Useful axioms

Matteo Viale

Dipartimento di Matematica
Università di Torino

Pisa — 13/6/2017

Non-constructive principles for mathematics

A list of five (in some cases apparently unrelated) useful non-constructive principles:

1. The axiom of choice,
2. Baire's category theorem,
3. Large cardinal axioms,
4. Shoenfield's absoluteness,
5. Łoś Theorem for ultrapowers of first orders structures.

First aim: show that the language of forcing allows to bring out the analogies more or less evident between all these distinct principles and to express all of them as forcing axioms.

Second aim: formulate stronger and stronger non constructive principles leveraging on different aspects of the above analogies.

Non-constructive principles for mathematics

A list of five (in some cases apparently unrelated) useful non-constructive principles:

1. The axiom of choice,
2. Baire's category theorem,
3. Large cardinal axioms,
4. Shoenfield's absoluteness,
5. Łoś Theorem for ultrapowers of first orders structures.

First aim: show that the language of forcing allows to bring out the analogies more or less evident between all these distinct principles and to express all of them as forcing axioms.

Second aim: formulate stronger and stronger non constructive principles leveraging on different aspects of the above analogies.

Non-constructive principles for mathematics

A list of five (in some cases apparently unrelated) useful non-constructive principles:

1. The axiom of choice,
2. Baire's category theorem,
3. Large cardinal axioms,
4. Shoenfield's absoluteness,
5. Łoś Theorem for ultrapowers of first orders structures.

First aim: show that the language of forcing allows to bring out the analogies more or less evident between all these distinct principles and to express all of them as forcing axioms.

Second aim: formulate stronger and stronger non constructive principles leveraging on different aspects of the above analogies.

Non-constructive principles for mathematics

A list of five (in some cases apparently unrelated) useful non-constructive principles:

1. The axiom of choice,
2. Baire's category theorem,
3. Large cardinal axioms,
4. Shoenfield's absoluteness,
5. Łoś Theorem for ultrapowers of first orders structures.

First aim: show that the language of forcing allows to bring out the analogies more or less evident between all these distinct principles and to express all of them as forcing axioms.

Second aim: formulate stronger and stronger non constructive principles leveraging on different aspects of the above analogies.

Non-constructive principles for mathematics

A list of five (in some cases apparently unrelated) useful non-constructive principles:

1. The axiom of choice,
2. Baire's category theorem,
3. Large cardinal axioms,
4. Shoenfield's absoluteness,
5. Łoś Theorem for ultrapowers of first orders structures.

First aim: show that the language of forcing allows to bring out the analogies more or less evident between all these distinct principles and to express all of them as forcing axioms.

Second aim: formulate stronger and stronger non constructive principles leveraging on different aspects of the above analogies.

Non-constructive principles for mathematics

A list of five (in some cases apparently unrelated) useful non-constructive principles:

1. The axiom of choice,
2. Baire's category theorem,
3. Large cardinal axioms,
4. Shoenfield's absoluteness,
5. Łoś Theorem for ultrapowers of first orders structures.

First aim: show that the language of forcing allows to bring out the analogies more or less evident between all these distinct principles and to express all of them as forcing axioms.

Second aim: formulate stronger and stronger non constructive principles leveraging on different aspects of the above analogies.

Non-constructive principles for mathematics

A list of five (in some cases apparently unrelated) useful non-constructive principles:

1. The axiom of choice,
2. Baire's category theorem,
3. Large cardinal axioms,
4. Shoenfield's absoluteness,
5. Łoś Theorem for ultrapowers of first orders structures.

First aim: show that the language of forcing allows to bring out the analogies more or less evident between all these distinct principles and to express all of them as forcing axioms.

Second aim: formulate stronger and stronger non constructive principles leveraging on different aspects of the above analogies.

Non-constructive principles for mathematics

A list of five (in some cases apparently unrelated) useful non-constructive principles:

1. The axiom of choice,
2. Baire's category theorem,
3. Large cardinal axioms,
4. Shoenfield's absoluteness,
5. Łoś Theorem for ultrapowers of first orders structures.

First aim: show that the language of forcing allows to bring out the analogies more or less evident between all these distinct principles and to express all of them as forcing axioms.

Second aim: formulate stronger and stronger non constructive principles leveraging on different aspects of the above analogies.

Non-constructive principles for mathematics

A list of five (in some cases apparently unrelated) useful non-constructive principles:

1. The axiom of choice,
2. Baire's category theorem,
3. Large cardinal axioms,
4. Shoenfield's absoluteness,
5. Łoś Theorem for ultrapowers of first orders structures.

First aim: show that the language of forcing allows to bring out the analogies more or less evident between all these distinct principles and to express all of them as forcing axioms.

Second aim: formulate stronger and stronger non constructive principles leveraging on different aspects of the above analogies.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom

This observation has been handled to me by Stevo Todorčević.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom

Definition

Let λ be an infinite cardinal. DC_λ holds if for all sets X and all functions $F : X^{<\lambda} \to P(X)$, there exists $g : \lambda \to X$ such that $g(\alpha) \in F(g \upharpoonright \alpha)$ for all $\alpha < \lambda$.

Fact

The axiom of choice AC is equivalent over ZF to the assertion DC_λ holds for all λ.

This is a local statement, i.e. there is a level by level correspondance between the amount of choice and of dependent choice available in the universe.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom

Definition

Let λ be an infinite cardinal. DC_λ holds if for all sets X and all functions $F : X^{<\lambda} \to P(X)$, there exists $g : \lambda \to X$ such that $g(\alpha) \in F(g \upharpoonright \alpha)$ for all $\alpha < \lambda$.

Fact

The axiom of choice AC is equivalent over ZF to the assertion DC_λ holds for all λ.

This is a local statement, i.e. there is a level by level correspondance between the amount of choice and of dependent choice available in the universe.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom

Definition

Let λ be an infinite cardinal. DC_λ holds if for all sets X and all functions $F : X^{<\lambda} \to P(X)$, there exists $g : \lambda \to X$ such that $g(\alpha) \in F(g \restriction \alpha)$ for all $\alpha < \lambda$.

Fact

The axiom of choice AC *is equivalent over* ZF *to the assertion* DC_λ *holds for all* λ*.*

This is a local statement, i.e. there is a level by level correspondance between the amount of choice and of dependent choice available in the universe.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom

Definition

Let λ be an infinite cardinal. DC_λ holds if for all sets X and all functions $F : X^{<\lambda} \to P(X)$, there exists $g : \lambda \to X$ such that $g(\alpha) \in F(g \restriction \alpha)$ for all $\alpha < \lambda$.

Fact

The axiom of choice AC *is equivalent over* ZF *to the assertion* DC_λ *holds for all* λ.

This is a local statement, i.e. there is a level by level correspondance between the amount of choice and of dependent choice available in the universe.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom

Definition

Let P be a partial order. $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(P)$ holds if for all family $\{D_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ of dense subsets of P, there exists a filter $G \subset P$ which has non-empty intersection with all the D_α.

Let Γ be a class of partial orders. Then $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(\Gamma)$ holds if $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(P)$ holds for all $P \in \Gamma$.

Fact

$\mathrm{DC}_{\aleph_0}$ *is equivalent over* ZF *to the assertion* $\mathrm{FA}_{\aleph_0}(P)$ *holds for all* P*.*

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom

Definition

Let P be a partial order. $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(P)$ holds if for all family $\{D_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ of dense subsets of P, there exists a filter $G \subset P$ which has non-empty intersection with all the D_α.
Let Γ be a class of partial orders. Then $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(\Gamma)$ holds if $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(P)$ holds for all $P \in \Gamma$.

Fact

$\mathrm{DC}_{\aleph_0}$ *is equivalent over* ZF *to the assertion* $\mathrm{FA}_{\aleph_0}(P)$ *holds for all* P.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom

Definition

Let P be a partial order. $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(P)$ holds if for all family $\{D_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ of dense subsets of P, there exists a filter $G \subset P$ which has non-empty intersection with all the D_α.

Let Γ be a class of partial orders. Then $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(\Gamma)$ holds if $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(P)$ holds for all $P \in \Gamma$.

Fact

$\mathrm{DC}_{\aleph_0}$ *is equivalent over* ZF *to the assertion* $\mathrm{FA}_{\aleph_0}(P)$ *holds for all* P.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom.

Sketch of proof. I show just the direction I want to bring forward: Assume $F : X^{<\omega} \to P(X)$ is a function. Let T be the subtree of $X^{<\omega}$ given by finite sequences $s \in X^{<\omega}$ such that $s(i) \in F(s \upharpoonright i)$ for all $i < |s|$. Consider the family given by the dense sets

$$D_n = \{s \in T : |s| > n\}.$$

If G is a filter on T meeting the dense sets of this family, $\cup G$ works.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom.

More generally:

Definition

A partial order P is $< \lambda$-closed if all chains in P of length less than λ have a lower bound.

Let $\mathsf{AC} \upharpoonright \lambda$ abbreviate DC_γ *holds for all* $\gamma < \lambda$ and Γ_λ be the class of $< \lambda$-closed posets.

Fact

DC_λ *is equivalent to* $\mathsf{FA}_\lambda(\Gamma_\lambda)$ *over the theory* $\mathsf{ZF} + \mathsf{AC} \upharpoonright \lambda$.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom.

More generally:

Definition

A partial order P is $<\lambda$-closed if all chains in P of length less than λ have a lower bound.

Let $\mathrm{AC} \upharpoonright \lambda$ abbreviate DC_γ *holds for all* $\gamma < \lambda$ and Γ_λ be the class of $<\lambda$-closed posets.

Fact

DC_λ *is equivalent to* $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(\Gamma_\lambda)$ *over the theory* $\mathrm{ZF} + \mathrm{AC} \upharpoonright \lambda$.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom.

More generally:

Definition

A partial order P is $< \lambda$-closed if all chains in P of length less than λ have a lower bound.

Let $\mathsf{AC} \upharpoonright \lambda$ abbreviate DC_γ *holds for all* $\gamma < \lambda$ and Γ_λ be the class of $< \lambda$-closed posets.

Fact

DC_λ *is equivalent to* $\mathsf{FA}_\lambda(\Gamma_\lambda)$ *over the theory* $\mathsf{ZF} + \mathsf{AC} \upharpoonright \lambda$.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom.

Conclusion:

Fact

The axiom of choice is equivalent over the theory ZF *to the assertion that* $\mathrm{FA}_\lambda(\Gamma_\lambda)$ *holds for all* λ*.*

The usual forcing axioms such as Martin's maximum or the proper forcing axiom are natural strenghtenings of the axiom of choice. They aim to isolate a maximal strengthening of $\mathrm{AC} \restriction \omega_2$ enlarging the family Γ for which $\mathrm{FA}_{\aleph_1}(\Gamma)$ holds.

The axiom of choice is a global forcing axiom.

Conclusion:

Fact

The axiom of choice is equivalent over the theory ZF *to the assertion that* $\mathsf{FA}_\lambda(\Gamma_\lambda)$ *holds for all* λ.

The usual forcing axioms such as Martin's maximum or the proper forcing axiom are natural strenghtenings of the axiom of choice. They aim to isolate a maximal strengthening of $\mathsf{AC} \restriction \omega_2$ enlarging the family Γ for which $\mathsf{FA}_{\aleph_1}(\Gamma)$ holds.

Baire's category theorem is a forcing axiom

Theorem (BCT)

Assume (X, τ) is compact and Hausdorff. Let $\{D_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a family of dense open subsets of X. Then $\bigcap_{n\in\omega} D_n$ is non-empty.

Fact

$\mathrm{FA}_{\aleph_0}(P)$ *for all forcing P entails* BCT.

Baire's category theorem is a forcing axiom

Theorem (BCT)

Assume (X, τ) is compact and Hausdorff. Let $\{D_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a family of dense open subsets of X. Then $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} D_n$ is non-empty.

Fact

$\mathsf{FA}_{\aleph_0}(P)$ *for all forcing P entails* BCT.

Proof.

Let (X, τ) compact Hausdorff and $\{D_n : n \in \omega\}$ a family of dense open subsets of X.
Let $(P, \leq_P) = (\tau \setminus \{\emptyset\}, \subseteq)$ and

$$E_n = \{A \in \tau : \overline{A} \subseteq D_n\}.$$

Each E_n is a dense subset of P. Let G be a filter on P with $G \cap E_n \neq \emptyset$ for all n. By compactness of X

$$\emptyset \neq \bigcap \{\mathrm{Cl}(A) : A \in G\} \subseteq \bigcap_{n \in \omega} D_n.$$

□

Proof.

Let (X, τ) compact Hausdorff and $\{D_n : n \in \omega\}$ a family of dense open subsets of X.
Let $(P, \leq_P) = (\tau \setminus \{\emptyset\}, \subseteq)$ and

$$E_n = \{A \in \tau : \overline{A} \subseteq D_n\}.$$

Each E_n is a dense subset of P. Let G be a filter on P with $G \cap E_n \neq \emptyset$ for all n. By compactness of X

$$\emptyset \neq \bigcap \{\mathrm{Cl}(A) : A \in G\} \subseteq \bigcap_{n \in \omega} D_n.$$

□

More general forcing axioms

Fact

Let G be a filter on a poset P and $X \subseteq P$. Then $G \cap X$ is non-empty iff $G \cap \downarrow X$ is non-empty.

Hence G meets a predense set A iff it meets the dense open set $\downarrow A$.

Definition

Given a poset P and a property ϕ, $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(P)$ holds if

> *For all $\mathcal{D}$ collection of predense subsets of P such that $\phi(\mathcal{D})$ holds, there exists G filter on P such that $G \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for all $X \in \mathcal{D}$.*

$\mathrm{FA}_\kappa(P)$ stands for $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(P)$ where
$\phi(\mathcal{D}) \equiv |\mathcal{D}| = \kappa$ *and each* $D \in \mathcal{D}$ *is predense.*
$\mathrm{BFA}_{\omega_1}(P)$ stands for $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(\mathrm{RO}(P))$ where
$\phi(\mathcal{D}) \equiv |\mathcal{D}| = \omega_1$ *and each* $D \in \mathcal{D}$ *is a predense subset of* $\mathrm{RO}(P)$ *of size* ω_1.

More general forcing axioms

Fact

Let G be a filter on a poset P and $X \subseteq P$. Then $G \cap X$ is non-empty iff $G \cap \downarrow X$ is non-empty.

Hence G meets a predense set A iff it meets the dense open set $\downarrow A$.

Definition

Given a poset P and a property ϕ, $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(P)$ holds if

> *For all $\mathcal{D}$ collection of predense subsets of P such that $\phi(\mathcal{D})$ holds, there exists G filter on P such that $G \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for all $X \in \mathcal{D}$.*

$\mathsf{FA}_\kappa(P)$ stands for $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(P)$ where
$\phi(\mathcal{D}) \equiv |\mathcal{D}| = \kappa$ *and each $D \in \mathcal{D}$ is predense.*
$\mathsf{BFA}_{\omega_1}(P)$ stands for $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(\mathrm{RO}(P))$ where
$\phi(\mathcal{D}) \equiv |\mathcal{D}| = \omega_1$ *and each $D \in \mathcal{D}$ is a predense subset of $\mathrm{RO}(P)$ of size ω_1.*

More general forcing axioms

Fact

Let G be a filter on a poset P and $X \subseteq P$. Then $G \cap X$ is non-empty iff $G \cap \downarrow X$ is non-empty.

