Generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$

Vincenzo Dimonte

09 April 2015

Two possible motivations:

Two possible motivations:

- model-theoretic / combinatorial on the first ω cardinals,

Two possible motivations:

- model-theoretic / combinatorial on the first ω cardinals, or
- $\neg$AC combinatorics of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$.

Two possible motivations:

- model-theoretic / combinatorial on the first ω cardinals, or
- $\neg$AC combinatorics of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$.

The first is a motivation for the *hypothesis*.

Two possible motivations:

- model-theoretic / combinatorial on the first ω cardinals, or
- $\neg$AC combinatorics of $\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$.

The first is a motivation for the *hypothesis*.
The second is a motivation for the *thesis*.

Definition (Chang's Conjecture, 1963)

Every model of type $(\aleph_2, \aleph_1)$ (i.e., the universe has cardinality $\aleph_2$ and there is a predicate of cardinality $\aleph_1$) for a countable language has an elementary submodel of type $(\aleph_1, \aleph_0)$.

Definition (Chang's Conjecture, 1963)

Every model of type $(\aleph_2, \aleph_1)$ (i.e., the universe has cardinality $\aleph_2$ and there is a predicate of cardinality $\aleph_1$) for a countable language has an elementary submodel of type $(\aleph_1, \aleph_0)$.
Notation: $(\aleph_2, \aleph_1) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_1, \aleph_0)$.

Definition (Chang's Conjecture, 1963)

Every model of type $(\aleph_2, \aleph_1)$ (i.e., the universe has cardinality $\aleph_2$ and there is a predicate of cardinality $\aleph_1$) for a countable language has an elementary submodel of type $(\aleph_1, \aleph_0)$.
Notation: $(\aleph_2, \aleph_1) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_1, \aleph_0)$.

Pretty much, the relationship between $\aleph_2$ and $\aleph_1$ is not that different from the one between $\aleph_1$ and $\aleph_0$

Definition (Chang's Conjecture, 1963)

Every model of type $(\aleph_2, \aleph_1)$ (i.e., the universe has cardinality $\aleph_2$ and there is a predicate of cardinality $\aleph_1$) for a countable language has an elementary submodel of type $(\aleph_1, \aleph_0)$.
Notation: $(\aleph_2, \aleph_1) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_1, \aleph_0)$.

Pretty much, the relationship between $\aleph_2$ and $\aleph_1$ is not that different from the one between $\aleph_1$ and $\aleph_0$.

Proposition

Chang's Conjecture $\rightarrow$ the non-existence of a Kurepa tree.

What is the consistency strength of Chang's Conjecture?

What is the consistency strength of Chang's Conjecture?

Theorem (Silver, 1967)

Con(Ramsey) $\rightarrow$ Con(Chang's Conjecture)

What is the consistency strength of Chang's Conjecture?

Theorem (Silver, 1967)

Con(Ramsey) $\rightarrow$ Con(Chang's Conjecture).

Theorem (Rowbottom, 1971)

Chang's Conjecture $\rightarrow$ $\aleph_1$ is inaccessible in L

What is the consistency strength of Chang's Conjecture?

Theorem (Silver, 1967)

Con(Ramsey) $\rightarrow$ Con(Chang's Conjecture).

Theorem (Rowbottom, 1971)

Chang's Conjecture $\rightarrow$ $\aleph_1$ is inaccessible in L.

Theorem (Kunen)

Chang's Conjecture $\rightarrow$ $0^\sharp$ (in fact, $x^\sharp$ for all reals x)

What is the consistency strength of Chang's Conjecture?

Theorem (Silver, 1967)

Con(Ramsey) $\rightarrow$ Con(Chang's Conjecture).

Theorem (Rowbottom, 1971)

Chang's Conjecture $\rightarrow$ $\aleph_1$ is inaccessible in L.

Theorem (Kunen)

Chang's Conjecture $\rightarrow$ $0^\sharp$ (in fact, $x^\sharp$ for all reals x).

Theorem (Silver)

Con(ω_1-Erdös) $\rightarrow$ Con(Chang's Conjecture)

What is the consistency strength of Chang's Conjecture?

Theorem (Silver, 1967)

Con(Ramsey) $\rightarrow$ Con(Chang's Conjecture).

