Universally Baire sets and definable well-orderings of the reals*†

Sy D. Friedman‡ Ralf Schindler§

January 20, 2003

Abstract

Let $n \geq 3$ be an integer. We show that it is consistent (relative to the consistency of $n-2$ strong cardinals) that every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_n$-set of reals is universally Baire yet there is a (lightface) projective well-ordering of the reals. The proof uses "David's trick" in the presence of inner models with strong cardinals.

1 Introduction.

Let $\Gamma \subset \Gamma' \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ be pointclasses, where Γ' is not too far away from Γ. There is tension between every set in Γ being "regular" (being Lebesgue measurable, having the property of Baire, being Ramsey, each of which contradicts certain doses of choice) and Γ' providing choice-like principles for Γ (every non-empty set in Γ contains a Γ'-singleton, or there is a well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ in Γ'). For example, Woodin has shown that if every projective set of

*Math. Subj. Class. 03E35, 03E45, and 03E55.

†Keywords and phrases: Descriptive set theory, large cardinals, inner models.

‡The first author was supported by NSF Grant Number 9625997-DMS

§The second author gratefully acknowledges a fellowship from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). The results in this paper were obtained while he was visiting the UC Berkeley. He would like to thank Greg Hjorth, Vladimir Kanovei, John Steel, Philip Welch, and Hugh Woodin for providing illuminating information about the questions addressed in this paper.

reals is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire and every projective relation on $\mathbb{R}^2$ can be uniformized by a function with a projective graph then $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$-determinacy holds (c.f. [16]).

The present paper also deals with this tension at the projective level. Let $n \geq 2$, $\Gamma = \mathbf{\Sigma}^1_n$ and $\Gamma' = \mathbf{\Delta}^1_{n+1}$. Of course, if every Γ-set of reals is Lebesgue measurable then there cannot be a well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ in Γ. But we may ask whether nevertheless there can be a projective well-ordering of the reals, or one in Γ' for that matter.

An answer to this question can be found in the literature. Moschovakis (cf. [10]) showed that if Projective Determinacy holds then there is an inner model M^n with a Σ^1_{n+1}-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ and in which $\mathbf{\Delta}^1_{n-1}$-determinacy holds (hence if n is odd then in M^n every set in Γ is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire). Moreover, if M_{n-1} denotes the minimal sufficiently iterable inner model with $n-1$ Woodin cardinals then in M_{n-1} there is a Δ^1_{n+1}-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_{n-1}$-determinacy holds (hence in M_{n-1} every set in Γ is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire; cf. [14]).

Let us consider the following question.

Question. Let $n \geq 3$. Suppose that every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_n$-set of reals is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire, and that there is a lightface projective well-ordering of the reals. Does $\mathbf{\Delta}^1_{n-1}$-determinacy hold?

For the case $n = 3$ or 4 this is refuted by a couple of theorems due to the first author of the present paper. He showed (cf. [5]): starting from a Mahlo cardinal in L (or, alternatively, from an inaccessible cardinal plus $\sharp$'s), one can construct a forcing extension with a Δ^1_4-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ in which all $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_3$-sets of reals are Lebesgue measurable and have the property of Baire; and starting from a Mahlo cardinal plus $\sharp$'s, one can construct a forcing extension with a Δ^1_5-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ in which all $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_4$-sets of reals are Lebesgue measurable and have the property of Baire. (David had earlier shown that if L has an inaccessible then there is a forcing extension with a Δ^1_3-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ in which all $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_2$-sets of reals are Lebesgue measurable and have the property of Baire; cf. [2].)

We here answer the above question negatively for all $n < \omega$, as follows.

Theorem 1.1 *Let $n \geq 3$. It is consistent, relative to the existence of $n-2$ strong cardinals, that every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_n$-set of reals is Lebesgue measurable and has* *the property of Baire, and yet there is a lightface projective well-ordering of the reals.*

Recall that by a theorem of Woodin Δ^1_2-determinacy implies the existence of an inner model with a Woodin cardinal, and hence the existence of transitive models with infinitely many strong cardinals, so that Gödel's second incompleteness theorem shows that 1.1 provides a negative answer to the above question, granting the consistency of strong cardinals.

Theorem 1.1 is a corollary to the next result.

Theorem 1.2 *Let $n \in \omega$. Let $L[E^n]$ denote the minimal inner model closed under the $\sharp$-operation if $n = 0$, viz. the minimal fully iterable inner model with n strong cardinals if $n > 0$.*

Then there is a real a ($a = 0$ if $n = 0$), set-generic over $L[E^n]$, such that in $L[E^n][a]$ every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_{n+2}$-set of reals is universally Baire, there is a $\Delta^1_{n+3}(a)$-well-ordering of the reals, and a is a Π^1_{n+4}-singleton (and hence there is a Δ^1_{n+5}-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$).

We shall in fact see that a may be chosen in such a way that every Σ^1_{n+3}-set of reals is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire. Refining this observation we can also show:

Theorem 1.3 *Let $n > 0$, and let $L[E^n]$ be the minimal fully iterable inner model with n strong cardinals. Suppose that in $L[E^n]$ there is an inaccessible cardinal above the strong cardinals.*

Then there is a set-generic extension of $L[E^n]$ in which every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_{n+2}$-set of reals is universally Baire, every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_{n+3}$-set of reals is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire, and there is a Δ^1_{n+5}-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$.

Recall that a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ is called universally Baire iff for every compact Hausdorff space $\mathcal{X}$ and every continuous $f\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ it is the case that $f^{-1}{}''A$ has the property of Baire (in $\mathcal{X}$). If $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ is universally Baire then A is Lebesgue measurable, is Ramsey, and has the Bernstein property (and, trivially, has the property of Baire, cf. [3] Theorems 2.2 and 2.3). In the following, as in the statements of 1.2 and 1.3, we shall always suppose that $L[E^n]$ as well as enough generics exist.

We don't know whether the models of 1.2 and 1.3 have a Δ^1_{n+4}-well-ordering of their reals. We hence have to leave unanswered the strengthening of the above question in which "projective" is replaced by Δ^1_{n+1} (for $n \geq 5$).

We also don't know whether the large cardinals used for constructing the models in 1.2 and 1.3 are actually necessary. It is open as how to get more than an inaccessible cardinal in L from the assumption of the above question.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the necessary inner model theory, and states a crucial technical lemma due to Woodin. Sections 3 and 4 contain proofs of 1.2 and 1.3, respectively, using heavily ideas of R. David (cf. [1], [2], and also [4]). We shall in fact only prove 1.2 for the case $n > 0$, as the case $n = 0$ is easily seen to be given by [2] (or may be derived by simplifying the arguments to follow). Section 5 lists three open problems.

2 Preliminaries.

Woodin has seen how strong cardinals may be used to obtain universal Baireness in certain generic extensions. More precisely, he proved the following theorem which will become crucial for the construction of our models.

Theorem 2.1 (**Woodin**) *Let $0 < n < \omega$, and let $\kappa_1 < ... < \kappa_n$ be strong cardinals. Let G be P-generic over V for some $P \in V$, and suppose that $(2^{2^{\kappa_n}})^V$ becomes countable in $V[G]$. Then in $V[G]$, every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_{n+2}$-set of reals is universally Baire.*

In fact, in $V[G]$ there is a definable sequence $(T_m, S_m \colon 2 \leq m \leq n+2)$ of proper class sized trees on $\omega \times OR$ such that:

(a) S_2 is the Shoenfield tree for a universal Σ^1_2-set of reals in every (set-generic) extension,

(b) for $3 \leq m \leq n+2$, S_m is T_{m-1} reorganized so as to have $p[S_m] \approx \exists^{\mathbb{R}}\ p[T_{m-1}]$, and

(c) for $2 \leq m \leq n+2$, for all p.o.'s $Q \in V[G]$,

$$Q \Vdash p[(T_m \restriction \alpha)\check{}\,] = \mathbb{R} \setminus p[(S_m \restriction \alpha)\check{}\,]$$

for all sufficiently large α.

Notice that the existence of the sequence $(T_m, S_m \colon 2 \leq m \leq n+2)$ implies that every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_{n+2}$-set of reals is universally Baire (in every set-generic extension) by the main characterization of universal Baireness from [3].

We now turn to the inner model theory. We shall presuppose that the reader is familiar to a certain extent with [15]. In order to compute the complexity of the canonical well-ordering of the reals in the models we are about to construct, we shall also have to use some of the machinery of [8].

In the sections to follow we shall make heavy use of the fact that the ground model we are starting with will be the core model of all of its set-generic extensions. This is true if the ground model is a minimal fully iterable inner model for a given large cardinal assumption (roughly) below one Woodin cardinal. In particular, it will be true if the ground model happens to be $L[E^n]$, some $n < \omega$, the minimal fully iterable inner model with n strong cardinals.

In what follows we shall work with the core model theory of [13]. In particular, our premice will be Friedman-Jensen premice rather than Mitchell-Steel premice. This choice becomes technically significant in the proof of 2.5. The referee pointed out that at the cost of slightly modifying the statement of 2.5 and the constructions in our proofs of 1.2 and 1.3 we probably could also have worked with Mitchell-Steel premice instead (they were invented earlier, cf. [12] and [15]). However, our choice of building upon [13] is natural as we'll also have to exploit [8], a paper which also uses Friedman-Jensen premice.

