

# FORCING OVER THE LANGUAGE

$\{\epsilon, \mathbf{j}\}$

Paul Corazza

Boise State University

# I. Introduction

1. Kunen's Theorem: Formalizing in KM Set Theory, there is no elementary embedding  $j : V \rightarrow V$ .
2. Replace KM Set Theory with axiomatic approach in the language  $\{\in, \mathbf{j}\}$ .

Axioms:

- ZFC (for  $\in$ -formulas)
- Elementarity schema (asserts  $\mathbf{j}$  is elementary)
- Critical Point axiom (asserts there is a least ordinal moved by  $\mathbf{j}$ )
- Separation $\mathbf{j}$  schema (asserts usual Separation holds for  $\mathbf{j}$ -formulas)

3. The **Wholeness Axiom** (WA) =  
 Elementarity+Critical Point+  
 Separation<sub>j</sub>

WA<sub>0</sub> = Elementarity+Critical Point+  
 Σ<sub>0</sub>-Separation<sub>j</sub>

4. Standard models of ZFC + WA (ZFC +  
 WA<sub>0</sub>) are of the form  $\langle M, \in, j \rangle$  where  
 $j : M \rightarrow M$  is elementary, and  $j$ -fmlas  
 satisfy Separation (Σ<sub>0</sub>-Separation).

$$\kappa_0 = \text{crit}(j) \quad \kappa_{n+1} = j(\kappa_n)$$

$$V_{\kappa_0}^M \prec V_{\kappa_1}^M \prec V_{\kappa_2}^M \prec \dots \prec M.$$

5. Strength of these theories:

- $\text{ZFC} + \text{WA}_0 \vdash \kappa$  is super- $n$ -huge for “every”  $n$
- if  $i : V_\lambda \rightarrow V_\lambda$  is an  $I_3$  embedding,

$$\langle V_\lambda, \in, i \rangle \models \text{ZFC} + \text{WA}$$

- so:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Con}(I_3) &\implies \text{Con}(\text{WA}) \\ &\implies \text{Con}(\text{WA}_0) \\ &\implies \text{Con}(\text{super-}n\text{-huge}) \end{aligned}$$

6. Natural Question:

- Is GCH or  $V = HOD$  consistent with  $\text{ZFC} + \text{WA}$  (or  $\text{ZFC} + \text{WA}_0$ )?

## 7. Fundamental Problem:

Starting from a model  $\langle M, \in, j \rangle$  of ZFC + WA (or ZFC + WA<sub>0</sub>), after forcing with a **typical** iteration, can  $j$  be extended to  $\hat{j} : M[G] \rightarrow M[G]$  so that  $\langle M[G], \in, \hat{j} \rangle$  is also a model of ZFC + WA (or ZFC + WA<sub>0</sub>)?

## 8. The typical iteration $P_\lambda$ : Suppose inaccessibles are unbounded in $\lambda$ . Let

$$in_\lambda : \lambda \rightarrow \lambda$$

$: \alpha \mapsto$  least inaccessible above  $\alpha$

- reverse Easton iteration
- adequate ( $|P_\alpha| < in(\alpha)$ ;  $\Vdash_\alpha \dot{Q}_\alpha$  is  $\alpha^+$ -directed closed)

9. Fact: If  $P_\lambda$  is a  $\lambda$ -stage adequate reverse Easton iteration and inaccessibles are unbounded in  $\lambda$ , then for every  $\alpha < \lambda$ ,

$P_{\alpha\lambda}$  is  $\alpha^+$ -directed closed.

## II. A Coarse Solution

1. Start with an  $I_1$  embedding  $j : V_{\lambda+1} \rightarrow V_{\lambda+1}$  inside a countable transitive model  $V$  of ZFC.
2. Let  $P_\lambda \subseteq V_{\lambda+1}$  be adequate reverse Easton iteration.
3. Lift  $j$  to  $\hat{j} : V[G]_{\lambda+1} \rightarrow V[G]_{\lambda+1}$  by

$$\hat{j}(\sigma_G) = (j(\sigma))_G$$

(for a particular choice of  $G$ )

4. Result:

$$\langle V[G]_\lambda, \in, \hat{j} \upharpoonright V[G]_\lambda \rangle \models \text{ZFC} + \text{WA}$$

5. Why it works: Main issue is to verify that  $\hat{j}$  is well-defined.

6. Verifying “well-defined”: Show

if  $p \Vdash \sigma = \tau$  and  $p \in G$

then  $j(p) \Vdash j(\sigma) = j(\tau)$  and  $j(p) \in G$

7. Requires:

- $\Vdash$  is definable in  $V_{\lambda+1}$  (holds because  $P_\lambda \subseteq V_{\lambda+1}$ )
- existence of “master condition”  $q$   
— i.e.  $q$  satisfies:

$$\forall p \in G_{\kappa_n} \ q \upharpoonright \kappa_{n+1} \leq j(p).$$

(holds because of adequacy of  $P_\lambda$ )

- Separation<sub>j</sub> automatically holds



### III. A Refinement

1. Start with a transitive model  $\langle M, \in, j_0 \rangle$  of ZFC + WA (or ZFC + WA<sub>0</sub>).
2. Try taking limit of **models** instead of iterating forcing
3. Inductively build

$$M \subseteq M[G_{\kappa_0}] \subseteq M[G_{\kappa_1}] \subseteq \dots;$$

$$N = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} M[G_{\kappa_n}],$$

and embeddings  $j_1, j_2, \dots$  so that

$$M[G_{\kappa_0}] \xrightarrow{j_1} M[G_{\kappa_1}] \xrightarrow{j_2} M[G_{\kappa_2}] \xrightarrow{j_3} \dots$$