Theorem (Rowbottom, 1971)

Chang's Conjecture $\rightarrow$ $\aleph_1$ is inaccessible in L.

Theorem (Kunen)

Chang's Conjecture $\rightarrow$ $0^\sharp$ (in fact, $x^\sharp$ for all reals x).

Theorem (Silver)

Con(ω_1-Erdös) $\rightarrow$ Con(Chang's Conjecture).

Theorem (Donder, 1979)

Chang's Conjecture $\rightarrow$ $\aleph_1$ is ω_1-Erdös in the core model.

What about $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_2, \aleph_1)$?

What about $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_2, \aleph_1)$?

Theorem (Laver)

Con(huge cardinal)$\rightarrow$Con($(\aleph_3, \aleph_2) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_2, \aleph_1)$)

What about $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_2, \aleph_1)$?

Theorem (Laver)

Con(huge cardinal)$\rightarrow$Con$((\aleph_3, \aleph_2) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_2, \aleph_1))$.

Theorem (Schindler)

Con$((\aleph_3, \aleph_2) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_2, \aleph_1))$$\rightarrow$Con$(o(\kappa) = \kappa^{+\omega})$.

Theorem (Keisler, 1962)

κ is measurable iff there exists $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$

Theorem (Keisler, 1962)

κ is measurable iff there exists $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. This implies ${}^{<\kappa}M \subseteq M$

Theorem (Keisler, 1962)

κ is measurable iff there exists $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. This implies ${}^{<\kappa}M \subseteq M$.

Definition (late 60's)

Let κ and γ be cardinals

Theorem (Keisler, 1962)

κ is measurable iff there exists $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. This implies ${}^{<\kappa}M \subseteq M$.

Definition (late 60's)

Let κ and γ be cardinals. Then κ is γ-*supercompact* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, $\gamma < j(\kappa)$ and ${}^{\gamma}M \subseteq M$

Theorem (Keisler, 1962)

κ is measurable iff there exists $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. This implies ${}^{<\kappa}M \subseteq M$.

Definition (late 60's)

Let κ and γ be cardinals. Then κ is γ-*supercompact* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, $\gamma < j(\kappa)$ and ${}^{\gamma}M \subseteq M$. If κ is γ-supercompact for any γ, then κ is supercompact

Theorem (Keisler, 1962)

κ is measurable iff there exists $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. This implies ${}^{<\kappa}M \subseteq M$.

Definition (late 60's)

Let κ and γ be cardinals. Then κ is γ-*supercompact* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, $\gamma < j(\kappa)$ and ${}^{\gamma}M \subseteq M$. If κ is γ-supercompact for any γ, then κ is supercompact.

Definition (Kunen, 1972)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *huge* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, ${}^{j(\kappa)}M \subseteq M$.

Definition

Let $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. We define the critical sequence $\langle \kappa_0, \kappa_1, \dots \rangle$ as $\kappa_0 = \kappa$ and $j(\kappa_n) = \kappa_{n+1}$.

Definition

Let $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. We define the critical sequence $\langle \kappa_0, \kappa_1, \ldots \rangle$ as $\kappa_0 = \kappa$ and $j(\kappa_n) = \kappa_{n+1}$.

Definition (Kunen, 1972)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *n-huge* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, ${}^{\kappa_n}M \subseteq M$.

Definition

Let $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. We define the critical sequence $\langle \kappa_0, \kappa_1, \ldots \rangle$ as $\kappa_0 = \kappa$ and $j(\kappa_n) = \kappa_{n+1}$.

Definition (Kunen, 1972)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *n-huge* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, ${}^{\kappa_n}M \subseteq M$.

Definition (Reinhardt, 1970)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *ω-huge* or *Reinhardt* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa_0$, ${}^{\lambda}M \subseteq M$, with $\lambda = \sup_{n\in\omega} \kappa_n$.

Definition

Let $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$. We define the critical sequence $\langle \kappa_0, \kappa_1, \dots \rangle$ as $\kappa_0 = \kappa$ and $j(\kappa_n) = \kappa_{n+1}$.

Definition (Kunen, 1972)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *n-huge* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa$, ${}^{\kappa_n}M \subseteq M$.