Suppose that $0^{\P}$ does not exist (cf. [13, Definition 2.3]; the non-existence of $0^{\P}$ is consistent with the existence of an inner model with a proper class of strong cardinals). Then the core model K exists (cf. [13]). Throughout this section (except for in the discussion before 2.3), the letter K will be reserved for denoting the object constructed in [13].

Now let n be a positive integer, and suppose that there are n strong cardinals but $0^{\P}$ does not exist. Let $0^{n\P}$ denote the "sharp" for an inner model with n strong cardinals. If $0^{n\P} \notin K$ then we let $L[E^n]$ denote K; otherwise we let $L[E^n]$ denote the inner model obtained by iterating the top measure of $0^{n\P}$ out of the universe. As a matter of fact, $L[E^n]$ is then a fully iterable inner model with n strong cardinals. Moreover, in this case $L[E^n]$ satisfies $V = K$. (This reduces to some absoluteness of iterability fact. This, and in fact a more general result, is due to Steel.) Also, $K^{V[G]} = K$ for any G being set-generic over V. (Cf. [15].)

Let $n < \omega$. For our purposes, a premouse $\mathcal{M}$ is called n-full iff there is a universal weasel $W \triangleright \mathcal{M}$ having the definability property (see [15] 4.4) at all $\kappa \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{J}_\kappa^{\mathcal{M}} \models$ "there are $< n$ many strong cardinals." It is straightforward to verify that if $W \triangleright \mathcal{M}$ witnesses that $\mathcal{M}$ is n-full then W has the hull-property (see [15] 4.2) at all $\kappa \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{J}_\kappa^{\mathcal{M}} \models$ "there are $\leq n$ many strong cardinals" (cf. [8] 1.3). One of the main results of [8], Corollary 2.18 (a), is that the set of reals coding n-full premice is Π^1_{n+3}. (The informed reader will notice that the concept of "n-fullness" of [8] is just a bit stronger than the one defined above.)

In order to arrive at a neat formulation of 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4, let us ad hoc, for $n < \omega$, denote by $\P^+_n$ the assertion that there is a measurable cardinal κ and there are n cardinals $< \kappa$ which are each strong up to κ.

Lemma 2.2 *Let $1 \leq n < \omega$, and suppose that there is no inner model in which $\P^+_n$ holds. Let α be an infinite cardinal of K, and let $\mathcal{M} \trianglerighteq \mathcal{J}^K_\alpha$ be a premouse with $\mathcal{M} \models$ "α is the largest cardinal."*

Then $\mathcal{M} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{J}^K_{\alpha^{+K}}$ iff $\mathcal{M}$ is $(n-1)$-full. Moreover, the set of reals coding $\mathcal{J}^K_{\alpha^{+K}}$ is Π^1_{n+3} in any code for $\mathcal{J}^K_\alpha$.

PROOF. As to the first part, "$\Rightarrow$" is trivial, so let us show "$\Leftarrow$. Let $W \triangleright \mathcal{M}$ witness that $\mathcal{M}$ is $(n-1)$-full, and let K' be a very soundness witness for $\mathcal{J}^K_{\alpha^{+K}}$. Let Q denote the common coiterate of W, K'.

Claim. The iteration is above α along the main branch on the W-side.

PROOF. Suppose not. Let π_{WQ} and $\pi_{K'Q}$ be the respective maps obtained from the main branches on the W- and K'-side. Set $\kappa = c.p.(\pi_{WQ})$, so that $\kappa < \alpha$ by assumption. Let Γ be a class of fixed points under both π_{WQ} and $\pi_{K'Q}$ which is thick in W, K', and Q (see [15] 3.8 through 3.11).

Of course, $\mathcal{J}^W_\kappa$ has $< n$ many strong cardinals, because otherwise we would end up with an inner model in which $\P^+_n$ holds. By the above remarks, W hence has the hull- and definability property at all $\bar{\kappa} < \kappa$ which are strong in $\mathcal{J}^W_\kappa$, and W has the hull property at κ. Moreover, K' has the hull- and definability property at all $\gamma < \alpha^{+K}$.

Suppose $\bar{\kappa} = c.p.(\pi_{K'Q}) < \kappa$, so that $\bar{\kappa}$ is easily seen to be strong in $\mathcal{J}^{K'}_\kappa = \mathcal{J}^W_\kappa$. Then $\bar{\kappa} = \tau^W[a, b]$ where τ is a term, $a \in [\bar{\kappa}]^{<\omega}$, and $b \in [\Gamma]^{<\omega}$. Hence $\bar{\kappa} = \tau^W[a, b] = \tau^Q[a, b] \in ran(\pi_{K'Q})$. Contradiction!

Repeating the same argument with $\kappa = \tau^{K'}[a, b]$ for some term τ, $a \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$, and $b \in [\Gamma]^{<\omega}$ shows that we must actually have $\kappa = c.p.(\pi_{K'Q})$. This readily implies that W, Q, and K' all have the same $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$, just written $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ in what follows.

Let $X \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. As W has the hull-property at κ we have $X = \tau^W[a, b] \cap \kappa$ where τ is a term, $a \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$, and $b \in [\Gamma]^{<\omega}$. For $\xi < \kappa$ we have that $\xi \in \tau^W[a, b]$ iff $\xi \in \tau^Q[a, b]$ iff $\xi \in \tau^{K'}[a, b]$, so that also $X = \tau^{K'}[a, b] \cap \kappa$. But then for $\beta < min\{\pi_{WQ}(\kappa), \pi_{K'Q}(\kappa)\}$ we get that $\beta \in \pi_{WQ}(X)$ iff $\beta \in \tau^Q[a,b]$ iff $\beta \in \pi_{K'Q}(X)$. This finally would mean that the two first extenders used for getting π_{WQ} and $\pi_{K'Q}$ are compatible. Contradiction!

$\square$ (Claim)

In particular, $\mathcal{M} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{J}^W_{\alpha^{+W}} = \mathcal{J}^Q_{\alpha^{+Q}}$, as α is the largest cardinal of $\mathcal{M}$. Hence we are done in the case that $Q = K'$.

Otherwise let ν be the index of the first extender used along the main branch on the K'-side. Of course, $\nu > \alpha$, and because ν will be a cardinal in Q we have that $\nu \geq \alpha^{+Q}$, and thus $\mathcal{M} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{J}^Q_{\alpha^{+Q}} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{J}^Q_\nu = \mathcal{J}^{K'}_\nu$. But $\alpha^{+K} = \alpha^{+K'} \geq \alpha^{+Q}$, so that in fact $\mathcal{M} \triangleleft K$, as desired.

This proves the first part. But now we have that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{J}^K_{\alpha^{+K}}$ iff $\mathcal{M} \triangleright \mathcal{J}^K_\alpha$, $\mathcal{M} \models$ "α is the largest cardinal," and $\mathcal{M}$ is $(n-1)$-full, and for all $\mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathcal{N} \triangleright \mathcal{J}^K_\alpha$, $\mathcal{N} \models$ "α is the largest cardinal," and $\mathcal{N}$ is $(n-1)$-full we have that $\mathcal{N} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{M}$. As $(n-1)$-fullness is Π^1_{n+2} in the codes (cf. [8, Corollary 2.18 (a)]), this proves the second part.

$\square$ (2.2)

As a simple corollary to 2.2 we get that under the hypotheses of 2.2 $K \cap HC$ is Σ^1_{n+4}. (This generalizes a result of Jensen and Mitchell, cf. [15] p. 85f.) Both 2.2 and this corollary are new.

Suppose that Steel's K exists (which we take to mean Ω is measurable and there is no inner model with a Woodin cardinal; cf. [15]). The paper [7] shows that if $\omega_1^V = \beta^{+K}$ where β is a limit cardinal of K or else a double successor cardinal of K and if there are at most n ordinals $\kappa < \beta$ with $\mathcal{J}^K_\beta \models$ "κ is strong" then $K \cap HC$ is $\Sigma^1_{n+3}(x)$ for any real x coding $\mathcal{J}^K_\beta$ (cf. [7, Corollary 3.5]). Also, if for every $\beta < \omega_1^V$ which is is a limit cardinal of K or else a double successor cardinal of K there are at most n ordinals $\kappa < \beta$ with $\mathcal{J}^K_\beta \models$ "κ is strong" then $K \cap HC$ is Δ^1_5. (These bounds were implicit in earlier unpublished work of Steel.) These results were improved in [8]. If $\omega_1^V = \beta^{+K}$ is a successor cardinal of K and $\mathcal{J}^K_{\omega_1^V}$ has at most n strong cardinals then $K \cap HC$ is $\Delta^1_{n+3}(x)$ for any real x coding $\mathcal{J}^K_\beta$ (cf. [8, Theorem 3.6] and the remark on [8, p. 141]). If ω_1^V is inaccessible in K and $\mathcal{J}^K_{\omega_1^V}$ has at most n strong cardinals then $K \cap HC$ is Δ^1_{n+5}. The following Corollary says that if $\P^+_n$ fails in every inner model then $K \cap HC$ is Σ^1_{n+4}.

Corollary 2.3 *Let $1 \leq n < \omega$, and suppose that there is no inner model in which $\P_n^+$ holds.*

Then $\mathcal{M} \triangleleft \mathcal{J}^K_{\omega_1^V}$ and $\mathcal{M} \cap OR$ is a cardinal in K iff [$\mathcal{M}$ is $(n-1)$-full, and IF $\alpha < \mathcal{M} \cap OR$ is a cardinal of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N} \triangleright \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{M}}_\alpha$ is $(n-1)$-full with largest cardinal α THEN $\mathcal{N} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{M}$].