Hence G meets a predense set A iff it meets the dense open set $\downarrow A$.

Definition

Given a poset P and a property ϕ, $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(P)$ holds if

> *For all $\mathcal{D}$ collection of predense subsets of P such that $\phi(\mathcal{D})$ holds, there exists G filter on P such that $G \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for all $X \in \mathcal{D}$.*

$\mathrm{FA}_\kappa(P)$ stands for $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(P)$ where $\phi(\mathcal{D}) \equiv |\mathcal{D}| = \kappa$ *and each* $D \in \mathcal{D}$ *is predense.*

$\mathrm{BFA}_{\omega_1}(P)$ stands for $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(\mathrm{RO}(P))$ where $\phi(\mathcal{D}) \equiv |\mathcal{D}| = \omega_1$ *and each* $D \in \mathcal{D}$ *is a predense subset of* $\mathrm{RO}(P)$ *of size* ω_1.

More general forcing axioms

Fact

Let G be a filter on a poset P and $X \subseteq P$. Then $G \cap X$ is non-empty iff $G \cap \downarrow X$ is non-empty.

Hence G meets a predense set A iff it meets the dense open set $\downarrow A$.

Definition

Given a poset P and a property ϕ, $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(P)$ holds if

> *For all $\mathcal{D}$ collection of predense subsets of P such that $\phi(\mathcal{D})$ holds, there exists G filter on P such that $G \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for all $X \in \mathcal{D}$.*

$\mathrm{FA}_\kappa(P)$ stands for $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(P)$ where
$\phi(\mathcal{D}) \equiv |\mathcal{D}| = \kappa$ *and each* $D \in \mathcal{D}$ *is predense.*

$\mathrm{BFA}_{\omega_1}(P)$ stands for $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(\mathrm{RO}(P))$ where
$\phi(\mathcal{D}) \equiv |\mathcal{D}| = \omega_1$ *and each* $D \in \mathcal{D}$ *is a predense subset of* $\mathrm{RO}(P)$ *of size* ω_1.

More general forcing axioms

Fact

Let G be a filter on a poset P and $X \subseteq P$. Then $G \cap X$ is non-empty iff $G \cap \downarrow X$ is non-empty.

Hence G meets a predense set A iff it meets the dense open set $\downarrow A$.

Definition

Given a poset P and a property ϕ, $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(P)$ holds if

> *For all $\mathcal{D}$ collection of predense subsets of P such that $\phi(\mathcal{D})$ holds, there exists G filter on P such that $G \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for all $X \in \mathcal{D}$.*

$\mathrm{FA}_\kappa(P)$ stands for $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(P)$ where
$\phi(\mathcal{D}) \equiv |\mathcal{D}| = \kappa$ *and each* $D \in \mathcal{D}$ *is predense.*
$\mathrm{BFA}_{\omega_1}(P)$ stands for $\mathrm{FA}_\phi(\mathrm{RO}(P))$ where
$\phi(\mathcal{D}) \equiv |\mathcal{D}| = \omega_1$ *and each* $D \in \mathcal{D}$ *is a predense subset of* $\mathrm{RO}(P)$ *of size* ω_1.

Large cardinals as forcing axioms

Given a cardinal κ,

- I_κ is the ideal of bounded subsets of κ,
- $\mathcal{A}_\kappa$ is the family of maximal antichains of size less than κ in $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa}$.

Definition

κ is measurable iff there is a ultrafilter $G \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa}$ such that $G \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_\kappa$.

I.e. κ is measurable if $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa})$, where $\phi(\mathcal{D})$ stands for $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{A}_\kappa$.
Cofinally many large cardinal properties of κ can be formulated as forcing axiom of the type $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\lambda))/_{J_{\kappa,\lambda}})$, choosing ϕ and $J_{\kappa,\lambda}$ suitably.
for example supercompact, huge, extendible, n-huge, I_1, etc......

Large cardinals as forcing axioms

Given a cardinal κ,

- I_κ is the ideal of bounded subsets of κ,
- $\mathcal{A}_\kappa$ is the family of maximal antichains of size less than κ in $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa}$.

Definition

κ is measurable iff there is a ultrafilter $G \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa}$ such that $G \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_\kappa$.

I.e. κ is measurable if $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa})$, where $\phi(\mathcal{D})$ stands for $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{A}_\kappa$.
Cofinally many large cardinal properties of κ can be formulated as forcing axiom of the type $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\lambda))/_{J_{\kappa,\lambda}})$, choosing ϕ and $J_{\kappa,\lambda}$ suitably.
for example supercompact, huge, extendible, n-huge, I_1, etc......

Large cardinals as forcing axioms

Given a cardinal κ,

- I_κ is the ideal of bounded subsets of κ,
- $\mathcal{A}_\kappa$ is the family of maximal antichains of size less than κ in $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa}$.

Definition

κ is measurable iff there is a ultrafilter $G \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa}$ such that $G \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_\kappa$.

I.e. κ is measurable if $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa})$, where $\phi(\mathcal{D})$ stands for $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{A}_\kappa$.
Cofinally many large cardinal properties of κ can be formulated as forcing axiom of the type $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\lambda))/_{J_{\kappa,\lambda}})$, choosing ϕ and $J_{\kappa,\lambda}$ suitably.
for example supercompact, huge, extendible, n-huge, I_1, etc......

Large cardinals as forcing axioms

Given a cardinal κ,

- I_κ is the ideal of bounded subsets of κ,
- $\mathcal{A}_\kappa$ is the family of maximal antichains of size less than κ in $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa}$.

Definition

κ is measurable iff there is a ultrafilter $G \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa}$ such that $G \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_\kappa$.

I.e. κ is measurable if $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/_{I_\kappa})$, where $\phi(\mathcal{D})$ stands for $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{A}_\kappa$.
Cofinally many large cardinal properties of κ can be formulated as forcing axiom of the type $\mathsf{FA}_\phi(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\lambda))/_{J_{\kappa,\lambda}})$, choosing ϕ and $J_{\kappa,\lambda}$ suitably.
for example supercompact, huge, extendible, n-huge, I_1, etc......

Łoś theorem

Theorem

Let $\{\mathfrak{M}_l = (M_l, R_l) : l \in L\}$ be first oreder models for $\mathcal{L} = \{R\}$. Let $G \subseteq \mathcal{P}(L)$ be a ultrafilter on L. Set

- $[f]_G = [h]_G$ *iff* $\{l \in L : f(l) = h(l))\} \in G$,
- $\bar{R}([f_1]_G, \ldots, [f_n]_G)$ *iff* $\{l \in L : R_l(f_1(l), \ldots, f_n(l))\} \in G$.

Then:

1. *For all* $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ $(\prod_{l \in L} M_l/G, \bar{R}) \models \phi([f_1]_G, \ldots, [f_n]_G)$ *if and only if* $\{l \in L : \mathfrak{M}_l \models \phi(f_1(l), \ldots, f_n(l))\} \in G$.
2. *If* $\mathfrak{M}_l = \mathfrak{M}$ *for all* $l \in L$, $M \prec \prod_{l \in L} M_l/G$ *as witnessed by the map* $m \mapsto [c_m]_G$ *(where* $c_m : L \to M$ *is constant with value* m*).*

Łoś theorem

Theorem

Let $\{\mathfrak{M}_l = (M_l, R_l) : l \in L\}$ be first oreder models for $\mathcal{L} = \{R\}$. Let $G \subseteq \mathcal{P}(L)$ be a ultrafilter on L. Set

- $[f]_G = [h]_G$ *iff* $\{l \in L : f(l) = h(l))\} \in G$,
- $\bar{R}([f_1]_G, \ldots, [f_n]_G)$ *iff* $\{l \in L : R_l(f_1(l), \ldots, f_n(l))\} \in G$.

Then:

1. *For all* $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ $(\prod_{l \in L} M_l/G, \bar{R}) \models \phi([f_1]_G, \ldots, [f_n]_G)$ *if and only if* $\{l \in L : \mathfrak{M}_l \models \phi(f_1(l), \ldots, f_n(l))\} \in G$.
2. *If* $\mathfrak{M}_l = \mathfrak{M}$ *for all* $l \in L$, $M \prec \prod_{l \in L} M_l/G$ *as witnessed by the map* $m \mapsto [c_m]_G$ *(where* $c_m : L \to M$ *is constant with value* m*).*

Łoś theorem

Theorem

Let $\{\mathfrak{M}_l = (M_l, R_l) : l \in L\}$ be first oreder models for $\mathcal{L} = \{R\}$. Let $G \subseteq \mathcal{P}(L)$ be a ultrafilter on L. Set

- $[f]_G = [h]_G$ *iff* $\{l \in L : f(l) = h(l))\} \in G$,
- $\bar{R}([f_1]_G, \ldots, [f_n]_G)$ *iff* $\{l \in L : R_l(f_1(l), \ldots, f_n(l))\} \in G$.

Then:

1. *For all* $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ $(\prod_{l \in L} M_l/G, \bar{R}) \models \phi([f_1]_G, \ldots, [f_n]_G)$ *if and only if* $\{l \in L : \mathfrak{M}_l \models \phi(f_1(l), \ldots, f_n(l))\} \in G$.
2. *If* $\mathfrak{M}_l = \mathfrak{M}$ *for all* $l \in L$, $M \prec \prod_{l \in L} M_l/G$ *as witnessed by the map* $m \mapsto [c_m]_G$ *(where* $c_m : L \to M$ *is constant with value* m*).*

Recall on boolean algebras and Stone spaces

Given a boolean algebra B:

- St(B) is given by its ultrafilters G.
- St(B) is endowed with a *compact, Hausdorff* topology τ_{B} whose clopens are $N_b = \{G \in \mathrm{St}(\mathrm{B}) : b \in G\}$.
- The map $b \mapsto N_b$ defines a natural isomorphism of B with the boolean algebra CLOP(St(B)) of clopen subset of St(B).

- B is *complete* if and only if $\mathrm{CLOP}(\mathrm{St}(\mathrm{B})) = \mathrm{RO}(\mathrm{St}(\mathrm{B}), \tau_{\mathrm{B}}) \cong \mathrm{B}$.
- Spaces X satisfying the property that its regular open sets are closed are *extremally (or extremely) disconnected.*
- $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is a complete boolean algebra, and $\beta(X) = \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the Stone-Cech compactification of X with discrete topology and is extremally disconnected.

Recall on boolean algebras and Stone spaces

Given a boolean algebra B:

- St(B) is given by its ultrafilters G.
- St(B) is endowed with a *compact, Hausdorff* topology τ_{B} whose clopens are $N_b = \{G \in \mathrm{St}(\mathrm{B}) : b \in G\}$.
- The map $b \mapsto N_b$ defines a natural isomorphism of B with the boolean algebra CLOP(St(B)) of clopen subset of St(B).

- B is *complete* if and only if $\mathrm{CLOP}(\mathrm{St}(\mathrm{B})) = \mathrm{RO}(\mathrm{St}(\mathrm{B}), \tau_{\mathrm{B}}) \cong \mathrm{B}$.
- Spaces X satisfying the property that its regular open sets are closed are *extremally (or extremely) disconnected.*
- $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is a complete boolean algebra, and $\beta(X) = \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the Stone-Cech compactification of X with discrete topology and is extremally disconnected.

Recall on boolean algebras and Stone spaces

Given a boolean algebra B:

- St(B) is given by its ultrafilters G.
- St(B) is endowed with a *compact, Hausdorff* topology τ_{B} whose clopens are $N_b = \{G \in \mathrm{St(B)} : b \in G\}$.
- The map $b \mapsto N_b$ defines a natural isomorphism of B with the boolean algebra CLOP(St(B)) of clopen subset of St(B).

- B is *complete* if and only if $\mathrm{CLOP(St(B))} = \mathrm{RO(St(B)}, \tau_{\mathrm{B}}) \cong \mathrm{B}$.
- Spaces X satisfying the property that its regular open sets are closed are *extremally (or extremely) disconnected*.
- $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is a complete boolean algebra, and $\beta(X) = \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the Stone-Cech compactification of X with discrete topology and is extremally disconnected.

Recall on boolean algebras and Stone spaces

Given a boolean algebra B:

- St(B) is given by its ultrafilters G.
- St(B) is endowed with a *compact, Hausdorff* topology τ_{B} whose clopens are $N_b = \{G \in \mathrm{St(B)} : b \in G\}$.
- The map $b \mapsto N_b$ defines a natural isomorphism of B with the boolean algebra CLOP(St(B)) of clopen subset of St(B).

- B is *complete* if and only if $\mathrm{CLOP(St(B))} = \mathrm{RO}(\mathrm{St(B)}, \tau_{\mathrm{B}}) \cong \mathrm{B}$.
- Spaces X satisfying the property that its regular open sets are closed are *extremally (or extremely) disconnected*.
- $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is a complete boolean algebra, and $\beta(X) = \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the Stone-Cech compactification of X with discrete topology and is extremally disconnected.

Boolean valued models

Definition

Let B be a *cba* and a $\mathcal{L}$ be first order *relational* language.
A B-*valued model* for $\mathcal{L}$ is a tuple
$\mathcal{M} = \langle M, =^{\mathcal{M}}, R_i^{\mathcal{M}} : i \in I, c_j^{\mathcal{M}} : j \in J \rangle$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
=^{\mathcal{M}} &: M^2 \to \mathsf{B} \\
&(\tau, \sigma) \mapsto [\![\tau = \sigma]\!]_{\mathsf{B}}^{\mathcal{M}} = [\![\tau = \sigma]\!],
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^{\mathcal{M}} &: M^n \to \mathsf{B} \\
(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n) &\mapsto [\![R(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)]\!]_{\mathsf{B}}^{\mathcal{M}} = [\![R(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)]\!]
\end{aligned}
$$

for $R \in \mathcal{L}$ an n-ary relation symbol.

Boolean valued models

Definition

Let B be a *cba* and a $\mathcal{L}$ be first order *relational* language.
A B-*valued model* for $\mathcal{L}$ is a tuple
$\mathcal{M} = \langle M, =^{\mathcal{M}}, R_i^{\mathcal{M}} : i \in I, c_j^{\mathcal{M}} : j \in J\rangle$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
=^{\mathcal{M}} &: M^2 \to \mathsf{B} \\
(\tau, \sigma) &\mapsto [\![\tau = \sigma]\!]^{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathsf{B}} = [\![\tau = \sigma]\!] \,,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^{\mathcal{M}} &: M^n \to \mathsf{B} \\
(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) &\mapsto [\![R(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)]\!]^{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathsf{B}} = [\![R(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)]\!]
\end{aligned}
$$

for $R \in \mathcal{L}$ an n-ary relation symbol.

