



Happy birthday Ralf!

# Towards extending Dehornoy's analysis

---

Philipp Schlicht, University of Siena

23 June 2025

Patrick Dehornoy studied iterated ultrapowers of  $V$  by a single measure.

In particular, he analysed intersection models at limit steps of the iteration via Prikry forcing.

- Dehornoy: Iterated ultrapowers and Prikry forcing.  
Annals of Mathematical Logic 15, 2 (1978)

We aim to generalise this analysis to several measurable cardinals.

Joint work with Christopher Henney-Turner, IMPAN. Most results are due to Christopher.

# The Bukovský-Dehornoy phenomenon

Suppose that  $\kappa$  is a measurable cardinal and  $U$  is a normal measure on  $\kappa$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}_U$  denote Prikry forcing with respect to  $U$ .

## Notation:

- $N_\alpha$  is the  $\alpha$ th iterate of  $V$
- $i_{\alpha,\beta} : N_\alpha \rightarrow N_\beta$  is the iteration map
- $\kappa_\alpha = i_{0,\alpha}(\kappa)$
- $U_\alpha = i_{0,\alpha}(U)$

So  $N_0 = V$ ,  $\kappa_0 = \kappa$ , and for every  $\alpha$ ,  $i_{\alpha,\alpha+1} : N_\alpha \rightarrow N_{\alpha+1}$  is the ultrapower embedding by  $U_\alpha$ .

## Mathias' criterion (1973): TFAE

1.  $(\nu_n)_{n \in \omega}$  is  $\mathbb{P}_U$ -generic over  $V$
2. for every set  $X \in U$ ,  $\nu_n \in X$  for all sufficiently large  $n$

## Proposition (Solovay)

The sequence  $\vec{\kappa} := (\kappa_n)_{n \in \omega}$  is  $\mathbb{P}_{U_\omega}$ -generic over  $N_\omega$ .

## Proof.

By Mathias' criterion.



## Theorem (Bukovský 1977, Dehornoy 1977)

$$N_\omega[\vec{\kappa}] = \bigcap_{n < \omega} N_n$$

Suppose that  $\mathbb{B}$  is a complete Boolean algebra and  $U$  is an ultrafilter on  $\mathbb{B}$ .

- $V^{\mathbb{B}}/U$  is the full Boolean model.
- The subset  $\check{V}_U$  of  $V^{\mathbb{B}}/U$  given by names  $\sigma$  with  $\llbracket \sigma \in \check{V} \rrbracket = 1$  is the Boolean ultrapower

### Theorem (Bukovsky 1977)

*The  $\omega$ -th iterate  $N_\omega$  of  $V$  on  $\kappa$  is the Boolean ultrapower of  $V$  for the Boolean completion  $\mathbb{B}$  of Prikry forcing. Moreover, the embedding  $i_{0,\omega}$  equals the Boolean ultrapower embedding  $V \rightarrow \check{V}_U$ .*

Fuchs and Hamkins (2017) found conditions for Bukovsky-Dehornoy phenomena for Boolean ultrapowers for  $\mathbb{B}$ . But there are limitations:

### Theorem (Fuchs, Hamkins 2017)

*Suppose that  $\kappa$  is measurable and there exists no measurable  $< \kappa$  in any generic extension. Then for any  $\alpha > \omega$ ,  $i_{0,\alpha}: V \rightarrow N_\alpha$  is not a Boolean ultrapower embedding.*

Sakai discovered that for iterations of generic ultrapowers of length  $\omega$ , the critical sequence is generic.

### Theorem (Sakai 2005)

*Suppose that  $I$  is a normal precipitous ideal on  $\omega_2$  and  $V = N_0 \rightarrow N_1 \rightarrow \dots$  is a **generic** iteration of  $I$  via the inverse limit of the forcings.*

*Then the critical sequence is **Namba** generic over the direct limit.*

In this situation, it is not quite clear how one could sensibly define an intersection model.

Do the previous results hold for **longer** iterations?

# Long iterations

Suppose that  $\text{cof}(\theta) = \omega$ .

## Lemma (Dehornoy 1977)

Let  $\vec{\kappa} := (\kappa_{i_n})_{n < \omega}$  be a strictly increasing cofinal sequence of critical points below  $\kappa_\theta$ . Then  $\vec{\kappa}$  is generic over  $N_\theta$ .