Definition (Reinhardt, 1970)

Let κ be a cardinal. Then κ is *ω-huge* or *Reinhardt* iff there is a $j : V \prec M$ with $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \kappa_0$, ${}^{\lambda}M \subseteq M$, with $\lambda = \sup_{n\in\omega} \kappa_n$. Equivalently, if there is a $j : V \prec V$, with $\kappa = \mathrm{crt}(j)$.

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

Proof

Let $E^{\omega}_{\lambda^+} = \{\alpha < \lambda^+ : \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\}$

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

Proof

Let $E^{\omega}_{\lambda^+} = \{\alpha < \lambda^+ : \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\}$. By Solovay there exists $\langle S_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$ a partition of S_ω in ω-stationary sets

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

Proof

Let $E^{\omega}_{\lambda^+} = \{\alpha < \lambda^+ : \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\}$. By Solovay there exists $\langle S_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$ a partition of S_ω in ω-stationary sets. It's a quick calculation that $j(\lambda) = \lambda$ and $j(\lambda^+) = \lambda^+$

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

Proof

Let $E^{\omega}_{\lambda^+} = \{\alpha < \lambda^+ : \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\}$. By Solovay there exists $\langle S_\xi : \xi < \kappa\rangle$ a partition of S_ω in ω-stationary sets. It's a quick calculation that $j(\lambda) = \lambda$ and $j(\lambda^+) = \lambda^+$. Let $j(\langle S_\xi : \xi < \kappa\rangle) = \langle T_\xi : \xi < \kappa_1\rangle$

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

Proof

Let $E^{\omega}_{\lambda^+} = \{\alpha < \lambda^+ : \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\}$. By Solovay there exists $\langle S_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$ a partition of S_ω in ω-stationary sets. It's a quick calculation that $j(\lambda) = \lambda$ and $j(\lambda^+) = \lambda^+$. Let $j(\langle S_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle) = \langle T_\xi : \xi < \kappa_1 \rangle$. $C = \{\alpha < \lambda^+ : j(\alpha) = \alpha\}$ is an ω-club, therefore there exists $\alpha \in C \cap T_\kappa$

Theorem (Kunen, 1971)

There is no Reinhardt cardinal.

Proof

Let $E^{\omega}_{\lambda^+} = \{\alpha < \lambda^+ : \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\}$. By Solovay there exists $\langle S_\xi : \xi < \kappa\rangle$ a partition of S_ω in ω-stationary sets. It's a quick calculation that $j(\lambda) = \lambda$ and $j(\lambda^+) = \lambda^+$. Let $j(\langle S_\xi : \xi < \kappa\rangle) = \langle T_\xi : \xi < \kappa_1\rangle$. $C = \{\alpha < \lambda^+ : j(\alpha) = \alpha\}$ is an ω-club, therefore there exists $\alpha \in C \cap T_\kappa$. Let $\alpha \in S_\xi$. Then $j(\alpha) = \alpha \in T_j(\xi) \cap T_\kappa$.

Large cardinals are really large, but there is a trick to apply their properties to small cardinals

Large cardinals are really large, but there is a trick to apply their properties to small cardinals.
Generic large cardinals are a "virtual" version of large cardinals

Large cardinals are really large, but there is a trick to apply their properties to small cardinals.

Generic large cardinals are a “virtual” version of large cardinals.

Definition (Jech, Prikry, 1976)

Let κ be a cardinal, I an ideal on $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. Then $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/I$ is a forcing notion

Large cardinals are really large, but there is a trick to apply their properties to small cardinals.
Generic large cardinals are a "virtual" version of large cardinals.

Definition (Jech, Prikry, 1976)

Let κ be a cardinal, I an ideal on $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. Then $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/I$ is a forcing notion. If G is generic for $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/I$, then G is a V-ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ and there exists $j : V \prec \mathrm{Ult}(V, G)$

Large cardinals are really large, but there is a trick to apply their properties to small cardinals.
Generic large cardinals are a “virtual” version of large cardinals.

