

# Models of Set Theory II – Winter 2019/20

Peter Holy – Problem Sheet 6

Problems 1 and 2 are relevant for the proof of Lemma 8.6, which I now spelled out properly at the end of this exercise sheet (this was the lemma that I think we all got confused about in the lecture).

**Problem 1:** Assume that  $P \in H(\chi)$  is a partial order, and that  $\chi$  is a regular and uncountable cardinal. Verify that for every condition  $p \in P$ , and every first order formula  $\varphi$  in the forcing language of  $H(\chi)$  – this means that only names in  $H(\chi)$  are allowed to appear as parameters within  $\varphi$  – the following statements are equivalent:

1.  $p \Vdash [\varphi^{H(\check{\chi})}]$ .
2.  $H(\chi) \models [p \Vdash \varphi]$ .

**Problem 2:**

1. Let  $P$  be a notion of forcing, and let  $\varphi(x)$  be a first order formula with one free variable. Show that there is a  $P$ -name  $\dot{x}$  such that

$$\Vdash_P [\exists x \varphi(x) \rightarrow \varphi(\dot{x})].$$

2. Let  $\chi$  be a regular uncountable cardinal, let  $P \in H(\chi)$  be a notion of forcing, and let  $\varphi$  be a first order sentence. Assume that  $\dot{x}$  is a  $P$ -name such that

$$\Vdash_P \varphi \rightarrow \dot{x} \in H(\check{\chi}).$$

Show that we can find a  $P$ -name  $\dot{y} \in H(\chi)$  such that  $\Vdash_P \varphi \rightarrow \dot{x} = \dot{y}$ .

**Problem 3:** Verify the following, under the assumptions of Problem 1:

1. If  $M \prec H(\chi)$  and  $P \in M$ , then

$$\Vdash_P \langle \check{M}[\dot{G}], \check{M}[\dot{G}] \cap H(\chi)^V, \in \rangle \prec \langle H(\check{\chi}), H(\chi)^V, \in \rangle.$$

2. If under the above assumptions,  $q$  is  $(M, P)$ -generic, then

$$q \Vdash_P \langle \check{M}[\dot{G}], \check{M}, \in \rangle \prec \langle H(\check{\chi}), H(\chi)^V, \in \rangle.$$

**Problem 4:** Let  $j: M \rightarrow N$  be an elementary embedding, where  $M$  and  $N$  are both transitive (possibly class-sized) models of  $\text{ZFC}^-$ . Verify the following:

1.  $j(\alpha) \geq \alpha$  for every ordinal  $\alpha$ .
2. If  $j \neq \text{id}$ , then  $j \upharpoonright \text{Ord}^M \neq \text{id}$ .
3. If  $\text{crit}(j) = \kappa$ , then
  - (a)  $\kappa$  is regular in  $M$  and
  - (b)  $j \upharpoonright H(\text{crit}(j))^M = \text{id}$ .

**Lemma 8.6:** If  $M \prec H(\chi)$  for some regular and uncountable  $\chi$ , and  $P \in M$ , then  $1_P \Vdash \check{M}[\dot{G}] \prec H(\check{\chi})$ .

*Proof:* Note first that since  $|P| < \chi$ , forcing with  $P$  preserves the regularity of  $\chi$ , so  $H(\chi)$  still is a well-defined object. Using the Tarski-Vaught criterion in the generic extensions of  $P$ , it is enough to verify that for all  $P$ -names  $\dot{a} \in M$ , and for any fixed first order formula  $\varphi$ ,  $1_P$  forces the following statement

$$(*) \quad (\exists x \varphi(x, \dot{a}))^{H(\check{\chi})} \rightarrow \exists x \in \check{M}[\dot{G}] \varphi(x, \dot{a})^{H(\check{\chi})}.$$

Using Problem 2.1, let  $\dot{x}$  be a  $P$ -name such that

$$1_P \Vdash \exists x [x \in H(\check{\chi}) \wedge \varphi(x, \dot{a})^{H(\check{\chi})}] \rightarrow [\dot{x} \in H(\check{\chi}) \wedge \varphi(\dot{x}, \dot{a})^{H(\check{\chi})}].$$

By Problem 2.2, we find a  $P$ -name  $\dot{y} \in H(\chi)$  such that

$$1_P \Vdash [\exists x \in H(\check{\chi}) \varphi(x, \dot{a})^{H(\check{\chi})}] \rightarrow \varphi(\dot{y}, \dot{a})^{H(\check{\chi})}.$$

Using Problem 1, the existence of such a  $P$ -name  $\dot{y}$  can be equivalently rewritten as a first order statement within  $H(\chi)$ , and thus we find such a  $P$ -name  $\dot{y}$  in  $M$  by elementarity. But then,  $1_P \Vdash \dot{y} \in \check{M}[\dot{G}]$ , and if

$$p \Vdash [\dot{y} \in \check{M}[\dot{G}] \wedge \varphi(\dot{y}, \dot{a})^{H(\check{\chi})}],$$

then also

$$p \Vdash \exists x \in \check{M}[\dot{G}] \varphi(x, \dot{a})^{H(\check{\chi})},$$

for any condition  $p \in P$ . Taking a maximal antichain of conditions  $p$  which decide whether or not  $(\exists x \varphi(x, \dot{a}))^{H(\check{\chi})}$  holds, the above implies that each such  $p$  forces the statement  $(*)$ , and therefore that  $1_P$  forces  $(*)$ , as desired.

□