

A GENERIC ABSOLUTENESS PRINCIPLE CONSISTENT WITH LARGE CONTINUUM

MOHAMMAD GOLSHANI

ABSTRACT. We state a new generic absoluteness principle, and use Shelah's memory iteration technique to show that it is consistent with the large continuum.

§ 0. INTRODUCTION

Generic absoluteness principles are widely studied in set theory. They assert that certain properties of the set-theoretic universe cannot be changed by forcing. For instance Shoenfield in [19], showed that if a sentence ψ is Σ_2^1 or Π_2^1 , it is impossible to reach a forcing extension in which ψ holds if it does not already hold in the ground model. See [2], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [20], [21], [22] and [23] for more on the subject.

In this paper we introduce another generic absoluteness principle and show its consistency with large values of the continuum. Our main result is the following:

Theorem 0.1. *Assume GCH. Let $\kappa \geq \aleph_2$ be a regular cardinal. Then there is a proper partial order \mathbb{P} with the \aleph_2 -chain condition and forcing the following statements.*

(†) $2^{\aleph_0} = \kappa$,

(‡) *Suppose $\varphi(x, y)$ is a restricted formula in the language of set theory. Suppose for every $a \in \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)$ and every inner model M of the form $M = \mathbf{V}[\mathbf{H}]$, where \mathbf{H}*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03E50, 03E35, 03E65.

Key words and phrases. large continuum, generic absoluteness, memory iteration, \aleph_2 -p.i.c.

The author's research has been supported by a grant from IPM (No. 1402030417). The results of this paper are motivated from discussions with David Asperó, to whom the author is very grateful. In particular, the current presentation of Theorem 0.1 is suggested by him. He also thanks David Asperó and Rahman Mohammadpour for their useful comments.

is \mathbb{R} -generic over \mathbf{V} , for some $\mathbb{R} \triangleleft \mathbb{P}$, if $x \in M$, $\omega_1^M = \omega_1$, and $M \models \text{CH}$, then there is an \mathbb{R} -name \underline{Q} such that \underline{Q} is (\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{P}) -proper¹ with the \aleph_2 -p.i.c. and forcing $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2) \models (\exists y)\varphi(a, y)$. Then $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2) \models (\forall x)(\exists y)\varphi(x, y)$.

Remark 0.2. A generalization of the above theorem has recently announced in [3]. However our proof is here completely different, and might be of some interest. In particular, we develop a general theory of countable support memory iteration, and prove some general results about it.

The proof uses a countable support version of Shelah's memory iteration. See [11], [12], [13], [17] and [18] for more on the method. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1, we recall some definitions and results which are used in this paper, and then in Section 2, we develop a general case of countable support memory iteration and prove some results about it. Then in Section 3 we present the proof of Theorem 0.1.

§ 1. SOME PRELIMINARIES

In this section we present some definitions and results that we will make use in the next sections.

§ 1.1. $(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ -properness. In this subsection we define the following notion of properness. It will help us to show that some memory iterations of proper forcing notions are again proper.

Definition 1.1. Suppose $\mathbb{P}_0 \triangleleft \mathbb{P}_1$ are forcing notions, and $\underline{Q} \in \mathbf{V}$ is a \mathbb{P}_0 -names for a forcing notion. We say that \underline{Q} is $(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ -proper if for every large enough regular cardinal χ and every countable $M \prec \mathcal{H}(\chi)^{\mathbf{V}}$ such that $\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1, \underline{Q} \in M$, if $(p, q) \in (\mathbb{P}_1 * \underline{Q}) \cap M$, then there is q^* such that:

¹See Section 1 for the definition of (\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{P}) -properness.

- (1) q^* is a \mathbb{P}_0 -name for an element of \mathbb{Q} ,
- (2) If \mathbf{G} is \mathbb{P}_1 -generic over \mathbf{V} and $\mathbf{V} \cap M[\mathbf{G}] = M$ and $p \in \mathbf{G}$, then

$$\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}] \models \text{“} \check{q}_{(\mathbf{G} \cap \mathbb{P}_0)}^* \text{ is an } (M[\mathbf{G}], \mathbb{Q}_{\mathbf{G}})\text{-generic condition, extending } q_{\mathbf{G}} \text{”}.$$

Definition 1.2. Suppose $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathbf{V}$ is a \mathbb{P}_0 -names for a forcing notion. We say \mathbb{Q} is \mathbb{P}_0 -*stably proper* if for each proper forcing notion \mathbb{P}_1 such that $\mathbb{P}_0 \triangleleft \mathbb{P}_1$ and $\mathbb{P}_1/\dot{\mathbf{G}}_{\mathbb{P}_0}$ is proper, \mathbb{Q} is $(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ -proper.

