We can WLOG assume that the $\iota \in N$ from Hypothesis 3 on page 21 maps
31 regularly into \mathbb{Q} .*
- 32 (2) *\mathbb{Q} satisfies item 4 from Definition 5.28.*

⁴⁰This poset is forcing equivalent to $\text{Col}(\mu, \delta)$.

1 *Proof.* If \vec{U} is almost huge then the lemma is trivial (since \mathbb{Q} is a regular end-
 2 extension of $j(\mathbb{P})$ in that case). So assume that \vec{U} is not almost huge. First we
 3 show the “WLOG” part; i.e. that it can be arranged that ι maps into $RO^N(\mathbb{Q})$
 4 and be the identity on \mathbb{P} . Note that

$$(54) \quad \mathbb{Q} \simeq \mathbb{P} \times Col(\mu, [\kappa, \delta + 1])$$

5 and that each factor is computed the same in V and $V^{\mathbb{P}}$. Also, by standard absorp-
 6 tion theory for Levy collapses:

$$(55) \quad \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} Col^{V^{\mathbb{P}}}(\kappa, < \delta) \text{ regularly embeds into } RO^{V^{\mathbb{P}}}(Col(\mu, [\kappa, \delta + 1]))$$

Let \dot{r} be a \mathbb{P} -name for a regular embedding witnessing (55). Then by Fact 5.7,
 the map

$$\ell : \mathbb{P} * Col^{V^{\mathbb{P}}}(\kappa, < \delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{P} * RO^{V^{\mathbb{P}}}(Col(\mu, [\kappa, \delta + 1]))$$

defined by

$$(p, \dot{q}) \mapsto (p, \dot{r}(\dot{q}))$$

7 is a regular embedding.

8 Let $D := \{(p, \dot{q}) \mid q \in Col(\mu, [\kappa, \delta + 1])\}$. D is dense in the target poset of ℓ , i.e.
 9 D is dense in $\mathbb{P} * RO(Col(\mu, [\kappa, \delta + 1]))$. Define $\ell_D : \mathbb{P} * Col^{V^{\mathbb{P}}}(\kappa, < \delta) \rightarrow D$ by

$$(p, \dot{q}) \mapsto \sup\{d \in D \mid \ell(p, \dot{q}) \geq d\}$$

10 Note that D is closed under arbitrary suprema in the poset $\mathbb{P} * RO(Col(\mu, [\kappa, \delta + 1]))$;
 11 this is just due to the fact that the underlying set of \mathbb{Q} is closed under arbitrary
 12 intersections.⁴¹ So ℓ_D is well-defined, maps into D , and is a regular embedding.
 13 Moreover, it is easy to see that ℓ_D acts as the identity on \mathbb{P} ; i.e. $\ell_D(p, 1) = (p, 1)$
 14 for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Let $\phi : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ be the isomorphism defined by $(p, \dot{q}) \mapsto p \cup q$. Then
 15 $\phi \circ \ell_D$ is a regular embedding from $\mathbb{P} * Col^{V^{\mathbb{P}}}(\kappa, < \delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\phi(p, 1) = p$ for
 16 all $p \in \mathbb{P}$.

17 To see that \mathbb{Q} satisfies item 4 from Definition 5.28: Let $G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be $(V[G][H], \frac{\mathbb{Q}}{i^*G^*H})$ -
 18 generic. Since N is closed under $< \delta$ sequences and \mathbb{Q} is $< \mu$ -distributive and adds
 19 a surjection from $\mu \rightarrow_{\text{onto}} \delta$,⁴² then:

$$(56) \quad V[G_{\mathbb{Q}}] \models N[G_{\mathbb{Q}}] \text{ is closed under } < \mu \text{ sequences}$$

Consider the poset $\mathbb{Q}' := Col(\mu, [\delta + 1, j(\kappa)])$; this is computed the same in all
 models and

$$\mathcal{A} := \{A \in N[G_{\mathbb{Q}}] \mid A \text{ is maximal antichain in } \mathbb{Q}'\}$$

20 has size $j(\kappa)$ in $N[G_{\mathbb{Q}}]$ and thus size μ in $V[G_{\mathbb{Q}}]$ (since $j(\kappa) > \delta$). Then $V[G_{\mathbb{Q}}]$ can
 21 pick a μ -enumeration of \mathcal{A} and use (56) to construct a $g_{\mathbb{Q}'}$ which is $(N[G_{\mathbb{Q}}], \mathbb{Q}')$ -
 22 generic. Thus by the Product Lemma, $G_{\mathbb{Q}} \times g_{\mathbb{Q}'}$ is $(N, \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}')$ -generic. Let $\phi : \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}' \leftrightarrow Col(\mu, < j(\kappa))$ be the standard isomorphism given by $(q, q') \mapsto q \cup q'$.
 23 Then $\hat{g} := \phi^*(G_{\mathbb{Q}} \times g_{\mathbb{Q}'})$ is $(N, Col(\mu, < j(\kappa)))$ -generic and $\hat{g} \cap \mathbb{Q} = G_{\mathbb{Q}}$. \square
 24

