
Eventually Different Functions and Inaccessible Cardinals

Jörg Brendle^{1,4}, Benedikt Löwe^{2,3,4*}

¹ Graduate School of Engineering, Kobe University, Rokko-dai 1-1, Nada, Kobe 657-8501, Japan

² Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Postbus 94242, 1090 GE Amsterdam, The Netherlands

³ Department Mathematik, Universität Hamburg, Bundesstraße 55, 20146 Hamburg, Germany

⁴ Mathematisches Institut, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, Endenicher Allee 60, 53115 Bonn, Germany

brendle@kurt.scitec.kobe-u.ac.jp, bloewe@science.uva.nl

Abstract

In this paper, we are considering the Baire property of the eventually different topology as a regularity property for sets of reals and investigate the logical strength of the statements “Every Δ_2^1 set has the Baire property in the eventually different topology” and “Every Σ_2^1 set has the Baire property in the eventually different topology”. The latter statement turns out to be equivalent to “ ω_1 is inaccessible by reals”.

Keywords. Eventually different forcing, regularity properties, Hechler forcing.

MSC 2010. 03E15, 03E40, 03E55.

1 Introduction

Statements about regularity properties at the second level of the projective hierarchy such as “Every Δ_2^1 set of reals has property \mathbf{P} ” or “Every Σ_2^1 set of reals has property \mathbf{P} ” are complicated enough not to be ZFC theorems (typically, they fail to hold in \mathbf{L}) and thus it is interesting to investigate their relative logical strength. The strongest such statement is “ $\forall x(\omega_1^{\mathbf{L}^{[x]}} < \omega_1)$ ” (or “ ω_1 is inaccessible by reals”) which typically implies all of the

* This work was started in 1997 when the second author was supported by DAAD-Grant D/96/20969 in the program HSPII/AUFE and the Studienstiftung des Deutschen Volkes. The paper was finished during the second author’s visit in Kobe in March 2008, funded by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) 19540127 of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. The authors would like to thank Daisuke Ikegami and an anonymous referee for their very helpful comments.

above mentioned properties and the weakest nontrivial such statement is “ $\forall x(\omega^\omega \setminus \mathbf{L}[x] \neq \emptyset)$ ” (which by [BL99, Theorem 7.1] is equivalent to “every Σ_2^1 set of reals is Sacks-measurable”).

Most of the regularity properties investigated in this context are derived from forcing notions, and the computation of relative logical strength has been done for many such properties, e.g., in [Sol70, JS89, BL99, BHL05]. In this paper, we continue this work by looking at the Baire property in the eventually different topology (cf. §2) and the statements $\Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ “every Σ_2^1 set of reals has the Baire property in the eventually different topology” and $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ “every Δ_2^1 set of reals has the Baire property in the eventually different topology”. Based on preliminaries on definability of ideals and forcing absoluteness (§3), we prove in §4 that $\Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ is equivalent to “ ω_1 is inaccessible by reals” (Theorem 7). This result was not unexpected, as the present authors showed the same for the Baire property in the dominating topology in [BL99, Theorem 5.11], based on a combinatorial property of the Hechler ideal. In our proof here, we use the analogue of that property for eventually different forcing (Theorem 2). In §5, we then move on to $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ and show that it fails in the ω_1 -stage finite support iteration of Hechler forcing (Theorem 18). With this ingredient, we are then (§6) able to place $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ in the diagram of regularity statements on the second level of the projective hierarchy and prove implications and non-implications, giving an almost complete diagram.

The technical result leading to Theorem 18 (cf. Corollary 13 and Theorem 17) says that eventually different reals in the (iterated) Hechler extension are necessarily dominating reals. This may be of independent interest.

2 Eventually different forcing

The conditions of **eventually different forcing**, denoted by \mathbb{E} , are pairs $\langle s, F \rangle$, where $s \in \omega^{<\omega}$ is a finite sequence of natural numbers and F is a finite set of reals. We say that $\langle s, F \rangle \leq \langle t, G \rangle$ if and only if $t \subseteq s$, $G \subseteq F$ and for all $i \in \text{dom}(s \setminus t)$ and all $g \in G$, we have that $s(i) \neq g(i)$. In [Lab96], Ląbędzki discusses all basic properties of this forcing partial order, and we refer to this paper for details. Eventually different forcing is a c.c.c. and even σ -centered forcing that generates a topology \mathcal{E} refining the standard topology on Baire space. Basic open sets of \mathcal{E} are of the form $[s, F] = \{x \in \omega^\omega; s \subseteq x \text{ and } \forall f \in F \forall n \geq |s| (x(n) \neq f(n))\}$ where $\langle s, F \rangle \in \mathbb{E}$. These sets are in fact closed in the standard topology and thus \mathcal{E} -clopen. Hence \mathcal{E} -open dense sets are F_σ , and \mathcal{E} -closed nowhere dense sets G_δ , in the standard topology. Therefore the \mathcal{E} -meager sets form an ideal $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{E}}$ which has a basis of Σ_3^0 sets in the standard topology (cf. also [Lab96, Theorem 3.1]).