§ 1.2. The \aleph_2 -properness isomorphism condition. The following notion is due to Shelah [16, VIII, Section 2].

Definition 1.3. Given a partial order \mathbb{Q} , we say that \mathbb{Q} *has the \aleph_2 -properness isomorphism condition* (\aleph_2 -p.i.c.) in case for every large enough regular cardinal θ and for any two countable $N_0, N_1 \prec H(\theta)$ such that $\omega_2, \mathbb{Q} \in N_0 \cap N_1$, if $\pi : (N_0; \in) \rightarrow (N_1; \in)$ is an isomorphism, $N_0 \cap N_1 \cap \omega_2$ is a proper initial segment of both $N_0 \cap \omega_2$ and $N_1 \cap \omega_2$, and $N_0 \cap \omega_2 \subseteq \min((N_1 \cap \omega_2) \setminus N_0)$, then for every $p \in \mathbb{Q} \cap N_0$ there is a condition $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ extending p and such that

- (1) $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{“} (\forall r \in N_0 \cap \mathbb{Q})(r \in \dot{G}_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{ iff } \pi(r) \in \dot{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}) \text{”}$,
- (2) $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} p \in \dot{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, and
- (3) q is (N_0, \mathbb{Q}) -generic.

It is a standard fact that if CH holds, then every partial order with the \aleph_2 -p.i.c. has the \aleph_2 -c.c. Also, the following is standard and well-known, see [16, Ch. VIII], or the proof of [1, Theorems 2.10 and 2.12]).

Lemma 1.4. *Suppose $\mathbb{P} = \langle \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle, \langle \mathbb{Q}_\beta : \beta < \delta \rangle \rangle$ is a countable support iteration and for each $\beta < \delta$, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta} \text{“} \mathbb{Q}_\beta \text{ is proper and has the } \aleph_2\text{-p.i.c.} \text{”}$. Then:*

²Here by $\mathbf{G} \cap \mathbb{P}_0$ we mean the canonical \mathbb{P}_0 -generic filter obtained from \mathbf{G} , using the hypothesis $\mathbb{P}_0 \triangleleft \mathbb{P}_1$.

- (1) if $\delta < \omega_2$, then \mathbb{P}_δ has the \aleph_2 -p.i.c.;
- (2) if $\delta \leq \omega_2$ and CH holds, then \mathbb{P}_δ has the \aleph_2 -c.c.;
- (3) if $\delta < \omega_2$ and CH holds, then CH holds in $V^{\mathbb{P}_\delta}$.

§ 2. SHELAH'S MEMORY ITERATION

In this section we give a general version of Shelah's memory iteration with countable supports, and study some of its properties. Suppose $\kappa \geq \aleph_2$ is an uncountable regular cardinal. A countable support memory iteration of length κ is defined as a sequence

$$\mathfrak{q} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\beta, \mathcal{U}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \alpha \rangle$$

where:

- (1) $\mathcal{U}_\beta \in [\beta]^{<\kappa}$;
- (2) if $\xi \in \mathcal{U}_\beta$, then $\mathcal{U}_\xi \subseteq \mathcal{U}_\beta$;
- (3) $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\beta} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : \text{dom}(p) \subseteq \mathcal{U}_\beta\} \triangleleft \mathbb{P}_\beta$;
- (4) \mathbb{Q}_β is a $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}$ -name for a forcing notion;
- (5) for each $\alpha \leq \kappa$ we have $p \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ iff
 - (a) p is a function with $\text{dom}(p)$ a countable subset of α ;
 - (b) for each $\beta \in \text{dom}(p)$, $p(\beta)$ is a $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}$ -name and $p \upharpoonright \mathcal{U}_\beta \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}} "p(\beta) \in \mathbb{Q}_\beta"$;

Given \mathbb{P}_α -conditions p_0, p_1 , we define $p_1 \leq_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha} p_0$ (p_1 extends p_0) iff

- (1) $\text{dom}(p_0) \subseteq \text{dom}(p_1)$ and
- (2) for every $\beta \in \text{dom}(p_0)$, $p_0 \upharpoonright \beta \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta} "p_1(\beta) \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_\beta} p_0(\beta)"$.