Forcing relations on boolean valued models

The constraints on $R^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $=^{\mathcal{M}}$ are the following:

- for $\tau, \sigma, \chi \in M$,
  1. $[\![\tau = \tau]\!] = 1_{\mathsf{B}}$;
  2. $[\![\tau = \sigma]\!] = [\![\sigma = \tau]\!]$;
  3. $[\![\tau = \sigma]\!] \wedge [\![\sigma = \chi]\!] \leq [\![\tau = \chi]\!]$;
- for $R \in \mathcal{L}$ with arity n, and $(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n), (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n) \in M^n$,

$$[\![R(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)]\!] \wedge \bigwedge_{h \in \{1, \ldots, n\}} [\![\tau_h = \sigma_h]\!] \leq [\![R(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n)]\!] .$$

Forcing relations on boolean valued models

The constraints on $R^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $=^{\mathcal{M}}$ are the following:

- for $\tau, \sigma, \chi \in M$,
  1. $[\![\tau = \tau]\!] = 1_{\mathsf{B}}$;
  2. $[\![\tau = \sigma]\!] = [\![\sigma = \tau]\!]$;
  3. $[\![\tau = \sigma]\!] \wedge [\![\sigma = \chi]\!] \leq [\![\tau = \chi]\!]$;
- for $R \in \mathcal{L}$ with arity n, and $(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n), (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n) \in M^n$,

$$[\![R(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)]\!] \wedge \bigwedge_{h \in \{1,\ldots,n\}} [\![\tau_h = \sigma_h]\!] \leq [\![R(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n)]\!].$$

Forcing relations on boolean valued models

The constraints on $R^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $=^{\mathcal{M}}$ are the following:

- for $\tau, \sigma, \chi \in M$,
  1. $[\![\tau = \tau]\!] = 1_{\mathsf{B}}$;
  2. $[\![\tau = \sigma]\!] = [\![\sigma = \tau]\!]$;
  3. $[\![\tau = \sigma]\!] \wedge [\![\sigma = \chi]\!] \leq [\![\tau = \chi]\!]$;
- for $R \in \mathcal{L}$ with arity n, and $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n), (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in M^n$,

$$[\![R(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)]\!] \wedge \bigwedge_{h \in \{1,\dots,n\}} [\![\tau_h = \sigma_h]\!] \leq [\![R(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)]\!].$$

Boolean valued semantics

Definition

Let $\langle M, =^{\mathcal{M}}, R^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle$ be a B-valued model in the relational language $\mathcal{L} = \{R\}$, $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ a $\mathcal{L}$-formula with displayed free variables, ν : free variables $\to M$.

$[\![\phi]\!]_{\mathsf{B}}^{\mathcal{M},\nu} = [\![\phi]\!]$, the *boolean value* of ϕ with the assignment ν is defined by recursion as follows:

- $[\![t = s]\!] = [\![\nu(t) = \nu(s)]\!]$,
  $[\![R(t_1, \ldots, t_n)]\!] = [\![R(\nu(t_1), \ldots, \nu(t_n))]\!]$;
- $[\![\neg\psi]\!] = \neg [\![\psi]\!]$;
- $[\![\psi \wedge \theta]\!] = [\![\psi]\!] \wedge [\![\theta]\!]$;
- $[\![\exists y \psi(y)]\!] = \bigvee_{\tau \in M} [\![\psi(y/\tau)]\!]$.

Boolean valued semantics

Definition

Let $\langle M, =^{\mathcal{M}}, R^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle$ be a B-valued model in the relational language $\mathcal{L} = \{R\}$, $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ a $\mathcal{L}$-formula with displayed free variables, ν : free variables $\rightarrow M$.

$[\![\phi]\!]_{\mathsf{B}}^{\mathcal{M},\nu} = [\![\phi]\!]$, the *boolean value* of ϕ with the assignment ν is defined by recursion as follows:

- $[\![t = s]\!] = [\![\nu(t) = \nu(s)]\!]$,
  $[\![R(t_1, \ldots, t_n)]\!] = [\![R(\nu(t_1), \ldots, \nu(t_n))]\!]$;
- $[\![\neg\psi]\!] = \neg [\![\psi]\!]$;
- $[\![\psi \wedge \theta]\!] = [\![\psi]\!] \wedge [\![\theta]\!]$;
- $[\![\exists y \psi(y)]\!] = \bigvee_{\tau \in M} [\![\psi(y/\tau)]\!]$.

Boolean valued semantics

Definition

Let $\langle M, =^{\mathcal{M}}, R^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle$ be a B-valued model in the relational language $\mathcal{L} = \{R\}$, $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ a $\mathcal{L}$-formula with displayed free variables, ν : free variables $\rightarrow M$.

$[\![\phi]\!]_{\mathsf{B}}^{\mathcal{M},\nu} = [\![\phi]\!]$, the *boolean value* of ϕ with the assignment ν is defined by recursion as follows:

- $[\![t = s]\!] = [\![\nu(t) = \nu(s)]\!]$,
  $[\![R(t_1, \ldots, t_n)]\!] = [\![R(\nu(t_1), \ldots, \nu(t_n))]\!]$;
- $[\![\neg\psi]\!] = \neg\,[\![\psi]\!]$;
- $[\![\psi \wedge \theta]\!] = [\![\psi]\!] \wedge [\![\theta]\!]$;
- $[\![\exists y\psi(y)]\!] = \bigvee_{\tau\in M} [\![\psi(y/\tau)]\!]$.

Soundness Theorem for B-valued semantics

Theorem (Soundness Theorem)

Assume $\mathcal{L}$ is a relational language and ϕ is a $\mathcal{L}$-formula which is syntactically provable by a $\mathcal{L}$-theory T.
Assume each formula in T has boolean value at least $b \in \mathsf{B}$ in a B-valued model $\mathcal{M}$ with valuation ν.
Then $[\![\phi]\!]_{\mathsf{B}}^{\mathcal{M},\nu} \geq b$ as well.

The completeness theorem is automatic given that 2 is a complete boolean algebra.

Soundness Theorem for B-valued semantics

Theorem (Soundness Theorem)

Assume $\mathcal{L}$ is a relational language and ϕ is a $\mathcal{L}$-formula which is syntactically provable by a $\mathcal{L}$-theory T.
Assume each formula in T has boolean value at least $b \in \mathsf{B}$ in a B-valued model $\mathcal{M}$ with valuation ν.
Then $[\![\phi]\!]_{\mathsf{B}}^{\mathcal{M},\nu} \geq b$ as well.

The completeness theorem is automatic given that 2 is a complete boolean algebra.

Tarski quotient of B-valued models

Definition

Let B be a *cba*, $\mathcal{M}$ a B-valued model for $\mathcal{L}$, and G a ultrafilter over B. Consider the following equivalence relation on M:

$$\tau \equiv_G \sigma \Leftrightarrow [\![\tau = \sigma]\!] \in G$$

The first order (Tarski) model $\mathcal{M}/_G = \langle M/_G, R_i^{\mathcal{M}/_G} : i \in I, c_j^{\mathcal{M}/G} : j \in J \rangle$ is defined letting:

- For any n-ary relation symbol R in $\mathcal{L}$

$$R^{\mathcal{M}/G} = \{([\tau_1]_G, \ldots, [\tau_n]_G) \in (M/_G)^n : [\![R(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)]\!] \in G\}.$$

- For any constant symbol c in $\mathcal{L}$

$$c^{\mathcal{M}/G} = [c^{\mathcal{M}}]_G.$$

Tarski quotient of B-valued models

Definition

Let B be a *cba*, $\mathcal{M}$ a B-valued model for $\mathcal{L}$, and G a ultrafilter over B. Consider the following equivalence relation on M:

$$\tau \equiv_G \sigma \Leftrightarrow [\![\tau = \sigma]\!] \in G$$

The first order (Tarski) model $\mathcal{M}/_G = \langle M/_G, R_i^{\mathcal{M}/_G} : i \in I, c_j^{\mathcal{M}/G} : j \in J\rangle$ is defined letting:

- For any n-ary relation symbol R in $\mathcal{L}$

$$R^{\mathcal{M}/G} = \{([\tau_1]_G, \ldots, [\tau_n]_G) \in (M/_G)^n : [\![R(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)]\!] \in G\}.$$

- For any constant symbol c in $\mathcal{L}$

$$c^{\mathcal{M}/G} = [c^{\mathcal{M}}]_G.$$

Full B-valued models

Definition

A B-valued model $\mathcal{M}$ for the language $\mathcal{L}$ is *full* if for every $\mathcal{L}$-formula $\phi(x, \bar{y})$ and every $\bar{\tau} \in M^{|\bar{y}|}$ there is a $\sigma \in M$ such that

$$[\![\exists x \phi(x, \bar{\tau})]\!] = [\![\phi(\sigma, \bar{\tau})]\!]$$

Boolean valued Łoś Theorem — Forcing theorem

Theorem (B-valued Łoś's Theorem — Forcing theorem)

Assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a full B*-valued model for the relational language $\mathcal{L}$. Then for every formula $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ in $\mathcal{L}$ and $(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n) \in M^n$:*

1. *For all ultrafilters G over* B*, $\mathcal{M}/G \models \phi([\tau_1]_G, \ldots, [\tau_n]_G)$ if and only if $[\![\phi(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)]\!] \in G$.*
2. *For all $a \in$ B the following are equivalent:*
   1. $[\![\phi(f_1, \ldots, f_n)]\!] \geq a$,
   2. $\mathcal{M}/G \models \phi([\tau_1]_G, \ldots, [\tau_n]_G)$ *for all $G \in N_a$,*
   3. $\mathcal{M}/G \models \phi([\tau_1]_G, \ldots, [\tau_n]_G)$ *for densely many $G \in N_a$.*

Łoś's Theorem versus boolean valued Łoś's Theorem

Fact

Let $(M_x : x \in X)$ be a family of Tarski-models in the first order relational language $\mathcal{L}$. Then $N = \prod_{x \in X} M_x$ is a full $\mathcal{P}(X)$-model, letting for each n-ary relation symbol $R \in \mathcal{L}$,
$[\![R(f_1, \ldots, f_n)]\!]_{\mathcal{P}(X)} = \{x \in X : M_x \models R(f_1(x), \ldots, f_n(x))\}$.

Let G be any non-principal ultrafilter on X. Then the Tarski quotient N/G is the familiar ultraproduct of the family $(M_x : x \in X)$ by G.

> *The usual Łoś theorem for ultraproducts of Tarski models is the specialization to the case of the full $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued model N of the boolean valued Łoś theorem.*
>
> *If N is an ultrapower of a model M, the embedding $a \mapsto [c_a]_G$ (where $c_a(x) = a$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in M$) is elementary.*

Łoś's Theorem versus boolean valued Łoś's Theorem

Fact

Let $(M_x : x \in X)$ be a family of Tarski-models in the first order relational language $\mathcal{L}$. Then $N = \prod_{x \in X} M_x$ is a full $\mathcal{P}(X)$-model, letting for each n-ary relation symbol $R \in \mathcal{L}$,
$[\![R(f_1, \ldots, f_n)]\!]_{\mathcal{P}(X)} = \{x \in X : M_x \models R(f_1(x), \ldots, f_n(x))\}$.

Let G be any non-principal ultrafilter on X. Then the Tarski quotient N/G is the familiar ultraproduct of the family $(M_x : x \in X)$ by G.

The usual Łoś theorem for ultraproducts of Tarski models is the specialization to the case of the full $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued model N of the boolean valued Łoś theorem.

If N is an ultrapower of a model M, the embedding $a \mapsto [c_a]_G$ (where $c_a(x) = a$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in M$) is elementary.

Łoś's Theorem versus boolean valued Łoś's Theorem

Fact

Let $(M_x : x \in X)$ be a family of Tarski-models in the first order relational language $\mathcal{L}$. Then $N = \prod_{x \in X} M_x$ is a full $\mathcal{P}(X)$-model, letting for each n-ary relation symbol $R \in \mathcal{L}$,
$[\![R(f_1, \ldots, f_n)]\!]_{\mathcal{P}(X)} = \{x \in X : M_x \models R(f_1(x), \ldots, f_n(x))\}$.

Let G be any non-principal ultrafilter on X. Then the Tarski quotient N/G is the familiar ultraproduct of the family $(M_x : x \in X)$ by G.

> *The usual Łoś theorem for ultraproducts of Tarski models is the specialization to the case of the full $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued model N of the boolean valued Łoś theorem.*

> *If N is an ultrapower of a model M, the embedding $a \mapsto [c_a]_G$ (where $c_a(x) = a$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in M$) is elementary.*

Łoś's Theorem versus boolean valued Łoś's Theorem

Fact

Let $(M_x : x \in X)$ be a family of Tarski-models in the first order relational language $\mathcal{L}$. Then $N = \prod_{x \in X} M_x$ is a full $\mathcal{P}(X)$-model, letting for each n-ary relation symbol $R \in \mathcal{L}$,
$[\![R(f_1, \ldots, f_n)]\!]_{\mathcal{P}(X)} = \{x \in X : M_x \models R(f_1(x), \ldots, f_n(x))\}$.

Let G be any non-principal ultrafilter on X. Then the Tarski quotient N/G is the familiar ultraproduct of the family $(M_x : x \in X)$ by G.

> *The usual Łoś theorem for ultraproducts of Tarski models is the specialization to the case of the full $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued model N of the boolean valued Łoś theorem.*
>
> *If N is an ultrapower of a model M, the embedding $a \mapsto [c_a]_G$ (where $c_a(x) = a$ for all $x \in X$ and $a \in M$) is elementary.*

Boolean ultrapowers of compact Hausdorff spaces

Let X be a set with the discrete topology.

- For $a \in X$, $G_a \in \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the principal ultrafilter of supersets of $\{a\}$.
- The map $a \mapsto G_a$ embeds X as an open, dense, discrete subspace of $\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$.
- For any space (Y, τ), any $f : X \to Y$ is continuous. (since X has the discrete topology)

Moreover if Y is compact Hausdorff:

- $f : X \to Y$ induces a unique continuous extension $\bar{f} : \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)) \to Y$. ($\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is also the Stone-Cech compactification of X).
- $C(X, Y) = Y^X$ is canonically isomorphic to $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y)$.
- $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y) \cong Y^X$ can be endowed of the structure of a $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued *elementary* extension of Y for any first order structure on Y.

What if we replace $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with an arbitrary (complete) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of compact Hausdorff spaces

Let X be a set with the discrete topology.

- For $a \in X$, $G_a \in \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the principal ultrafilter of supersets of $\{a\}$.
- The map $a \mapsto G_a$ embeds X as an open, dense, discrete subspace of $\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$.
- For any space (Y, τ), any $f : X \to Y$ is continuous. (since X has the discrete topology)

Moreover if Y is compact Hausdorff:

- $f : X \to Y$ induces a unique continuous extension $\bar{f} : \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)) \to Y$. ($\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is also the Stone-Cech compactification of X).
- $C(X, Y) = Y^X$ is canonically isomorphic to $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y)$.
- $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y) \cong Y^X$ can be endowed of the structure of a $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued *elementary* extension of Y for any first order structure on Y.

What if we replace $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with an arbitrary (complete) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of compact Hausdorff spaces

Let X be a set with the discrete topology.