We fix some reasonable coding of the Borel sets by real numbers, and

write B_c^M for the Borel set coded by c as interpreted in the model M and $B_c := B_c^V$ (in Lemma 5, we need to be more careful about our coding). Note that the statement “ c is a code for a Borel set in $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{E}}$ ” is absolute between models of set theory, allowing us to call a Borel code c \mathcal{E} -**meager** if B_c^M is meager in any model M of set theory. For a given model of set theory M , we write $\text{EvD}(M)$ for the set of reals \mathbb{E} -generic over M . Since \mathbb{E} is a c.c.c. forcing notion, we have the usual connection between \mathcal{E} -meager Borel codes and the notion of \mathbb{E} -genericity:

Lemma 1 ([Lab96, Theorem 3.3]). If M is a model of set theory and $x \in \omega^\omega$, then x is \mathbb{E} -generic over M if and only if for all \mathcal{E} -meager Borel codes $c \in M$, we have that $x \notin B_c$.

Let $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < 2^\omega \rangle$ be a family of pairwise eventually different functions. Let $E_\alpha := \{x \in \omega^\omega ; \exists^\infty k \in \omega (x(k) = f_\alpha(k))\}$. Note that these sets are \mathcal{E} -nowhere dense.

Theorem 2 (Brendle). If G is \mathcal{E} -meager and $\langle f_\alpha ; \alpha < 2^\omega \rangle$ is a family of pairwise eventually different functions then the set $\{\alpha ; E_\alpha \subseteq G\}$ is countable.

Proof. [Lab96, Theorem 4.7]

Q.E.D.

This theorem is the main ingredient of the proof that the additivity of the meager ideal in \mathcal{E} is \aleph_1 . Its combinatorics is based on the construction in [Bre95, Theorem 2.1].

3 Preliminaries

We shall work in the general framework introduced by Ikegami [Ike10] which we briefly review: We call a forcing notion \mathbb{P} **arboreal** if its conditions are (isomorphic to) a set of perfect trees ordered by inclusion and we call it **strongly arboreal** if in addition for any $T \in \mathbb{P}$ and any $t \in T$, we have that $\{s \in T ; s \subseteq t \vee t \subseteq s\} \in \mathbb{P}$. For arboreal forcings, we say that a set $X \subseteq \omega^\omega$ is **\mathbb{P} -null** if for any $T \in \mathbb{P}$ there is some $S \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $S \leq T$ and $[S] \cap X = \emptyset$. We let $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}$ be the σ -ideal generated by the \mathbb{P} -null sets. Using $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}$, we call a set X **\mathbb{P} -measurable** if for any $T \in \mathbb{P}$ there is an $S \in \mathbb{P}$ with $S \leq T$ such that either $[S] \cap X \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}$ or $[S] \setminus X \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}$. We define an ideal $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}^* \supseteq \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}$ by $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}^* := \{X ; \forall T \in \mathbb{P} \exists S \in \mathbb{P} (S \leq T \wedge [S] \cap X \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}})\}$. If Γ is a pointclass and \mathbb{P} is an arboreal forcing, we write $\Gamma(\mathbb{P})$ for the statement “Every set in Γ is \mathbb{P} -measurable”.

For all classical forcing notions (Cohen, random, Hechler, Laver, Miller, Sacks, etc.), \mathbb{P} -measurability coincides with the natural notion of measurability. It is easy to see that for eventually different forcing \mathbb{E} , the ideal $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{E}}$ is exactly the ideal of \mathcal{E} -meager sets (thus allowing us to use the same notation) and being \mathbb{E} -measurable coincides with having the \mathcal{E} -Baire property.

In joint work with Halbeisen, the present authors introduced a notion of quasigenericity in [BHL05, §1.5]: given a model of set theory M , an ideal \mathcal{I} and a real r , we say that r is \mathcal{I} -**quasigeneric** over M if for all Borel codes $c \in M$ such that $B_c \in \mathcal{I}$, we have that $r \notin B_c$.¹ For classical c.c.c. forcing notions \mathbb{P} (Cohen, random, Hechler, eventually different, etc.), $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}$ -quasigenericity agrees with \mathbb{P} -genericity (cf. Lemma 1 for eventually different forcing). These are particular instances of a general fact [Ike10, Proposition 2.17]. Ikegami established abstract connections between the existence of quasigenerics and measurability properties. To state Ikegami's results, recall that if Γ is a projective pointclass, we say Γ - **\mathbb{P} -absoluteness** holds if for every sentence φ in Γ with parameters in V , $V \models \varphi$ iff $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \varphi$.

Theorem 3 ([Ike10, Theorem 4.3]). If \mathbb{P} is a proper and strongly arboreal forcing notion such that $\{c; c \text{ is a Borel code and } B_c \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}^*\}$ is Σ_2^1 , then the following are equivalent:

- (i) Σ_3^1 - \mathbb{P} -absoluteness,
- (ii) every Δ_2^1 set is \mathbb{P} -measurable, and
- (iii) for every real x and every $T \in \mathbb{P}$, there is a $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}^*$ -quasigeneric real in $[T]$ over $\mathbf{L}[x]$.

Theorem 4 ([Ike10, Theorem 4.4]). If \mathbb{P} is a proper and strongly arboreal forcing notion such that $\{c; c \text{ is a Borel code and } B_c \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}^*\}$ is Σ_2^1 and $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}$ is Borel generated, then the following are equivalent:

- (i) every Σ_2^1 set is \mathbb{P} -measurable, and
- (ii) for every real x , the set $\{y; y \text{ is not } \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}^*\text{-quasigeneric over } \mathbf{L}[x]\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}^*$.

Since the ideal $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}^* \supseteq \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}$ is equal to $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}$ for c.c.c. forcing notions [Ike10, Lemma 2.13] and since we only deal with c.c.c. forcing, we can ignore the difference between $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}^*$ and $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{P}}$.

