

# On the consistency strength of the proper forcing axiom

Matteo Viale  
University of Torino

Joint work with Christoph Weiss  
(University of München)

## MAIN RESULT

**Definition 1**  $\{(P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta) : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa\}$  is a standard iteration of length  $\kappa$  if:

$|P_\alpha| < \kappa$  for all  $\alpha < \kappa$ ,

$P_\alpha$  is a direct limit for stationary many  $\alpha < \kappa$ .

**Theorem 2** Assume PFA is proved consistent by means of a standard iteration  $\{(P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta) : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa\}$  such that:

- $P_\kappa$  is proper,
- $\kappa$  is  $\aleph_2$  in the generic extension.

Then  $\kappa$  is supercompact in the ground model.

There is an essential contribution by Magidor in the proof of this result.

Without Magidor's contribution this is the optimal result:

**Theorem 3** *Assume PFA is proved consistent by means of a standard iteration of length  $\kappa$  such that:*

- $\kappa$  is  $\aleph_2$  in the generic extension.

*Then  $\kappa$  is at least strongly compact in the ground model.*

Hiroshi Sakai has shown that there is a huge obstruction in order to get the optimal result without the assumption that the iteration is proper.

## HOW TO GET TO THE MAIN RESULT:

### STEP 1: Combinatorial characterization of supercompactness and strong compactness.

There are combinatorial properties  $\text{ISP}(\kappa)$  and  $\text{SP}(\kappa)$  such that  $\text{ISP}(\kappa)$  implies  $\text{SP}(\kappa)$  and:

- $\kappa$  is *supercompact* iff  $\kappa$  is inaccessible and  $\text{ISP}(\kappa)$  holds (Magidor 1974).
- $\kappa$  is *strongly compact* iff  $\kappa$  is inaccessible and  $\text{SP}(\kappa)$  holds (Jech 1973).
- $\text{ISP}(\kappa)$  can hold even for  $\kappa$  a successor of a regular uncountable cardinal (Weiss 2008) !!!

**STEP 2:** PFA implies that " $\aleph_2$  is supercompact" i.e  $\text{ISP}(\aleph_2)$  holds (WEISS, viale 2009)

**STEP 3:** In many circumstances  $\text{ISP}(\kappa)$  and  $\text{SP}(\kappa)$  can be relativized to inner models

For what concerns  $\text{SP}(\kappa)$ :

**Theorem 4 (Viale, 2010)** *If  $W$  is a generic extension of  $V$  by a standard iteration of length  $\kappa$  and:*

- $\text{SP}(\kappa)$  holds in  $W$ ,
- $\kappa$  is inaccessible in  $V$ ,

*Then  $\kappa$  is strongly compact in  $V$ .*

For what concerns  $\text{ISP}(\kappa)$ :

**Theorem 5 (MAGIDOR, viale, 2010)**

*If  $W$  is a generic extension of  $V$  by a standard iteration*

*$\{(P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta) : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa\}$  and:*

- $P_\kappa$  is proper,
- $\text{ISP}(\kappa)$  holds in  $W$ ,
- $\kappa$  is inaccessible in  $V$ ,

*Then  $\kappa$  is supercompact in  $V$ .*

## Some words on step 1

Let  $j : V \rightarrow M \subseteq V$  be elementary with  $M$  a transitive class and assume:

- $j(\kappa) > \lambda$ ,
- $V_\lambda \in M$ ,
- eventually  $j[V_\lambda] \in M$ .

If 1 and 2 hold,  $j$  witnesses  $\kappa$  is at least  $V_\lambda$ -strong.



If 1,2,3 hold,  $j$  witnesses  $\kappa$  is at least  $V_\lambda$ -supercompact:

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be the normal measure on  $[V_\lambda]^{<\kappa}$  given by

$$A \in \mathcal{U} \text{ iff } j[V_\lambda] \in j(A)$$

Notice  $j[V_\lambda] = N \prec M_{j(\lambda)}$ .