- For $a \in X$, $G_a \in \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the principal ultrafilter of supersets of $\{a\}$.
- The map $a \mapsto G_a$ embeds X as an open, dense, discrete subspace of $\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$.
- For any space (Y, τ), any $f : X \to Y$ is continuous. (since X has the discrete topology)

Moreover if Y is compact Hausdorff:

- $f : X \to Y$ induces a unique continuous extension $\bar{f} : \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)) \to Y$. ($\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is also the Stone-Cech compactification of X).
- $C(X, Y) = Y^X$ is canonically isomorphic to $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y)$.
- $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y) \cong Y^X$ can be endowed of the structure of a $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued *elementary* extension of Y for any first order structure on Y.

What if we replace $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with an arbitrary (complete) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of compact Hausdorff spaces

Let X be a set with the discrete topology.

- For $a \in X$, $G_a \in \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the principal ultrafilter of supersets of $\{a\}$.
- The map $a \mapsto G_a$ embeds X as an open, dense, discrete subspace of $\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$.
- For any space (Y, τ), any $f : X \to Y$ is continuous. (since X has the discrete topology)

Moreover if Y is compact Hausdorff:

- $f : X \to Y$ induces a unique continuous extension $\bar{f} : \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)) \to Y$. ($\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is also the Stone-Cech compactification of X).
- $C(X, Y) = Y^X$ is canonically isomorphic to $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y)$.
- $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y) \cong Y^X$ can be endowed of the structure of a $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued *elementary* extension of Y for any first order structure on Y.

What if we replace $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with an arbitrary (complete) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of compact Hausdorff spaces

Let X be a set with the discrete topology.

- For $a \in X$, $G_a \in \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the principal ultrafilter of supersets of $\{a\}$.
- The map $a \mapsto G_a$ embeds X as an open, dense, discrete subspace of $\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$.
- For any space (Y, τ), any $f : X \to Y$ is continuous. (since X has the discrete topology)

Moreover if Y is compact Hausdorff:

- $f : X \to Y$ induces a unique continuous extension $\bar{f} : \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)) \to Y$. ($\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is also the Stone-Cech compactification of X).
- $C(X, Y) = Y^X$ is canonically isomorphic to $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y)$.
- $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y) \cong Y^X$ can be endowed of the structure of a $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued *elementary* extension of Y for any first order structure on Y.

What if we replace $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with an arbitrary (complete) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of compact Hausdorff spaces

Let X be a set with the discrete topology.

- For $a \in X$, $G_a \in \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the principal ultrafilter of supersets of $\{a\}$.
- The map $a \mapsto G_a$ embeds X as an open, dense, discrete subspace of $\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$.
- For any space (Y, τ), any $f : X \to Y$ is continuous. (since X has the discrete topology)

Moreover if Y is compact Hausdorff:

- $f : X \to Y$ induces a unique continuous extension $\bar{f} : \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)) \to Y$. ($\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is also the Stone-Cech compactification of X).
- $C(X, Y) = Y^X$ is canonically isomorphic to $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y)$.
- $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y) \cong Y^X$ can be endowed of the structure of a $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued *elementary* extension of Y for any first order structure on Y.

What if we replace $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with an arbitrary (complete) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of compact Hausdorff spaces

Let X be a set with the discrete topology.

- For $a \in X$, $G_a \in \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the principal ultrafilter of supersets of $\{a\}$.
- The map $a \mapsto G_a$ embeds X as an open, dense, discrete subspace of $\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$.
- For any space (Y, τ), any $f : X \to Y$ is continuous. (since X has the discrete topology)

Moreover if Y is compact Hausdorff:

- $f : X \to Y$ induces a unique continuous extension $\bar{f} : \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)) \to Y$. ($\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is also the Stone-Cech compactification of X).
- $C(X, Y) = Y^X$ is canonically isomorphic to $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y)$.
- $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y) \cong Y^X$ can be endowed of the structure of a $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued *elementary* extension of Y for any first order structure on Y.

What if we replace $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with an arbitrary (complete) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of compact Hausdorff spaces

Let X be a set with the discrete topology.

- For $a \in X$, $G_a \in \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is the principal ultrafilter of supersets of $\{a\}$.
- The map $a \mapsto G_a$ embeds X as an open, dense, discrete subspace of $\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$.
- For any space (Y, τ), any $f : X \to Y$ is continuous. (since X has the discrete topology)

Moreover if Y is compact Hausdorff:

- $f : X \to Y$ induces a unique continuous extension $\bar{f} : \mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)) \to Y$. ($\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is also the Stone-Cech compactification of X).
- $C(X, Y) = Y^X$ is canonically isomorphic to $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y)$.
- $C(\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{P}(X)), Y) \cong Y^X$ can be endowed of the structure of a $\mathcal{P}(X)$-valued *elementary* extension of Y for any first order structure on Y.

What if we replace $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with an arbitrary (complete) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of 2^ω

Let B be an arbitrary complete boolean algebra, and set $M = C(St(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega)$.

Fix R a Borel (Universally Baire) relation on $(2^\omega)^n$. The continuity of an n-tuple $f_1, \dots, f_n \in M$ grants that

$$\{G : R(f_1(G) \dots, f_n(G))\} = (f_1 \times \dots \times f_n)^{-1}[R]$$

has the Baire property in St(B), where $f_1 \times \dots \times f_n(G) = (f_1(G), \dots, f_n(G))$.
Define:

$$\begin{aligned} R^M : & M^n \to \mathsf{B} \\ & (f_1, \dots, f_n) \mapsto \operatorname{Reg}(\{G : R(f_1(G), \dots, f_n(G)\}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\operatorname{Reg}(A) = \operatorname{Int}(\operatorname{Cl}(A))$.
Also, since the diagonal is closed in $(2^\omega)^2$,

$$=^M (f, g) = \operatorname{Reg}(\{G : f(G) = g(G)\})$$

is well defined.

Boolean ultrapowers of 2^ω

Let B be an arbitrary complete boolean algebra, and set $M = C(St(\mathrm{B}), 2^\omega)$.

Fix R a Borel (Universally Baire) relation on $(2^\omega)^n$. The continuity of an n-tuple $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in M$ grants that

$$\{G : R(f_1(G) \ldots, f_n(G))\} = (f_1 \times \cdots \times f_n)^{-1}[R]$$

has the Baire property in St(B), where $f_1 \times \cdots \times f_n(G) = (f_1(G), \ldots, f_n(G))$.
Define:

$$\begin{aligned} R^M : & M^n \to \mathrm{B} \\ & (f_1, \ldots, f_n) \mapsto \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : R(f_1(G), \ldots, f_n(G)\}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{Reg}\,(A) = \mathrm{Int}\,(\mathrm{Cl}\,(A))$.
Also, since the diagonal is closed in $(2^\omega)^2$,

$$=^M (f, g) = \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : f(G) = g(G)\}\right)$$

is well defined.

Boolean ultrapowers of 2^ω

Let B be an arbitrary complete boolean algebra, and set $M = C(St(\mathrm{B}), 2^\omega)$.

Fix R a Borel (Universally Baire) relation on $(2^\omega)^n$. The continuity of an n-tuple $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in M$ grants that

$$\{G : R(f_1(G) \ldots, f_n(G))\} = (f_1 \times \cdots \times f_n)^{-1}[R]$$

has the Baire property in St(B), where $f_1 \times \cdots \times f_n(G) = (f_1(G), \ldots, f_n(G))$. Define:

$$\begin{aligned} R^M :& M^n \to \mathrm{B} \\ & (f_1, \ldots, f_n) \mapsto \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : R(f_1(G), \ldots, f_n(G)\}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{Reg}\,(A) = \mathrm{Int}\,(\mathrm{Cl}\,(A))$.

Also, since the diagonal is closed in $(2^\omega)^2$,

$$=^M (f, g) = \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : f(G) = g(G)\}\right)$$

is well defined.

Boolean ultrapowers of 2^ω

Let B be an arbitrary complete boolean algebra, and set $M = C(St(\mathrm{B}), 2^\omega)$.

Fix R a Borel (Universally Baire) relation on $(2^\omega)^n$. The continuity of an n-tuple $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in M$ grants that

$$\{G : R(f_1(G) \ldots, f_n(G))\} = (f_1 \times \cdots \times f_n)^{-1}[R]$$

has the Baire property in $\mathrm{St}(\mathrm{B})$, where $f_1 \times \cdots \times f_n(G) = (f_1(G), \ldots, f_n(G))$.

Define:

$$R^M : M^n \to \mathrm{B}$$
$$(f_1, \ldots, f_n) \mapsto \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : R(f_1(G), \ldots, f_n(G)\}\right)$$

where $\mathrm{Reg}\,(A) = \mathrm{Int}\,(\mathrm{Cl}\,(A))$.

Also, since the diagonal is closed in $(2^\omega)^2$,

$$=^M (f, g) = \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : f(G) = g(G)\}\right)$$

is well defined.

Boolean ultrapowers of 2^ω

Let B be an arbitrary (even atomless) complete boolean algebra. The following holds:

- For any Borel (universally Baire) relation R on $(2^\omega)^n$, the structure $(M, =^M, R^M)$ is a *full* B-valued model.
- For $G \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B})$,

$$\begin{aligned} i_G : 2^\omega &\to M/G \\ x &\mapsto [c_x]_G \end{aligned}$$

  (c_x is the constant function with value x) defines an injective morphism $(2^\omega, R)$ into $(M/G, R^M/G)$.

It is not clear whether this morphism is an elementary map or not:

- This is the case for $\mathsf{B} = \mathcal{P}(X)$, since in this case we are analyzing the standard embedding of the first order structure $(2^\omega, R)$ in its ultrapowers induced by ultrafilters on $\mathcal{P}(X)$.
- What are the properties of this map if B is some other complete (atomless) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of 2^ω

Let B be an arbitrary (even atomless) complete boolean algebra. The following holds:

- For any Borel (universally Baire) relation R on $(2^\omega)^n$, the structure $(M, =^M, R^M)$ is a *full* B-valued model.
- For $G \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B})$,

$$i_G : 2^\omega \to M/G$$
$$x \mapsto [c_x]_G$$

  (c_x is the constant function with value x) defines an injective morphism $(2^\omega, R)$ into $(M/G, R^M/G)$.

It is not clear whether this morphism is an elementary map or not:

- This is the case for $\mathsf{B} = \mathcal{P}(X)$, since in this case we are analyzing the standard embedding of the first order structure $(2^\omega, R)$ in its ultrapowers induced by ultrafilters on $\mathcal{P}(X)$.
- What are the properties of this map if B is some other complete (atomless) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of 2^ω

Let B be an arbitrary (even atomless) complete boolean algebra. The following holds:

- For any Borel (universally Baire) relation R on $(2^\omega)^n$, the structure $(M, =^M, R^M)$ is a *full* B-valued model.
- For $G \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B})$,

$$\begin{aligned} i_G : 2^\omega &\to M/G \\ x &\mapsto [c_x]_G \end{aligned}$$

  (c_x is the constant function with value x) defines an injective morphism $(2^\omega, R)$ into $(M/G, R^M/G)$.

It is not clear whether this morphism is an elementary map or not:

- This is the case for $\mathsf{B} = \mathcal{P}(X)$, since in this case we are analyzing the standard embedding of the first order structure $(2^\omega, R)$ in its ultrapowers induced by ultrafilters on $\mathcal{P}(X)$.
- What are the properties of this map if B is some other complete (atomless) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of 2^ω

Let B be an arbitrary (even atomless) complete boolean algebra. The following holds:

- For any Borel (universally Baire) relation R on $(2^\omega)^n$, the structure $(M, =^M, R^M)$ is a *full* B-valued model.
- For $G \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B})$,

$$\begin{aligned} i_G : 2^\omega &\to M/G \\ x &\mapsto [c_x]_G \end{aligned}$$

  (c_x is the constant function with value x) defines an injective morphism $(2^\omega, R)$ into $(M/G, R^M/G)$.

It is not clear whether this morphism is an elementary map or not:

- This is the case for $\mathsf{B} = \mathcal{P}(X)$, since in this case we are analyzing the standard embedding of the first order structure $(2^\omega, R)$ in its ultrapowers induced by ultrafilters on $\mathcal{P}(X)$.
- What are the properties of this map if B is some other complete (atomless) boolean algebra?

Boolean ultrapowers of 2^ω

Let B be an arbitrary (even atomless) complete boolean algebra. The following holds:

- For any Borel (universally Baire) relation R on $(2^\omega)^n$, the structure $(M, =^M, R^M)$ is a *full* B-valued model.
- For $G \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B})$,

$$i_G : 2^\omega \to M/G$$
$$x \mapsto [c_x]_G$$

  (c_x is the constant function with value x) defines an injective morphism $(2^\omega, R)$ into $(M/G, R^M/G)$.

It is not clear whether this morphism is an elementary map or not:

- This is the case for $\mathsf{B} = \mathcal{P}(X)$, since in this case we are analyzing the standard embedding of the first order structure $(2^\omega, R)$ in its ultrapowers induced by ultrafilters on $\mathcal{P}(X)$.
- What are the properties of this map if B is some other complete (atomless) boolean algebra?

Shoenfield's absoluteness rephrased

Theorem (Cohen's absoluteness)

Assume B *is a complete boolean algebra and* $R \subseteq (2^{\omega})^n$ *is a Borel (Universally Baire) relation. Let* $M = C(St(\mathsf{B}), 2^{\omega})$ *and* $G \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B})$*. Then*

$$(2^{\omega}, =, R) \prec_{\Sigma_2} (M/_G, =^M/_G, R^M/_G).$$

If one assumes the existence of class many Woodin cardinals

$$(2^{\omega}, =, R) \prec (M/_G, =^M/_G, R^M/_G).$$

Proof.

$C(St(\mathsf{B}), 2^{\omega})$ is isomorphic to the B-names in V^{B} for elements of 2^{ω} (see next slide). Apply Shoenfield's (or Woodin's) absoluteness to V and $V[H]$ (for H V-generic for B) to infer the desired conclusion. □

Shoenfield's absoluteness rephrased

Theorem (Cohen's absoluteness)

Assume B *is a complete boolean algebra and* $R \subseteq (2^\omega)^n$ *is a Borel (Universally Baire) relation. Let* $M = C(St(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega)$ *and* $G \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B})$. *Then*

$$(2^\omega, =, R) \prec_{\Sigma_2} (M/_G, =^M/_G, R^M/_G).$$

If one assumes the existence of class many Woodin cardinals

$$(2^\omega, =, R) \prec (M/_G, =^M/_G, R^M/_G).$$

Proof.

$C(St(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega)$ is isomorphic to the B-names in V^{B} for elements of 2^ω (see next slide). Apply Shoenfield's (or Woodin's) absoluteness to V and $V[H]$ (for H V-generic for B) to infer the desired conclusion. □

Shoenfield's absoluteness rephrased

Theorem (Cohen's absoluteness)

Assume B *is a complete boolean algebra and* $R \subseteq (2^\omega)^n$ *is a Borel (Universally Baire) relation. Let* $M = C(St(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega)$ *and* $G \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B})$. *Then*

$$(2^\omega, =, R) \prec_{\Sigma_2} (M/_G, =^M /_G, R^M/_G).$$

If one assumes the existence of class many Woodin cardinals

$$(2^\omega, =, R) \prec (M/_G, =^M /_G, R^M/_G).$$

Proof.