We now study the properness condition for such iterations. The following theorem gives a general criteria for a memory iteration as above to be proper.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose \mathfrak{q} is as above, and suppose that for each $\beta < \kappa$, \mathbb{Q}_β is $(\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}, \mathbb{P}_\beta)$ -proper. Then, for each $\alpha \leq \kappa$:*

- (a) \mathbb{P}_α is proper,

(b) $\mathbb{P}_\alpha/\dot{\mathbf{G}}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\alpha}}$ is proper.

Proof. By induction on $\alpha \leq \kappa$ we show that:

$(*)_\alpha$ if $\beta < \alpha$, $M \prec \mathcal{H}(\chi)$ is countable, where $\chi > \kappa$ is large enough regular and $\mathfrak{q}, \alpha, \beta \in M$, if $p \in M \cap \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ and if $p' \leq p \upharpoonright \beta$ is (\mathbb{P}_β, M) -generic, then there is $p'' \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ such that $p'' \leq p$ and p'' is (\mathbb{P}_α, M) -generic.

The successor case $\alpha = \beta + 1$ follows from the assumption \mathbb{Q}_β is $(\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}, \mathbb{P}_\beta)$ -proper, and the limit case can be treated as usual proof of properness in limit cases. \square

In the next theorem we give general conditions under which the iteration has good chain conditions. We first start by fixing some definitions and notations.

Definition 2.2. Suppose \mathfrak{q} is as above.

(1) We say $A \subseteq \kappa$ is \mathfrak{q} -closed, if

$$\beta \in A \Rightarrow \mathcal{U}_\beta \subseteq A.$$

(2) if $\alpha \leq \kappa$ and $A \subseteq \alpha$ is \mathfrak{q} -closed, then

$$\mathbb{P}_A^\alpha = \{p \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha : \text{dom}(p) \subseteq A\}.$$

We also set $\mathbb{P}_A = \mathbb{P}_A^\kappa$.

It is easily seen that if $A \subseteq \alpha$ is \mathfrak{q} -closed, then $\mathbb{P}_A^\alpha \triangleleft \mathbb{P}_\alpha$.

We also have an analogue of Lemma 1.4, whose proof is essentially the same.

Lemma 2.3. Suppose \mathfrak{q} is as above, $A \subseteq \kappa$ is \mathfrak{q} -closed of size $\leq \aleph_1$ and for each $\beta \in A$,

$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}} \text{“}\mathbb{Q}_\beta \text{ satisfies the } \aleph_2\text{-p.i.c.} \text{”}$. Then:

(1) \mathbb{P}_A is \aleph_2 -c.c.,

(2) If CH holds, then it holds in the generic extension by \mathbb{P}_A .

Theorem 2.4. Suppose \mathfrak{q} is as above, and suppose that

- (1) for each $\beta < \kappa$, $\mathcal{U}_\beta \in [\beta]^{\leq \aleph_1}$,
- (2) for each $\beta < \kappa$, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}} \text{“}\mathbb{Q}_\beta \text{ satisfies the } \aleph_2\text{-p.i.c.} \text{”}$.

Then \mathbb{P}_κ is \aleph_2 -c.c.