$N$  has the following crucial property:

**Fact 1** *For every  $X \in N$  and every  $d \in P(X)^M$  ( $d$  may not be in  $M$ ), there is  $z \in N$  such that  $z \cap N = d \cap N$ .*

**Proof:**  $N$  is isomorphic to  $V_\lambda$ ,  
thus we can find  $d' \in V_\lambda$  such that  $j[d'] = d \cap N$ .  
Then  $j(d') = z$  is as required.  $\square$

Magidor has characterized supercompactness using models with this "guessing" property.

**Definition 6** Given some  $N \prec V_\lambda$  and some  $d \subseteq X$  for some  $X \in N$ , we say that  $d$  is  $N$ -guessed if  $d \cap N = z \cap N$  for some  $z \in N$ .

Which sets  $d$  can be  $N$ -guessed?

It depends on the structure  $N$  and on the choice of the sets  $d$ .

In the terminology of the previous slide:

$M \models$  Every  $d \subseteq X$  is  $j[V_\lambda]$ -guessed for any  $X \in j[V_\lambda]$ .

On the other hand

Assume  $M = \bigcup \{M_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \prec H(\aleph_3)$  is internally approachable of size  $\aleph_1$ .

Let  $C = \{M_\alpha \cap \aleph_2 : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ . Then  $C$  cannot be guessed. Why?

Otherwise  $C$  would be guessed by a  $D \in M$  such that  $D \cap M$  is unbounded in  $\aleph_2 \cap M$ .

Thus  $M$  models  $D$  is an unbounded subset of  $\aleph_2$ .

Thus  $\omega_1 = \text{otp}(C) = \text{otp}(D \cap M) = M \cap \aleph_2 > \omega_1$ .

Notice however that all the initial segments of  $C$  are in  $M$ .....

## CONCLUSION:

An internally approachable model  $M$  of size  $\aleph_1$  contains a subset  $C \subseteq M \cap \aleph_2$  such that:

1.  $C \cap X \in M$  for all countable  $X \in M$ ,
2.  $C$  is not guessed, i.e.  $C = C \cap M \neq E \cap M$  for all  $E \in M$ .

BUT:

If  $M \prec H(\theta)$  has size  $\aleph_1$ , then for any set  $C$  which is  $M$ -guessed, item 1 above holds.

**QUESTION:** Can there be an  $M \prec H(\theta)$  of size  $\aleph_1$  such that item 1 above is a sufficient condition for a set to be  $M$ -guessed?

Let  $R$  be a suitable initial segment of the universe  $V$  ( $R = H(\theta)^V$  or  $R = V_\lambda$ ). What matters is:

- $R$  satisfies enough axioms of ZFC,
- $R$  is a transitive set,
- $P(X)^V \subseteq R$  for all  $X \in R$ .

Let  $N \prec R$  be a substructure.

Define

$$\kappa_N = \min\{\alpha : N \cap \alpha + 1 \text{ is not an ordinal}\}$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_N = \sup\{|\alpha| : N \cap \alpha \text{ is an ordinal}\}$$

It is easy to check that  $\kappa_N$  and  $\bar{\kappa}_N$  are cardinals in  $V$ .



## Two illuminating examples to compute $\kappa_N$ and $\bar{\kappa}_N$ :

1. If  $N \prec H(\theta)$ ,  $|N| = \omega_1$  and  $\omega_1 \subseteq N$ , then  $\bar{\kappa}_N = \omega_1$  and  $\kappa_N$  is in  $N$  and  $\kappa_N = \aleph_2$  is also in  $N$ .
2. According to the previous slides,  $\bar{\kappa}_{j[V_\lambda]} = \kappa \notin j[V_\lambda]$  is an inaccessible cardinal while  $\kappa_{j[V_\lambda]} = j(\kappa) \in j[V_\lambda]$ .

**Definition 7** (Weiss, Viale) Let  $N \prec H(\theta)$  ( $N \prec V_\lambda$ ) and  $X \in N$ .

$d \subseteq X$  is an  $N$ -slender subset of  $X$  if  $d \cap Z \in N$  for all  $Z \in [N]^{<|\overline{\kappa_N}|}$ .