In particular, the set of all reals coding some $\mathcal{M} \triangleleft \mathcal{J}^K_{\omega_1^V}$ with $\mathcal{M} \cap OR$ being a K-cardinal is Π^1_{n+3}. Moreover, $K \cap HC$ is Σ^1_{n+4} in the codes.

Proof. Straightforward, using 2.2 and the fact that $(n-1)$-fullness is Π^1_{n+2} in the codes.

$\square$ (2.3)

We shall need later:

Corollary 2.4 *Let $n < \omega$, and suppose that there is no inner model in which $\P_n^+$ holds. Assume that K has n strong cardinals $\kappa_1 < ... < \kappa_n$ such that $\lambda = \kappa_n^{++K} < \omega_1^V$.*

Then the set of reals coding $\mathcal{J}^K_\lambda$ is Π^1_{n+4}.

Proof. It is clear that that $\mathcal{J}^K_\lambda$ is the longest initial segment of K with height a K-cardinal and satisfying "there are n strong cardinals, the largest of which is the second largest cardinal." But then 2.3 easily gives the result.

$\square$ (2.4)

We shall be able to arrange later that under certain circumstances there is a Π^1_{n+4}-singleton coding $\mathcal{J}^K_\lambda$.

We shall also need a condensation result. In general, the condensation properties provable for K are much weaker than the ones provable for L. However, in the very special case that $K = L[E^n]$ for some $n < \omega$ we get that K satisfies an "L-like" condensation lemma. We state it in the form in which we shall need it. Its proof builds upon the proof of [12, 8.2].

Lemma 2.5 *Let $0 < n < \omega$, and set $E = E^n$. Let $\kappa_1 < ... < \kappa_n$ denote the strong cardinals of $L[E]$. Let $\alpha > \kappa_n^{+L[E]}$ be s.t. $J_\alpha[E]$ is cardinal-correct in $L[E]$, i.e., all cardinals $< \alpha$ in $J_\alpha[E]$ are also cardinals in $L[E]$. Let $\sigma\colon \mathcal{M} \rightarrow_{\Sigma_1} J_\alpha[E]$ where $\mathcal{M}$ is transitive and $\sigma \restriction \kappa_n^{+L[E]} + 1 = id$.*

Then $\mathcal{M} = J_{\bar{\alpha}}[E]$ for some $\bar{\alpha} \leq \alpha$.

Proof. In fact 2.5 is a consequence of the argument for Lemma 8.1 of [12]. We may of course assume w.l.o.g. that $\sigma \neq id$, and let δ denote the critical point of σ. Using σ, any iteration of the phalanx $\mathcal{P} = ((J_\alpha[E], \mathcal{M}), \delta)$ can be copied onto $J_\alpha[E]$ to give an iteration of $J_\alpha[E]$, so that in particular $\mathcal{P}$ is iterable.

We may hence coiterate $\mathcal{P}$ with $J_\alpha[E]$, getting iteration trees $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$ on $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ on $J_\alpha[E]$. By copying $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$ onto $J_\alpha[E]$ we get $\mathcal{T}$ on $J_\alpha[E]$ together with an embedding $\tilde{\sigma}\colon \mathcal{M}^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_\infty \to \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{T}}_\infty$. In the case that $\pi^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_{0\infty}$ exists and $\mathcal{M}^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_\infty$ is above $J_\alpha[E]$ we also have that $\pi^{\mathcal{T}}_{0\infty} = \tilde{\sigma} \circ \pi^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_{0\infty}$.

Claim 1. $\mathcal{M}^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_\infty$ is above $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Suppose not, so $\mathcal{M}^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_\infty$ is above $J_\alpha[E]$. If $\mathcal{M}^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_\infty \rhd \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{U}}_\infty$ or there were a drop on the main branch of the $\mathcal{P}$-side then there wouldn't be a drop on the main branch of the $J_\alpha[E]$-side and the map $\tilde{\sigma} \circ \pi^{\mathcal{U}}_{0\infty}$ would give a contradiction with the Dodd-Jensen Lemma. Similarily, if $\mathcal{M}^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_\infty \lhd \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{U}}_\infty$ or there were a drop on the main branch of the $J_\alpha[E]$-side then there wouldn't be a drop on the main branch of the $\mathcal{P}$-side and the map $\pi^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_{0\infty}$ would give a contradiction with Dodd-Jensen.

Hence $\mathcal{M}^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_\infty = \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{U}}_\infty$ and there's no drop on the main branch of either side. Let ξ be an ordinal. We now have $\pi^{\mathcal{U}}_{0\infty}(\xi) \leq \pi^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_{0\infty}(\xi)$ by Dodd-Jensen. Similarily, we have $\pi^{\mathcal{T}}_{0\infty}(\xi) \leq \tilde{\sigma} \circ \pi^{\mathcal{U}}_{0\infty}(\xi)$ by Dodd-Jensen; but $\pi^{\mathcal{T}}_{0\infty} = \tilde{\sigma} \circ \pi^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_{0\infty}$, so $\tilde{\sigma} \circ \pi^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_{0\infty}(\xi) \leq \tilde{\sigma} \circ \pi^{\mathcal{U}}_{0\infty}(\xi)$, and hence $\pi^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_{0\infty}(\xi) \leq \pi^{\mathcal{U}}_{0\infty}(\xi)$. We have shown that $\pi^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_{0\infty} = \pi^{\mathcal{U}}_{0\infty}$, giving the usual contradiction.

$\square$ (Claim 1)

Claim 2. $\pi^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_{0\infty}$ exists, and in fact $\mathcal{M}^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_\infty = \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. If there were a drop on the main branch of the $\mathcal{P}$-side of the comparison then $\pi^{\mathcal{U}}_{0\infty}$ would exist and the map $\tilde{\sigma} \circ \pi^{\mathcal{U}}_{0\infty}$ would contradict the Dodd-Jensen Lemma. Hence $\pi^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_{0\infty}$ exists.

Now suppose that $\mathcal{M}^{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}_\infty \neq \mathcal{M}$, let F be the first extender used along $[0, \infty]_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}$, and let μ be its critical point. By Claim 1 and what has been shown so far we have that F is applied to $\mathcal{M}$, i.e., $\mu \geq \delta$ and μ is a cardinal in $\mathcal{M}$. Then $\sigma(\mu)$ is a cardinal in $J_\alpha[E]$, hence in $L[E]$ by cardinal-correctness, which implies that every κ_i, $0 < i \leq n$, is strong in $J_{\sigma(\mu)}[E]$. So using σ every κ_i, $0 < i \leq n$, is strong in $\mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{M}}_\mu$.

But this is now easily seen to imply that the model where F is taken from provides a sharp for an inner model with n strong cardinals. This contradicts the choice of $L[E]$ as the minimal (fully iterable) inner model with n strong cardinals.

$\square$ (Claim 2)

Notice that the second part of Claim 2 immediately gives that $\mathcal{M}_\infty^\mathcal{U} \trianglerighteq \mathcal{M}$: this is clear if there is a drop on the main branch of $\mathcal{U}$; but if not we have $\mathcal{M}_\infty^\mathcal{U} \cap OR \geq \alpha \geq \mathcal{M} \cap OR$.

Claim 3. $\mathcal{M}_\infty^\mathcal{U} = J_\alpha[E]$.

PROOF. Suppose not, and let F be the first extender used along $[0, \infty]_\mathcal{U}$, and let μ be its critical point.

Let us first assume that $\mu < \delta$. Using a "minimality of $L[E]$" argument as above it is then straightforward to check that $\mu = \kappa_i$ for some $0 < i \leq n$. Let $\lambda = i_F(\kappa)$, i.e., the image of κ under the ultrapower map given by F. Let $\varepsilon + 1$ be least in $(0, \infty]_U$, and let ν be the index of F; i.e.,

$$F = E_\varepsilon^\mathcal{U} = E_\nu^{\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^\mathcal{U}}.$$

It is easy to verify that μ is not strong in $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^{\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^\mathcal{U}}$. Otherwise we would get that, for any $\zeta < \mu$,

$$Ult(\mathcal{J}_\nu^{\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^\mathcal{U}}; F) \models \exists \tilde{\kappa} > \zeta \text{ (} \tilde{\kappa} \text{ is strong up to } \lambda \text{)}$$

(as witnessed by μ), and hence

$$\mathcal{J}_\nu^{\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^\mathcal{U}} \models \exists \tilde{\kappa} > \zeta \text{ (} \tilde{\kappa} \text{ is strong up to } \mu \text{).}$$

As this would be true for all $\zeta < \mu$, we would get that $\mathcal{J}_\mu^{\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^\mathcal{U}}$ thinks that there is a proper class of strong cardinals. This certainly contradicts the minimality of $L[E]$. (This is the point where we have exploited the fact that we work with Friedman-Jensen premice rather than with Mitchell-Steel premice.)

We now have that $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{J}_\lambda^{\mathcal{M}_\infty^\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{J}_\lambda^{\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^\mathcal{U}}$. Hence $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^\mathcal{M}$ does not satisfy that μ is strong. Therefore, using σ, $J_{\sigma(\lambda)}[E]$ does not satisfy that μ is strong.