Proof. Let $\bar{p} = \langle p_\xi : \xi < \omega_2 \rangle$ be a set of conditions in \mathbb{P}_κ . For each $\xi < \omega_2$ pick a \mathfrak{q} -closed set A_ξ of size \aleph_1 such that

$$\text{dom}(p_\xi) \subseteq A_\xi.$$

We may suppose that $\langle A_\xi : \xi < \omega_2 \rangle$ is increasing. By shrinking the sequence \bar{p} if necessary, suppose that $\{\text{dom}(p_\xi) : \xi < \omega_2\}$ forms a Δ -system with root d . Let $i_* < \omega_2$ be such that $d \subseteq A_{i_*}$. As $|A_{i_*}| \leq \aleph_1$, by Lemma 2.3(1) $\mathbb{P}_{A_{i_*}}$ satisfies the \aleph_2 -c.c., so for some $\xi < \zeta < \omega_2$, $p_\xi \upharpoonright A_{i_*}$ is compatible with $p_\zeta \upharpoonright A_{i_*}$. But then it is easily seen that p_ξ and p_ζ are compatible. \square

§ 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 0.1

In this section we prove Theorem 0.1. Thus suppose GCH holds and let $\kappa \geq \aleph_2$ be a regular cardinal. Let $\phi : \kappa \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\kappa)$ be such that for each $x \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa)$, the set $\phi^{-1}(x) \subseteq \kappa$ is unbounded. Let

$$\mathfrak{q} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\beta, \mathcal{U}_\beta : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \alpha \rangle$$

be a memory iteration as in Section 2, with the following additional properties:

- (6) for each $\beta < \kappa$, \mathbb{Q}_β is $(\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}, \mathbb{P}_\beta)$ proper and is forced by $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}$ to be \aleph_2 -p.i.c.
- (7) Assume $\beta < \kappa$.
 - (a) if $\phi(\beta) = (A, \varphi(x, y), x)$, where $A \in [\beta]^{\leq \aleph_1}$ is $(\mathfrak{q} \upharpoonright \beta)$ -closed, $\varphi(x, y)$ is a restricted formula in the language of set theory and $x \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa)$ is a \mathbb{P}_A^β -name for a member of $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)$, and if there is a \mathbb{P}_A^β -name \mathbb{Q} for a $(\mathbb{P}_A^\beta, \mathbb{P}_\beta)$ -proper poset with the \aleph_2 -p.i.c. forcing $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2) \models (\exists y)\varphi(x, y)$, then \mathbb{Q}_β is a name for such a poset. We also set $\mathcal{U}_\beta = A$.

(b) Otherwise we let \mathbb{Q}_β be the trivial forcing notion, and set $\mathcal{U}_\beta = \emptyset$.

Let us show that the forcing notion $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_\kappa$ is as required. We can easily show that $2^{\aleph_0} = \kappa$ holds in $V^{\mathbb{P}_\kappa}$, thus item (\dagger) of Theorem 0.1 is satisfied. Let us show that item (\ddagger) holds in $V^{\mathbb{P}_\kappa}$.

Thus assume $\varphi(x, y)$ is a restricted formula in the language of set theory, and suppose for every $a \in \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)$ and every inner model M of the form $M = \mathbf{V}[\mathbf{H}]$, where \mathbf{H} is \mathbb{R} -generic over \mathbf{V} , for some $\mathbb{R} \leq \mathbb{P}$, if $x \in M$, $\omega_1^M = \omega_1$, and $M \models \text{CH}$, then there is an \mathbb{R} -name \mathbb{Q} such that \mathbb{Q} is (\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{P}) -proper with the \aleph_2 -p.i.c. and forcing $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2) \models (\exists y)\varphi(a, y)$. Let also \dot{x} be a \mathbb{P}_κ -name for an element of $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)$. Let $\beta < \kappa$ be such that:

- $\phi(\beta) = (A, \varphi(x, y), \dot{x})$,
- $A \in [\beta]^{\leq \aleph_1}$ is \mathfrak{q} -closed,
- \dot{x} is a \mathbb{P}_A -name,
- there is a \mathbb{P}_A^β -name \mathbb{Q} such that \mathbb{Q} is $(\mathbb{P}_A^\beta, \mathbb{P}_\beta)$ -proper with the \aleph_2 -p.i.c. and forcing $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2) \models (\exists y)\varphi(a, y)$.

By Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 and our assumption, such a β exists. It then follows that \mathbb{Q}_β is such a forcing notion. From this, we can easily conclude the result. The theorem follows.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abraham, Uri; *Proper forcing*, Handbook of set theory, vols. 1, 2, 3, pp. 333–394, Springer, Dordrecht, 2010.
- [2] Asperó, David; *Generic absoluteness for Σ_1 -formulas and the continuum problem*. Logic Colloquium '02, 1–27, Lect. Notes Log., 27, Assoc. Symbol. Logic, La Jolla, CA, 2006.
- [3] Asperó, David; Golshani, Mohammad; *PFA for \aleph_1 -sized posets, Prikty-type proper forcing, and the size of the continuum* submitted.
- [4] Eisworth, Todd, Milovich, David; Moore, Justin; *Iterated forcing and the Continuum Hypothesis*, in Appalachian set theory 2006–2012, J. Cummings and E. Schimmerling, eds., London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes series, Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 2013, pp. 207–244.

- [5] Bagaria, Joan; *Generic absoluteness and forcing axioms*. Models, algebras, and proofs (Bogotá, 1995), 1–12, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., 203, Dekker, New York, 1999.
- [6] Bagaria, Joan; *Bounded forcing axioms as principles of generic absoluteness*. Arch. Math. Logic 39 (2000), no. 6, 393–401.
- [7] Bagaria, Joan; *Axioms of generic absoluteness*. Logic Colloquium '02, 28–47, Lect. Notes Log., 27, Assoc. Symbol. Logic, La Jolla, CA, 2006.
- [8] Bagaria, Joan; Bosch, Roger; *Generic absoluteness under projective forcing*. Fund. Math. 194 (2007), no. 2, 95–120.
- [9] Bagaria, Joan; Friedman, Sy D.; *Generic absoluteness*. Proceedings of the XIth Latin American Symposium on Mathematical Logic (Mérida, 1998). Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 108 (2001), no. 1-3, 3–13.
- [10] Friedman, Sy D. *Generic Σ_3^1 -absoluteness*. J. Symbolic Logic 69 (2004), no. 1, 73–80.
- [11] Golshani, Mohammad; Shelah, Saharon; *The measuring principle and the continuum hypothesis*, submitted.
- [12] Kumar, Ashutosh; Shelah, Saharon; *On possible restrictions of the null ideal*, J. Math. Log., 19 (2019), no. 2, paper no. 1950008, 14 pp.
- [13] Mildenerger, Heike; Shelah, Saharon; *Changing cardinal characteristics without changing ω -sequences or cofinalities*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic, 106 (2000), no. 1-3, 207–261.
- [14] Mitchell, William J.; *$I[\omega_2]$ can be the nonstationary ideal on $\text{Cof}(\omega_1)$* . Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 361 (2009), no. 2, 561–601.
- [15] Neeman, Itay; *Forcing with sequences of models of two types*. Notre Dame J. Form. Log. 55(2), 265–298 (2014).
- [16] Shelah, Saharon; *Proper and improper forcing, Second edition*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. xlviii+1020 pp. ISBN: 3-540-51700-6.
- [17] Shelah, Saharon; *Covering of the null ideal may have countable cofinality*, Saharon Shelah’s anniversary issue, Fund. Math. 166 (2000), no. 1-2, 109–136.
- [18] Shelah, Saharon; *The null ideal restricted to some non-null set may be \aleph_1 -saturated*, Fund. Math., 179 (2003), no., 2, 97–129.
- [19] Shoenfield, J. R.; *The problem of predicativity*. 1961 Essays on the foundations of mathematics pp. 132–139 Magnes Press, Hebrew Univ., Jerusalem

- [20] Todorćević, Stevo; *Generic absoluteness and the continuum*. Math. Res. Lett. 9 (2002), no. 4, 465–471.
- [21] Viale, Matteo; *Category forcings, MM^{+++} , and generic absoluteness for the theory of strong forcing axioms*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 29 (2016), no. 3, 675–728.
- [22] Wilson, Trevor M.; *Universally Baire sets and generic absoluteness*. J. Symb. Log. 82 (2017), no. 4, 1229–1251.
- [23] W. H. Woodin. Beyond Σ_1^2 absoluteness. In Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. I (Beijing, 2002), pages 515–524. Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN FUNDAMENTAL SCIENCES (IPM), P.O. BOX: 19395-5746, TEHRAN-IRAN.

Email address: `golshani.m@gmail.com`

URL: `http://math.ipm.ac.ir/~golshani/`