Suppose that Γ is a projective pointclass. A σ -ideal \mathcal{I} is called Γ on Σ_1^1 if for every analytic set $A \subseteq 2^\omega \times \omega^\omega$, the set $\{y \in 2^\omega; A_y \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is in Γ (where $A_y := \{x; \langle y, x \rangle \in A\}$ is the vertical section at y). The notion of being Π_1^1 on Σ_1^1 is a crucial property of ideals, as discussed in [Zap08, §3.8]. Most ideals occurring in nature are Δ_2^1 on Σ_1^1 . The ideal of \mathcal{E} -meager sets is Π_1^1 on Σ_1^1 [Zap08, Proposition 3.8.12].

Lemma 5. Assume \mathcal{I} is a Σ_2^1 on Σ_1^1 σ -ideal which has a Borel basis. Then $\{c; c \text{ is a Borel code and } B_c \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is Σ_2^1 .

¹ Note that we are presupposing that “ $B_c \in \mathcal{I}$ ” is absolute between models of set theory. This is the case by Shoenfield absoluteness if \mathcal{I} is sufficiently definable, for instance if it is Σ_2^1 on Σ_1^1 (cf. the definition before Lemma 5).

Proof. By [Kec94, Theorem (35.5)], there is a coding of Borel sets by a Π_1^1 set $D \subseteq \omega^\omega$ and a Σ_1^1 set $S \subseteq 2^\omega \times \omega^\omega$ such that the Borel subsets of Baire space are exactly $\{S_d; d \in D\}$.

Then $B_c \in \mathcal{I}$ iff there is d such that $S_d \in \mathcal{I}$, $B_c \subseteq S_d$, and $d \in D$. By assumption, the first statement is Σ_2^1 , and the second and third are obviously Π_1^1 . Q.E.D.

A similar argument, using a universal analytic set instead, shows that if \mathcal{I} is Π_2^1 on Σ_1^1 , then $\{c; c \text{ is a Borel code and } B_c \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is Π_2^1 .

4 Σ_2^1 sets

We start by proving a ‘‘Judah-Shelah-style characterization’’ connecting the \mathcal{E} -Baire property of all sets in Δ_2^1 and the existence of generics.

Theorem 6. The following are equivalent:

- (i) Σ_3^1 - \mathbb{E} -absoluteness,
- (ii) Every Δ_2^1 set has the \mathcal{E} -Baire property (i.e., $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$), and
- (iii) for every x , there is an \mathbb{E} -generic over $\mathbf{L}[x]$.

Proof. This follows immediately from Ikegami’s Theorem 3, keeping in mind that in the case of \mathbb{E} , having the \mathcal{E} -Baire property and being \mathbb{E} -measurable are the same, that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{E}}^* = \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{E}}$, that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{E}}$ -quasigenericity and \mathbb{E} -genericity are the same (Lemma 1), that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{E}}$ has a basis consisting of Σ_3^0 sets, that it is Π_1^1 on Σ_1^1 [Zap08, Proposition 3.8.12], and that $\{c; c \text{ is a Borel code and } B_c \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{E}}\}$ therefore is Σ_2^1 by Lemma 5. Q.E.D.

Here is the characterization of the \mathcal{E} -Baire property of the Σ_2^1 sets.

Theorem 7. The following are equivalent:

- (i) Every Σ_2^1 set has the \mathcal{E} -Baire property (i.e., $\Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{E})$),
- (ii) for every x , the set of \mathbb{E} -generics over $\mathbf{L}[x]$ is \mathcal{E} -comeager, and
- (iii) ω_1 is inaccessible by reals.

Proof. The equivalence of (i) and (ii) follows from Ikegami’s Theorem 4.

‘‘(iii) \Rightarrow (ii)’’: If $\omega_1^{\mathbf{L}[x]}$ is countable, then there are at most countably many codes for \mathcal{E} -meager sets in $\mathbf{L}[x]$. By Lemma 1, $\omega^\omega \setminus \text{EvD}(\mathbf{L}[x]) = \bigcup \{B_c; c \in \mathbf{L}[x] \text{ is an } \mathcal{E}\text{-meager Borel code}\}$ which now is a countable union of \mathcal{E} -meager sets, and thus \mathcal{E} -meager. Consequently, $\text{EvD}(\mathbf{L}[x])$ is \mathcal{E} -comeager.

‘‘(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)’’: Towards a contradiction, let $\omega_1^{\mathbf{L}[x]} = \omega_1$ for some fixed x . In $\mathbf{L}[x]$, there is a family $\langle f_\alpha; \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ of pairwise eventually different

functions. Recall that the sets $E_\alpha := \{y \in \omega^\omega; \exists^\infty k(y(k) = f_\alpha(k))\}$ are \mathcal{E} -nowhere dense in $\mathbf{L}[x]$. Therefore, $\omega^\omega \setminus \text{EvD}(\mathbf{L}[x])$ must contain all (i.e., uncountably many) of these sets E_α . By Theorem 2, $\omega^\omega \setminus \text{EvD}(\mathbf{L}[x])$ cannot be \mathcal{E} -meager, and thus $\text{EvD}(\mathbf{L}[x])$ cannot be \mathcal{E} -comeager. Q.E.D.

5 Δ_2^1 sets

In this section we compare the \mathcal{E} -Baire property of Δ_2^1 sets with measurability and the Baire property of Σ_2^1 sets. We first show that the statement that all Σ_2^1 are Lebesgue measurable, $\Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{B})$, implies $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$.