⁴¹i.e. if $Z \subset D$, then the supremum of Z in $\mathbb{P} * RO(Col(\mu, [\kappa, \delta + 1]))$ is exactly (p^*, \dot{q}^*) where
 p^* is the intersection of all the first coordinates of elements of Z and q^* is the intersection of all
 the second coordinates of elements of Z .

⁴²Recall we're assuming \vec{U} is not almost huge, so $j(\kappa) > \delta$.

1 **Lemma 5.36.** *Suppose \vec{U}' is a proper end-extension of \vec{U} . Let $j' : V \rightarrow_{\vec{U}'} N'$ and*
 2 *$k : N \rightarrow N'$ be the map from Fact 5.4. Let $\mathbb{P} = Col(\mu, < \kappa)$ and $\iota \in N$ be as in*
 3 *Lemma 5.35. Let $\mathbb{Q} := Col(\mu, < \delta + 1)$. Suppose \vec{U} is **not** almost huge, and that*
 4 *$crit(k) = \delta^{+N}$. Then \mathbb{Q} interpolates $j(\mathbb{P})$ and $j'(\mathbb{P})$ w.r.t. ι .*

5 *Proof.* $\mathbb{Q} \in (H_{\delta^+})^N$ and is a regular suborder of $Col(\mu, < \eta)$ for any $\eta \geq \delta + 1$.
 6 Since $crit(k) = \delta^{+N}$ then $k(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q}$ is a regular suborder of $Col(\mu, < j'(\kappa)) = j'(\mathbb{P})$.
 7 That \mathbb{Q} satisfies the other requirements of interpolation was proved in Lemma 5.35.
 8 \square

9 Finally we use these to prove the main theorem of this section:

10 **Theorem 5.37.** *Suppose $\kappa < \delta$ are inaccessible, κ is δ -supercompact, and δ is*
 11 *the least inaccessible cardinal above κ . Let $\mu < \kappa$ be a regular cardinal. Then the*
 12 *model $V^{Col(\mu, < \kappa) * Col(\kappa, < \delta)}$ believes there is a normal ideal \mathcal{F} on $\kappa = \mu^+$ such that*
 13 *$ProjectiveCatch(\mathcal{F})$ holds and \mathcal{F} is not a strong ideal.*

14 *If $\mu > \omega$ then the starred version $ProjectiveCatch^*(\mathcal{F})$ holds.*

15 *Proof.* Let U be a normal measure on $P_\kappa(\delta)$. Let \vec{U} be the projection of U to a
 16 tower of height δ . To conform to the terminology above, let $\vec{U}' := \vec{U} \cup \{(\delta, U)\}$
 17 (so ultrapowers by U are the same as ultrapowers by \vec{U}'). Let $j : V \rightarrow_{\vec{U}} N$,
 18 $j' : V \rightarrow_{\vec{U}'} N'$, and $k : N \rightarrow N'$ as usual. Since N and N' are both correct about δ
 19 being the least inaccessible cardinal above κ , then $k(\delta) = \delta$, \vec{U} is not almost huge,
 20 and:

$$(57) \quad crit(k) = \delta^{+N}$$

21 Let μ be any regular cardinal below κ , and let $\mathbb{P} := Col(\mu, < \kappa)$. Let $\iota \in N$ be a
 22 regular embedding from $\mathbb{P} * Col(\kappa, < \delta) \rightarrow RO^N(Col(\mu, < \delta + 1))$ given by Lemma
 23 5.35. Let $\mathbb{Q} := Col(\mu, < \delta + 1)$. By Lemma 5.36, \mathbb{Q} interpolates $j(\mathbb{P})$ and $j'(\mathbb{P})$
 24 w.r.t. the map ι .

25 Let $G * H$ be $(V, \mathbb{P} * Col(\kappa, < \delta))$ -generic and $\mathbb{R} := \frac{\mathbb{Q}}{i^* G * H}$. Let $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{\hat{g}}$ where \hat{g}
 26 is from Definition 5.28. Let $S \in V[G][H]$ be \mathcal{F} -positive. By Corollary 5.32 there is
 27 an $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $0 < [S_r^*]_{\mathcal{F}} \leq [S]_{\mathcal{F}}$.