Definition (Jech, Prikry, 1976)

Let κ be a cardinal, I an ideal on $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. Then $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/I$ is a forcing notion. If G is generic for $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/I$, then G is a V-ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ and there exists $j : V \prec \mathrm{Ult}(V, G)$.
I is precipitous iff $\mathrm{Ult}(V, G)$ is well-founded, and in that case there exists $j : V \prec M \subseteq V[G]$

Large cardinals are really large, but there is a trick to apply their properties to small cardinals.
Generic large cardinals are a “virtual” version of large cardinals.

Definition (Jech, Prikry, 1976)

Let κ be a cardinal, I an ideal on $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. Then $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/I$ is a forcing notion. If G is generic for $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/I$, then G is a V-ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ and there exists $j : V \prec \mathrm{Ult}(V, G)$.
I is precipitous iff $\mathrm{Ult}(V, G)$ is well-founded, and in that case there exists $j : V \prec M \subseteq V[G]$.
We say that κ is a generically measurable cardinal.

One can extend the definition to all the large cardinals above: generic γ-supercompact, generic huge, generic *n*-huge

One can extend the definition to all the large cardinals above: generic γ-supercompact, generic huge, generic n-huge.
In fact, the Theorem above by Laver is in fact divided in two

One can extend the definition to all the large cardinals above: generic γ-supercompact, generic huge, generic n-huge.
In fact, the Theorem above by Laver is in fact divided in two:

Theorem (Laver)

Con(huge cardinal)$\rightarrow$Con($\aleph_1$ is generic huge cardinal and $j(\aleph_2)=\aleph_3$)

One can extend the definition to all the large cardinals above: generic γ-supercompact, generic huge, generic n-huge.
In fact, the Theorem above by Laver is in fact divided in two:

Theorem (Laver)

Con(huge cardinal)$\rightarrow$Con($\aleph_1$ is generic huge cardinal and $j(\aleph_2) = \aleph_3$).

Proposition

If $j : V \prec M \subseteq V[G]$, M closed under $\aleph_3$-sequences, $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \aleph_2$ and $j(\aleph_2) = \aleph_3$, then $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_2, \aleph_1)$.

Proof

Suppose not. Let $\mathcal{U}$ of type $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2)$ be a counterexample

Proof

Suppose not. Let $\mathcal{U}$ of type $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2)$ be a counterexample. Then $j(\mathcal{U})$ is of tpye $(\aleph_3^M, \aleph_2^M)$

Proof

Suppose not. Let $\mathcal{U}$ of type $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2)$ be a counterexample. Then $j(\mathcal{U})$ is of tpye $(\aleph_3^M, \aleph_2^M)$. But by hugeness $j``\mathcal{U}$ is in M, and $j''\mathcal{U} \prec j(\mathcal{U})$

Proof

Suppose not. Let $\mathcal{U}$ of type $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2)$ be a counterexample. Then $j(\mathcal{U})$ is of tpye $(\aleph_3^M, \aleph_2^M)$. But by hugeness $j``\mathcal{U}$ is in $M$, and $j''\mathcal{U} \prec j(\mathcal{U})$. Finally, $j``\mathcal{U}$ is of type $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2) = (\aleph_2^M, \aleph_1^M)$

Proof

Suppose not. Let $\mathcal{U}$ of type $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2)$ be a counterexample. Then $j(\mathcal{U})$ is of tpye $(\aleph_3^M, \aleph_2^M)$. But by hugeness $j``\mathcal{U}$ is in $M$, and $j''\mathcal{U} \prec j(\mathcal{U})$. Finally, $j``\mathcal{U}$ is of type $(\aleph_3, \aleph_2) = (\aleph_2^M, \aleph_1^M)$.

In the same way,

Proposition

If $j : V \prec M \subseteq V[G]$, M closed under $\aleph_{n+1}$-sequences, $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \aleph_1$ and $j(\aleph_1) = \aleph_2$, $j(\aleph_2) = \aleph_3, \dots,$ then $(\aleph_{n+1}, \dots, \aleph_2, \aleph_1) \twoheadrightarrow (\aleph_n, \dots, \aleph_1, \aleph_0)$.

Definition

κ is Jónsson iff every structure for a countable language with domain of cardinality κ has a proper elementary substructure with domain of the same cardinality

Definition

κ is Jónsson iff every structure for a countable language with domain of cardinality κ has a proper elementary substructure with domain of the same cardinality.