The partial order LOC of **localization forcing** consists of all pairs $\langle \sigma, F \rangle$ such that $\sigma \in ([\omega]^{<\omega})^{<\omega}$ is a finite sequence with $|\sigma(n)| = n$ for all $n < |\sigma|$ and F is a finite set of reals with $|F| \leq |\sigma|$. The order is given by $\langle \tau, G \rangle \leq \langle \sigma, F \rangle$ iff $\tau \supseteq \sigma$, $G \supseteq F$, and $f(n) \in \tau(n)$ for all $f \in F$ and all $n \in |\tau| \setminus |\sigma|$. The forcing LOC is c.c.c. and even σ -linked (but not σ -centered) and adds a generic **slalom** $\varphi \in ([\omega]^{<\omega})^\omega$ given by $\varphi = \bigcup \{\sigma; \langle \sigma, F \rangle \in G \text{ for some } F\}$ where G is the generic filter over V . The slalom φ **localizes** the ground model reals in the sense that $f(n) \in \varphi(n)$ for almost all n for all reals f from V .

Lemma 8. The product $\text{LOC} \times \mathbb{C}$ adds an \mathbb{E} -generic real. In particular $\mathbb{E} \triangleleft \text{LOC} \times \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. Let φ be the LOC -generic real. Since $\text{LOC} \times \mathbb{C} \cong \text{LOC} \star \dot{\mathbb{C}}$, we may think of Cohen forcing \mathbb{C} as adding a generic real c over $V[\varphi]$. Furthermore, we may think of \mathbb{C} as being the order of finite partial functions s with $s(n) \notin \varphi(n)$ for all $n < |s|$. That is, $c(n) \notin \varphi(n)$ for all n . We claim that this c is \mathbb{E} -generic over V .

Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ be open dense. Let $(\langle \sigma, F \rangle, s) \in \text{LOC} \times \mathbb{C}$. Without loss we may assume $|\sigma| = |s|$. By our stipulation in the preceding paragraph this means that $s(n) \notin \sigma(n)$ for all $n < |s|$. We need to find $(\langle \tau, G \rangle, t) \leq (\langle \sigma, F \rangle, s)$ with $|\tau| = |t|$ and $\langle t, G \rangle \in D$. To see that this suffices note that such $(\langle \tau, G \rangle, t)$ necessarily forces that $t \subseteq \dot{c}$ and $\dot{c}(n) \neq f(n)$ for all $n \geq |t|$ and $f \in G$.

Clearly, $\langle s, F \rangle \in \mathbb{E}$. There is $\langle t, G \rangle \leq \langle s, F \rangle$ with $\langle t, G \rangle \in D$. By extending t , if necessary, we may assume that $|t| \geq |G|$. Next extend σ to τ such that $|\tau| = |t|$ and for all n with $|s| \leq n < |t|$ and all $f \in F$ we have $f(n) \in \tau(n)$ and $t(n) \notin \tau(n)$. This is possible because $t(n) \neq f(n)$ for all $f \in F$ and all such n . Then $(\langle \tau, G \rangle, t) \leq (\langle \sigma, F \rangle, s)$ is as required. Q.E.D.

In the following, we shall be interested in the statement “for all reals x , there is a LOC -generic over $\mathbf{L}[x]$ ”. Using Ikegami’s general methods, we can prove that this is equivalent to the statement $\Delta_2^1(\text{LOC})$, i.e., every Δ_2^1 set is LOC -measurable, as in Theorem 6. We shall not go into details here,

and just use the notation $\Delta_2^1(\text{LOC})$ as a shorthand for the statement “for all reals x , there is a LOC -generic over $\mathbf{L}[x]$ ”.

Corollary 9. $\Delta_2^1(\text{LOC})$ implies $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$.

Proof. It is easy to see that LOC adds a Cohen real. Therefore $\mathbb{E} \triangleleft \text{LOC} \star \text{LOC}$ by Lemma 8. In particular, if for all x there is a LOC -generic over $\mathbf{L}[x]$, then for all x there is an \mathbb{E} -generic over $\mathbf{L}[x]$, and $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ follows by Theorem 6. Q.E.D.

Lemma 10. $\Delta_2^1(\text{LOC})$ is equivalent to $\Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{B})$, the statement “all Σ_2^1 sets are Lebesgue measurable”.

Proof. By Bartoszyński’s characterization of additivity of measure [BJ95, Theorems 2.3.11 and 2.3.12], $\Delta_2^1(\text{LOC})$ implies Σ_2^1 -Lebesgue measurability. The same characterization yields that $\Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{B})$ implies that for all x , there is a slalom localizing all reals in $\mathbf{L}[x]$. By [Bre06, Lemma 2.1], this in turn entails that there is a LOC -generic over $\mathbf{L}[x]$ for all x , that is, $\Delta_2^1(\text{LOC})$ holds. Q.E.D.

Corollary 11. $\Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{B})$ implies $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$.

Proof. This follows from the two preceding results. Q.E.D.

After Lebesgue measurability, we are now considering the (regular) Baire property. The statement $\Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{C})$, i.e., “all Σ_2^1 sets have the Baire property (in the ordinary topology)” is equivalent to $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{D})$, i.e., “all Δ_2^1 sets have the Baire property in the dominating topology” by [BL99, Theorem 5.8]. The rest of this section will contain the proof that this statement does not imply $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$.