28 In $V[G][H]$ consider an arbitrary algebra $\mathcal{A} = (H_{\delta^+}[G][H], \in, \{\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{F}}\} \dots)$. We
 29 need to show that, in $V[G][H]$, there is some $M \prec \mathcal{A}$ such that $M \cap \kappa \in S_r^*$ and M
 30 is \mathcal{F} -self-generic.

31 Let $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ be $(V[G][H], \mathbb{R})$ -generic with $r \in G_{\mathbb{R}}$. Now pick any \hat{G}' which is
 32 $(V[G][H][G_{\mathbb{R}}], \frac{j'(\mathbb{P})}{G_{\mathbb{R}}})$ -generic and let \hat{H}' be $(V[\hat{G}'], Col^{N'[\hat{G}']}(j'(\kappa), < j'(\delta)))$ -generic
 33 with $\bigcup \hat{j}' \text{``} H \in \hat{H}'$, and in $V[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$ let $\tilde{j}' : V[G][H] \rightarrow N'[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$ be the lifting of
 34 j' given by Lemma 5.27. Then $\kappa \in \tilde{j}'(S_r^*)$, and by (57) and Corollary 5.34:

$$(58) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{The ultrafilter on } P^{V[G][H]}(\kappa) \text{ derived from } \tilde{j}' \text{ is} \\ (V[G][H], \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{F}})\text{-generic} \end{array}$$

35 In $V[G][H]$ fix some transitive W such that $\delta \subset W \prec \mathcal{A}$, $|W| = \delta$, and ${}^\omega W \subset$
 36 W .⁴³ Then $M' \prec \tilde{j}'(\mathcal{A})$, and $M' \cap \tilde{j}'(\kappa) = \kappa$. Also, by (58) the ultrafilter derived
 37 from \tilde{j}' is $(W, \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{F}})$ -generic; this is equivalent to saying that M' is $\tilde{j}'(\mathcal{F})$ -self-generic.

⁴³This is possible because $\delta^\omega = \delta$ in $V[G][H]$.

1 Thus $V[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$ models:

$$(59) \quad \begin{aligned} M' &\prec \tilde{j}'(\mathcal{A}) \\ M' &\text{ is } \tilde{j}'(\mathcal{F})\text{-self-generic} \\ M' \cap j'(\kappa) &\in \tilde{j}'(S_r^*) \end{aligned}$$

2 Since $|W| = \delta$ then $M' := \tilde{j}'[W]$ is an element of $N'[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$; furthermore
 3 the statements appearing in (59) are just Σ_0 statements, so they are also true
 4 in $N'[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$. So by elementarity of \tilde{j}' :

$$V[G][H] \models (\exists M)(M \prec \mathcal{A} \ \& \ M \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-self-generic} \ \& \ M \cap \kappa \in S_r^*)$$

5 Finally, note that in the case where $\mu > \omega$, then $\text{crit}(\tilde{j}') > 2^\omega$. In this case the ω -
 6 closure of W transfers over to ω -closure of M' from the view of $N'[\hat{G}'][\hat{H}']$. It follows
 7 that in $V[G][H]$ we would obtain $\text{ProjectiveCatch}^*(\mathcal{F})$, not merely $\text{ProjectiveCatch}(\mathcal{F})$.
 8 □

9 **5.5. Negative solution to Open Question 13 from [7].** Theorem 5.37 of the
 10 previous section implies that the hypothesis of the following lemma is consistent
 11 (relative to large cardinals), for any regular uncountable κ :

12 **Lemma 5.38.** *Suppose \mathcal{J}_0 is a normal ideal on a regular uncountable κ such that:*

- 13 • *ProjectiveCatch(\mathcal{J}_0) holds; yet*
- 14 • *\mathcal{J}_0 is not a strong ideal*

15 *Then there is a normal ideal \mathcal{J}_1 projecting to \mathcal{J}_0 such that the pair $\mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_0$ witnesses*
 16 *a “no” answer to Open Question number 13 from Foreman [7]. More precisely,*
 17 *$\mathcal{J}_1 \subset \wp \wp(\kappa^+)$, \mathcal{J}_1 projects canonically to \mathcal{J}_0 , the canonical homomorphism $h_{\mathcal{J}_0, \mathcal{J}_1} :$
 18 $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}_1}$ is a regular embedding, yet \mathcal{J}_0 is not saturated.*