Then $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson is $(\ldots, \aleph_2, \aleph_1) \to (\ldots, \aleph_1, \aleph_0)$

Definition

κ is Jónsson iff every structure for a countable language with domain of cardinality κ has a proper elementary substructure with domain of the same cardinality.

Then $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson is $(\ldots, \aleph_2, \aleph_1) \to (\ldots, \aleph_1, \aleph_0)$.

Open Problem

What about Con($\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson)?

Definition

κ is Jónsson iff every structure for a countable language with domain of cardinality κ has a proper elementary substructure with domain of the same cardinality.

Then $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson is $(\ldots, \aleph_2, \aleph_1) \to (\ldots, \aleph_1, \aleph_0)$.

Open Problem

What about Con($\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson)?

There is no ω-huge (and Shelah proved there is no generic ω-huge)! What can we do?

Kunen proved in fact $\neg\exists j : V_{\lambda+2} \prec V_{\lambda+2}$

Kunen proved in fact $\neg\exists j : V_{\lambda+2} \prec V_{\lambda+2}$. This leaves space for the following definitions:

Kunen proved in fact $\neg\exists j : V_{\lambda+2} \prec V_{\lambda+2}$. This leaves space for the following definitions:

Definition

I3 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_\lambda \prec V_\lambda$;

Kunen proved in fact $\neg\exists j : V_{\lambda+2} \prec V_{\lambda+2}$. This leaves space for the following definitions:

Definition

- I3 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_\lambda \prec V_\lambda$;
- I2 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec_1 V_{\lambda+1}$;

Kunen proved in fact $\neg\exists j : V_{\lambda+2} \prec V_{\lambda+2}$. This leaves space for the following definitions:

Definition

- I3 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_\lambda \prec V_\lambda$;
- I2 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec_1 V_{\lambda+1}$;
- I1 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$;

Kunen proved in fact $\neg\exists j : V_{\lambda+2} \prec V_{\lambda+2}$. This leaves space for the following definitions:

Definition

- I3 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_\lambda \prec V_\lambda$;
- I2 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec_1 V_{\lambda+1}$;
- I1 iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$;
- I0 For some λ there exists a $j : L(V_{\lambda+1}) \prec L(V_{\lambda+1})$, with $\mathrm{crt}(j) < \lambda$

Kunen proved in fact $\neg\exists j : V_{\lambda+2} \prec V_{\lambda+2}$. This leaves space for the following definitions:

Definition

- **I3** iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_\lambda \prec V_\lambda$;
- **I2** iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec_1 V_{\lambda+1}$;
- **I1** iff there exists λ s.t. $\exists j : V_{\lambda+1} \prec V_{\lambda+1}$;
- **I0** For some λ there exists a $j : L(V_{\lambda+1}) \prec L(V_{\lambda+1})$, with $\mathrm{crt}(j) < \lambda$.

With the "right" forcing, generic I* implies $\aleph_\omega$ is Jónsson.

Disclaimer: it is still not clear how strong this is

Disclaimer: it is still not clear how strong this is:

Theorem (Foreman,1982)

Con(2-huge cardinal)$\rightarrow$Con($\aleph_1$ is generic 2-huge cardinal and ...)

Disclaimer: it is still not clear how strong this is:

Theorem (Foreman,1982)

Con(2-huge cardinal)$\rightarrow$Con($\aleph_1$ is generic 2-huge cardinal and $\ldots$).

Open Problem

What about Con($\aleph_1$ is generic 3-huge cardinal and $\ldots$)?

Definition (GCH)

Generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$ is true

Definition (GCH)

Generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$ is true if there exists a forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ such that for any generic G there exists $j : L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))^{V[G]}$ and $\mathbb{P}$ is reasonable.

Examples: $\mathbb{P} = \mathrm{Coll}(\aleph_3, \aleph_2)$

Definition (GCH)

Generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$ is true if there exists a forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ such that for any generic G there exists $j : L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))^{V[G]}$ and $\mathbb{P}$ is reasonable.

Examples: $\mathbb{P} = \mathrm{Coll}(\aleph_3, \aleph_2)$, $\mathbb{P} =$ product of $\mathbb{P}_n$, where $\mathbb{P}_n = \mathrm{Coll}(\aleph_{n+3}, \aleph_n + 2)$.