### Proof.

By Mathias' criterion. □

**Note.** There are many generic extensions of  $N_\theta$  of this kind.

- Two sequences generate the same model if and only if they are eventually equal.
- This follows from the analysis of the submodels of Prikry extensions by Gitik, Kanovei and Koepke (2010).

All sequences are elements of the intersection model  $M_\theta = \bigcap_{\alpha < \theta} N_\alpha$ .

Dehornoy's analysis is used to describe the intersection model

$$M_\theta = \bigcap_{\alpha < \theta} N_\alpha.$$

### Theorem (Dehornoy 1977)

Suppose that  $\text{cof}(\theta) = \omega$ .

1.  $M_\theta = \bigcup \{N_\theta[\vec{\kappa}] : \vec{\kappa} \text{ is as above}\}.$
2.  $M_\theta$  is a model of  $ZF$ , but not of the axiom of choice.

### Theorem (Dehornoy 1977)

If  $N_\alpha \models \text{cof}(\theta) > \omega$  for some  $\alpha < \theta$ , then  $M_\theta = N_\theta$ .

$M_\theta = \bigcap_{\alpha < \theta} N_\alpha$  always denotes the intersection model at a limit step  $\theta$ .

An application of the analysis:

**Theorem (Dehornoy 1977)**

$\text{HOD}_{N_\theta}^{M_\theta} = N_\theta$  for all  $\theta \in \text{Ord}$ .

There is a related result for **Magidor** forcing.

- Dehornoy: An application of ultrapowers to changing cofinality  
The Journal of Symbolic Logic 48, 2 (1983)

Here  $(U_\alpha)_{\alpha < \gamma}$  is a strictly increasing (in the Mitchell order) sequence of ultrafilters on the same  $\kappa$  of length  $\gamma < \kappa$ .

The **intersection** model is formed via all models given by finitely many ultrapowers.

However, this does not address the question of **several** measurable cardinals.

# More measurables

## Theorem (Fuchs 2005)

Let  $\vec{\kappa}$  be a discrete sequence of measurables. Then there is a “product” of Prikry forcings for  $\vec{\kappa}$  which admits a Mathias criterion.

- The “product” has finite support for stems and full support for full measure sets.
- For finitely many measurables, product and iteration are equivalent.

## Theorem (Fuchs 2005)

Suppose  $\vec{\kappa}$  is a discrete sequence of measurables and each measurable is iterated  $\omega$  many times. Then the combination of critical sequences is generic.

## Theorem (Welch 2022)

Suppose  $\vec{\kappa}$  is a discrete sequence of measurables. Iterate  $\kappa_i$  in  $\lambda_i$  steps, where  $\text{cof}(\lambda_i) = \omega$ , and choose a cofinal  $\omega$ -sequence of critical points below each measurable. Then the combination of these sequences is generic.

Ben-Neria recently generalised Fuchs' result to arbitrary sequences of measurables.

### Theorem (Ben-Neria 2024)

Let  $\vec{\kappa}$  be a sequence of measurables. The *Magidor* iteration of Prikry forcings for  $\vec{\kappa}$  admits a (more complex) *Mathias* criterion.

Using this, the previous results can be improved:

### Theorem (Henney-Turner, Welch 2024)

Let  $\vec{\kappa}$  be *any* sequence of measurables. Iterate  $\kappa_i$  in  $\lambda_i$  steps, where  $\text{cof}(\lambda_i) = \omega$ , and choose a cofinal  $\omega$ -sequence of critical points below each measurable. Then the combination of sequences is *generic*.

Given these results, we ask:

## Problem

*Can Dehornoy's analysis be extended to two (or more) measurable cardinals?*

We found this problem in an indirect way when working on a proof strategy for a tentative application.

## Notation.

- Let  $\kappa < \lambda$  be measurable cardinals.
- Let  $N_{\alpha,\beta}$  be the result of iterating  $\kappa$   $\alpha$  many times, and then iterating  $\lambda$   $\beta$  many times.
- Let  $i_{\alpha,\alpha',\beta,\beta'} : N_{\alpha,\beta} \rightarrow N_{\alpha',\beta'}$  be the iteration map.
- Let  $\kappa_\alpha = i_{0,\alpha,0,0}(\kappa) = i_{0,\alpha,0,\beta}(\kappa)$ .
- Let  $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta} = i_{0,\alpha,0,\beta}(\lambda)$ .
- Let  $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \bigcap_{i < \alpha, j < \beta} N_{i,j}$  be the intersection model.