19 *Proof.* By Lemma 3.4 there is a \mathcal{J}_2 (with a large support relative to \mathcal{J}_0) such that
 20 $\text{Catch}(\mathcal{J}_2, \mathcal{J}_0)$ holds. Let \mathcal{J}_1 be the canonical projection of \mathcal{J}_2 to κ^+ . Then \mathcal{J}_2
 21 projects canonically to \mathcal{J}_1 , and \mathcal{J}_1 projects canonically to \mathcal{J}_0 . By Corollary 3.12,
 22 the canonical homomorphism from $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{J}_1}$ is a regular embedding. Since \mathcal{J}_0 is
 23 not strong, then it is not saturated. □

24 **Remark 5.39.** *For the special case where $\kappa = \omega_1$, the negative answer to Fore-*
 25 *man’s question also follows from Theorem 3.8 and the fact that precipitousness*
 26 *does not imply strongness. More precisely: if \mathcal{J}_0 is a precipitous ideal on ω_1 , then*
 27 *ProjectiveCatch(\mathcal{J}_0) holds by Theorem 3.8; so if \mathcal{J}_0 is not strong⁴⁴ then \mathcal{J}_0 satis-*
 28 *fies the hypotheses of Lemma 5.38.*

29 6. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND QUESTIONS

30 **Question 6.1.** *PFA implies there is no presaturated ideal on ω_2 (Foreman-Magidor [9]).*
 31 *Is PFA consistent with an ideal \mathcal{I} on ω_2 such that StatCatch(\mathcal{I}) or ProjectiveCatch(\mathcal{I})*
 32 *holds? It is known (see Cox [5]) that, relative to a huge supercompact cardi-*
 33 *nal, PFA is consistent with an ideal \mathcal{I} on $[\lambda]^{\omega_1}$ (with completeness ω_2) such that*
 34 *ProjectiveCatch^{*}(\mathcal{I}) holds.*

⁴⁴The Jech-Magidor-Mitchell-Prikry example of a precipitous ideal in $V^{\text{Col}(\omega, < \kappa)}$ where κ is measurable is not a strong ideal.

1 **Question 6.2.** Set $S_1^2 := \omega_2 \cap \text{cof}(\omega_1)$. Building on work of Kunen and Magidor,
 2 Woodin proved that it is consistent relative to an almost-huge cardinal that $NS \upharpoonright S$
 3 is saturated for some stationary $S \subset S_1^2$. It is a well-known open problem whether
 4 $NS \upharpoonright S_1^2$ can be saturated. Since *ProjectiveCatch* is a weakening of saturation,
 5 it also makes sense to ask: Can *ProjectiveCatch*($NS \upharpoonright S_1^2$) hold? What about
 6 *ProjectiveCatch* $^*(NS \upharpoonright S_1^2)$?

7 **Question 6.3.** By a well-known theorem of Shelah, if \mathcal{I} is an ideal whose dual
 8 concentrates on $\omega_2 \cap \text{cof}(\omega)$, then \mathcal{I} is not presaturated. Can *ProjectiveCatch*(\mathcal{I})
 9 hold for such an \mathcal{I} ? What about when \mathcal{I} is the nonstationary ideal restricted to
 10 $\omega_2 \cap \text{cof}(\omega)$?

11 Note that the answer to Questions 6.2 and 6.3 is “yes” if we replace *ProjectiveCatch*
 12 with *StatCatch*; this is because of Lemma 3.7 and the fact that it is consistent (by
 13 Woodin; see [7]) for some restriction of NS_{ω_2} to be saturated.