For technical purposes, we consider a slight variant of standard Hechler forcing: conditions of our \mathbb{D} are trees $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ such that for any $s \in T$ beyond the stem, $s \hat{\ } n$ belongs to T for almost all n . Obviously \mathbb{D} is a σ -centered forcing notion which adds a dominating real. So $\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{C}$ adds a standard Hechler real [BJ95, Corollary 3.5.3]. On the other hand, it is easy to see that standard Hechler forcing adds a \mathbb{D} -generic. (In fact, if $d \in \omega^\omega$ is a standard Hechler generic satisfying $d(n) > n$ for all n , then $d' \in \omega^\omega$ given recursively by $d'(0) = d(0)$ and $d'(n+1) = d(d'(n))$ is a \mathbb{D} -generic.) Thus, the finite support iterations of the two partial orders have the same properties. In particular, the finite support iteration of \mathbb{D} forces $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{D})$.

The reason we use \mathbb{D} is that this makes the rank analysis of Hechler forcing (which is originally due to Baumgartner and Dordal [BD85]) a bit simpler. Recall that, if $s \in \omega^{<\omega}$ and φ is a statement of the forcing language,

we say s **forces** φ if there is $T \in \mathbb{D}$ with stem s such that T forces φ . Next, define the rank ρ_φ by:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_\varphi(s) = 0 &\iff s \text{ forces } \varphi \\ \rho_\varphi(s) \leq \alpha &\iff \exists^\infty n \ \rho_\varphi(s \hat{\ } n) < \alpha\end{aligned}$$

Say that s **favors** φ if $\rho_\varphi(s) < \infty$. The following are well-known and easy:

- (i) A sequence can force at most one of φ and $\neg\varphi$.
- (ii) Each sequence favors at least one of φ and $\neg\varphi$.
- (iii) A sequence s forces φ iff s does not favor $\neg\varphi$.
- (iv) A sequence s favors φ iff for all T with stem s there is $U \leq T$ such that $U \Vdash \varphi$.

We prove (and this is the main technical result of this section):

Theorem 12. Let W be a c.c.c. extension of V with the property that for all infinite partial functions $x : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ in W which are not dominating over V , there are infinite partial functions $\{x_n; n \in \omega\}$ in V such that whenever $y \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ is infinitely often equal to all x_n , then y is infinitely often equal to x . Then, if d is \mathbb{D} -generic over W , for all infinite partial functions $x : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ in $W[d]$ which are not dominating over V , there are infinite partial functions $\{x_n; n \in \omega\}$ in V such that whenever $y \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ is infinitely often equal to all x_n , then y is infinitely often equal to x .

Corollary 13 (Dichotomy for Hechler forcing). Let d be a Hechler real over V and let $x \in V[d]$ be a real. Then

- (i) either x is dominating over V
- (ii) or x is not eventually different over V .

Proof. Apply the theorem with $V = W$.

Q.E.D.

The following consequence of Corollary 13 was pointed out to us by the anonymous referee and solved positively a conjecture in an earlier version of this work.²

² The proof of Theorem 12 splits into three cases (see below); in **Case 1** and **Case 2**, we find a ground model real that is infinitely often equal to x (i.e., case (ii) in Corollary 13), and in **Case 3**, we can prove that x is dominating (i.e., case (i) in Corollary 13). In Corollary 14, the split occurs along different lines: It can be shown that in **Case 2** of the proof of Theorem 12, $V[x]$ does contain a dominating real.

Corollary 14. Assume that there is a proper class of Woodin cardinals.³ Let $x \in V[d]$ be a new real. Then

- (i) either there is a dominating real (over V) in $V[x]$
- (ii) or $V[x]$ is a Cohen extension of V .

Proof. Assume there is no dominating real over V in $V[x]$. By Corollary 13, there is no eventually different real over V in $V[x]$ either. By the proof of [BJ95, Lemma 2.4.8], the reals of V form a non-meager set in $V[x]$. Now [Zap08, Corollary 3.5.7] applies, and we obtain that $V[x]$ is indeed a Cohen extension of V .

To see that the assumptions of [Zap08, Corollary 3.5.7] are indeed satisfied, let \dot{x} be a \mathbb{D} -name for x . Put $\mathcal{I}_{\dot{x}} = \{B; B \text{ is Borel and } \Vdash_{\mathbb{D}} \dot{x} \notin B\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{I}_{\dot{x}}$ is a c.c.c. σ -ideal and the subforcing of \mathbb{D} leading to the intermediate extension $V[x]$ is forcing equivalent to $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}_{\dot{x}}}$, the quotient of Borel sets modulo sets in $\mathcal{I}_{\dot{x}}$. Furthermore, since there is a Borel function f such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{D}} \dot{x} = f(\dot{d})$ where \dot{d} is the name for the \mathbb{D} -generic, we obtain $\mathcal{I}_{\dot{x}} = \{B; f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{D}}\}$ where $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{D}}$ is the Hechler ideal (the ideal of meager sets in the dominating topology). Thus $\mathcal{I}_{\dot{x}}$ is universally Baire. Q.E.D.

One may even conjecture:

Conjecture 15. Let $x \in V[d]$ be a new real. Then

- (i) either $V[x]$ is a Hechler extension of V
- (ii) or $V[x]$ is a Cohen extension of V .

This would probably require a proof that the various forms of Hechler forcing (e.g., the one with trees we consider here, the one with increasing functions as side conditions mentioned as \mathbb{D}' above, or a third one with arbitrary functions as side conditions) are all forcing equivalent. This problem has been considered by a number of people, including the first author.

Unlike the original dichotomy (Corollary 13), this conjecture cannot hold in the iterated Hechler extension (because $\mathbb{D} \star \mathbb{D} \not\equiv \mathbb{D}$ [Paw86]).