Suppose:

- $\kappa$  is iterated  $\omega$  many times
- $\lambda$  is iterated  $\theta$  many times, where  $\text{cof}(\theta) = \omega$ .

Suppose  $X \in N_{n,\alpha}$  for all  $n < \omega$  and  $\alpha < \theta$ . We can apply Dehornoy's result twice:

- $X \in N_{\omega,\alpha}[\vec{\kappa}]$  for all  $\alpha < \theta$ .
- $X \in N_{\omega,\theta}[\vec{\kappa}][\vec{\nu}]$  for some cofinal  $\omega$ -sequence  $\vec{\nu}$  in  $\lambda_{\omega,\theta}$ .

But there is a problem if:

- $\kappa$  is iterated  $\mu$  many times, where  $\text{cof}(\mu) = \omega$ .

Then

- For each  $\alpha < \theta$ , there exists a cofinal sequence  $\vec{\mu}^\alpha = (\mu_n^\alpha)_{n \in \omega}$  in  $\mu$  such that  $X \in N_{\mu, \alpha}[\kappa_{\vec{\mu}^\alpha}]$ .
- The sequences  $\kappa_{\vec{\mu}^\alpha}$  and models  $N_{\mu, \alpha}[\kappa_{\vec{\mu}^\alpha}]$  might all be different.
- We would need  $\mu_n^\alpha = \mu_n^{\alpha'}$  for all  $\alpha < \alpha' < \theta$ .

However, we will show that the latter condition holds, if  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$  are sufficiently nice, by analysing supports.

The support of a set  $X$  is a minimal set of critical points generating  $X$  in a model  $N_{\alpha, \beta}$  over  $i_{\alpha, \beta}[N_{0, 0}]$ .

# Supports for a single measure

Theorem (Bukovský 1977, Dehornoy 1977)

$M_\omega = N_\omega[\vec{\kappa}]$ , where  $\vec{\kappa} = (\kappa_n)_{n \in \omega}$ .

Claim

Suppose that  $x \in N_\omega$ . For all sufficiently large  $n < \omega$ :

$$i_{n,\omega}(x) = i_{\omega,\omega \cdot 2}(x).$$

Proof of Claim.

Pick  $x_n \in N_n$  with  $i_{n,\omega}(x_n) = x$ . Then

$N_n \models$  the  $\omega$ th iterate sends  $x_n$  to  $x$

By elementarity of  $i_{n,\omega}$

$N_\omega \models$  the  $\omega$ th iterate sends  $x = i_{n,\omega}(x_n)$  to  $i_{n,\omega}(x)$

Hence  $i_{\omega,\omega \cdot 2}(x) = i_{n,\omega}(x)$ .

## Theorem (Bukovský 1977, Dehornoy 1977)

$M_\omega = N_\omega[\vec{\kappa}]$ , where  $\vec{\kappa} = (\kappa_n)_{n \in \omega}$ .

### Proof sketch.

Suppose  $X \in M_\omega$  is a subset of  $\gamma$ .

Pick  $(g_n)_{n \in \omega}$  with  $X = i_{0,n}(g_n)(\vec{\kappa} \upharpoonright n)$ . Then  $i_{n,\omega}(X) = i_{0,\omega}(g_n)(\vec{\kappa} \upharpoonright n)$ .

For each  $\alpha < \gamma$  TFAE:

1.  $\alpha \in X$
  2.  $i_{n,\omega}(\alpha) \in i_{0,\omega}(g_n)(\vec{\kappa} \upharpoonright n)$  for some/all/sufficiently large  $n$
  3.  $i_{\omega,\omega \cdot 2}(\alpha) \in i_{0,\omega}(g_n)(\vec{\kappa} \upharpoonright n)$  for sufficiently large  $n$
3. can be tested in  $N_\omega[\vec{\kappa}]$ , since  $i_{0,\omega}((g_n)_{n \in \omega}) \in N_\omega$ . □

There are three changes in Dehornoy's proof for iterations of length  $\theta$  with  $\text{cof}(\theta) = \omega$ :

1.  $i_{\alpha,\theta}$  might move  $\theta$ . Therefore the equality in the claim above is replaced by

$$i_{\alpha,\theta}(x) = i_{\theta,\theta+i_{\alpha,\theta}(\theta-\alpha)}(x)$$

for sufficiently large  $\alpha < \theta$ .