**Remark 8** Assume  $\overline{\kappa_N}$  is inaccessible (it is enough that  $\overline{\kappa_N}^{<\overline{\kappa_N}} = \overline{\kappa_N}$ ).

Then for every  $X \in N$  every  $d \subseteq X$  is  $N$ -slender.

**Proof:** Notice that if  $Z \in N$  has size less than  $\overline{\kappa_N}$ ,  $P(Z) \subseteq N$ , thus  $d \cap Z \in N$  for any set  $d$ .  $\square$

**Definition 9** Let  $N \prec H(\theta)$  ( $N \prec V_\lambda$ ) and  $X \in N$ .

$N$  is an  $X$ -guessing model if every  $N$ -slender subset of  $X$  is  $N$ -guessed.

$N$  is a guessing model if it is  $X$ -guessing for all  $X \in N$ .

**Example:**

If  $j : V \rightarrow M$  is elementary and such that  $V_\lambda \subseteq M$ ,

$N = j[V_\lambda] \prec M_{j(\lambda)}$  is a guessing model with respect to the universe  $M$  (even if  $N$  might not be in  $M$ ).

$j$  witnesses the  $V_\lambda$ -supercompactness of  $\kappa$  in  $V$  if  $N \in M$ .

**Definition 10** Given a cardinal  $\kappa$ ,  $\text{ISP}(\kappa)$  holds if:

For all  $\theta > \kappa$  there are stationarily many  $N$  in  $[H(\theta)]^{<\kappa}$  such that:

- $N$  is a guessing model,
- $\kappa_N = \kappa$ .

**Theorem 11 (Magidor, 1974)**  $\kappa$  is supercompact iff it is inaccessible and  $\text{ISP}(\kappa)$  holds.

## STEP 2:

**Theorem 12 (WEISS, viale, 2009)** PFA implies  $\text{ISP}(\aleph_2)$  holds.

**Proof:** Use PFA to find a model  $M \prec H(\theta)$  of size  $\aleph_1$  which has an  $M$ -generic filter for a variation of the poset to show that the approachability property fails at  $\aleph_2$ .  $\square$

### **STEP 3: How to relativize $\text{ISP}(\kappa)$ to inner models.**

**Definition 13 (Hamkins?, Laver?)** Let  $V \sqsubseteq W$  be transitive models of ZFC.

The pair  $(V, W)$  has the  $\kappa$ -covering property if:

Every  $X \in [\text{Ord}]^{<\kappa} \cap W$  is covered by some  $Y \in [\text{Ord}]^{<\kappa} \cap V$ .

The pair  $(V, W)$  has the  $\kappa$ -approximation property if:

For every set of ordinals  $X \in W$  such that:

$$X \cap Z \in V \text{ for all } Z \in [\text{Ord}]^{<\kappa} \cap V,$$

we actually have that  $X \in V$ .

**Theorem 14 (Laver, 1999)** *Assume  $W$  is a generic extension of  $V$ .*

*Then for some  $\kappa$  the pair  $(V, W)$  has the  $\kappa$ -covering property and the  $\kappa$ -approximation property.*

**Theorem 15 (Viale, 2010)** *Assume  $W = V[G]$  where  $G$  is a  $P_\kappa$ -generic filter for a standard iteration  $\{(P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta) : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa\}$ .*

*Then the pair  $(V, W)$  has the  $\kappa$ -covering property and the  $\kappa$ -approximation property.*

## Theorem 16 Assume

- $V$  models that  $\{(P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta) : \alpha \leq \kappa, \beta < \kappa\}$  is a standard iteration,
- $V \models \kappa$  is inaccessible,
- $G$  is  $V$ -generic over  $P_\kappa$ ,
- $P_\kappa$  is proper,
- $W = V[G] \models \text{ISP}(\kappa)$ .

Then  $V$  models that  $\kappa$  is supercompact.



Notice that in the previous theorem  $\kappa$  may not be anymore inaccessible in  $W$ .

*If I skip the proof remember me to go to the last slide!*

**Proof:** For the sake of simplicity assume that:

$\lambda > \kappa$  is inaccessible in  $W$ ,

Fix in  $V$  a bijection  $f$  between  $\lambda$  and  $V_\lambda = H(\lambda)^V$ .