However, λ is a cardinal in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{U}}_\infty$, and hence in $\mathcal{M}$ by $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{U}}_\infty \trianglerighteq \mathcal{M}$. So $\sigma(\lambda)$ is a cardinal in $J_\alpha[E]$, and hence in $L[E]$ by cardinal-correctness. Thus after all $\mu = \kappa_i$ must be strong in $J_{\sigma(\lambda)}[E]$. Contradiction!

We have shown that $\mu \geq \delta$. But we can now again just vary the "minimality of $L[E]$" argument from above. We shall have that μ is a cardinal in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{U}}_\infty$, and hence of $\mathcal{M}$ by $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{U}}_\infty \trianglerighteq \mathcal{M}$. Thus $\sigma(\mu)$ is a cardinal in $J_\alpha[E]$, and hence of $L[E]$ as well. But then every κ_i, $0 < i \leq n$, is strong in $J_{\sigma(\mu)}[E]$, and hence is strong in $\mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{M}}_\mu$ as well. But then the model where F is taken from provides a sharp for an inner model with n strong cardinals. Contradiction!

□ (Claim 3)
□ (2.5)

The reader will have noticed that by the above proof the hypothesis of 2.5 can be further weakened.

3 Proof of 1.2.

Throughout this section we fix some $n < \omega$, $n > 0$, and we assume $L[E^n]$, the minimal fully iterable inner model with n strong cardinals, exists. We shall write $L[E] = L[E^n]$. Let $\kappa_1 < ... < \kappa_n$ be the strong cardinals of $L[E]$, and set $\lambda = \kappa_n^{++L[E]}$. As explained above, $L[E]$ is the core model of all set-generic extensions of $L[E]$.

To a certain extent, the construction to be described closely follows [1]. However, there are some complications here, as we force over $L[E]$ rather than L.

Proof of 1.2. To begin with, we define a sequence $(T_k\colon k < \omega)$ of λ^+-Suslin trees inside $L[E]$. Given a tree T and an ordinal α we write T^α for the α^{th} level of T. We define the T_k's by simultaneously constructing all T_k^α's by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^{+L[E]}$. We shall have that $T_k^\alpha \subset {}^\alpha 2$, and $T_k = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda^+} T_k^\alpha$ (where $\lambda^+ = \lambda^{+L[E]}$), ordered by $\subset$.

Work inside $L[E]$ until further notice. We set $x \in T_k^0$ iff $x = \emptyset$, and $x \in T_k^{\alpha+1}$ iff $x = y^\frown 0$ or $= y^\frown 1$ for some $y \in T_k^\alpha$. If α is a limit ordinal of cofinality $< \lambda$ then we let $x \in T_k^\alpha$ iff $x \upharpoonright \beta \in T_k^\beta$ for all $\beta < \alpha$ (noticing that we only get $\leq \lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ many branches).

Now suppose that α is a limit ordinal of cofinality λ. Let $\eta = \eta_\alpha$ be least such that $(T^\beta_k : k < \omega, \beta < \alpha) \in J_\eta[E]$, every set has cardinality $\leq \lambda$ in $J_\eta[E]$, $cf(\eta) = \lambda$, and $J_\eta[E] \models ZF^-$. Inside $J_\eta[E]$, let us consider the forcing

$$P_\alpha = \{p : dom(p) \subset \omega \times \lambda, |dom(p)| < \lambda, p(k, \xi) \in \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} T^\beta_k \text{ for all } (k, \xi) \in dom(p)\},$$

ordered by $p' \leq_{P_\alpha} p$ iff $p'(k, \xi) \supset p(k, \xi)$ for all $(k, \xi) \in dom(p)$. In V (which is $L[E]$ for the moment), we may pick some P_α-generic over $J_\eta[E]$ (notice ${}^{<\lambda}J_\eta[E] \subset J_\eta[E]$, and P_α is $< \lambda$-closed). Any such generic gives λ many branches for each $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} T^\beta_k$. We let $(T^\alpha_k : k < \omega)$ be the result of adding these branches at level α, for the $<_{L[E]}$-least P_α-generic over $J_\eta[E]$.

This defines $(T_k : k < \omega)$. For $X \subset \omega$ we write P^X for $\prod_{k \in X} T_k$, and we write $P = P^\omega$. So forcing with P adds cofinal branches thru the T_k's.

Claim 1. Let $X \subset \omega$. Then P^X is $< \lambda$-closed and has the λ^+-c.c. In particular, T_l is a Suslin tree in $L[E]^{P^{\omega \setminus \{l\}}}$ for any $l < \omega$.

Proof. $< \lambda$-closedness is trivial. Let $A \subset P^X$ be a maximal antichain in P^X. Let $\sigma : J_\tau[E] \to J_{\lambda^{++}}[E]$ be elementary such that $\sigma \restriction \lambda = id$, $\tau < \lambda^+$, and $A \in ran(\sigma)$. (Such a map exists by 2.5.) Let $\alpha = c.p.(\sigma)$. We may assume that $cf(\alpha) = \lambda$.

It is easy to see that $(T^\beta_k : k < \omega, \beta < \alpha) \in J_\tau[E]$. But also $\eta = \eta_\alpha > \tau$, because $\alpha = \lambda^+$ in $J_\tau[E]$, whereas every set has size $\leq \lambda$ in $J_\eta[E]$. In particular, $P_\alpha \in J_\eta[E]$, and using the elementarity of σ we get that every $f \in \prod_{k \in X} \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} T^\beta_k$ in $J_\tau[E]$ is compatible with some element of $\sigma^{-1}(A)$.

So if $p \in P_\alpha$, we can easily find a $q \leq_{P_\alpha} p$ with the same domain as p such that for all sequences $\langle (k, \xi_k) : k \in X \rangle$ with each $(k, \xi_k) \in dom(p)$, $\langle q(k, \xi_k) : k \in X \rangle$ extends some element of $\sigma^{-1}(A)$. Thus by a straightforward density argument, every element of $prod_{k \in X} T^\alpha_k$ extends some element of $\sigma^{-1}(A)$.

Thus $\sigma^{-1}(A)$ is maximal, $A = \sigma^{-1}(A)$, and A has size $\leq \lambda$.

$\square$ (Claim 1)

Stepping out of $L[E]$, we now force with (P, Q), where $Q = Col(\omega, \lambda)$. Fix a P-generic over $L[E]$, and let $B = (B_k : k < \omega)$ be the sequence of cofinal branches obtained from the generic (essentially, B *is* the generic). Pick G

being Q-generic over $L[E][B]$. Then $\lambda^{+L[E]} = \lambda^{+L[E][B]} = \omega_1^{L[E][B][G]}$, which we shall from now on denote by ω_1.

Claim 1 easily gives:

Claim 2. Let $X \subset \omega$, $X \in L[E]$. Then P^X has the c.c.c. in $L[E][G]$. In particular, forcing with $(Q, P^{\omega \setminus \{l\}})$ over $L[E]$ does not destroy Suslinness of T_l, for any $l < \omega$.

We may fix some recursive bijection $e\colon \omega \to {}^{<\omega}2$. We have $({}^{<\omega}2, \subset) \in J_{\omega+\omega}$ is a tree, any two cofinal branches of which give a pair of almost disjoint (a.d.) subsets of ω via e. Let us fix $(a_k\colon k < \omega) \in L$, obtained from the first (in $<_L$) ω many branches in L thru $({}^{<\omega}2, \subset)$. Then $(a_k\colon k < \omega)$ is definable (without parameters) inside any transitive structure $\mathcal{S} \supset J_{\omega+\omega}$.

Let $x \subset \omega$ be any real. We then let

$$x^{dec} = \{k < \omega\colon x \cap a_k \text{ is finite }\}.$$

For $\mathcal{S}$ as above and $x \in \mathcal{S}$ we have that $(x^{dec})^{\mathcal{S}} = x^{dec}$. We also want to have a notation at hand for a second decoding device. Given $x \subset \omega$, we define $E \subset \omega \times \omega$ by $(k,l) \in E$ iff $\Gamma(k,l) \in x$ (Γ being Gödel's pairing function), and we let

$$\mathcal{M}_x = \text{ the transitive collapse of } (\omega, E),$$

provided that E is well-founded and extensional (if not, we let $\mathcal{M}_x$ be undefined). Hence if $\mathcal{S}$ is admissible and $x \in \mathcal{S}$ then $(\mathcal{M}_x)^{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{M}_x$ (if it exists). We shall also have to deal with the function sending x to $\mathcal{M}_{x^{dec}}$. Let us write $\mathcal{M}_x^\star$ for $\mathcal{M}_{x^{dec}}$.

Now pick a real $g \subset \omega$ (inside $L[E][B][G]$) such that $\mathcal{M}_g = J_\lambda[E]$. We may and shall assume that $L[E][B][G] = L[E][B][g]$. We want to force over $L[E][B][g]$ to obtain a real a such that $g = a^{dec}$ (hence $\mathcal{M}_a^\star = J_\lambda[E]$), and a is a Π^1_{n+4}-singleton inside $L[E][a]$. It will then be easy to see that $L[E][a]$ is as desired.