This comes from the **commuting** diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N_{\alpha+\gamma} & \xrightarrow{i_{\alpha,\beta}} & N_{\beta+i_{\alpha,\beta}(\gamma)} \\ \downarrow i_{\alpha+\gamma,\alpha+\delta} & & \downarrow i_{\beta+i_{\alpha,\beta}(\gamma),\beta+i_{\alpha,\beta}(\delta)} \\ N_{\alpha+\delta} & \xrightarrow{i_{\alpha,\beta}} & N_{\beta+i_{\alpha,\beta}(\delta)} \end{array}$$

This part is similar in the two measure case.

2. A particularly nice cofinal sequence  $(\alpha_n)_{n < \omega}$  in  $\theta$  is constructed.

Dehornoy's properties state that either

- all  $\alpha_n < \kappa$
- all  $\alpha_n$  are sufficiently closed
- all  $\alpha_n$  are additively indecomposable and  $i_{0, \alpha_k}(\alpha_n) = \alpha_{n+k}$  for all  $k, n$

In the two measure case, the last property becomes

- all  $\alpha_i$  are additively indecomposable and  $i_{0, \alpha_k, 0, \alpha_{k-1}}(\alpha_n) = \alpha_{n+k}$  for all  $k, n$

3. We need **compatibility** of supports.

Pick  $(g_n)_{n \in \omega}$  with  $x = i_{0, \alpha_n}(g_n)(\vec{\kappa} \restriction S_n)$  for some finite subset  $S_n$  of  $\alpha_n$ .

We need to rule out that **infinitely** many ordinals are added below some  $\alpha_k$  as  $n$  increases.

Then the union of the  $S_n$  would not have order type  $\omega$ .

### Lemma (folklore)

*Suppose that  $x \in N_\alpha$ . Then there exists a function  $f \in N_0$  and a finite tuple of ordinals  $j_0 < \dots < j_n < \alpha$  such that  $x = i_{0, \alpha}(f)(\kappa_{j_0}, \dots, \kappa_{j_n})$*

### Proof sketch.

By induction. □

We call such a set  $\{j_0, \dots, j_n\}$  a **candidate support** of  $x$ .

Dehornoy proved that every set  $x$  in  $N_\alpha$  has a **least** candidate support, called the **support** of  $x$ .

**Notation.**  $e_\alpha(x)$  denotes the support of  $x \in N_\alpha$ .

The main point is: we need that the union  $E(X) = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} e_n(X)$  is

- finite or
- cofinal in  $\theta$  with order type  $\omega$ .

Let  $\alpha \leq \alpha'$ . Let  $x \in N_{\alpha'}$ .

### Theorem (Dehornoy - upwards compatibility of supports)

*Suppose*

- $\alpha' - \alpha \in \text{Im } i_{0,\alpha}$
- $\mu - \alpha \in \text{Im } i_{0,\alpha}$  for all  $\mu \in e_{\alpha',\beta'}^0(x) \setminus \alpha$

*Then  $e_\alpha(x) \subseteq e_{\alpha'}(x)$ .*

### Theorem (Dehornoy - downwards compatibility of supports)

*Suppose that  $\alpha' - \alpha \in \text{Im } i_{0,\alpha}$ . Then*

$$e_{\alpha'}(x) \cap \alpha \subseteq e_\alpha(x)$$

# Supports for two measures

## Lemma (folklore)

Suppose  $x \in N_{\alpha,\beta}$ . Then there is some function  $f \in M_{0,0}$  and some finite tuples of ordinals  $j_0 < \dots < j_n < \alpha$  and  $k_0 < \dots < k_m < \beta$  such that  $x = i_{0,\alpha,0,\beta}(f)(\kappa_{j_0}, \dots, \kappa_{j_n}, \lambda_{\alpha,k_0}, \dots, \lambda_{\alpha,k_m})$

## Proof sketch.

By induction. □

We call such a set  $\{j_0, \dots, j_n, k_0, \dots, k_m\}$  a **candidate support** of  $x$ .

One can show that every set  $x$  in  $N_{\alpha,\beta}$  has a **least** candidate support, called the **support** of  $x$ .