Fix also in  $V$  a partition  $S = (S_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda)$  of the ordinals of countable cofinality below  $\lambda$ .

Remark that  $S$  remains a partition of stationary sets in  $W$ .

Take in  $W$ , a guessing model  $M \prec H(\lambda^+)^W$  such that

- $\kappa_M = \kappa$  and  $|M| < \kappa$ .
- $P_\kappa, f, S, \dots \dots \dots \in M$ .

The two crucial observations are the following:

**Fact 2**  $M \cap V \prec H(\lambda^+)^V$  is a guessing model with respect to  $V$ .

**Fact 3**  $M \cap V_\lambda \in V$ .

Then we can conclude using Magidor's characterization of supercompactness in  $V$ .

I will prove both facts in some detail.

The first fact relies on the assumption that  $W \models \text{ISP}(\kappa)$ .

The second relies on the assumption that  $W$  is an extension of  $V$  by a proper forcing.

First of all standard arguments using the fact that  $M \prec H(\lambda^+)^W$  and  $M \cap \kappa$  is an ordinal show that:

1.  $M = M \cap V[G \cap M]$  (Use that  $P_\kappa$  has the  $\kappa$ -CC),
2.  $M \cap V \prec H(\lambda^+)^V$ ,
3.  $P(Z)^V \subseteq M \cap V$  for all  $Z \in M \cap V$  whose size in  $V$  is less than  $M \cap \kappa$ .  
(Use that  $\kappa$  is inaccessible in  $V$ , the elementarity of  $M \cap V$  and the fact that  $M \cap \kappa$  is an ordinal),
4. Every  $Z \in M \cap [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$  is covered by some  $Y \in M \cap V \cap [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$ .  
(Use the  $\kappa$ -covering property of the pair  $(V, W)$ ).

**Proof of the first fact:**

**First step:** we want to show that any  $d \in H(\lambda^+)^V$  is an  $M$ -slender subset of  $M$ .

It is enough to check that this is the case for any  $d \in P(\lambda)^V$  since any set in  $H(\lambda^+)^V$  can be coded by a subset of  $\lambda$ .

Pick  $Z \in M \cap V \cap [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$ ,  
then by the third item of the previous slide  $d \cap Z \in P(Z)^V \subseteq$   
 $M \cap V$ .

Thus for all  $Z \in M \cap V \cap [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$ ,  $d \cap Z \in M$ .

Now if  $Y \in (M \setminus V) \cap [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$ ,  
 $M$  models that there is  $Z \in V \cap [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$  such that  $Y \subseteq Z$ .

Thus  $d \cap Y = d \cap Y \cap Z$ . But  $d \cap Z \in M$ , so  $d \cap Y$  is also in  
 $M$ .

Thus  $d$  is an  $M$ -slender subset of  $\lambda$ ,  
since  $d \cap Y \in M$  for all  $Y \in [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$ .

Since  $M$  is a guessing model,  
 $d \cap M = e \cap M$  for some  $e \in M$ .

Now  $e \cap Z = d \cap Z \in V$  for all  $Z \in [\lambda]^{<\kappa_M} \cap V \cap M$ . Thus

$$M \models e \cap Z \in V \text{ for all } Z \in V \cap [\lambda]^{<\kappa}$$

By elementarity of  $M$ :

$$W \models e \cap Z \in V \text{ for all } Z \in V \cap [\lambda]^{<\kappa}.$$

By the  $\kappa$ -approximation property of the pair  $(V, W)$  we have  
that  $e \in V$ .

In conclusion for every  $d \in V$  there is  $e \in M \cap V$  such that  
 $d \cap M = e \cap M$ , i.e.  $M \cap V \prec H(\lambda^+)^V$  is a guessing model.

This proves the first fact. □

**Proof of the second fact:**

Let  $\delta = \sup(M \cap \lambda)$ .

This is the key observation:

**Claim 17** *For every  $S \in P(\lambda)^V \cap M$  set of limit ordinals of countable cofinality, we have that in  $V$*

$V \models S$  is stationary iff  $V \models S$  reflects on  $\delta$ .