$C(St(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega)$ is isomorphic to the B-names in V^{B} for elements of 2^ω (see next slide). Apply Shoenfield's (or Woodin's) absoluteness to V and $V[H]$ (for H V-generic for B) to infer the desired conclusion. □

$C(\mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega)$ and V^{B}

Given $f \in C(\mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega) = M$, $\sigma \in V^{\mathsf{B}}$ with $[\![\sigma \in 2^\omega]\!] = 1_{\mathsf{B}}$ define:

- $\tau_f = \left\{\langle\langle n, i\rangle, f^{-1}[N_{n,i}]\rangle : n < \omega, i < 2\right\} \in V^{\mathsf{B}}$,
- $g_\sigma \in M$ by $g_\sigma(G)(n) = i$ iff $[\![\sigma(n) = i]\!] \in G$.

Then

- $g_{\tau_f} = f$,
- $\left[\!\!\left[\tau_{g_\sigma} = \sigma\right]\!\!\right] = 1_{\mathsf{B}}$.

These identities allow to translate forcing relations from both sides.

The lift of a Universally Baire relation R to V^{B} is translated as the forcing relation (on M)

$$\begin{aligned} R^M : & M^n \to \mathsf{B} \\ & (f_1, \dots, f_n) \mapsto \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : R(f_1(G), \dots, f_n(G)\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Universal Baireness grants that the lift R^M behaves as desired.

$C(\mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega)$ and V^B

Given $f \in C(\mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega) = M$, $\sigma \in V^\mathsf{B}$ with $[\![\sigma \in 2^\omega]\!] = 1_\mathsf{B}$ define:

- $\tau_f = \left\{\langle\langle n, i\rangle, f^{-1}[N_{n,i}]\rangle : n < \omega, i < 2\right\} \in V^\mathsf{B}$,
- $g_\sigma \in M$ by $g_\sigma(G)(n) = i$ iff $[\![\sigma(n) = i]\!] \in G$.

Then

- $g_{\tau_f} = f$,
- $\left[\!\!\left[\tau_{g_\sigma} = \sigma\right]\!\!\right] = 1_\mathsf{B}$.

These identities allow to translate forcing relations from both sides.

The lift of a Universally Baire relation R to V^B is translated as the forcing relation (on M)

$$\begin{aligned} R^M : & M^n \to \mathsf{B} \\ & (f_1, \dots, f_n) \mapsto \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : R(f_1(G), \dots, f_n(G)\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Universal Baireness grants that the lift R^M behaves as desired.

$C(\mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega)$ and V^B

Given $f \in C(\mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega) = M$, $\sigma \in V^\mathsf{B}$ with $[\![\sigma \in 2^\omega]\!] = 1_\mathsf{B}$ define:

- $\tau_f = \left\{\langle\langle n, i\rangle, f^{-1}[N_{n,i}]\rangle : n < \omega, i < 2\right\} \in V^\mathsf{B}$,
- $g_\sigma \in M$ by $g_\sigma(G)(n) = i$ iff $[\![\sigma(n) = i]\!] \in G$.

Then

- $g_{\tau_f} = f$,
- $\left[\!\!\left[\tau_{g_\sigma} = \sigma\right]\!\!\right] = 1_\mathsf{B}$.

These identities allow to translate forcing relations from both sides.

The lift of a Universally Baire relation R to V^B is translated as the forcing relation (on M)

$$\begin{aligned} R^M : & M^n \to \mathsf{B} \\ & (f_1, \ldots, f_n) \mapsto \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : R(f_1(G), \ldots, f_n(G)\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Universal Baireness grants that the lift R^M behaves as desired.

$C(\mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega)$ and V^B

Given $f \in C(\mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega) = M$, $\sigma \in V^\mathsf{B}$ with $[\![\sigma \in 2^\omega]\!] = 1_\mathsf{B}$ define:

- $\tau_f = \left\{\langle\langle n, i\rangle, f^{-1}[N_{n,i}]\rangle : n < \omega, i < 2\right\} \in V^\mathsf{B}$,
- $g_\sigma \in M$ by $g_\sigma(G)(n) = i$ iff $[\![\sigma(n) = i]\!] \in G$.

Then

- $g_{\tau_f} = f$,
- $\left[\!\!\left[\tau_{g_\sigma} = \sigma\right]\!\!\right] = 1_\mathsf{B}$.

These identities allow to translate forcing relations from both sides.

The lift of a Universally Baire relation R to V^B is translated as the forcing relation (on M)

$$\begin{aligned} R^M : & M^n \to \mathsf{B} \\ & (f_1, \ldots, f_n) \mapsto \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : R(f_1(G), \ldots, f_n(G)\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Universal Baireness grants that the lift R^M behaves as desired.

$C(\mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega)$ and V^B

Given $f \in C(\mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B}), 2^\omega) = M$, $\sigma \in V^\mathsf{B}$ with $[\![\sigma \in 2^\omega]\!] = 1_\mathsf{B}$ define:

- $\tau_f = \left\{\langle\langle n, i\rangle, f^{-1}[N_{n,i}]\rangle : n < \omega, i < 2\right\} \in V^\mathsf{B}$,
- $g_\sigma \in M$ by $g_\sigma(G)(n) = i$ iff $[\![\sigma(n) = i]\!] \in G$.

Then

- $g_{\tau_f} = f$,
- $\left[\!\!\left[\tau_{g_\sigma} = \sigma\right]\!\!\right] = 1_\mathsf{B}$.

These identities allow to translate forcing relations from both sides.

The lift of a Universally Baire relation R to V^B is translated as the forcing relation (on M)

$$\begin{aligned} R^M : & M^n \to \mathsf{B} \\ & (f_1, \dots, f_n) \mapsto \mathrm{Reg}\left(\{G : R(f_1(G), \dots, f_n(G)\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Universal Baireness grants that the lift R^M behaves as desired.

Two questions

1. Where are forcing axioms playing a role in the above proof (and rephrasing) of Shoenfield's absoluteness?
2. What if $Y \neq 2^\omega$ is some other compact Hausdorff space?

1. Time not permitting I won't give a proof of the above rephrasing of Shoenfield's absoluteness, which can be based on a Baire category argument and on Cohen's forcing theorem.
2. We will now inquire on the second question, which leads us to other stronger formulation of forcing axioms in categorial terms.

Two questions

1. Where are forcing axioms playing a role in the above proof (and rephrasing) of Shoenfield's absoluteness?
2. What if $Y \neq 2^{\omega}$ is some other compact Hausdorff space?

1. Time not permitting I won't give a proof of the above rephrasing of Shoenfield's absoluteness, which can be based on a Baire category argument and on Cohen's forcing theorem.
2. We will now inquire on the second question, which leads us to other stronger formulation of forcing axioms in categorial terms.

Two questions

1. Where are forcing axioms playing a role in the above proof (and rephrasing) of Shoenfield's absoluteness?
2. What if $Y \neq 2^{\omega}$ is some other compact Hausdorff space?

1. Time not permitting I won't give a proof of the above rephrasing of Shoenfield's absoluteness, which can be based on a Baire category argument and on Cohen's forcing theorem.
2. We will now inquire on the second question, which leads us to other stronger formulation of forcing axioms in categorial terms.

Two questions

1. Where are forcing axioms playing a role in the above proof (and rephrasing) of Shoenfield's absoluteness?
2. What if $Y \neq 2^{\omega}$ is some other compact Hausdorff space?

1. Time not permitting I won't give a proof of the above rephrasing of Shoenfield's absoluteness, which can be based on a Baire category argument and on Cohen's forcing theorem.
2. We will now inquire on the second question, which leads us to other stronger formulation of forcing axioms in categorial terms.

Two questions

1. Where are forcing axioms playing a role in the above proof (and rephrasing) of Shoenfield's absoluteness?
2. What if $Y \neq 2^\omega$ is some other compact Hausdorff space?

1. Time not permitting I won't give a proof of the above rephrasing of Shoenfield's absoluteness, which can be based on a Baire category argument and on Cohen's forcing theorem.
2. We will now inquire on the second question, which leads us to other stronger formulation of forcing axioms in categorial terms.

Looking at 2^ω is the same as looking at H_{ω_1}

There exists a natural correspondence between the theory of projective subsets of 2^ω and the first order theory of H_{ω_1}. Any Σ^1_2-property of 2^ω corresponds to a Σ_1-property on H_{ω_1}.

Moreover 2^ω is a definable class in H_{ω_1}, hence the first order theory of H_{ω_1} interprets that of 2^ω with projective predicates.

The converse holds as well.

Hence it is essentially the same to look at the first order theory of 2^ω or at the first order theory of H_{ω_1}.

Looking at 2^ω is the same as looking at H_{ω_1}

There exists a natural correspondence between the theory of projective subsets of 2^ω and the first order theory of H_{ω_1}. Any Σ^1_2-property of 2^ω corresponds to a Σ_1-property on H_{ω_1}.
Moreover 2^ω is a definable class in H_{ω_1}, hence the first order theory of H_{ω_1} interprets that of 2^ω with projective predicates.
The converse holds as well.
Hence it is essentially the same to look at the first order theory of 2^ω or at the first order theory of H_{ω_1}.

Looking at 2^ω is the same as looking at H_{ω_1}

There exists a natural correspondence between the theory of projective subsets of 2^ω and the first order theory of H_{ω_1}. Any Σ^1_2-property of 2^ω corresponds to a Σ_1-property on H_{ω_1}.

Moreover 2^ω is a definable class in H_{ω_1}, hence the first order theory of H_{ω_1} interprets that of 2^ω with projective predicates.

The converse holds as well.

Hence it is essentially the same to look at the first order theory of 2^ω or at the first order theory of H_{ω_1}.

Boolean ultrapowers of H_κ

To analyze how to use forcing for the analysis of compact spaces other than 2^ω it is more convenient to move from an analysis of a compact space X to the analysis of the H_κ in which X is definable for κ large enough.

If we can define *elementary* boolean ultrapowers of H_κ, we can naturally define *elementary* boolean ultrapowers of any compact Hausdorff Y (or more generally any mathematical structure) definable in H_κ.

Let us address now the question of how to use generic absoluteness results as a template to formulate stronger and stronger forcing axioms.

Boolean ultrapowers of H_κ

To analyze how to use forcing for the analysis of compact spaces other than 2^ω it is more convenient to move from an analysis of a compact space X to the analysis of the H_κ in which X is definable for κ large enough.

If we can define *elementary* boolean ultrapowers of H_κ, we can naturally define *elementary* boolean ultrapowers of any compact Hausdorff Y (or more generally any mathematical structure) definable in H_κ.

Let us address now the question of how to use generic absoluteness results as a template to formulate stronger and stronger forcing axioms.

Boolean ultrapowers of H_κ

To analyze how to use forcing for the analysis of compact spaces other than 2^ω it is more convenient to move from an analysis of a compact space X to the analysis of the H_κ in which X is definable for κ large enough.

If we can define *elementary* boolean ultrapowers of H_κ, we can naturally define *elementary* boolean ultrapowers of any compact Hausdorff Y (or more generally any mathematical structure) definable in H_κ.

Let us address now the question of how to use generic absoluteness results as a template to formulate stronger and stronger forcing axioms.

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

Definition

Let Γ be a class of complete boolean algebras and Θ be a class of complete homomorphisms between elements of Γ and closed under composition and identity maps.

- $B \geq_\Theta Q$ if there is a complete homomorphism $i : B \to Q$ in Θ.
- $B \geq^*_\Theta Q$ if there is a complete and *injective* homomorphism $i : B \to Q$ in Θ.

With these definitions $(\Gamma, \leq_\Theta)$ and $(\Gamma, \leq^*_\Theta)$ are class partial orders.

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

Definition

Let Γ be a class of complete boolean algebras and Θ be a class of complete homomorphisms between elements of Γ and closed under composition and identity maps.

- $B \geq_\Theta Q$ if there is a complete homomorphism $i : B \to Q$ in Θ.
- $B \geq^*_\Theta Q$ if there is a complete and *injective* homomorphism $i : B \to Q$ in Θ.

With these definitions $(\Gamma, \leq_\Theta)$ and $(\Gamma, \leq^*_\Theta)$ are class partial orders.

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

Definition

Let Γ be a class of complete boolean algebras and Θ be a class of complete homomorphisms between elements of Γ and closed under composition and identity maps.

- $\mathsf{B} \geq_{\Theta} \mathsf{Q}$ if there is a complete homomorphism $i : \mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{Q}$ in Θ.
- $\mathsf{B} \geq^{*}_{\Theta} \mathsf{Q}$ if there is a complete and *injective* homomorphism $i : \mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{Q}$ in Θ.

With these definitions $(\Gamma, \leq_{\Theta})$ and $(\Gamma, \leq^{*}_{\Theta})$ are class partial orders.

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

Definition

Let Γ be a class of complete boolean algebras and Θ be a class of complete homomorphisms between elements of Γ and closed under composition and identity maps.

- $B \geq_\Theta Q$ if there is a complete homomorphism $i : B \to Q$ in Θ.
- $B \geq^*_\Theta Q$ if there is a complete and *injective* homomorphism $i : B \to Q$ in Θ.

With these definitions $(\Gamma, \leq_\Theta)$ and $(\Gamma, \leq^*_\Theta)$ are class partial orders.

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

We can look at these class partial orders as forcing notions, and check whether they are interesting forcing notions.

In particular we look for universal objects satisfying both of Woodin's ingredients for some H_λ with $\lambda > \omega_1$.

The order $\leq^*_\Theta$ is the one we use to study iterated forcing and captures the notion of complete embedding for partial orders.

$\leq_\Theta$ has been neglected so far but is sufficient to grant that whenever $i : \mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{Q}$ witnesses $\mathsf{Q} \leq_\Theta \mathsf{B}$ and G is V-generic for Q, then $i^{-1}[G]$ is V-generic for B.

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

We can look at these class partial orders as forcing notions, and check whether they are interesting forcing notions.

In particular we look for universal objects satisfying both of Woodin's ingredients for some H_λ with $\lambda > \omega_1$.

The order $\leq^*_\Theta$ is the one we use to study iterated forcing and captures the notion of complete embedding for partial orders.

$\leq_\Theta$ has been neglected so far but is sufficient to grant that whenever $i : \mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{Q}$ witnesses $\mathsf{Q} \leq_\Theta \mathsf{B}$ and G is V-generic for Q, then $i^{-1}[G]$ is V-generic for B.

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

We can look at these class partial orders as forcing notions, and check whether they are interesting forcing notions.

In particular we look for universal objects satisfying both of Woodin's ingredients for some H_λ with $\lambda > \omega_1$.

The order $\leq^*_\Theta$ is the one we use to study iterated forcing and captures the notion of complete embedding for partial orders.

$\leq_\Theta$ has been neglected so far but is sufficient to grant that whenever $i : \mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{Q}$ witnesses $\mathsf{Q} \leq_\Theta \mathsf{B}$ and G is V-generic for Q, then $i^{-1}[G]$ is V-generic for B.