Definition

$$\Theta = \sup\{\alpha : \exists \pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha,\ \pi \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$$

Definition

$\Theta = \sup\{\alpha : \exists\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha,\ \pi \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Theorem

Suppose generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$

Definition

$\Theta = \sup\{\alpha : \exists\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha,\ \pi \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))\}$.

Theorem

Suppose generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$. Then in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$

Definition

$\Theta = \sup\{\alpha : \exists \pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha,\ \pi \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Theorem

Suppose generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$. Then in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$:

1. $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable

Definition

$\Theta = \sup\{\alpha : \exists\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha,\ \pi \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Theorem

Suppose generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$. Then in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$:

1. $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable;
2. Θ is weakly inaccessible

Definition

$\Theta = \sup\{\alpha : \exists \pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha,\ \pi \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Theorem

Suppose generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$. Then in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$:

1. $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable;
2. Θ is weakly inaccessible;
3. Θ is limit of measurable cardinals

Definition

$\Theta = \sup\{\alpha : \exists\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha,\ \pi \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Theorem

Suppose generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$. Then in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$:

1. $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable;
2. Θ is weakly inaccessible;
3. Θ is limit of measurable cardinals.

Confront this with:

Theorem (Shelah)

If $\aleph_\omega$ is strong limit, then $2^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_{\omega_4}$

Definition

$\Theta = \sup\{\alpha : \exists\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha,\ \pi \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Theorem

Suppose generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$. Then in $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$:

1. $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable;
2. Θ is weakly inaccessible;
3. Θ is limit of measurable cardinals.

Confront this with:

Theorem (Shelah)

If $\aleph_\omega$ is strong limit, then $2^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_{\omega_4}$.

(From now on, let's suppose $\mathrm{crt}(j) = \aleph_2$ and $j(\aleph_2) = \aleph_3$).

Proof of (1)

It is practically the same proof as Kunen's Theorem

Proof of (1)

It is practically the same proof as Kunen's Theorem. Suppose $\langle S_\xi : \xi < \aleph_2 \rangle$ is an ω-stationary partition

Proof of (1)

It is practically the same proof as Kunen's Theorem. Suppose $\langle S_\xi : \xi < \aleph_2 \rangle$ is an ω-stationary partition. Now, $j \upharpoonright L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}) \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$, so $C = \{\alpha < \aleph_{\omega+1} : j(\alpha) = \alpha\} \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$

Proof of (1)

It is practically the same proof as Kunen's Theorem. Suppose $\langle S_\xi : \xi < \aleph_2 \rangle$ is an ω-stationary partition. Now, $j \restriction L_\alpha(\mathcal{P}) \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$, so $C = \{\alpha < \aleph_{\omega+1} : j(\alpha) = \alpha\} \in L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))[G]$. As before, then there exists $\alpha \in T_\xi \cap T_{\aleph_2}$.
In $L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ we have some choice, namely $\mathrm{DC}_{\aleph_\omega}$...

school1354853352.jpg

For points (2) and (3) we need more choice than $DC_{\aleph_\omega}$

For points (2) and (3) we need more choice than $\mathrm{DC}_{\aleph_\omega}$:

Coding Lemma

$\forall \eta < \Theta \, \forall \rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \eta \ \exists \gamma < \Theta \ \forall A \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \ \exists B \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \ B \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \ B \subseteq A$ and $\{\rho(a) : a \in B\} = \{\rho(a) : a \in A\}$.