Let us fix $(a_i\colon i < \omega_1) \in L[E][g]$, obtained from the first (in $<_{L[E][g]}$) ω_1 many branches in $L[E][g]$ thru $({}^{<\omega}2, \subset)$. (Here and in what follows, by $<_{L[E][g]}$ we just mean the order of constructibility of $L[E][g] = L[E,g]$.) Notice that for $k < \omega$, a_k has now been defined twice, but the point is that both definitions yield the same object. In particular, the a_i's form a family of a.d. subsets of ω. The forcing R (for adding a) consists of conditions

$p = (l(p), r(p))$ where $l(p)\colon k \to 2$ for some $k < \omega$ and $r(p)$ is a finite subset of ω_1. We set $q = (l(q), r(q)) \leq_R p = (l(p), r(p))$ iff $l(q) \supset l(p)$, $r(q) \supset r(p)$, and the following holds true:

$$\forall k\ [k < dom(l(p)) \wedge k \in g \Rightarrow$$

$$\{m \in dom(l(q)) \setminus dom(l(p))\colon l(q)(m) = 1\} \cap a_k = \emptyset],$$

$$\forall k\ \forall \alpha\ [k < dom(l(p)) \wedge l(p)(k) = 1 \wedge \alpha \in r(p) \cap B_{2k} \Rightarrow$$

$$\{m \in dom(l(q)) \setminus dom(l(p))\colon l(q)(m) = 1\} \cap a_{\omega\cdot(1+\alpha)+2k} = \emptyset],\ \text{and}$$

$$\forall k\ \forall \alpha\ [k < dom(l(p)) \wedge l(p)(k) = 0 \wedge \alpha \in r(p) \cap B_{2k+1} \Rightarrow$$

$$\{m \in dom(l(q)) \setminus dom(l(p))\colon l(q)(m) = 1\} \cap a_{\omega\cdot(1+\alpha)+2k+1} = \emptyset].$$

Let H be R-generic over $L[E][g][B]$, and let $a \subset \omega$ be such that $\bigcup_{p\in H}\ l(p)$ is its characteristic function. Clearly:

Claim 3. $\forall k\ (k \in g \Leftrightarrow a \cap a_k$ is finite), i.e., $g = a^{dec}$, and $J_\lambda[E] = \mathcal{M}^\star_a$.

Setting $D_k = \{\alpha\colon a \cap a_{\omega\cdot(1+\alpha)+k}$ is finite $\}$, we also easily get

Claim 4. $\forall k\ (k \in a \Rightarrow D_{2k} = B_{2k} \wedge D_{2k+1} = \emptyset)$,

and

Claim 5. $\forall k\ (k \notin a \Rightarrow D_{2k} = \emptyset \wedge D_{2k+1} = B_{2k+1})$.

As in [1], the following two claims are crucial.

Claim 6. $\forall k\ (k \in a \Rightarrow T_{2k+1}$ is Suslin in $L[E][a]$).

Claim 7. $\forall k\ (k \notin a \Rightarrow T_{2k}$ is Suslin in $L[E][a]$).

Proof. We give the proof of Claim 6, that of Claim 7 being identical modulo notational changes. Suppose that $l \in a$, but T_{2l+1} is no longer a Suslin tree in $L[E][a]$. Set $T = T_{2l+1}$. Essentially, $(G, (B_k\colon k \neq 2l+1))$ is $(Q, P^{\omega\setminus\{2l+1\}})$-generic over $L[E]$. Moreover, there is a canonical forcing $R' \in L[E][G][(B_k\colon k \neq 2l+1)]$ such that a is generic over $L[E]$ for the forcing

$$[(Q, P^{\omega\setminus\{2l+1\}}) \star \dot{R}'] \star \dot{T}.$$

(R' is defined exactly as R except that we require that $l(p)(l) = 1$ and rewrite the definition of $\leq_R$ so as not to mention B_{2k+1}.) It now suffices to show that T is still Suslin in $L[E][(G, (B_k: k \neq 2l + 1), a)]$.

By Claim 2, T is still Suslin in $L[E][(G, (B_k: k \neq 2l+1))]$. It hence remains to show that forcing with R' over this model does not add an antichain $A \subset T$ of size ω_1.

So let $\dot{A}$ be a name for a maximal antichain A in T, and let $p \in R'$ be such that

$$p \Vdash \dot{A} \text{ is a maximal antichain in } \hat{T}.$$

Let $A' = \{x \in T: q \Vdash \hat{x} \in \dot{A}, \text{ some } q \leq_{R'} p\}$. As $A' \supset A$, it suffices to show that A' is countable in $L[E][G][(B_k: k \neq 2l + 1)]$.

Let us work in $L[E][G][(B_k: k \neq 2l + 1)]$, and suppose that A' is uncountable. For any $x \in A'$ we may pick $q_x \leq_{R'} p$ with $q_x \Vdash x \in \dot{A}$. Of course, $Q = \{q_x: x \in A'\}$ cannot be countable, as otherwise there would be an uncountable $A'' \subset A'$ such that $q_x = q_{x'}$ for all $x, x' \in A''$. But such A'' would also be an antichain in T.

So Q is uncountable. But then there is an uncountable $A^\star \subset A'$ such that $l(q_x) = l(q_{x'})$ for all $x, x' \in A^\star$. In particular, any two conditions q_x, $q_{x'}$ in $A^\star$ are compatible, which implies that x, x' itself are incompatible. But now we get that $\{x \in T: q_x \in A^\star\}$ is an uncountable antichain. Contradiction!

We have thus shown that A' and hence A must be countable, so that T is still Suslin in $L[E][(G, (B_k: k \neq 2l + 1), a)]$.

$\square$ (Claims 6, 7)

We are now going to write down a formula showing that a is a Π^1_{n+4}-singleton inside $L[E][a]$. In order to do this we have to relativize the construction of $(T_k: k < \omega)$, our sequence of Suslin trees in $L[E]$, as well as $(a_i: i < \omega_1)$, our sequence of pairwise a.d. subsets of ω.

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be a premouse with a largest cardinal η which actually happens to be a double successor cardinal in $\mathcal{N}$. We may then, working inside $\mathcal{N}$, construct a sequence $(T_k^{\mathcal{N}}: k < \omega)$ of trees of height η by using a word for word repetition of how $(T_k: k < \omega)$ was constructed in $L[E]$, but with every occurence of "$L[E]$" replaced by "$\mathcal{N}$," and with "λ" replaced by "the predecessor of η in $\mathcal{N}$." Further, if x is any real with $\mathcal{N}[x]$ admissible such that $\omega_1^{\mathcal{N}[x]}$ exists then we shall write $(a_i^{\mathcal{N},x}: i < \omega_1^{\mathcal{N}[x]})$ for that sequence of pairwise a.d. subsets of ω obtained from the first (along $<_{\mathcal{N}[x]}$) $\omega_1^{\mathcal{N}[x]}$ many branches in $\mathcal{N}[x^{dec}]$ thru $({}^{<\omega}2, \subset)$. (Here and in what follows, by $\mathcal{N}[x]$ we just mean $J_\epsilon[F][x] = J_\epsilon[F,x]$ if $\mathcal{N} = J_\epsilon[F]$, and by $<_{\mathcal{N}[x]}$ we just mean the order of constructibility of $\mathcal{N}[x]$.)

We now consider the following formula, abbreviated $\Phi(x)$:

"$\mathcal{M}_x^\star = J_\lambda[E]$, and

IF (a) $\mathcal{N}$ is $(n-1)$-full, $\mathcal{N} \triangleright \mathcal{M}_x^\star$,
(b) $\mathcal{M}_x^\star \cap OR$ is the second largest cardinal of $\mathcal{N}$,
(c) $\mathcal{N}[x] \models ZF^-$,
(d) $(T_n^{\mathcal{N}} \colon n < \omega)$ and $(a_i^{\mathcal{N},x} \colon i < \omega_1^{\mathcal{N}[x]})$ are as described above, and
(e) $(B_n^{\mathcal{N},x} \colon n < \omega)$ is such that $B_k^{\mathcal{N},x} = \{\alpha \colon x \cap a_{\omega\cdot(1+\alpha)+k}^{\mathcal{N},x}$ is finite $\}$,
THEN we have that:
(a') if $k \in x$ then $B_{2k}^{\mathcal{N},x}$ is a cofinal branch thru $T_{2k}^{\mathcal{N}}$, and
(b') if $k \notin x$ then $B_{2k+1}^{\mathcal{N},x}$ is a cofinal branch thru $T_{2k+1}^{\mathcal{N}}$."

Claim 8. $\{x \colon \Phi(x)\}$ is a Π_{n+4}^1-set of reals.

Proof. This readily follows from 2.4.

$\square$ (Claim 8)

Claim 9. In $L[E][a]$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that $\Phi(x)$ iff $x = a$.

Proof. We work inside $L[E][a]$. First let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ be given such that $\Phi(x)$ holds. Suppose that $x \neq a$, and suppose w.l.o.g. that there is $l < \omega$ such that $l \in x$, yet $l \notin a$, so that in particular T_{2l} is a Suslin tree by Claim 5. (Otherwise we can pick $l \in a \setminus x$ and consider T_{2l+1}, being Suslin by Claim 4.)

We may now pick $\sigma \colon \mathcal{N}[x] \to J_{\omega_2}[E][x]$ with $\mathcal{N}$ being countable and $c.p.(\sigma) > \lambda$. By 2.5 we have that $\mathcal{N} = J_\tau[E]$ where $\lambda < \tau < \omega_1$. Notice that $\lambda^{+\mathcal{N}} = c.p.(\sigma)$, which is sent to ω_1 by σ.