**Notation.**  $e_{\alpha,\beta}(x)$  denotes the support of  $x \in N_{\alpha,\beta}$ .

Let  $\alpha \leq \alpha'$  and  $\beta \leq \beta'$ . Let  $x \in N_{\alpha',\beta'}$ .

## Theorem (upwards compatibility of supports)

Suppose

- $\alpha' - \alpha, \beta' - \beta \in \text{Im } i_{0,\alpha,0,\beta}$
- $\mu - \alpha \in \text{Im } i_{0,\alpha,0,\beta}$  for all  $\mu \in e_{\alpha',\beta'}^0(x) \setminus \alpha$
- $\mu - \beta \in \text{Im } i_{0,\alpha,0,\beta}$  for all  $\mu \in e_{\alpha',\beta'}^1(x) \setminus \alpha'$

Then  $e_{\alpha,\beta}(x) \subseteq e_{\alpha',\beta'}(x)$ .

## Theorem (downwards compatibility of lower supports)

Suppose that  $\alpha' - \alpha, \beta' - \beta \in \text{Im } i_{0,\alpha,0,\beta}$ . Then

$$e_{\alpha',\beta'}^0(x) \cap \alpha \subseteq e_{\alpha,\beta}^0(x)$$

## Theorem (downwards compatibility of upper supports)

Suppose that  $\alpha' - \alpha, \beta' - \beta \in \text{Im } i_{0,\alpha,0,\beta}$ , and  $\alpha > \beta$ . Then

$$e_{\alpha',\beta'}^1(x) \cap \beta \subseteq e_{\alpha,\beta}^1(x)$$

# Result for two measures

## Theorem (Henney-Turner, Schlicht)

Suppose that  $\text{cof}(\theta) = \omega$  and  $X \in M_{\theta,\theta} = \bigcap_{\alpha,\beta < \theta} N_{\alpha,\beta}$ .

Then  $X \in N_{\theta,\theta}[\vec{\kappa}, \vec{\lambda}]$  for some  $\vec{\kappa} = (\kappa_{\alpha_n})_{n < \omega}$  and  $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_{\theta,\beta_n})_{n < \omega}$ .

## Outline of the proof:

- Prove some technical lemmas about the iteration maps
- Define the support  $e_{\alpha,\alpha'}(X) = e_{\alpha,\alpha'}^0(X) \sqcup e_{\alpha,\alpha'}^1(X)$  of a set  $X$  in  $N_{\alpha,\alpha'}$  and show that it is well-defined.
- (upwards compatibility) Show that if  $\alpha < \beta$  and  $\alpha' < \beta'$  are all sufficiently nice, then  $e_{\alpha,\alpha'}(X) \subseteq e_{\beta,\beta'}(X)$ .
- (downwards compatibility) Suppose that  $\alpha < \alpha'$  and  $\beta < \beta'$  are all sufficiently nice. Then:
  - $e_{\alpha,\alpha'}^0(X) \supseteq e_{\beta,\beta'}^0(X) \cap \alpha$ .
  - $e_{\alpha,\alpha'}^1(X) \supseteq e_{\beta,\beta'}^1(X) \cap \alpha$  if  $\alpha > \beta$ .
- Let  $E(X)$  be the union of supports  $e_{\alpha,\alpha'}(X)$  for nice  $\alpha, \alpha'$ . Show that  $N_{\theta,\theta}[\kappa_{E(X)}, \lambda_{E(X)}]$  is a Prikry extension of  $N_{\theta,\theta}$  containing  $X$ .

The last step is similar to the argument for the Bukovsky-Dehornoy result for a single measure:

- Suppose that  $X \in N_{\theta, \theta}$  is a set of ordinals.
- Fix a cofinal sequence of nice ordinals  $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots$  cofinal below  $\theta$ .
- Let  $E(X) = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} e_{\alpha_{2n+1}, \alpha_{2n}}(X)$ . By compatibility,  $E(X)$  is (at most) a pair of Prikry generic  $\omega$ -sequences
- In  $M_{\theta, \theta}[(\kappa, \lambda)_{E(X)}]$  we can calculate the sequence  $(i_{\alpha_{2n+1}, \theta, \alpha_{2n}, \theta}(X))_{n \in \omega}$ .
- There exists  $\epsilon$  such that for all  $x \in N_{\theta, \theta}$ , for all large enough  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ,  $i_{\alpha, \theta, \beta, \theta}(x) = i_{\theta, \theta+\epsilon, \theta, \theta+\epsilon}(x)$ .
- $X = \{x \in N_{\theta, \theta} : \exists m \forall n > m, i_{\theta, \theta+\epsilon, \theta, \theta+\epsilon}(x) \in i_{\alpha_{2n+1}, \theta, \alpha_{2n}, \theta}(X)\}$

A useful lemma:  $i$  and  $e$  commute.