Proof of (2)

One has to prove that if there exists $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha$, then there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$

Proof of (2)

One has to prove that if there exists $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha$, then there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$. Let $A \subseteq \alpha$, and consider $\{a : \rho(a) \in A\}$

Proof of (2)

One has to prove that if there exists $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha$, then there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$. Let $A \subseteq \alpha$, and consider $\{a : \rho(a) \in A\}$. Apply the Coding Lemma to this, to find $B \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that $\{\rho(a) : a \in B\} = A$

Proof of (2)

One has to prove that if there exists $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha$, then there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$. Let $A \subseteq \alpha$, and consider $\{a : \rho(a) \in A\}$. Apply the Coding Lemma to this, to find $B \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that $\{\rho(a) : a \in B\} = A$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}(\alpha) \subseteq L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$

Proof of (2)

One has to prove that if there exists $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha$, then there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$. Let $A \subseteq \alpha$, and consider $\{a : \rho(a) \in A\}$. Apply the Coding Lemma to this, to find $B \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that $\{\rho(a) : a \in B\} = A$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}(\alpha) \subseteq L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Proof of (3)

The measurable cardinals will be the first γ's such that $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec_1 L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ above a fixed point

Proof of (2)

One has to prove that if there exists $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha$, then there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$. Let $A \subseteq \alpha$, and consider $\{a : \rho(a) \in A\}$. Apply the Coding Lemma to this, to find $B \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that $\{\rho(a) : a \in B\} = A$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}(\alpha) \subseteq L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Proof of (3)

The measurable cardinals will be the first γ's such that $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec_1 L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ above a fixed point. Prove the Coding Lemma inside $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$

Proof of (2)

One has to prove that if there exists $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha$, then there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$. Let $A \subseteq \alpha$, and consider $\{a : \rho(a) \in A\}$. Apply the Coding Lemma to this, to find $B \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that $\{\rho(a) : a \in B\} = A$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}(\alpha) \subseteq L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Proof of (3)

The measurable cardinals will be the first γ's such that $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec_1 L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ above a fixed point. Prove the Coding Lemma inside $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. One can prove, as before, that the ω-club filter on γ is $\aleph_{\omega+1}$-complete

Proof of (2)

One has to prove that if there exists $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha$, then there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$. Let $A \subseteq \alpha$, and consider $\{a : \rho(a) \in A\}$. Apply the Coding Lemma to this, to find $B \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that $\{\rho(a) : a \in B\} = A$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}(\alpha) \subseteq L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Proof of (3)

The measurable cardinals will be the first γ's such that $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec_1 L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ above a fixed point. Prove the Coding Lemma inside $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. One can prove, as before, that the ω-club filter on γ is $\aleph_{\omega+1}$-complete. Change the filter with the ω-club filter generated by the fixed points of $k : N \prec \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$

Proof of (2)

One has to prove that if there exists $\rho : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \alpha$, then there exists $\pi : \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$. Let $A \subseteq \alpha$, and consider $\{a : \rho(a) \in A\}$. Apply the Coding Lemma to this, to find $B \in L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ such that $\{\rho(a) : a \in B\} = A$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}(\alpha) \subseteq L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$.

Proof of (3)

The measurable cardinals will be the first γ's such that $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)) \prec_1 L(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$ above a fixed point. Prove the Coding Lemma inside $L_\gamma(\mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega))$. One can prove, as before, that the ω-club filter on γ is $\aleph_{\omega+1}$-complete. Change the filter with the ω-club filter generated by the fixed points of $k : N \prec \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$. Pick $\langle A_\xi : \xi < \gamma \rangle$ and choose inside each one the sets of fixed points that witness the non-empty intersection.

Having just $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ measurable is nothing new

Having just $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ measurable is nothing new:

Theorem (Apter, 1985)

Suppose κ is 2^λ-supercompact, with λ measurable. Then there is a model of ZF+ $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable

Having just $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ measurable is nothing new:

Theorem (Apter, 1985)

Suppose κ is 2^λ-supercompact, with λ measurable. Then there is a model of ZF$+$ $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable.

It's the rest that it is interesting

Having just $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ measurable is nothing new:

Theorem (Apter, 1985)

Suppose κ is 2^λ-supercompact, with λ measurable. Then there is a model of ZF+ $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable.

It's the rest that it is interesting:

Definition

Define $D(\lambda)$ as the following

Having just $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ measurable is nothing new:

Theorem (Apter, 1985)

Suppose κ is 2^λ-supercompact, with λ measurable. Then there is a model of ZF+ $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable.

It's the rest that it is interesting:

Definition

Define $D(\lambda)$ as the following: in $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda))$:

1. λ^+ is measurable;
2. Θ is a weakly inaccessible limit of measurable cardinals

Having just $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ measurable is nothing new:

Theorem (Apter, 1985)

Suppose κ is 2^λ-supercompact, with λ measurable. Then there is a model of ZF+ $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ is measurable.