With respect to the eventually dominating order \leq^* on the Baire space ω^ω , one may consider three different kinds of eventually different reals: bounded reals, unbounded reals which are not dominating, and reals which are dominating. E.g., random forcing \mathbb{B} adds a bounded eventually different real and, since \mathbb{B} is ω^ω -bounding, there are no other kinds of eventually

³ This assumption is needed for the full generality of [Zap08, Corollary 3.5.7] which is used in the proof (W. Hugh Woodin, personal communication, 10 October 2009 for the consistency strength upper bound). In some similar cases, the use of large cardinals can be completely avoided if you restrict yourself to a concretely given forcing. In this particular case, we do not know how to do this.

different reals. By Corollary 13, \mathbb{D} adds a dominating (and thus necessarily eventually different) real, but no other eventually different reals. Finally, \mathbb{E} adds an eventually different real which is unbounded but not dominating and, again, there are no other kinds of eventually different reals. This is so because a(n iteration of) σ -centered forcing cannot add a bounded eventually different real. (The proof for this is similar to, but easier than, the arguments in the proof of Theorem 12.)

Proof of Theorem 12. Let \dot{x} be a \mathbb{D} -name for x . Call $s \in \omega^{<\omega}$ *very good* if there is an infinite partial function $x_s : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ in W which is not dominating over V such that s favors $\dot{x}(k) = x_s(k)$ for all $k \in \text{dom}(x_s)$. By “not-dominating” we mean, of course, that there is $z \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ such that $x_s(k) \leq z(k)$ for infinitely many $k \in \text{dom}(x_s)$. With respect to this notion we introduce a rank $\text{rk}_{\dot{x}}$ exactly as before:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}_{\dot{x}}(s) = 0 &\iff s \text{ is very good} \\ \text{rk}_{\dot{x}}(s) \leq \alpha &\iff \exists^\infty n \text{ rk}_{\dot{x}}(s \frown n) < \alpha \end{aligned}$$

We say that s is *good* if $\text{rk}_{\dot{x}}(s) < \infty$. Otherwise s is *not good*.

Case 1. *All s are good.*

This is the easiest case. By assumption, there is $\{x_n; n \in \omega\} \in V$ such that whenever $y \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ is infinitely often equal to all x_n , then y is infinitely often equal to all x_s for very good s . So, choose $y \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ which is infinitely often equal to all x_n . We claim that the trivial condition forces that y is infinitely often equal to \dot{x} .

For indeed, let k_0 and $T \in \mathbb{D}$ be given. Let s be its stem. By assumption, $\text{rk}_{\dot{x}}(s) < \infty$. Thus, by replacing T with a stronger condition if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $\text{rk}_{\dot{x}}(s) = 0$, i.e., s is very good. Choose $k \geq k_0$ such that $y(k) = x_s(k)$. Since s favors $\dot{x}(k) = x_s(k)$, there is a $U \leq T$ such that $U \Vdash \dot{x}(k) = y(k)$, as required. \dashv

Hence we may assume some s is not good. Then we can easily construct a condition T with stem s such that all $t \in T$ extending s are not good. We now work below the condition T . Call such t *not bad* if there are infinite partial functions $y_t, f_t : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ with the same domain in W such that y_t is not dominating over V , f_t is one-to-one, and $s \frown f_t(k)$ favors $\dot{x}(k) = y_t(k)$ for all $k \in \text{dom}(y_t)$. Define the rank $\text{Rk}_{\dot{x}}$ as before:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rk}_{\dot{x}}(t) = 0 &\iff t \text{ is not bad} \\ \text{Rk}_{\dot{x}}(t) \leq \alpha &\iff \exists^\infty n \text{ Rk}_{\dot{x}}(t \frown n) < \alpha \end{aligned}$$

We say that t is *not very bad* if $\text{Rk}_{\dot{x}}(t) < \infty$. Otherwise t is *very bad*.

Case 2. *No $t \in T$ is very bad.*

Again, there is $\{x_n; n \in \omega\} \in V$ such that whenever $y \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ is infinitely often equal to all x_n , then y is infinitely often equal to all y_t for t which is not bad. Choose $y \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ which is infinitely often equal to all x_n . We claim that T forces that y is infinitely often equal to \dot{x} .

Assume k_0 and $U \leq T$ are given. Let t be the stem of U . By assumption, $\text{Rk}_{\dot{x}}(t) < \infty$. Without loss of generality, $\text{Rk}_{\dot{x}}(t) = 0$. Choose $k \geq k_0$ such that $y(k) = y_t(k)$ and $s \frown f_t(k)$ belongs to U . Since $s \frown f_t(k)$ favors $\dot{x}(k) = y_t(k)$, there is a $U' \leq U$ such that $U' \Vdash \dot{x}(k) = y(k)$. \dashv

Case 3. *Some $t \in T$ is very bad.*

Construct a condition $U \leq T$ with stem t such that all $u \in U$ extending t are very bad. We claim that U forces that \dot{x} is a dominating real over V .

To see this let $z \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ and $U' \leq U$. We need to find k_0 and $U'' \leq U'$ such that $U'' \Vdash \dot{x}(k) \geq z(k)$ for all $k \geq k_0$.

Let $t' = \text{stem}(U')$. For $u' \in U'$, define the partial function $x_{u'}$ by $x_{u'}(k) = \min\{\ell; u' \text{ favors } \dot{x}(k) = \ell\}$ if the latter set is non-empty; otherwise $x_{u'}(k)$ is undefined. Note that, since u' is not (very) good, $x_{u'}$ either has finite domain or dominates V . Therefore there is k_0 such that for all $k \geq k_0$, either $x_{t'}(k)$ is undefined or $x_{t'}(k) \geq z(k)$.