We have that $\mathcal{M}_x^\star = J_\lambda[E]$ by the first part of $\Phi(x)$, so that $\mathcal{N}$ and x certainly satisfy the IF part of $\Phi(x)$. We have that $\sigma(T_{2n}^{J_\tau[E]}) = T_{2n}$.

By (a') we now get that $B_{2l}^{\mathcal{N},x} \in \mathcal{N}[x]$ is a cofinal branch thru $\mathcal{T}_{2l}^{\mathcal{N}}$, so that by the elementarity of σ there is a cofinal branch (in $J_{\omega_2}[E][x]$) thru T_{2l}. Contradiction!

Conversely, we want to show that $\Phi(a)$ holds. Well, the first part of $\Phi(a)$ is fulfilled by Claim 3. Moreover, for any $\mathcal{N}$ as in (a) through (c) of the IF part of $\Phi(a)$ we have by 2.2 that $\mathcal{N} = J_\tau[E]$ where $\lambda < \tau < \omega_1$.

But then $(a_i^{\mathcal{N},a} : i < \omega_1^{\mathcal{N}[a]}) = (a_i : i < \omega_1^{\mathcal{N}[a]})$ and $B_k^{\mathcal{N},a} = B_k \cap \mathcal{N}$ are clear. Moreover, we claim that $T_{2n}^{\mathcal{N}} = T_{2n} \cap \mathcal{N}$, in fact that $(T_k^{\mathcal{N}} : k < \omega) = (T_k \cap \mathcal{N} : k < \omega)$.

To verify this, one has to show $(T_k^\alpha)^{\mathcal{N}} = T_k^\alpha$ for all $k < \omega$ and all $\alpha < \omega_1^{\mathcal{N}[a]} = \lambda^{+\mathcal{N}}$ by induction on α. Notice that ${}^{<\lambda}\alpha \cap L[E] \subset \mathcal{N}$, so that the only non-trivial case is when α has cofinality λ (both in $\mathcal{N}$ and in $L[E]$). But then $\eta_\alpha < \lambda^{+\mathcal{N}}$ is easily seen, so that $(T_k^\alpha)^{\mathcal{N}} = T_k^\alpha$ follows from the choice of T_k^α.

But now (a') and (b') are clear.

$\square$ (Claim 9)

Now by virtue of 2.1 and Claims 8 and 9, in order to finish the proof of 1.2 it suffices to show:

Claim 10. In $L[E][a]$, there is a $\Delta^1_{n+3}(a)$-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Using the fact that $(P, Q) * \dot{R}$ has the λ^+-c.c., it is easily seen that $\mathbb{R} \subset J_{\omega_1}[E][a]$. Setting $\mathcal{P} = J_{\omega_1}[E][a]$, the reals of $L[E][a]$ may hence be well-ordered by $<_{\mathcal{P}}$, the order of constructibility of $\mathcal{P}$.

As $J_\lambda[E] = \mathcal{M}_a^\star$, 2.2 gives that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R} \cap L[E][a]$, $x <_{\mathcal{P}} y$ iff

$$\exists \mathcal{N}\ (\mathcal{N} \text{ is } (n-1)\text{−full},\ \rho_\omega(\mathcal{N}) = OR \cap \mathcal{M}_a^\star$$

$$\mathcal{N} \trianglerighteq \mathcal{M}_a, \text{ and } x <_{\mathcal{N}[a]} y).$$

This is a $\Sigma^1_{n+3}(a)$-relation. Hence $<_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a $\Delta^1_{n+3}(a)$-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R} \cap L[E][a]$.

$\square$ (Claim 10)
$\square$ (1.2)

4 Proof of 1.3.

As in the last section we fix $n < \omega$, $n > 0$, and we assume $L[E^n]$, the minimal fully iterable inner model with n strong cardinals, to exist. However, we shall now assume that $L[E^n]$ has an inaccessible cardinal above its strong cardinals. (This is for example the case if in V there is an inaccessible cardinal above the strong cardinals of $L[E^n]$.) Again, we shall write $L[E] = L[E^n]$, we let $\kappa_1 < ... < \kappa_n$ be the strong cardinals of $L[E]$, and we let $\eta > \kappa_n$ be the least inaccessible in $L[E]$ above κ_n.

The construction to follow will absorb the construction of the previous section, and it will heavily use the key idea of [2] (for a general formulation of David's trick, cf. [4]). We shall make use of the following little lemma (which is well-known).

Lemma 4.1 *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, and suppose that there is an inner model W with countably many reals and a tree (on $\omega \times \kappa$ say, for some ordinal κ) $T \in W$ such that $A = p[T]$ (in V). Then A is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire.*

PROOF. For a real x we have that $x \in A$ iff $x \in p[T]$ iff $W[x] \models x \in p[T]$, so A is Solovay over W (cf. [9, p. 544f.]). But the set of all reals not being random over W is null, and the set of all reals not being Cohen over W is meager (by $Card(\mathbb{R} \cap W) = \aleph_0$), and hence A is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire.

$\square$ (4.1)

It is a simple observation that 4.1 can be used to get a real a, set-generic over $L[E]$ such that in $L[E][a]$ every (lightface) Σ^1_{n+3}-set of reals is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire whereas there is a $\Delta^1_{n+3}(a)$-well-ordering of the reals. (For example, just let a be a code for some $Col(\omega, \kappa_n^{+++L[E]})$-generic over $L[E]$.) Being familiar with the methods of the preceding section one may then find some such a being a Π^1_{n+4}-singleton.

This idea can be exploited a bit further to give a

PROOF of 1.3. This time, we have to start from a sequence $(T^i_k : i < \eta \wedge k < \omega)$ of η^+-Suslin trees inside $L[E]$. In fact, we construct this sequence in exactly the same way as we had constructed $(T_k : k < \omega)$ in the proof of 1.2, except that λ is replaced by η, and we want to obtain η many trees instead of just ω many. We shall not repeat the details of the construction here.

For $X \subset \eta \times \omega$ we write P^X for $\prod_{(i,k) \in X} T^i_k$, and we write $P = P^{\eta \times \omega}$. We shall leave it to the reader to formulate and verify analogues to Claims

1 and 2 in the previous section. They play the same role here as they played there.

Forcing with $P^{\{(i,k)\}}$ over $L[E]$ gives a generic B^i_k, a cofinal branch thru the tree T^i_k. We want to code B^i_k "nicely" by A^i_k, a certain bounded subset of η. Before actually doing this we want to illustrate the method by describing a simplified version of the forcing which is to come.

Fix $(a_i : i < \eta^+) \in L[E]$, a canonical sequence of pairwise a.d. subsets of η, obtained in a fashion as in the previous section. Let $\bar{Q}^i_k$ be the standard a.d. forcing for coding B^i_k by a subset of η, using $(a_i : i < \eta^+)$. Forcing with $\bar{Q}^i_k$ over $L[E][B^i_k]$ adds $\bar{A}^i_k \subset \eta$ coding B^i_k in the sense that

$$\xi \in B^i_k \;\Leftrightarrow\; a_\xi \cap \bar{A}^i_k \text{ is bounded in } \eta,$$

and $\bar{Q}^i_k$ is $< \eta$-closed and has the η^+-c.c.

We now let Θ^+ denote $ZF^- +$ "there is an inaccessible cardinal κ which is also the second largest cardinal, and there are (exactly) n strong cardinals $< \kappa$." If $\mathcal{N} \models \Theta^+$ we denote by $\eta^{\mathcal{N}}$ its second largest cardinal. We may also denote by $(a^{\mathcal{N}}_i : i < (\eta^{\mathcal{N}})^{+\mathcal{N}}) \in \mathcal{N}$ a canonical sequence of pairwise a.d. subsets of $\eta^{\mathcal{N}}$. Moreover, as in the previous section, we may let $((T^i_k)^{\mathcal{N}} : i < \eta^{\mathcal{N}}, k < \omega)$ denote the sequence of $(\eta^{\mathcal{N}})^{+\mathcal{N}}$-Suslin trees being defined in $\mathcal{N}$ in exactly the same way as $(T^i_k : i < \eta, k < \omega)$ is defined in $L[E]$.

We now consider a forcing Q^i_k for adding $\hat{A}^i_k$, defined as follows. We let conditions be functions $p : \delta \to 2$ for some $\delta < \eta$ and such that the following holds true:

$$\forall \mathcal{N} \;(\; [\; J_{\kappa_n^{++}}[E] \triangleleft \mathcal{N} \triangleleft L[E] \wedge \mathcal{N} \models \Theta^+ \wedge \mathcal{N}[\bar{A}^i_k \cap \eta^{\mathcal{N}}, p \restriction \eta^{\mathcal{N}}] \models \Theta^+ \wedge$$
$$i < \eta^{\mathcal{N}} \leq dom(p) \wedge p(\bar{\eta}) \neq 0 \text{ for cofinally many } \bar{\eta} < \eta^{\mathcal{N}} \;] \;\Rightarrow$$
$$\{\xi \in (T^i_k)^{\mathcal{N}} : a^{\mathcal{N}}_\xi \cap \bar{A}^i_k \text{ is bounded in } \eta^{\mathcal{N}}\}$$
$$\text{is a cofinal branch thru } (T^i_k)^{\mathcal{N}} \;).$$

Claim 1. *For all $p \in Q^i_k$ and all $\delta < \eta$ there is some $q \leq_{Q^i_k} p$ with $dom(q) \geq \delta$.*

Proof. Easy. Just pick $q \in {}^{<\eta}2$ such that $dom(q) = max\{\delta, dom(p)\}$ and $q(\bar{\eta}) = 0$ for all $\bar{\eta} \in [dom(p), \delta)$.