It's the rest that it is interesting:

Definition

Define $D(\lambda)$ as the following: in $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda))$:

1. λ^+ is measurable;
2. Θ is a weakly inaccessible limit of measurable cardinals.

Therefore, the Theorem proves that if we have generic I0 at $\aleph_\omega$, then $D(\aleph_\omega)$.

Notice that if $D(\lambda)$ is true, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \not\models \mathsf{AC}$

Notice that if $D(\lambda)$ is true, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \not\models \mathrm{AC}$. Therefore the search for $D(\lambda)$ is a refinement of the the search for $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \not\models \mathrm{AC}$

Notice that if $D(\lambda)$ is true, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \not\models$ AC. Therefore the search for $D(\lambda)$ is a refinement of the the search for $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \not\models$ AC.

Theorem

With enough large cardinals, $L(\mathbb{R}) \models$ AD, therefore $L(\mathcal{P}(\omega)) \not\models$ AC

Notice that if $D(\lambda)$ is true, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \nvDash \mathrm{AC}$. Therefore the search for $D(\lambda)$ is a refinement of the the search for $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \nvDash \mathrm{AC}$.

Theorem

With enough large cardinals, $L(\mathbb{R}) \vDash \mathrm{AD}$, therefore $L(\mathcal{P}(\omega)) \nvDash \mathrm{AC}$. Moreover, $D(\omega)$ holds

Notice that if $D(\lambda)$ is true, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \nvDash$ AC. Therefore the search for $D(\lambda)$ is a refinement of the the search for $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \nvDash$ AC.

Theorem

With enough large cardinals, $L(\mathbb{R}) \vDash$ AD, therefore $L(\mathcal{P}(\omega)) \nvDash$ AC. Moreover, $D(\omega)$ holds.

For regular cardinals, with forcing one can kill AC, so it is not interesting

Notice that if $D(\lambda)$ is true, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \nvDash \mathrm{AC}$. Therefore the search for $D(\lambda)$ is a refinement of the the search for $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \nvDash \mathrm{AC}$.

Theorem

With enough large cardinals, $L(\mathbb{R}) \vDash \mathrm{AD}$, therefore $L(\mathcal{P}(\omega)) \nvDash \mathrm{AC}$. Moreover, $D(\omega)$ holds.

For regular cardinals, with forcing one can kill AC, so it is not interesting.

Theorem (Shelah, 1996)

If λ has uncountable cofinality, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \vDash \mathrm{AC}$, therefore $\neg D(\lambda)$

Notice that if $D(\lambda)$ is true, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \nvDash \mathsf{AC}$. Therefore the search for $D(\lambda)$ is a refinement of the the search for $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \nvDash \mathsf{AC}$.

Theorem

With enough large cardinals, $L(\mathbb{R}) \vDash \mathsf{AD}$, therefore $L(\mathcal{P}(\omega)) \nvDash \mathsf{AC}$. Moreover, $D(\omega)$ holds.

For regular cardinals, with forcing one can kill AC, so it is not interesting.

Theorem (Shelah, 1996)

If λ has uncountable cofinality, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \vDash \mathsf{AC}$, therefore $\neg D(\lambda)$.

Theorem

In the Mitchell-Steel core model, if λ is singular, then $L(\mathcal{P}(\lambda)) \vDash \mathsf{AC}$.

Theorem (Woodin)

$I0(\lambda) \to D(\lambda)$

Theorem (Woodin)

$I0(\lambda) \to D(\lambda)$.

Conjecture

In Ultimate L, $I0(\lambda)$ iff $D(\lambda)$.

Open Problem

How "small" can be λ (uncountable) if $D(\lambda)$?

Theorem (Woodin)

$I0(\lambda) \rightarrow D(\lambda)$.

Conjecture

In Ultimate L, $I0(\lambda)$ iff $D(\lambda)$.

Open Problem

How "small" can be λ (uncountable) if $D(\lambda)$?

Open Problem

What is the consistency strength of $D(\lambda)$ with λ uncountable?

Thanks for your attention.