### Lemma

Let  $i_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'} i_{0,\gamma,0,\gamma'} = i_{0,\delta,0,\delta'}$  with  $\alpha \leq \gamma$ , and let  $x \in N_{\gamma,\gamma'}$ . Then writing  $i = i_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'}$ , we have

$$\kappa_{e^0_{\delta,\delta'}}(i(x)) = i(\kappa_{e^0_{\gamma,\gamma'}}(x))$$

and

$$\lambda_{e^1_{\delta,\delta'}}(i(x)) = i(\lambda_{e^1_{\gamma,\gamma'}}(x))$$

The first step to show downwards compatibility is a criterion that

- holds for  $e_{\alpha, \alpha'}^0(x)$  if and only if it holds for  $e_{\beta, \beta'}^0(x)$ , for nice  $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta'$
- holds for  $e_{\alpha, \alpha'}^0(x)$ , but only holds for  $e_{\beta, \beta'}^0(x)$  if downwards compatibility holds at  $(\beta, \beta')$ , for a specific choice of  $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta'$

The criterion is " $\kappa_{e^0} \cup \lambda_{e^1} \in \text{Im } i_{\mu, \mu+1, 0, 0}$ " for a suitable choice of  $\mu$ .

## Lemma

Let  $\mu < \Lambda, \theta, \Lambda', \theta' \in \text{Ord}$  and  $z \in N_{\theta, \theta'} \cap N_{\Lambda, \Lambda'}$ . Suppose  $\Lambda - \mu, \theta - \mu, \Lambda', \theta' \in \text{Im } i_{\mu, \mu+1, 0, 0}$ . TFAE:

1.  $\kappa_{e_{\Lambda, \Lambda'}^0}(z) \cup \lambda_{e_{\Lambda, \Lambda'}^1}(z) \subseteq \text{Im } i_{\mu, \mu+1, 0, 0}$
2.  $\kappa_{e_{\theta, \theta'}^0}(z) \cup \lambda_{e_{\theta, \theta'}^1}(z) \subseteq \text{Im } i_{\mu, \mu+1, 0, 0}$
3.  $i_{\mu, \mu+1, 0, 0}(z) = i_{\mu+1, \mu+2, 0, 0}(z)$

We are working on extending the analysis to the setting of **infinitely** many measurable cardinals.

- Henney-Turner, Schlicht: Dehornoy for several measures  
In preparation, 34 pages

In a different direction, Sakai proved the genericity of the critical sequence for **generic** iterations of a normal precipitous ideal.

## Problem

*Can Sakai's result be extended to generic iterations of **arbitrary** length of a single normal precipitous ideal?*



Ben-Neria, O. (2024).

**A Mathias criterion for the Magidor iteration of Prikry forcings.**

*Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 63(1):119–134.



Bukovský, L. (1977).

**Iterated ultrapower and Prikry's forcing.**

*Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, 18(1):77–85.



Dehornoy, P. (1978).

**Iterated ultrapowers and Prikry forcing.**

*Annals of Mathematical Logic*, 15(2).



Dehornoy, P. (1983).

**An application of ultrapowers to changing cofinality.**

*The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 48(2):225–235.



Fuchs, G. (2005).

**A characterization of generalized Příkrý sequences.**

*Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 44(8):935–971.

## Bibliography iii



Fuchs, G. and Hamkins, J. D. (2017).

**Boolean ultrapowers, the Bukovsky-Dehornoy phenomenon, and iterated ultrapowers.**

*arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06702.*



Hayut, Y. (2023).

**Prikry type forcings and the Bukovský-Dehornoy phenomena.**

*arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05553.*



Henney-Turner, C. and Welch, P. (2024).

**Of mice and machetes.**

*arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21562.*



Sakai, H. (2005).

**Generalized Prikry forcing and iteration of generic ultrapowers.**

*Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 51(5):507–523.



Welch, P. D. (2022).

**Closed and unbounded classes and the H\"artig quantifier model.**

*The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 87(2):564–584.