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

We can look at these class partial orders as forcing notions, and check whether they are interesting forcing notions.

In particular we look for universal objects satisfying both of Woodin's ingredients for some H_λ with $\lambda > \omega_1$.

The order $\leq^*_\Theta$ is the one we use to study iterated forcing and captures the notion of complete embedding for partial orders.

$\leq_\Theta$ has been neglected so far but is sufficient to grant that whenever $i : \mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{Q}$ witnesses $\mathsf{Q} \leq_\Theta \mathsf{B}$ and G is V-generic for Q, then $i^{-1}[G]$ is V-generic for B.

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

We can look at these class partial orders as forcing notions, and check whether they are interesting forcing notions.

In particular we look for universal objects satisfying both of Woodin's ingredients for some H_λ with $\lambda > \omega_1$.

The order $\leq^*_\Theta$ is the one we use to study iterated forcing and captures the notion of complete embedding for partial orders.

$\leq_\Theta$ has been neglected so far but is sufficient to grant that whenever $i : \mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{Q}$ witnesses $\mathsf{Q} \leq_\Theta \mathsf{B}$ and G is V-generic for Q, then $i^{-1}[G]$ is V-generic for B.

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

Theorem

The following holds:

- ***Woodin:*** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals. Then Martin's maximum is equivalent to the assertion that the family of presaturated towers is dense in* $(\mathrm{SSP}, \leq_\Omega)$.
- ***V.:*** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals Then* MM^{++} *(a strong form of* MM*) is equivalent to the assertion that the family of presaturated towers* $\mathcal{T}$ *is dense in* $(\mathrm{SSP}, \leq_{\mathrm{SSP}})$*, where* $\mathrm{B} \geq_{\mathrm{SSP}} \mathrm{Q}$ *iff there is* $i : \mathrm{B} \to \mathrm{Q}$ *complete homomorphism such that*

$$[\![\mathrm{Q}/i[\dot{G}_\mathrm{B}] \in \mathrm{SSP}]\!]_\mathrm{B} = 1_\mathrm{B}.$$

if $\mathcal{T}$ *is a presaturated tower with critical point of generic embedding* ω_2,

$$H_{\omega_2} \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathcal{T}}}.$$

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

Theorem

The following holds:

- ***Woodin:*** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals. Then Martin's maximum is equivalent to the assertion that the family of presaturated towers is dense in* $(\mathrm{SSP}, \leq_\Omega)$.
- ***V.:*** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals Then* MM^{++} *(a strong form of* MM*) is equivalent to the assertion that the family of presaturated towers* $\mathcal{T}$ *is dense in* $(\mathrm{SSP}, \leq_{\mathrm{SSP}})$*, where* $\mathrm{B} \geq_{\mathrm{SSP}} \mathrm{Q}$ *iff there is* $i : \mathrm{B} \to \mathrm{Q}$ *complete homomorphism such that*

$$[\![\mathrm{Q}/i[\dot{G}_{\mathrm{B}}] \in \mathrm{SSP}]\!]_{\mathrm{B}} = 1_{\mathrm{B}}.$$

if $\mathcal{T}$ *is a presaturated tower with critical point of generic embedding* ω_2,

$$H_{\omega_2} \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathcal{T}}}.$$

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

Theorem

The following holds:

- ***Woodin:*** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals. Then Martin's maximum is equivalent to the assertion that the family of presaturated towers is dense in* $(\mathrm{SSP}, \leq_\Omega)$.
- ***V.:*** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals Then* MM^{++} *(a strong form of* MM*) is equivalent to the assertion that the family of presaturated towers* $\mathcal{T}$ *is dense in* $(\mathrm{SSP}, \leq_{\mathrm{SSP}})$*, where* $\mathrm{B} \geq_{\mathrm{SSP}} \mathrm{Q}$ *iff there is* $i : \mathrm{B} \to \mathrm{Q}$ *complete homomorphism such that*

$$[\![\mathrm{Q}/i[\dot{G}_{\mathrm{B}}] \in \mathrm{SSP}]\!]_{\mathrm{B}} = 1_{\mathrm{B}}.$$

if $\mathcal{T}$ *is a presaturated tower with critical point of generic embedding* ω_2*,*

$$H_{\omega_2} \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathcal{T}}}.$$

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

Theorem

The following holds:

- ***Woodin:*** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals. Then Martin's maximum is equivalent to the assertion that the family of presaturated towers is dense in* $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_\Omega)$.
- ***V.:*** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals Then* MM^{++} *(a strong form of* MM*) is equivalent to the assertion that the family of presaturated towers* $\mathcal{T}$ *is dense in* $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$*, where* $\mathsf{B} \geq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \mathsf{Q}$ *iff there is* $i : \mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{Q}$ *complete homomorphism such that*

$$[\![\mathsf{Q}/i[\dot{G}_{\mathsf{B}}] \in \mathsf{SSP}]\!]_{\mathsf{B}} = 1_{\mathsf{B}}.$$

if $\mathcal{T}$ *is a presaturated tower with critical point of generic embedding* ω_2*,*

$$H_{\omega_2} \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathcal{T}}}.$$

Forcing axioms as density properties of class posets.

Theorem

The following holds:

- ***Woodin:*** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals. Then Martin's maximum is equivalent to the assertion that the family of presaturated towers is dense in* $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_\Omega)$.
- ***V.:*** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals Then* MM^{++} *(a strong form of* MM*) is equivalent to the assertion that the family of presaturated towers* $\mathcal{T}$ *is dense in* $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$*, where* $\mathsf{B} \geq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \mathsf{Q}$ *iff there is* $i : \mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{Q}$ *complete homomorphism such that*

$$[\![\mathsf{Q}/i[\dot{G}_{\mathsf{B}}] \in \mathsf{SSP}]\!]_{\mathsf{B}} = 1_{\mathsf{B}}.$$

if $\mathcal{T}$ *is a presaturated tower with critical point of generic embedding* ω_2*,*

$$H_{\omega_2} \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathcal{T}}}.$$

Strongest forcing axioms

Definition (V.)

MM^{+++} holds if the class of SSP-super rigid presaturated towers is dense in $(\text{SSP}, \leq_{\text{SSP}})$.

Fact

$\text{MM}^{+++} \Rightarrow \text{MM}^{++} \Rightarrow \text{MM}$.

Theorem (V.)

MM^{+++} *is consistent relative to the existence of a huge cardinal.*

I postpone (or omit) the definition of SSP-super rigid presaturated tower.

Remark

MM^{+++} *will be forced by any of the standard iteration of length* δ *which yield* MM *provided that* δ *is superhuge.*

Strongest forcing axioms

Definition (V.)

MM^{+++} holds if the class of SSP-super rigid presaturated towers is dense in $(SSP, \leq_{SSP})$.

Fact

$MM^{+++} \Rightarrow MM^{++} \Rightarrow MM$.

Theorem (V.)

MM^{+++} *is consistent relative to the existence of a huge cardinal.*

I postpone (or omit) the definition of SSP-super rigid presaturated tower.

Remark

MM^{+++} *will be forced by any of the standard iteration of length* δ *which yield* MM *provided that* δ *is superhuge.*

Strongest forcing axioms

Definition (V.)

MM^{+++} holds if the class of SSP-super rigid presaturated towers is dense in $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$.

Fact

$\mathsf{MM}^{+++} \Rightarrow \mathsf{MM}^{++} \Rightarrow \mathsf{MM}$.

Theorem (V.)

MM^{+++} *is consistent relative to the existence of a huge cardinal.*

I postpone (or omit) the definition of SSP-super rigid presaturated tower.

Remark

MM^{+++} *will be forced by any of the standard iteration of length* δ *which yield* MM *provided that* δ *is superhuge.*

Strongest forcing axioms

Definition (V.)

MM^{+++} holds if the class of SSP-super rigid presaturated towers is dense in $(\mathrm{SSP}, \leq_{\mathrm{SSP}})$.

Fact

$\mathrm{MM}^{+++} \Rightarrow \mathrm{MM}^{++} \Rightarrow \mathrm{MM}$.

Theorem (V.)

MM^{+++} *is consistent relative to the existence of a huge cardinal.*

I postpone (or omit) the definition of SSP-super rigid presaturated tower.

Remark

MM^{+++} *will be forced by any of the standard iteration of length* δ *which yield* MM *provided that* δ *is superhuge.*

Strongest forcing axioms

Definition (V.)

MM^{+++} holds if the class of SSP-super rigid presaturated towers is dense in $(SSP, \leq_{SSP})$.

Fact

$MM^{+++} \Rightarrow MM^{++} \Rightarrow MM$.

Theorem (V.)

MM^{+++} *is consistent relative to the existence of a huge cardinal.*

I postpone (or omit) the definition of SSP-super rigid presaturated tower.

Remark

MM^{+++} *will be forced by any of the standard iteration of length* δ *which yield* MM *provided that* δ *is superhuge.*

The category forcing $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$:

Theorem (V.)

Assume that δ *is supercompact. Then* $(\mathsf{SSP} \cap V_\delta, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \restriction V_\delta)$ *is an* SSP *partial order* U_δ.
Moreover:

- $\mathsf{B} \geq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}$ *for all* $\mathsf{B} \in \mathsf{SSP} \cap V_\delta$.
- $(\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B})/_G = \mathsf{U}_\delta^{V[G]}$ *whenever* G *is* V*-generic for* B.
- U_δ *forces* MM^{++}.

Theorem (V.)

Assume δ *is a reflecting cardinal and* MM^{+++} *holds. Then* U_δ *is itself an* SSP*-super rigid presaturated tower. Hence*

$$(H_{\omega_2}, \in) \prec (H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta}}, \in).$$

The category forcing $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$:

Theorem (V.)

Assume that δ is supercompact. Then $(\mathsf{SSP} \cap V_\delta, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \restriction V_\delta)$ is an SSP *partial order* U_δ.

Moreover:

- $\mathsf{B} \geq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}$ *for all* $\mathsf{B} \in \mathsf{SSP} \cap V_\delta$.
- $(\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B})/_G = \mathsf{U}_\delta^{V[G]}$ *whenever G is V-generic for* B.
- U_δ *forces* MM^{++}.

Theorem (V.)

Assume δ is a reflecting cardinal and MM^{+++} *holds. Then* U_δ *is itself an* SSP*-super rigid presaturated tower. Hence*

$$(H_{\omega_2}, \in) \prec (H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta}}, \in).$$

The category forcing $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$:

Theorem (V.)

Assume that δ is supercompact. Then $(\mathsf{SSP} \cap V_\delta, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \restriction V_\delta)$ is an SSP partial order U_δ.
Moreover:

- $\mathsf{B} \geq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}$ *for all* $\mathsf{B} \in \mathsf{SSP} \cap V_\delta$.
- $(\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B})/_G = \mathsf{U}_\delta^{V[G]}$ *whenever G is V-generic for* B.
- U_δ *forces* MM^{++}.

Theorem (V.)

Assume δ is a reflecting cardinal and MM^{+++} holds. Then U_δ is itself an SSP-super rigid presaturated tower. Hence

$$(H_{\omega_2}, \in) \prec (H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta}}, \in).$$

The category forcing $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$:

Theorem (V.)

Assume that δ is supercompact. Then $(\mathsf{SSP} \cap V_\delta, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \restriction V_\delta)$ is an SSP partial order U_δ.
Moreover:

- $\mathsf{B} \geq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}$ *for all* $\mathsf{B} \in \mathsf{SSP} \cap V_\delta$.
- $(\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B})/_G = \mathsf{U}_\delta^{V[G]}$ *whenever G is V-generic for* B.
- U_δ *forces* MM^{++}.

Theorem (V.)

Assume δ is a reflecting cardinal and MM^{+++} *holds. Then* U_δ *is itself an* SSP*-super rigid presaturated tower.* Hence

$$(H_{\omega_2}, \in) \prec (H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta}}, \in).$$

The category forcing $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$:

Theorem (V.)

Assume that δ *is supercompact. Then* $(\mathsf{SSP} \cap V_\delta, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \restriction V_\delta)$ *is an* SSP *partial order* U_δ*.*
Moreover:

- $\mathsf{B} \geq_{\mathsf{SSP}} \mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}$ *for all* $\mathsf{B} \in \mathsf{SSP} \cap V_\delta$.
- $(\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B})/_G = \mathsf{U}_\delta^{V[G]}$ *whenever* G *is* V*-generic for* B.
- U_δ *forces* MM^{++}.

Theorem (V.)

Assume δ *is a reflecting cardinal and* MM^{+++} *holds. Then* U_δ *is itself an* SSP*-super rigid presaturated tower. Hence*

$$(H_{\omega_2}, \in) \prec (H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta}}, \in).$$

These items allow to prove that

$$(H_{\omega_2}, \in) \prec (H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathrm{B}}}/_G, \in/_G)$$

holds if we assume that V models MM^{+++} and B forces MM^{+++}

This gives other arguments to explain why MM has proved so useful as of now.

These items allow to prove that

$$(H_{\omega_2}, \in) \prec (H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{B}}}/_G, \in /_G)$$

holds if we assume that V models MM^{+++} and B forces MM^{+++}

This gives other arguments to explain why MM has proved so useful as of now.

These items allow to prove that

$$(H_{\omega_2}, \in) \prec (H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{B}}}/_G, \in /_G)$$

holds if we assume that V models MM^{+++} and B forces MM^{+++}

This gives other arguments to explain why MM has proved so useful as of now.