Similarly, for $u' \in U'$, define $y_{u'}$ by $y_{u'}(k) = \min\{\ell; \text{for some } n, \text{ we have } u' \frown n \in U' \text{ and } u' \frown n \text{ favors } \dot{x}(k) = \ell\}$ if the latter set is non-empty; otherwise $y_{u'}$ is undefined. Again, since u' is (very) bad, it is easy to see that $y_{u'}$ either has finite domain or dominates V .

Now we recursively construct $U'' \leq U'$ with $\text{stem}(U'') = t'$, as well as numbers $k_{u'}$ for all $u' \in U''$.

First put t' into U'' and fix $k_{t'} \geq k_0$ such that for all $k \geq k_{t'}$, either $y_{t'}(k)$ is undefined or $y_{t'}(k) \geq z(k)$. Next, put $t' \frown n$ into U'' if for all k with $k_0 \leq k < k_{t'}$, whenever $t' \frown n$ favors $\dot{x}(k) = \ell$, then $\ell \geq z(k)$. This defines the successor level of t' because for each such k and each $\ell < z(k)$, there are only finitely many n such that $t' \frown n$ favors $\dot{x}(k) = \ell$. By replacing the trees $U'_{t' \frown n}$ by appropriate subtrees if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $U'_{t' \frown n}$ forces $\dot{x}(k) \geq z(k)$ for all k with $k_0 \leq k < k_{t'}$. Thus, U'' will also force this. Notice that $x_{t' \frown n} \geq y_{t'}$ everywhere so that $x_{t' \frown n}(k) \geq z(k)$ for all $k \geq k_{t'}$.

In general, assume u' has been put into U'' . Fix $k_{u'} \geq k_{u' \upharpoonright (|u'|-1)}$ such that for all $k \geq k_{u'}$, either $y_{u'}(k)$ is undefined or $y_{u'}(k) \geq z(k)$. Next, put $u' \frown n$ into U'' if for all k with $k_{u' \upharpoonright (|u'|-1)} \leq k < k_{u'}$, whenever $u' \frown n$ favors $\dot{x}(k) = \ell$, then $\ell \geq z(k)$. Since $x_{u'}(k) \geq z(k)$ for all $k \geq k_{u' \upharpoonright (|u'|-1)}$, this indeed defines the successor level of u' . Again we may assume that $U'_{u' \frown n}$ forces $\dot{x}(k) \geq z(k)$ for all k with $k_{u' \upharpoonright (|u'|-1)} \leq k < k_{u'}$. Notice again that $x_{u' \frown n} \geq y_{u'}$ everywhere so that $x_{u' \frown n}(k) \geq z(k)$ for all $k \geq k_{u'}$.

This completes the construction of U'' , and it is immediate from the construction that U'' forces $\dot{x}(k) \geq z(k)$ for all $k \geq k_0$. \dashv

This completes the proof of the theorem. Q.E.D.

The following is proved by a standard argument.

Lemma 16. Let γ be a limit ordinal. Assume $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha, \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha; \alpha < \gamma)$ is a finite support iteration of c.c.c. forcing such that for all $\alpha < \gamma$ the following holds:

For every \mathbb{P}_α -name $\dot{x} : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ for an infinite partial function which is not dominating over V , there are infinite partial functions $x_n : \omega \rightarrow \omega$, $n \in \omega$, in V such that whenever $y \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ is infinitely often equal to all x_n , then y is forced to be infinitely often equal to \dot{x} . (\star_α)

Then (\star_γ) holds as well.

Proof. If $\text{cf}(\gamma) > \omega$, then no new real number occurs at stage γ , and so the claim is trivially true. Therefore we can assume that $\text{cf}(\gamma) = \omega$. Since an iteration of length γ with $\text{cf}(\gamma)$ is isomorphic to one of length ω , we can without loss of generality assume that $\gamma = \omega$.

Let \dot{x} be a \mathbb{P}_ω -name for an infinite partial function. Assume the trivial condition forces that \dot{x} is not dominating over V and fix $n < \omega$. In the \mathbb{P}_n -generic extension V_n , define a partial function x_n by $x_n(k) = \min\{\ell; \text{there is a } p \text{ in the remainder forcing } \mathbb{P}_\omega/\mathbb{P}_n \text{ such that } p \Vdash \dot{x}(k) = \ell\}$ if this set is non-empty; otherwise $x_n(k)$ is undefined. Notice that x_n is an infinite partial function, and that it cannot be dominating over V .

In the ground model V , we have \mathbb{P}_n -names \dot{x}_n for all the x_n . By (\star_n) , we can find a countable family $\{y_m; m \in \omega\}$ such that whenever $y \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ is infinitely often equal to all y_m , then y is forced to be infinitely often equal to all \dot{x}_n . We show that such a y is also forced to be infinitely often equal to \dot{x} .

Fix k_0 and $p \in \mathbb{P}_\omega$. Let n be such that $p \in \mathbb{P}_n$. Step into V_n where the generic contains p . Fix $k \geq k_0$ such that $x_n(k) = y(k)$. Let q be a condition in the remainder forcing which forces $\dot{x}(k) = x_n(k)$. Then clearly $r \hat{\wedge} q$ forces $\dot{x}(k) = y(k)$ for some $r \leq p$ in \mathbb{P}_n , as required. Q.E.D.