## Proof of the claim

First of all with some work it can be seen that for any guessing model  $M \prec H(\lambda^+)^W$ ,  $M \cap \lambda$  is closed under countable supremum, i.e.:

If  $\{\alpha_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq M \cap \lambda$ , then  $\alpha = \sup\{\alpha_n : n \in \omega\} \in M$ .

Pick  $S \in M \cap V$  set of ordinals of countable cofinality.

First assume:

$V \models S$  reflects on  $\delta$ .

Pick  $C \in M$  club subset of  $\lambda$ , then  $C \cap M$  is a countably closed subset of  $\delta$  so it meets  $S$ .

Thus  $M \models S$  is stationary .

So  $S$  is stationary in  $W$  and a fortiori in  $V$ .

Assume on the other hand that  $V \models S$  is stationary, we want to show that  $S$  reflects on  $\delta$ .

By the  $\kappa$ -CC of  $P_\kappa$  every  $C \in W$  club subset of  $\lambda$  is contained in a club in  $V$ .

Thus if  $S \in M \cap V$ :

$V \models S$  is stationary

iff

$W \models S$  is stationary

iff

$M \models S$  is stationary.

Now pick  $C \in V$  club subset of  $\delta$ , we want to show that  $C \cap S$  is non-empty.

We just saw  $C$  is an  $M$ -slender subset of  $\lambda$ .

Since  $M$  is a guessing model  $C \cap M = E \cap M$  for some  $E \in M$ .

Since  $C$  is a club we can easily argue that:

$M \models E$  is closed under countable suprema.

Since

$M \models S$  is stationary,

we get that

$M \models S \cap E \neq \emptyset$ .

Thus  $S \cap C \neq \emptyset$ .

Since  $C \in V$  is an arbitrary club subset of  $\delta$ ,

$V \models S$  reflects on  $\delta$ .

The claim is proved

□

We can conclude the proof of the second fact:

Since  $P_\kappa$  is proper, we get that for any  $S \in P(\delta)^V$  set of limit ordinals of countable cofinality,

$V \models S$  is a stationary subset of  $\delta$  iff  $W \models S$  is a stationary subset of  $\delta$ .

Now observe that

$$M \cap V_\lambda = f[M \cap \lambda],$$

where  $f \in M \cap V$  is the bijection we chose between  $\lambda$  and  $V_\lambda$ .

Observe also that  $(S_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda) \in M$ .

Thus for any  $\alpha < \lambda$ :

If  $\alpha \in M$ , then  $S_\alpha \in M$  and

$M \models S_\alpha$  is stationary in  $\lambda$

so

$V \models S_\alpha$  reflects on  $\lambda$ .

On the other hand

$V \models S_\alpha$  reflects on  $\delta$  iff  $W \models S_\alpha$  reflects on  $\delta$

because  $W$  is an extension of  $V$  by a proper forcing.

Since  $M \cap \lambda$ , is a subset of  $\delta$  closed under countable suprema,  
 $M \cap S_\alpha \neq \emptyset$

and since  $(S_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda) \in M$ , we get that  $\alpha \in M$ .

In conclusion:

$\alpha \in M$  iff  $V \models S_\alpha$  reflects on  $\delta$ .

Thus

$$M \cap \lambda = \{\alpha : V \models S_\alpha \text{ reflects on } \delta\} \in V$$

This means that  $M \cap V = f[M \cap \lambda] \in V$  and proves the second fact.  $\square$



**What happens if  $P_\kappa$  is not proper?**

**Theorem 18 (Sakai 2010)** *Assume  $P_\kappa \in V$  is the final poset of the standard semiproper iteration to force MM of length a supercompact cardinal  $\kappa$ .*

*Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals.*

*Let  $G$  be  $V$ -generic for  $P_\kappa$  and  $W = V[G]$ . Then for every  $\theta$  there are stationarily many  $M \in [H(\theta)^W]^{\aleph_1}$  which are guessing models and such that  $M \cap V$  is a guessing model but is not in  $V$ .*