Sketch of proof:

Let δ be large enough (for example Σ_2-reflecting). After forcing with B adding a V-geneirc filter G for B, δ remains large enough in $V[G]$. Since B forces MM^{+++}, we have that in $V[G]$, $\mathrm{U}_\delta^V[G]$ is a presaturated tower. Now $\mathrm{U}_\delta^V[G] \cong \mathrm{U}_\delta^V \restriction_{\mathrm{B}} /_G$, hence

$$H_{\omega_2}^V \subseteq H_{\omega_2}^{V[G]} \subseteq H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathrm{U}_\delta \restriction \mathrm{B}}}$$

and

$$H_{\omega_2}^V \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathrm{U}_\delta \restriction \mathrm{B}}},$$

$$H_{\omega_2}^{V[G]} \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathrm{U}_\delta \restriction \mathrm{B}}}.$$

Hence

$$H_{\omega_2}^V \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V[G]}.$$

Sketch of proof:

Let δ be large enough (for example Σ_2-reflecting). After forcing with B adding a V-geneirc filter G for B, δ remains large enough in $V[G]$. Since B forces MM^{+++}, we have that in $V[G]$, $\mathsf{U}_\delta^V[G]$ is a presaturated tower. Now $\mathsf{U}_\delta^V[G] \cong \mathsf{U}_\delta^V \restriction_{\mathsf{B}} / _G$, hence

$$H_{\omega_2}^V \subseteq H_{\omega_2}^{V[G]} \subseteq H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}}$$

and

$$H_{\omega_2}^V \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}},$$

$$H_{\omega_2}^{V[G]} \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}}.$$

Hence

$$H_{\omega_2}^V \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V[G]}.$$

Sketch of proof:

Let δ be large enough (for example Σ_2-reflecting). After forcing with B adding a V-geneirc filter G for B, δ remains large enough in $V[G]$. Since B forces MM^{+++}, we have that in $V[G]$, $\mathsf{U}_\delta^V[G]$ is a presaturated tower. Now $\mathsf{U}_\delta^V[G] \cong \mathsf{U}_\delta^V \restriction_{\mathsf{B}} /_G$, hence

$$H_{\omega_2}^V \subseteq H_{\omega_2}^{V[G]} \subseteq H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}}$$

and

$$H_{\omega_2}^V \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}},$$

$$H_{\omega_2}^{V[G]} \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}}.$$

Hence

$$H_{\omega_2}^V \prec H_{\omega_2}^{V[G]}.$$

Sketch of proof:

Let δ be large enough (for example Σ_2-reflecting). After forcing with B adding a V-geneirc filter G for B, δ remains large enough in $V[G]$. Since B forces MM^{+++}, we have that in $V[G]$, $\mathsf{U}^V_\delta[G]$ is a presaturated tower. Now $\mathsf{U}^V_\delta[G] \cong \mathsf{U}^V_\delta \restriction_{\mathsf{B}} /_G$, hence

$$H^V_{\omega_2} \subseteq H^{V[G]}_{\omega_2} \subseteq H^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}}_{\omega_2}$$

and

$$H^V_{\omega_2} \prec H^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}}_{\omega_2},$$

$$H^{V[G]}_{\omega_2} \prec H^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}}_{\omega_2}.$$

Hence

$$H^V_{\omega_2} \prec H^{V[G]}_{\omega_2}.$$

Sketch of proof:

Let δ be large enough (for example Σ_2-reflecting). After forcing with B adding a V-geneirc filter G for B, δ remains large enough in $V[G]$. Since B forces MM^{+++}, we have that in $V[G]$, $\mathsf{U}^V_\delta[G]$ is a presaturated tower. Now $\mathsf{U}^V_\delta[G] \cong \mathsf{U}^V_\delta \restriction_{\mathsf{B}} /_G$, hence

$$H^V_{\omega_2} \subseteq H^{V[G]}_{\omega_2} \subseteq H^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}}_{\omega_2}$$

and

$$H^V_{\omega_2} \prec H^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}}_{\omega_2},$$

$$H^{V[G]}_{\omega_2} \prec H^{V^{\mathsf{U}_\delta \restriction \mathsf{B}}}_{\omega_2}.$$

Hence

$$H^V_{\omega_2} \prec H^{V[G]}_{\omega_2}.$$

In general the following holds for suitable properties $\phi(x)$ for the category forcing U_δ:

> *$\phi(\mathsf{U}_\delta)$ holds if and only if the following set*
>
> $$\{\mathsf{B} \in \mathsf{U}_\delta : \phi(\mathsf{B}) \textit{ holds}\}$$
>
> *is dense in U_δ.*

Are all these results peculiar of the category SSP?

In general the following holds for suitable properties $\phi(x)$ for the category forcing U_δ:

> $\phi(\mathsf{U}_\delta)$ *holds if and only if the following set*
>
> $$\{\mathsf{B} \in \mathsf{U}_\delta : \phi(\mathsf{B}) \textit{ holds}\}$$
>
> *is dense in* U_δ*.*

Are all these results peculiar of the category SSP?

Modular generic absoluteness and modular category forcing axioms (joint with D. Asperò)

Definition

Let $\phi(x)$ be a Π_1-property.
Γ is ϕ-preserving if for all $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$ and all $S \in V$ such that $\phi(S)$ holds, we have that

$$V^{\mathsf{B}} \models \phi(\check{S}).$$

Properness, semiproperness, stationary set preserving forcings are all ϕ-preserving for suitable Π_1-properties $\phi(x)$.

- SSP: $\phi_{\mathrm{SSP}}(S) \equiv S$ is a stationary subset of ω_1
- **Properness:**
  $\phi_{\mathrm{proper}}(S) \equiv S$ is a stationary subset of $[X]^{\aleph_0}$ for some X.
- **Semiproperness:**
  $\phi_{\mathrm{semiproper}}(S) \equiv S$ is a semi-stationary subset of $[X]^{\aleph_0}$ for some X.

Modular generic absoluteness and modular category forcing axioms (joint with D. Asperò)

Definition

Let $\phi(x)$ be a Π_1-property.
Γ is ϕ-preserving if for all $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$ and all $S \in V$ such that $\phi(S)$ holds, we have that

$$V^{\mathsf{B}} \models \phi(\check{S}).$$

Properness, semiproperness, stationary set preserving forcings are all ϕ-preserving for suitable Π_1-properties $\phi(x)$.

- SSP: $\phi_{\mathrm{SSP}}(S) \equiv S$ is a stationary subset of ω_1
- **Properness:**
  $\phi_{\mathrm{proper}}(S) \equiv S$ is a stationary subset of $[X]^{\aleph_0}$ for some X.
- **Semiproperness:**
  $\phi_{\mathrm{semiproper}}(S) \equiv S$ is a semi-stationary subset of $[X]^{\aleph_0}$ for some X.

Lemma

Assume Γ is ϕ_Γ-preserving. Then Γ is closed under two step iterations, lottery sums and preimages of complete homomorphisms.

Γ-rigidity

Definition

Assume Γ is closed under two-steps iterations.

$B \in \Gamma$ is Γ-rigid if for all $Q \leq_\Gamma B$ there exists only one $i : B \to Q$ witnessing it.

Remark

Any $B \in \Gamma$ which is Γ-superrigid is forcing equivalent to a presaturated tower and is also Γ-rigid. It is not clear if the converse holds. For this reason the definition I came up for a Γ-superrigid presaturated tower is more involved.

Γ-rigidity

Definition

Assume Γ is closed under two-steps iterations.

$B \in \Gamma$ is Γ-rigid if for all $Q \leq_\Gamma B$ there exists only one $i : B \to Q$ witnessing it.

Remark

Any $B \in \Gamma$ *which is* Γ*-superrigid is forcing equivalent to a presaturated tower and is also* Γ*-rigid.* *It is not clear if the converse holds. For this reason the definition I came up for a* Γ*-superrigid presaturated tower is more involved.*

Γ-rigidity

Definition

Assume Γ is closed under two-steps iterations.

B ∈ Γ is Γ-rigid if for all $Q \leq_\Gamma B$ there exists only one $i : B \to Q$ witnessing it.

Remark

Any B ∈ Γ *which is* Γ*-superrigid is forcing equivalent to a presaturated tower and is also* Γ*-rigid. It is not clear if the converse holds. For this reason the definition I came up for a* Γ*-superrigid presaturated tower is more involved.*

Γ-rigidity

Definition

Assume Γ is closed under two-steps iterations.

B ∈ Γ is Γ-rigid if for all $Q \leq_\Gamma B$ there exists only one $i : B \to Q$ witnessing it.

Remark

Any B ∈ Γ which is Γ-superrigid is forcing equivalent to a presaturated tower and is also Γ-rigid. It is not clear if the converse holds. For this reason the definition I came up for a Γ-superrigid presaturated tower is more involved.

Definition (V.)

CFA(Γ) holds if the class of Γ-superrigid presaturated towers which belong to Γ is dense in $(\Gamma, \leq_\Gamma)$.

Definition (V., Asperó)

Γ is κ-suitable, if:

- it is ϕ-preserving for some Π_1-property $\phi(x)$ definable by a parameter in H_{κ^+},
- it is κ-iterable (essentially it has "nice" lower bounds in Γ for all "nice" $\leq^*_\Gamma$-descending sequences),
- it has a dense set of Γ-rigid elements.

Fact

For a κ-suitable Γ, CFA(Γ) implies $\mathrm{FA}_\kappa(\Gamma)$.

Definition (V.)

CFA(Γ) holds if the class of Γ-superrigid presaturated towers which belong to Γ is dense in $(\Gamma, \leq_\Gamma)$.

Definition (V., Asperó)

Γ is κ-suitable, if:

- it is ϕ-preserving for some Π_1-property $\phi(x)$ definable by a parameter in H_{κ^+},
- it is κ-iterable (essentially it has "nice" lower bounds in Γ for all "nice" $\leq^*_\Gamma$-descending sequences),
- it has a dense set of Γ-rigid elements.

Fact

For a κ-suitable Γ, CFA(Γ) *implies* $\mathrm{FA}_\kappa(\Gamma)$.

Definition (V.)

CFA(Γ) holds if the class of Γ-superrigid presaturated towers which belong to Γ is dense in $(\Gamma, \leq_\Gamma)$.

Definition (V., Asperó)

Γ is κ-suitable, if:

- it is ϕ-preserving for some Π_1-property $\phi(x)$ definable by a parameter in H_{κ^+},
- it is κ-iterable (essentially it has "nice" lower bounds in Γ for all "nice" $\leq^*_\Gamma$-descending sequences),
- it has a dense set of Γ-rigid elements.

Fact

For a κ-suitable Γ, CFA(Γ) *implies* FA$_\kappa$(Γ).

Definition (V.)

CFA(Γ) holds if the class of Γ-superrigid presaturated towers which belong to Γ is dense in $(\Gamma, \leq_\Gamma)$.

Definition (V., Asperó)

Γ is κ-suitable, if:

- it is ϕ-preserving for some Π_1-property $\phi(x)$ definable by a parameter in H_{κ^+},
- it is κ-iterable (essentially it has “nice” lower bounds in Γ for all “nice” $\leq^*_\Gamma$-descending sequences),
- it has a dense set of Γ-rigid elements.

Fact

For a κ-suitable Γ, CFA(Γ) implies $FA_\kappa(\Gamma)$.

Definition (V.)

CFA(Γ) holds if the class of Γ-superrigid presaturated towers which belong to Γ is dense in $(\Gamma, \leq_\Gamma)$.

Definition (V., Asperó)

Γ is κ-suitable, if:

- it is ϕ-preserving for some Π_1-property $\phi(x)$ definable by a parameter in H_{κ^+},
- it is κ-iterable (essentially it has "nice" lower bounds in Γ for all "nice" $\leq^*_\Gamma$-descending sequences),
- it has a dense set of Γ-rigid elements.

Fact

For a κ-suitable Γ, CFA(Γ) *implies* $\mathrm{FA}_\kappa(\Gamma)$.

Definition (V.)

CFA(Γ) holds if the class of Γ-superrigid presaturated towers which belong to Γ is dense in $(\Gamma, \leq_\Gamma)$.

Definition (V., Asperó)

Γ is κ-suitable, if:

- it is ϕ-preserving for some Π_1-property $\phi(x)$ definable by a parameter in H_{κ^+},
- it is κ-iterable (essentially it has "nice" lower bounds in Γ for all "nice" $\leq^*_\Gamma$-descending sequences),
- it has a dense set of Γ-rigid elements.

Fact

For a κ-suitable Γ, CFA(Γ) implies $\mathrm{FA}_\kappa(\Gamma)$.

Theorem (V.)

Assume Γ is κ-suitable for some κ and there is a 2-superhuge cardinal $\lambda > \kappa$. Then $\mathrm{CFA}(\Gamma)$ is consistent.

Theorem (V.)

Assume Γ is κ-suitable for some κ. Assume moreover that there are class many reflecting cardinals.
Then $\mathrm{CFA}(\Gamma)$ entails that the theory of $L(\mathrm{Ord}^{\kappa}) \supseteq H_{\kappa^+}$ is invariant with respect to forcing in Γ which preserve $\mathrm{CFA}(\Gamma)$.

Theorem (V.)

Assume Γ is κ-suitable for some κ and there is a 2-superhuge cardinal $\lambda > \kappa$. Then CFA(Γ) is consistent.

Theorem (V.)

Assume Γ is κ-suitable for some κ. Assume moreover that there are class many reflecting cardinals.
Then CFA(Γ) entails that the theory of $L(\mathrm{Ord}^\kappa) \supseteq H_{\kappa^+}$ is invariant with respect to forcing in Γ which preserve CFA(Γ).

Theorem (Asperó)

The following holds:

1. *Assume Γ is the intersection of any among the following 8 family of classes given by the union of*
   - *a singleton subset of*

     $$\{\textit{proper, semiproper}\}$$

   - *any non-empty subset of the following classes*

     $$\{\textit{preserving a Suslin tree on } \omega_1, \omega^\omega\textit{-bounding, all}\}.$$

   Then Γ is ω_1-suitable.
2. *There is a ninth ω_1-suitable class Γ such that* $\mathrm{CFA}(\Gamma)$ *implies* CH.

We obtain nine distinct classes Γ making the theory of $L(\mathrm{Ord}^{\omega_1})$ generically invariant with respect to the relevant forcings.

Theorem (Asperó)

The following holds:

1. *Assume* Γ *is the intersection of any among the following 8 family of classes given by the union of*
   - *a singleton subset of*

     $$\{\text{proper, semiproper}\}$$

   - *any non-empty subset of the following classes*

     $$\{\text{preserving a Suslin tree on } \omega_1, \omega^\omega\text{-bounding, all}\}.$$

   Then Γ *is* ω_1*-suitable.*
2. *There is a ninth* ω_1*-suitable class* Γ *such that* $\mathrm{CFA}(\Gamma)$ *implies* CH.

We obtain nine distinct classes Γ making the theory of $L(\mathrm{Ord}^{\omega_1})$ generically invariant with respect to the relevant forcings.

Γ-correct filters

Definition

Let Γ be a κ-suitable class of forcings and ϕ_Γ be the Π_1-property preserved by Γ.
Let $M \prec H_\theta$ with $\mathsf{B} \in M \cap \Gamma$ and $\kappa \subseteq M$, $\mathrm{otp}(M \cap \theta) \leq \kappa^+$.
Let $\pi_M : M \to N_M$ be the transitive collapse map of $(M, \in)$.

$H \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B} \cap M)$ is Γ-correct if

$$V \models \phi_\gamma(\pi_M(\dot{S})_{\pi_M[H]})$$

for all $\dot{S} \in M \cap V^{\mathsf{B}}$ such that $\left[\!\left[\phi_\gamma(\dot{S})\right]\!\right] = 1_{\mathsf{B}}$.

For example if $\Gamma = \mathrm{SSP}$,
Γ-correct filters for M and B are ultrafilters H for $\mathsf{B} \cap M$ which evaluate as stationary subsets of ω_1 in V all B-names for stationary subsets of ω_1 in M.

Γ-correct filters

Definition

Let Γ be a κ-suitable class of forcings and ϕ_Γ be the Π_1-property preserved by Γ.
Let $M \prec H_\theta$ with $\mathsf{B} \in M \cap \Gamma$ and $\kappa \subseteq M$, $\mathrm{otp}(M \cap \theta) \leq \kappa^+$.
Let $\pi_M : M \to N_M$ be the transitive collapse map of $(M, \in)$.

$H \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B} \cap M)$ is Γ-correct if

$$V \models \phi_\gamma(\pi_M(\dot{S})_{\pi_M[H]})$$

for all $\dot{S} \in M \cap V^{\mathsf{B}}$ such that $[\![\phi_\gamma(\dot{S})]\!] = 1_{\mathsf{B}}$.