14

REFERENCES

- 15 [1] B. Balcar and F. Franek, *Completion of factor algebras of ideals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.
 16 **100** (1987), no. 2, 205–212, DOI 10.2307/2045944. MR884452 (88g:06017)
- 17 [2] James E. Baumgartner and Alan D. Taylor, *Saturation properties of ideals in generic ex-*
 18 *tensions. II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **271** (1982), no. 2, 587–609, DOI 10.2307/1998900.
 19 MR654852 (83k:03040b)
- 20 [3] Douglas R. Burke, *Precipitous towers of normal filters*, J. Symbolic Logic **62** (1997), no. 3,
 21 741–754, DOI 10.2307/2275571. MR1472122 (2000d:03114)
- 22 [4] Benjamin Claverie and Ralf Schindler, *Woodin’s axiom (*), bounded forcing axioms,*
 23 *and precipitous ideals on ω_1* , J. Symbolic Logic **77** (2012), no. 2, 475–498, DOI
 24 10.2178/jsl/1333566633. MR2963017
- 25 [5] Sean Cox, *PFA and ideals on ω_2 whose associated forcings are proper*, Notre Dame Journal
 26 of Formal Logic **53** (2012), no. 3, 397–412.
- 27 [6] James Cummings, *Iterated forcing and elementary embeddings*, Handbook of set theory. Vols.
 28 1, 2, 3, Springer, Dordrecht, 2010, pp. 775–883. MR2768691
- 29 [7] Matthew Foreman, *Ideals and Generic Elementary Embeddings*, Handbook of Set Theory,
 30 Springer, 2010.
- 31 [8] Matthew Foreman and Peter Komjath, *The club guessing ideal: commentary on a theorem of*
 32 *Gitik and Shelah*, J. Math. Log. **5** (2005), no. 1, 99–147, DOI 10.1142/S0219061305000419.
 33 MR2151585 (2007a:03051)
- 34 [9] Matthew Foreman and Menachem Magidor, *Large cardinals and definable counterexamples*
 35 *to the continuum hypothesis*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **76** (1995), no. 1, 47–97. MR1359154
 36 (96k:03124)
- 37 [10] M. Foreman, M. Magidor, and S. Shelah, *Martin’s maximum, saturated ideals, and nonregular*
 38 *ultrafilters. I*, Ann. of Math. (2) **127** (1988), no. 1, 1–47. MR924672 (89f:03043)
- 39 [11] ———, *Martin’s maximum, saturated ideals and nonregular ultrafilters. II*, Ann. of Math.
 40 (2) **127** (1988), no. 3, 521–545. MR942519 (90a:03077)
- 41 [12] Moti Gitik, *The nonstationary ideal on \aleph_2* , Israel J. Math. **48** (1984), no. 4, 257–288.
 42 MR776310 (86i:03061)
- 43 [13] Moti Gitik and Saharon Shelah, *Forcings with ideals and simple forcing notions*, Israel J.
 44 Math. **68** (1989), no. 2, 129–160. MR1035887 (91g:03104)
- 45 [14] Thomas Jech, *Set theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin,
 46 2003. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded. MR1940513 (2004g:03071)
- 47 [15] T. Jech, M. Magidor, W. Mitchell, and K. Prikry, *Precipitous ideals*, J. Symbolic Logic **45**
 48 (1980), no. 1, 1–8. MR560220 (81h:03097)
- 49 [16] Akihiro Kanamori, *The higher infinite*, 2nd ed., Springer Monographs in Mathematics,
 50 Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. Large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings. MR1994835
 51 (2004f:03092)

- 1 [17] Richard Ketchersid, Paul Larson, and Jindřich Zapletal, *Increasing δ_2^1 and Namba-style forcing*, J. Symbolic Logic **72** (2007), no. 4, 1372–1378, DOI 10.2178/jsl/1203350792. MR2371211
2 (2008i:03058)
3
- 4 [18] Paul B. Larson, *The stationary tower*, University Lecture Series, vol. 32, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004. Notes on a course by W. Hugh Woodin. MR2069032
5 (2005e:03001)
6
- 7 [19] W. J. Mitchell and E. Schimmerling, *Weak covering without countable closure*, Math. Res. Lett. **2** (1995), no. 5, 595–609. MR1359965 (96k:03123)
8
- 9 [20] E. Schimmerling and J. R. Steel, *The maximality of the core model*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **351** (1999), no. 8, 3119–3141, DOI 10.1090/S0002-9947-99-02411-3. MR1638250 (99m:03104)
10
- 11 [21] Benjamin Claverie and Ralf-Dieter Schindler, *Woodin’s axiom (*), bounded forcing axioms, and precipitous ideals on ω_1* , to appear in Journal of Symbolic Logic.
12
- 13 [22] John R. Steel, *The core model iterability problem*, Lecture Notes in Logic, vol. 8, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996. MR1480175 (99k:03043)
14
- 15 [23] W. Hugh Woodin, *The axiom of determinacy, forcing axioms, and the nonstationary ideal*, de Gruyter Series in Logic and its Applications, vol. 1, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1999. MR1713438 (2001e:03001)
16
- 17 [24] Martin Zeman, *Inner models and large cardinals*, de Gruyter Series in Logic and its Applications, vol. 5, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2002. MR1876087 (2003a:03004)
18
- 19 *E-mail address: scox9@vcu.edu*
20

21 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY, 1015 FLOYD AVENUE, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23284, USA
22

23 *E-mail address: mzeman@math.uci.edu*

24 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 340 ROWLAND HALL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE, IRVINE, CA 92697-3875
25