#### 4. The Induction:

$$(P_{\kappa_0} \subseteq V_{\kappa_0})^M$$

let  $G_{\kappa_0}$  be  $P_{\kappa_0}$ -generic

#### FIRST STEP:

- $(P_{\kappa_1} = j(P_{\kappa_0}) \sim P_{\kappa_0} * P_{\kappa_0\kappa_1})^M$
- let  $G_{\kappa_0\kappa_1}$  be  $P_{\kappa_0\kappa_1}$ -generic
- $G_{\kappa_1} = G_{\kappa_0} * G_{\kappa_0\kappa_1}$
- lift  $j_0$  to  $j_1 : M[G_{\kappa_0}] \rightarrow M[G_{\kappa_1}]$  by
$$j_1(\sigma_{G_{\kappa_0}}) = (j_0(\sigma))_{G_{\kappa_1}}$$
- well-defined since  $p \in G_{\kappa_0} \Rightarrow p \leq j(p)$

## SECOND STEP:

- $(P_{\kappa_2} = j(P_{\kappa_1}) \sim P_{\kappa_1} * P_{\kappa_1\kappa_2})^M$
- pick  $G_{\kappa_1\kappa_2}$   $P_{\kappa_1\kappa_2}$ -generic
  - $G_{\kappa_1\kappa_2}$  contains master cond'n
- $G_{\kappa_2} = G_{\kappa_1} * G_{\kappa_1\kappa_2}$
- lift  $j_1$  to  $j_2 : M[G_{\kappa_1}] \rightarrow M[G_{\kappa_2}]$  by
$$j_2(\sigma_{G_{\kappa_1}}) = (j_0(\sigma))_{G_{\kappa_2}}$$
- well-defined since  $p \in G_{\kappa_1} \Rightarrow j(p) \in G_{\kappa_2}$   
(master condition argument)

5. As usual

$j_1 \upharpoonright (V_{\kappa_0})^{M[G_{\kappa_0}]}$  is the identity

So

$$(V_{\kappa_0})^{M[G_{\kappa_0}]} \prec (V_{\kappa_1})^{M[G_{\kappa_1}]}$$

and we get an elementary chain

$$(V_{\kappa_0})^{M[G_{\kappa_0}]} \prec (V_{\kappa_1})^{M[G_{\kappa_1}]} \prec \dots \prec N \models \text{ZFC}.$$

6. Show that restrictions of the  $j_n$  are elements of their next higher ranks, and piece these together to obtain elementary embedding  $k : N \rightarrow N$ .

7. We no longer may conclude that final model satisfies Separation<sub>j</sub>. But since restriction of  $k$  to each rank belongs to  $N$ ,  $\Sigma_0$ -Separation<sub>j</sub> does hold.

8. We have

$$\langle N, \in, k \rangle \models \text{ZFC} + \text{WA}_0$$

9. Question. Can a variation of this argument prove consistency of ZFC + WA?

10. A review of the argument shows that, to begin, we only need  $\langle M, \in, j \rangle$  to be a transitive model of ZFC + WA<sub>0</sub>.

## IV. Do We Have A Relative Consistency Result?

1. When forcing over ZFC, we may assume the ground model is transitive. Reason: For any finite number of ZFC axioms  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$ , ZFC proves there is a ctm of  $\phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n$ . Argument uses Reflection, hence Replacement.
2. In starting with a model of ZFC+WA<sub>0</sub>, in the language  $\{\in, \mathbf{j}\}$ , can't assume Replacement for  $\mathbf{j}$ -formulas. Also, the theory ZFC+WA<sub>0</sub> is finitely axiomatizable. Therefore: cannot assume transitive ground model.

3. **Question.** Starting with a possibly nonstandard model  $\langle M, E, j \rangle$  of ZFC +  $\text{WA}_0$ , how to proceed with forcing?

- Work in Boolean-valued model  $M^B$ ? But  $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_B$  is not well-defined when  $\phi$  is a  $\mathbf{j}$ -formula. Also, how to handle iteration of **models** used above instead of forcing iterations?

## V. A Solution

1. Develop forcing for nonstandard models of ZFC — given  $M$ , obtain  $M^B$  and collapse with a generic ultrafilter  $M_U = M^B / U$ .
2. Because  $E_U$  may be nonwellfounded, usual collapsing function (giving  $M[U]$ ) is not available.
3. Usual results about forcing extensions now hold “up to canonical isomorphism.”



4. Now attempt to copy earlier proof:

- Given a model  $\langle M, E, j_0 \rangle$  of ZFC+  
WA<sub>0</sub>, force over  $\langle M, E \rangle$  to obtain  
 $\langle M_{U_0}, E_{U_0} \rangle$
- Force again to get  $\langle M_{U_1}, E_{U_1} \rangle$
- “Lift”  $j_0$  to  $j_1 : M_{U_0} \rightarrow M_{U_1}$
- Continue induction over the **real**  
natural numbers (rather than us-  
ing the possibly nonstandard inte-  
gers of any of the models)
- Obtain model  $N$  as a direct limit  
of models rather than union of el-  
ementary chain.

- $N$  may not be a model of ZFC; however, images in  $N$  of diagonal ranks form an elementary chain whose union  $\tilde{N}$  is desired model.

5. Some consistency results using this method:

A.  $\text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \text{WA}_0) \implies \text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \text{WA}_0 + \text{GCH})$

B.  $\text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \text{WA}_0) \implies \text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \text{WA}_0 + V = \text{HOD})$

## VI. Other Results

1. Small forcing cannot destroy  $WA_0$  or  $WA$ .
2. Set forcing from a model of  $ZFC + WA$  cannot destroy  $WA_0$ .