For example if $\Gamma = \mathrm{SSP}$,
Γ-correct filters for M and B are ultrafilters H for $\mathsf{B} \cap M$ which evaluate as stationary subsets of ω_1 in V all B-names for stationary subsets of ω_1 in M.

Γ-correct filters

Definition

Let Γ be a κ-suitable class of forcings and ϕ_Γ be the Π_1-property preserved by Γ.
Let $M \prec H_\theta$ with $\mathsf{B} \in M \cap \Gamma$ and $\kappa \subseteq M$, $\mathrm{otp}(M \cap \theta) \leq \kappa^+$.
Let $\pi_M : M \to N_M$ be the transitive collapse map of $(M, \in)$.

$H \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B} \cap M)$ is Γ-correct if

$$V \models \phi_\gamma(\pi_M(\dot{S})_{\pi_M[H]})$$

for all $\dot{S} \in M \cap V^{\mathsf{B}}$ such that $\llbracket \phi_\gamma(\dot{S}) \rrbracket = 1_{\mathsf{B}}$.

For example if $\Gamma = \mathrm{SSP}$,
Γ-correct filters for M and B are ultrafilters H for $\mathsf{B} \cap M$ which evaluate as stationary subsets of ω_1 in V all B-names for stationary subsets of ω_1 in M.

Γ-correct filters

Definition

Let Γ be a κ-suitable class of forcings and ϕ_Γ be the Π_1-property preserved by Γ.
Let $M \prec H_\theta$ with $\mathsf{B} \in M \cap \Gamma$ and $\kappa \subseteq M$, $\mathrm{otp}(M \cap \theta) \leq \kappa^+$.
Let $\pi_M : M \to N_M$ be the transitive collapse map of $(M, \in)$.

$H \in \mathrm{St}(\mathsf{B} \cap M)$ is Γ-correct if

$$V \models \phi_\gamma(\pi_M(\dot{S})_{\pi_M[H]})$$

for all $\dot{S} \in M \cap V^{\mathsf{B}}$ such that $\left[\!\left[\phi_\gamma(\dot{S})\right]\!\right] = 1_{\mathsf{B}}$.

For example if $\Gamma = \mathrm{SSP}$,
Γ-correct filters for M and B are ultrafilters H for $\mathsf{B} \cap M$ which evaluate as stationary subsets of ω_1 in V all B-names for stationary subsets of ω_1 in M.

Self-generic filters

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_X : X \in V_\delta\}$ be a tower of normal ideals and $\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ be the corresponding tower forcing.

For example if $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathrm{NS}_X : X \in V_\delta\}$, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is Woodin's stationary tower.

$M \prec H_{\delta^+}$ is $\mathcal{I}$-self generic if

$$G_M = \{S \in M \cap V_\delta : M \cap \cup S \in S\}$$

is an M-generic filter for $\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$.

We let $T_{\mathcal{I}}$ denote the set of such models M.

Self-generic filters

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_X : X \in V_\delta\}$ be a tower of normal ideals and $\mathrm{T}_\mathcal{I}$ be the corresponding tower forcing.

For example if $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathrm{NS}_X : X \in V_\delta\}$, $\mathrm{T}_\mathcal{I}$ is Woodin's stationary tower.

$M \prec H_{\delta^+}$ is $\mathcal{I}$-self generic if

$$G_M = \{S \in M \cap V_\delta : M \cap \cup S \in S\}$$

is an M-generic filter for $\mathrm{T}_\mathcal{I}$.

We let $T_\mathcal{I}$ denote the set of such models M.

Self-generic filters

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_X : X \in V_\delta\}$ be a tower of normal ideals and $\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ be the corresponding tower forcing.

For example if $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathrm{NS}_X : X \in V_\delta\}$, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is Woodin's stationary tower.

$M \prec H_{\delta^+}$ is $\mathcal{I}$-self generic if

$$G_M = \{S \in M \cap V_\delta : M \cap \cup S \in S\}$$

is an M-generic filter for $\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$.

We let $T_{\mathcal{I}}$ denote the set of such models M.

Self-generic filters

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_X : X \in V_\delta\}$ be a tower of normal ideals and $\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ be the corresponding tower forcing.

For example if $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathrm{NS}_X : X \in V_\delta\}$, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is Woodin's stationary tower.

$M \prec H_{\delta^+}$ is $\mathcal{I}$-self generic if

$$G_M = \{S \in M \cap V_\delta : M \cap \cup S \in S\}$$

is an M-generic filter for $\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$.

We let $T_{\mathcal{I}}$ denote the set of such models M.

Γ-superrigid presaturated towers

Definition

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_X : X \in V_\delta\}$ be a tower of normal ideals and Γ be a κ-suitable class of forcings.

$\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is Γ-superrigid presaturated if:

- for all $M \prec H_{\delta^+}$ G_M is the unique possible Γ-correct M-generic filter for $\mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$.
- For all $S \in \mathrm{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$
  $$T_{\mathcal{I}} \wedge S$$
  is stationary.

Iterated resurrection axioms and generic absoluteness

There is a companion approach to generic absoluteness results inspired by Hamkins and Johnstone's resurrection axioms, and by Tsaprounis elaborations on their work.

Specifically generic absoluteness is also given by the iterated resurrection axioms $\mathsf{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma, \kappa)$ as Γ ranges among forcing classes, κ among cardinals, and α among ordinals.

It is joint work with Audrito, my former PhD student, now PostDoc in the computer science dept in Torino.

I will skip details due to time constraints.....

Iterated resurrection axioms and generic absoluteness

There is a companion approach to generic absoluteness results inspired by Hamkins and Johnstone's resurrection axioms, and by Tsaprounis elaborations on their work.

Specifically generic absoluteness is also given by the iterated resurrection axioms $\mathsf{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma, \kappa)$ as Γ ranges among forcing classes, κ among cardinals, and α among ordinals.

It is joint work with Audrito, my former PhD student, now PostDoc in the computer science dept in Torino.

I will skip details due to time constraints.....

Iterated resurrection axioms and generic absoluteness

There is a companion approach to generic absoluteness results inspired by Hamkins and Johnstone's resurrection axioms, and by Tsaprounis elaborations on their work.

Specifically generic absoluteness is also given by the iterated resurrection axioms $\mathsf{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma, \kappa)$ as Γ ranges among forcing classes, κ among cardinals, and α among ordinals.

It is joint work with Audrito, my former PhD student, now PostDoc in the computer science dept in Torino.

I will skip details due to time constraints.....

Iterated resurrection axioms and generic absoluteness

There is a companion approach to generic absoluteness results inspired by Hamkins and Johnstone's resurrection axioms, and by Tsaprounis elaborations on their work.

Specifically generic absoluteness is also given by the iterated resurrection axioms $\mathsf{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma, \kappa)$ as Γ ranges among forcing classes, κ among cardinals, and α among ordinals.

It is joint work with Audrito, my former PhD student, now PostDoc in the computer science dept in Torino.

I will skip details due to time constraints.....

Iterated resurrection axioms and generic absoluteness

There is a companion approach to generic absoluteness results inspired by Hamkins and Johnstone's resurrection axioms, and by Tsaprounis elaborations on their work.
Specifically generic absoluteness is also given by the iterated resurrection axioms $\mathsf{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma, \kappa)$ as Γ ranges among forcing classes, κ among cardinals, and α among ordinals.
It is joint work with Audrito, my former PhD student, now PostDoc in the computer science dept in Torino.
I will skip details due to time constraints.....

Comments and open questions

- Category forcing axioms spring out from a natural inquire to strengthen as much as possible the nonconstructive tools.
- Most often BCT and AC suffice. In some cases (which are not restricted to set theory but occurs also in other parts of mathematics) generic absolutness arguments for projective sets are useful.
- This leads us to model theoretic considerations which show that forcing axioms yield a variety of canonical elementary superstructures of initial fragments of V (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- We now have a definite pattern which isolate a modular strategy to obtain forcing axioms (the axioms CFA(Γ) and $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \kappa)$ for a κ-suitable Γ) yielding more and more generic absoluteness for larger and larger fragments of the universe (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- It remains wide open whether we can prove CFA(Γ) (or $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \omega_2)$, i.e. an axiom freezing the theory of $H_{\aleph_3}$) consistent for some Γ (other than the class of ω_1-closed forcings) which is ω_2-suitable.

Comments and open questions

- Category forcing axioms spring out from a natural inquire to strengthen as much as possible the nonconstructive tools.
- Most often BCT and AC suffice. In some cases (which are not restricted to set theory but occurs also in other parts of mathematics) generic absolutness arguments for projective sets are useful.
- This leads us to model theoretic considerations which show that forcing axioms yield a variety of canonical elementary superstructures of initial fragments of V (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- We now have a definite pattern which isolate a modular strategy to obtain forcing axioms (the axioms CFA(Γ) and $\mathsf{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \kappa)$ for a κ-suitable Γ) yielding more and more generic absoluteness for larger and larger fragments of the universe (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- It remains wide open whether we can prove CFA(Γ) (or $\mathsf{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \omega_2)$, i.e. an axiom freezing the theory of $H_{\aleph_3}$) consistent for some Γ (other than the class of ω_1-closed forcings) which is ω_2-suitable.

Comments and open questions

- Category forcing axioms spring out from a natural inquire to strengthen as much as possible the nonconstructive tools.
- Most often BCT and AC suffice. In some cases (which are not restricted to set theory but occurs also in other parts of mathematics) generic absolutness arguments for projective sets are useful.
- This leads us to model theoretic considerations which show that forcing axioms yield a variety of canonical elementary superstructures of initial fragments of V (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- We now have a definite pattern which isolate a modular strategy to obtain forcing axioms (the axioms CFA(Γ) and $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma,\kappa)$ for a κ-suitable Γ) yielding more and more generic absoluteness for larger and larger fragments of the universe (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- It remains wide open whether we can prove CFA(Γ) (or $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma,\omega_2)$, i.e. an axiom freezing the theory of $H_{\aleph_3}$) consistent for some Γ (other than the class of ω_1-closed forcings) which is ω_2-suitable.

Comments and open questions

- Category forcing axioms spring out from a natural inquire to strengthen as much as possible the nonconstructive tools.
- Most often BCT and AC suffice. In some cases (which are not restricted to set theory but occurs also in other parts of mathematics) generic absolutness arguments for projective sets are useful.
- This leads us to model theoretic considerations which show that forcing axioms yield a variety of canonical elementary superstructures of initial fragments of V (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- We now have a definite pattern which isolate a modular strategy to obtain forcing axioms (the axioms CFA(Γ) and $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \kappa)$ for a κ-suitable Γ) yielding more and more generic absoluteness for larger and larger fragments of the universe (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- It remains wide open whether we can prove CFA(Γ) (or $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \omega_2)$, i.e. an axiom freezing the theory of $H_{\aleph_3}$) consistent for some Γ (other than the class of ω_1-closed forcings) which is ω_2-suitable.

Comments and open questions

- Category forcing axioms spring out from a natural inquire to strengthen as much as possible the nonconstructive tools.
- Most often BCT and AC suffice. In some cases (which are not restricted to set theory but occurs also in other parts of mathematics) generic absolutness arguments for projective sets are useful.
- This leads us to model theoretic considerations which show that forcing axioms yield a variety of canonical elementary superstructures of initial fragments of V (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- We now have a definite pattern which isolate a modular strategy to obtain forcing axioms (the axioms $\mathsf{CFA}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathsf{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \kappa)$ for a κ-suitable Γ) yielding more and more generic absoluteness for larger and larger fragments of the universe (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- It remains wide open whether we can prove $\mathsf{CFA}(\Gamma)$ (or $\mathsf{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \omega_2)$, i.e. an axiom freezing the theory of $H_{\aleph_3}$) consistent for some Γ (other than the class of ω_1-closed forcings) which is ω_2-suitable.

Comments and open questions

- Category forcing axioms spring out from a natural inquire to strengthen as much as possible the nonconstructive tools.
- Most often BCT and AC suffice. In some cases (which are not restricted to set theory but occurs also in other parts of mathematics) generic absolutness arguments for projective sets are useful.
- This leads us to model theoretic considerations which show that forcing axioms yield a variety of canonical elementary superstructures of initial fragments of V (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- We now have a definite pattern which isolate a modular strategy to obtain forcing axioms (the axioms CFA(Γ) and $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \kappa)$ for a κ-suitable Γ) yielding more and more generic absoluteness for larger and larger fragments of the universe (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- It remains wide open whether we can prove CFA(Γ) (or $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \omega_2)$, i.e. an axiom freezing the theory of $H_{\aleph_3}$) consistent for some Γ (other than the class of ω_1-closed forcings) which is ω_2-suitable.

Comments and open questions

- Category forcing axioms spring out from a natural inquire to strengthen as much as possible the nonconstructive tools.
- Most often BCT and AC suffice. In some cases (which are not restricted to set theory but occurs also in other parts of mathematics) generic absolutness arguments for projective sets are useful.
- This leads us to model theoretic considerations which show that forcing axioms yield a variety of canonical elementary superstructures of initial fragments of V (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- We now have a definite pattern which isolate a modular strategy to obtain forcing axioms (the axioms CFA(Γ) and $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \kappa)$ for a κ-suitable Γ) yielding more and more generic absoluteness for larger and larger fragments of the universe (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- It remains wide open whether we can prove CFA(Γ) (or $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \omega_2)$, i.e. an axiom freezing the theory of $H_{\aleph_3}$) consistent for some Γ (other than the class of ω_1-closed forcings) which is ω_2-suitable.

Comments and open questions

- Category forcing axioms spring out from a natural inquire to strengthen as much as possible the nonconstructive tools.
- Most often BCT and AC suffice. In some cases (which are not restricted to set theory but occurs also in other parts of mathematics) generic absolutness arguments for projective sets are useful.
- This leads us to model theoretic considerations which show that forcing axioms yield a variety of canonical elementary superstructures of initial fragments of V (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- We now have a definite pattern which isolate a modular strategy to obtain forcing axioms (the axioms $\mathsf{CFA}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathsf{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \kappa)$ for a κ-suitable Γ) yielding more and more generic absoluteness for larger and larger fragments of the universe (if one is eager to accept their truth....).
- It remains wide open whether we can prove $\mathsf{CFA}(\Gamma)$ (or $\mathsf{RA}_\omega(\Gamma, \omega_2)$, i.e. an axiom freezing the theory of $H_{\aleph_3}$) consistent for some Γ (other than the class of ω_1-closed forcings) which is ω_2-suitable.

Bibliography

Giorgio Audrito and Matteo Viale.
Absoluteness via resurrection.
arXiv:1404.2111 (to apper in the Journal of Mathematical Logic), 2017.

A. Vaccaro and M. Viale.
Generic absoluteness and boolean names for elements of a Polish space.
Boll Unione Mat Ital, 2017.

Matteo Viale.
Category forcings, MM^{+++}, and generic absoluteness for the theory of strong forcing axioms.
J. Amer. Math. Soc., 29(3):675–728, 2016.

Matteo Viale.
Useful axioms.
2016.

THANKS FOR YOUR PATIENCE AND ATTENTION