$\square$ (Claim 1)

Claim 2. Q_k^i is $< \eta$-distributive (in $L[E][\bar{A}_k^i]$).

PROOF. Let $(D_\alpha : \alpha < \bar{\eta} < \eta) \in L[E][\bar{A}_k^i]$ be a sequence of open dense subsets of Q_k^i, and let $p \in Q_k^i$. Notice that $\{p, (D_\alpha : \alpha < \bar{\eta})\} \subset J_{\eta^+}[E][\bar{A}_k^i]$.

We define $(X_\alpha : \alpha \leq \bar{\eta})$ by the following recursion: X_0 = the smallest $X \prec J_{\eta^{++}}[E][\bar{A}_k^i]$ with $\{\kappa_n^+, i, p, (D_\alpha : \alpha < \bar{\eta})\} \subset X$ and $\eta \cap X$ being transitive, $X_{\alpha+1}$ = the smallest $X \prec J_{\eta^+}[E][\bar{A}_k^i]$ with $X_\alpha \cup \{X_\alpha\} \subset X$ and $\eta \cap X$ being transitive, and $X_\lambda = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} X_\alpha$ for a limit ordinal $\lambda \leq \bar{\eta}$. By 2.5, all X_α's condense to models of the form $J_\gamma[E][\bar{A}_k^i \cap \beta]$. I.e., we get

$$\sigma_\alpha : \mathcal{N}_\alpha = J_{\gamma_\alpha}[E][\bar{A}_k^i \cap \beta_\alpha] \simeq X_\alpha \prec J_{\eta^{++}}[E][\bar{A}_k^i],$$

where β_α is the critical point of σ_α, and $\sigma_\alpha(\beta_\alpha) = \eta$. Notice $\beta_\alpha = \eta^{\mathcal{N}_\alpha}$.

Next, we aim to define a sequence $(p_\alpha : \alpha \leq \bar{\eta})$ of conditions such that $p_0 = p$, $p_{\alpha+1}$ = the least $q \leq_{Q_k^i} p_\alpha$ with $q \in X_{\alpha+1}$, $dom(q) \geq \beta_\alpha$, and $q \in D_\alpha$, and for limit ordinals $\lambda \leq \bar{\eta}$, $p_\lambda = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} p_\alpha$.

It remains to show that this latter recursion does not break down, i.e., that $p_{\bar{\eta}} \in Q_k^i$ is well-defined. Well, the successor step does not cause any problems due to Claim 1 above. So let $\lambda \leq \bar{\eta}$ be a limit ordinal such that $p_\alpha \in Q_k^i$ is defined for all $\alpha < \lambda$. Notice that $\beta_\alpha \leq dom(p_{\alpha+1}) < \beta_{\alpha+1}$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, so that $dom(p_\lambda) = \beta_\lambda$.

Let $\mathcal{N} \lhd L[E]$ be as in the definition of what a condition is. The only problematic $\mathcal{N}$'s are the ones with $\eta^{\mathcal{N}} = \beta_\lambda$, so let us assume that this holds. Then $\mathcal{N} \cap OR \leq \gamma_\lambda$, because $(\beta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda)$ is definable over $\mathcal{N}_\lambda$ and hence if $\mathcal{N} \cap OR > \gamma_\lambda$ then $(\beta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda) \in \mathcal{N}[\bar{A}_k^i \cap \beta_\lambda]$ would witness that β_λ is singular in $\mathcal{N}$, contradicting $\mathcal{N}[A_k^i \cap \beta_\lambda, p_\lambda] \models \Theta^+$.

But then $\eta^{\mathcal{N}} = \eta^{\mathcal{N}_\lambda} = \beta_\lambda$, and $(T_k^i)^{\mathcal{N}} = (T_k^i)^{\mathcal{N}_\lambda} \cap \mathcal{N}$ by a reasoning as in the proof of Claim 9 of the previous section. Moreover, we clearly also have $a_i^{\mathcal{N}} = a_i^{\mathcal{N}_\lambda}$ for $i < \beta_\lambda^{+\mathcal{N}}$.

By elementarity, $\{\xi \in (T_k^i)^{\mathcal{N}_\lambda} : a_\xi^{\mathcal{N}_\lambda} \cap \bar{A}_k^i$ is bounded in $\beta_\lambda\}$ is a cofinal branch thru $(T_k^i)^{\mathcal{N}_\lambda}$, from which we may conclude by the previous paragraph that $\{\xi \in (T_k^i)^{\mathcal{N}} : a_\xi^{\mathcal{N}} \cap \bar{A}_k^i$ is bounded in $\eta^{\mathcal{N}}\}$ is a cofinal branch thru $(T_k^i)^{\mathcal{N}}$, as desired.

$\square$ (Claim 2)

The proofs of Claims 1 and 2 can easily be varied to give that if G is Q^i_k-generic over $L[E][B^i_k]$ then there are arbitrarily high $\mathcal{N} \triangleleft J_\eta[E]$ as in the definition of what a condition is such that

$$(\bigcup G)(\bar\eta) \neq 0 \text{ for cofinally many } \bar\eta < \eta^{\mathcal{N}},$$

for which $\mathcal{N}$'s we then have that there is a cofinal branch thru $(T^i_k)^{\mathcal{N}}$ in $\mathcal{N}[\bar A^i_k \cap \eta^{\mathcal{N}}]$.

We now have to turn towards the forcing which we shall actually use for constructing our model. Because we have to eventually code B^i_k "down to a real" without destroying the inaccessibility of η (to be able to apply 4.1), we have to incorporate more advanced Jensen-like coding techniques, due to the first author, to vary the above forcing construction. However, whereas Jensen coding itself achieves a "coding into L," we have to code into K instead - otherwise we would end up with a $\mathbf{\Delta}^1_2$-well-ordering of the reals!

Let $(\kappa^i : i < \eta)$ enumerate the cardinals of $L[E]$ in the half-open interval $[\kappa_n^{++}, \eta)$. By applying the above approach inside $L[E][B^i_k]$ there is a forcing S^i_k adding a subset A^i_k of $[\kappa^{i+1}, \kappa^{i+2})$ such that the following holds true:

Claim 3. For all $\mathcal{N}$ with $J_{\kappa^{i+1}}[E] \triangleleft \mathcal{N} \triangleleft L[E]$ and $\mathcal{N} \models \Theta^+$ as well as $\mathcal{N}[A^i_k \cap (\kappa^{i+1})^{+\mathcal{N}}] \models \Theta^+$ we have that if $A^i_k \cap (\kappa^{i+1})^{+\mathcal{N}}$ is decoded inside $\mathcal{N}[A^i_k \cap (\kappa^{i+1})^{+\mathcal{N}}]$ then a cofinal branch thru $(T^i_k)^{\mathcal{N}}$ is obtained.

Proof. Code relative to $L[E]$ as one codes relative to L, using the "almost disjoint codes" provided by the natural wellordering of $L[E]$. "Coding structures" are initial segments of $L[E]$. We require that our coding structure at an ordinal $\alpha < \eta^+$ be tall enough to construct the restriction of our branch B^i_k to α, relative to E. These coding structures are cardinal-correct initial segments of $L[E]$. We also use conditions with support bounded in η, which gives our forcing the η^+-cc.

We must verify distributivity for the forcing. Our only concern is that we have enough condensation to do so. However the only condensations that take place are within our coding structures, which are cardinal-correct initial segments of $L[E]$, using hulls which contain $\kappa_n^{+L[E]} + 1$. Condensation of this form follows from 2.5.

$\Box$ (Claim 3)

Let

$$S = \prod_{i<\eta, k<\omega} P^i_k \star \dot{S}^i_k,$$

so that S adds $(B^i_k : i < \eta, k < \omega)$, a sequence of branches thru the T^i_k's, together with codes $A^i_k \subset [\kappa^{i+1}, \kappa^{i+2})$ for $i < \eta$ and $k < \omega$. Then the proof of Claim 3 shows that S preserves cofinalities, and the analogues to Claims 1 and 2 in the previous section are still valid.

Next we want to add reals r^i by forcings R^i in such a way that r^i collapses κ^{i+1} to ω and such that r^i "codes" $(A^i_k : k < \omega)$ in much the same way as we had that a "codes" $(A_k : k < \omega)$ in the previous section. We let R^i be $Col(\omega, J_{\kappa^{i+1}}[E])\star$ (the forcing R from the previous section), but with ω_1 replaced by κ^{i+2} and with g being canonically obtained from the $Col(\omega, J_{\kappa^{i+1}}[E])$-generic (and naturally called g^i now). We shall denote

$$R = \prod_{i<\eta} R^i.$$

We denote by $(r^i : i < \eta)$ the sequence of reals obtained by forcing with R over $L[E][(A^i_k : i < \eta, k < \omega)]$. Our model witnessing 1.3 shall be $L[E][(r^i : i < \eta)]$.