Theorem 17 (Dichotomy for iterated Hechler forcing). Let $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha, \dot{\mathbb{D}}_\alpha; \alpha < \gamma)$ be a finite support iteration of Hechler forcing. Let x be a real in the \mathbb{P}_γ -generic extension. Then

- (i) either x is dominating over V
- (ii) or x is not eventually different over V .

More explicitly, if x is not dominating over V , then there are infinite partial functions $x_n : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ ($n \in \omega$) in V , such that whenever $y \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ is infinitely often equal to all x_n , then y is infinitely often equal to x as well.

Proof. By induction on γ . The case $\gamma = 1$ is Corollary 13. More generally, if $\gamma = \delta + 1$ is a successor, apply Theorem 12 with W being the \mathbb{P}_δ -generic extension of V . If γ is a limit, apply Lemma 16. Q.E.D.

Theorem 18. Let G be \mathbf{L} -generic for the ω_1 -stage finite support iteration of Hechler forcing. Then in $\mathbf{L}[G]$, $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{D})$ holds while $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ fails.

Proof. By Theorem 17, it is immediate that the finite support iteration of Hechler forcing does not add an \mathbb{E} -generic over the ground model V . Thus, if the ground model is \mathbf{L} , then in the generic extension after adding ω_1 Hechler reals, there are no \mathbb{E} -generics over \mathbf{L} . This implies the failure of $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ by Theorem 6. Q.E.D.




FIGURE 1.

6 Conclusions

Our two main results, Theorems 7 and 18, are enough to place the two statements $\Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ and $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ in the diagram of regularity statements, as

it has been developed by other work. In the diagram given in Figure 1, the letters \mathbb{A} , \mathbb{B} , \mathbb{C} , \mathbb{D} , \mathbb{E} , \mathbb{L} , \mathbb{M} , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{S} , and \mathbb{V} stand for Amoeba, random, Cohen, Hechler, eventually different, Laver, Miller, Mathias, Sacks, and Silver forcing, respectively. The notation *ev. diff.* stands for “for every x , there is an eventually different real over $\mathbf{L}[x]$ ”.

The diagram in Figure 1 is complete in the sense that if there is no arrow leading from a statement φ to another statement ψ in the diagram, then there is a model of $\varphi \wedge \neg\psi$. The only exceptions to this are “ $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{L}) \Rightarrow \Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{V})$ ” and “ $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{L}) \Rightarrow \Delta_2^1(\mathbb{V})$ ” marked by “?” symbols whose status is unknown (we expect that neither of the implications holds in general).

All implications and non-implications not involving \mathbb{E} have been known before this paper and in the following we’ll give arguments for all implications and non-implications involving $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$. In the arguments, we shall freely use Theorem 6 and its analogues for other forcings:

The statement “ $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E}) \Rightarrow \text{ev.diff.}$ ” is trivial, and “ $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E}) \Rightarrow \Delta_2^1(\mathbb{C})$ ” is easy because \mathbb{E} adds Cohen reals. Corollary 11 yields “ $\Sigma_2^1(\mathbb{B}) \Rightarrow \Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ ”, and Theorem 18 shows that the Hechler model witnesses “ $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{D}) \not\Rightarrow \Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ ”.

Note that neither random nor Mathias forcing add Cohen reals, so that the random model is a model of $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{B}) \wedge \neg\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{C})$ and the Mathias model is a model of $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{R}) \wedge \neg\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{C})$. Since every \mathbb{E} -generic defines a Cohen real, these two models witness “ $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{B}) \not\Rightarrow \Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ ” and “ $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{R}) \not\Rightarrow \Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E})$ ”, respectively.

Finally, the iteration of \mathbb{E} adds neither dominating nor random reals, and thus the eventually different model witnesses both “ $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E}) \not\Rightarrow \Delta_2^1(\mathbb{L})$ ” and “ $\Delta_2^1(\mathbb{E}) \not\Rightarrow \Delta_2^1(\mathbb{B})$ ”.

References

- [BD85] James E. Baumgartner and Peter Dordal. Adjoining dominating functions. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 50(1):94–101, 1985.
- [BHL05] Jörg Brendle, Lorenz Halbeisen, and Benedikt Löwe. Silver measurability and its relation to other regularity properties. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 138(1):135–149, 2005.
- [BJ95] Tomek Bartoszyński and Haim Judah. *Set theory. On the structure of the real line*. A K Peters Ltd., Wellesley, MA, 1995.
- [BL99] Jörg Brendle and Benedikt Löwe. Solovay-type characterizations for forcing-algebras. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 64(3):1307–1323, 1999.

- [Bre95] Jörg Brendle. Combinatorial properties of classical forcing notions. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 73(2):143–170, 1995.
- [Bre06] Jörg Brendle. Cardinal invariants of the continuum and combinatorics on uncountable cardinals. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 144(1-3):43–72, 2006.
- [Ike10] Daisuke Ikegami. Forcing absoluteness and regularity properties. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 2010. to appear.
- [JS89] Haim Judah and Saharon Shelah. Δ_2^1 -sets of reals. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 42(3):207–223, 1989.
- [Kec94] Alexander S. Kechris. *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*, volume 156 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 1994.
- [Łab96] Grzegorz Łabędzki. A topology generated by eventually different functions. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Mathematica et Physica*, 37(2):37–53, 1996.
- [Paw86] Janusz Pawlikowski. Why Solovay real produces Cohen real. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 51(4):957–968, 1986.
- [Sol70] Robert M. Solovay. A model of set-theory in which every set of reals is Lebesgue measurable. *Annals of Mathematics*, 92:1–56, 1970.
- [Zap08] Jindřich Zapletal. *Forcing idealized*, volume 174 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.