Claim 4. In $L[E][(A^i_k : i < \eta, k < \omega)][(r^i : i < \eta)]$, for any $i < \eta$ there are $g^i \subset \omega$ and $(D^i_k : k < \omega)$ with:

(a) $(r^i)^{dec} = g^i$, and $\mathcal{M}^\star_{r^i} = J_{\kappa^{i+1}}[E]$, in fact g^i is $Col(\omega, J_{\kappa^{i+1}}[E])$-generic over $L[E][(A^i_k : i < \eta, k < \omega)]$, and

(b) if $(a_l : l < \kappa^{i+2})$ is the "least" sequence of pairwise a.d. subsets of ω in $L[E][g^i]$ then, setting $D_l = \{\alpha : r^i \cap a_{\omega\cdot(1+\alpha)+l}$ is finite $\}$, we have that

$$\forall l (l \in r^i \Rightarrow D_{2l} = A^i_{2l} \wedge D_{2l+1} = \emptyset) \text{ and}$$

$$\forall l (l \notin r^i \Rightarrow D_{2l} = \emptyset \wedge D_{2l+1} = A^i_{2l+1}).$$

We now consider the model $L[E][\vec{r}]$, where we write $\vec{r} = (r^i : i < \eta)$. We again have the following:

Claim 5. $\forall i \; \forall k \; (k \in r^i \Rightarrow T^i_{2k+1}$ is Suslin in $L[E][\vec{r}])$.

Claim 6. $\forall i \; \forall k \; (k \notin r^i \Rightarrow T^i_{2k}$ is Suslin in $L[E][\vec{r}])$.

These two claims are verified in the same fashion as were Claims 6 and 7 of the previous section. In fact, the proof also shows that $\eta = \omega_1^{L[E][\vec{r}]}$, which we shall denote by ω_1 from now on.

Claim 7. For any $x \in \mathbb{R} \cap L[E][\vec{r}]$ there is some $\alpha < \omega_1$ with $x \in J_\alpha[E][\vec{r} \restriction \alpha]$, and η is inaccessible in $L[E][x]$.

Proof. Let $x \in J_\rho[E][\vec{r}]$, where $\rho > \omega_1$ is a cardinal of $L[E]$. By 2.5 we may pick some

$$\pi: J_\alpha[E][\vec{r} \restriction \tau] \to J_\rho[E][\vec{r}]$$

with $\tau < \alpha < \omega_1$, $c.p.(\pi) = \tau$, and $\pi(\tau) = \omega_1$. But then $x \in J_\alpha[E][\vec{r} \restriction \alpha]$.

That η is still inaccessible in $J_\alpha[E][\vec{r} \restriction \alpha]$ (and hence in $L[E][x]$) follows from the fact that $\vec{r} \restriction \alpha$ is obtained by forcing with $\prod_{i<\alpha} R^i$ over $L[E][(B_k^i : i < \eta, k < \omega)]$.

$\square$ (Claim 7)

Now Claim 7 together with 4.1 immediately buys us that in $L[E][\vec{r}]$, every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_{n+3}$-set of reals is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire. Moreover, 2.1 tells us that in $L[E][\vec{r}]$, every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_{n+2}$-set of reals is universally Baire.

We are hence left with having to verify that $L[E][\vec{r}]$ has a Δ^1_{n+5}-well-ordering of its reals. The key for being able to do this is the following claim. We let Θ denote the theory ZF^-+ "there is exactly one inaccessible cardinal, which is also the second largest cardinal."

Claim 8. For any $i < \omega_1$, r^i is uniformly Π^1_{n+4} in any code for $J_{\kappa^i}[E]$.

Proof. We consider the following formula, abbreviated $\Phi(x, J_{\kappa^i}[E])$:

"$\mathcal{M}_x^\star = J_{\kappa^{i+1}}[E]$, and

IF $\mathcal{N}$ is such that (a) $\mathcal{M}_x^\star \lhd \mathcal{N} \lhd L[E]$, and
(b) $\mathcal{N} \models \Theta^+$ and $\mathcal{N}[x] \models \Theta$
THEN we have that
(a)' if $k \in x$ then there is a cofinal branch in $\mathcal{N}[x]$ thru $(T^i_{2k})^{\mathcal{N}}$, and
(b)' if $k \notin x$ then there is a cofinal branch in $\mathcal{N}[x]$ thru $(T^i_{2k+1})^{\mathcal{N}}$."

By 2.2, "$\mathcal{M}^\star_x = J_{\kappa^{i+1}}[E]$" can be written uniformly as a Π^1_{n+3}-formula in any code for $J_{\kappa^i}[E]$, and by 2.3, the second conjunct is certainly uniformly Π^1_{n+4} in any code for $J_{\kappa^i}[E]$.

Using Claim 3 above we can then verify that $\Phi(x, J_{\kappa^i}[E])$ holds iff $x = r^i$ in much the same way as we had verified Claim 9 in the last section, but this time by using Claim 3 above.

□ (Claim 8)

We finally obtain the following:

Claim 9 In $L[E][\vec{r}]$, there is a Δ^1_{n+5}-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Set $\mathcal{P} = J_{\omega_1}[E][\vec{r}]$. By Claim 7, $\mathbb{R} \cap L[E][\vec{r}] \subset \mathcal{P}$, so that we may well-order the reals by $<_\mathcal{P}$, the order of constructibility of $\mathcal{P}$.

Well, we now clearly have that for any x, $y \in \mathbb{R} \cap L[E][\vec{r}]$, $x <_\mathcal{P} y$ iff

$$\exists \mathcal{N}_0 \ \exists \mathcal{N} \ \exists (s^i : i < \mathcal{N} \cap OR) \ [\ \mathcal{N}_0 = J_{\kappa^0}[E] \ \wedge \mathcal{N}_0 \lhd \mathcal{N} \lhd J_{\omega_1}[E] \wedge$$

$$\Phi(s^0, \mathcal{N}_0) \wedge \forall i < \mathcal{N} \cap OR \ \Phi(s^{i+1}, \mathcal{M}^\star_{s^i}) \ ].$$

Here, $\Phi(-,-)$ is the formula from the proof of Claim 8.

An inspection shows that, using 2.4 and 2.3 together with Claim 8, the displayed formula can be rewritten in a Σ^1_{n+5}-way. Hence $<_\mathcal{P}$ is a Δ^1_{n+5}-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R} \cap L[E][\vec{r}]$.

□ (Claim 9)

This finishes the proof of 1.3.

□ (1.3)

5 Open problems.

We want to finish this paper by stating three key open problems.

(1) Let $n < \omega$. Starting only from an inaccessible, can you construct a model in which every $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^1_{n+3}$-set of reals is Lebesgue measurable and has the property of Baire, yet there is a (lightface) projective (ideally, Δ^1_{n+4}) well-ordering of the reals?

(2) Do the conclusions of 1.2 and 1.3 imply the consistency of strong cardinals? (Cf. [3].)

(3) Is there a Δ^1_{n+4}-well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ in the model of 1.3 or a variant thereof?

References

[1] David, R., *A very absolute* Π^1_2*-singleton*, Ann. Math. Logic **23** (1982), pp. 101 - 120.

[2] ———, Δ^1_3 *reals*, Ann. Math. Logic **23** (1982), pp. 121 - 125.

[3] Feng, Q., Magidor, M., and Woodin, W. H., *Universally Baire sets of reals*, in: "Set theory of the continuum" (Judah et al., eds.), MSRI Publications ♯ 26, Springer Verlag 1992.

[4] Friedman, S. D., *David's trick*, Proceedings of the 1997 ASL Summer meeting at Leeds, pp. 67 - 71.

[5] ———, *Fine structure and class forcing*, de Gruyter Series in Logic and its Applications ♯3, Berlin, New York 2000.

[6] ———, *Genericity and large cardinals*, to appear.

[7] Hauser, K., *The consistency strength of projective absoluteness*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **74** (1995), pp. 245 - 295.

[8] Hauser, K., and Schindler, R.-D., *Projective uniformization revisited*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **103** (2000), pp. 109 - 153.

[9] Jech, T., *Set theory*, San Diego 1978.

[10] Kechris, A. S., and Moschovakis, Y.N. *Notes on the theory of scales*, in: "Cabal Seminar 76 - 77" (Kechris, Moschovakis, eds.), Lecture notes in mathematics ♯ 689, Berlin 1978.

[11] Martin, D.A., and Solovay, R., *A basis theorem for* Σ^1_3 *sets of reals*, Ann. of Math. **89** (1969), pp. 138 - 160.

[12] Mitchell, W., and Steel, J., *Fine structure and iteration trees*, Lecture notes in logic ♯ 3, Berlin 1994.

[13] Schindler, R., *The core model for almost linear iterations*, Annals of Pure and Appl. Logic **116** (2002), pp. 207 - 274.

[14] Steel, J. R., *Projectively well-ordered inner models*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **74** (1995), pp. 77 - 104.

[15] ———, *The core model iterability problem*, Lecture notes in logic ♯ 8, Berlin 1996.

[16] Woodin, H., *On the consistency strength of projective uniformization*, in: "Logic Colloquium 81" (J. Stern, ed.), Amsterdam 1982, pp. 365 - 383.

Institut für Formale Logik
Universität Wien
Währinger Str. 25
1090 Wien
Austria
sdf@logic.univie.ac.at
rds@logic.univie.ac.at