GENERIC ABSOLUTENESS REVISITED

SAKAÉ FUCHINO, TAKEHIKO GAPPO, AND FRANCESCO PARENTE

Abstract. The present article is concerned with the relation between recurrence axioms and Laver-generic large cardinal axioms in light of principles of generic absoluteness and the Ground Axiom (GA).

M. Viale proved that Martin's Maximum^{++} together with the assumption that there are class many Woodin cardinals implies $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$ for a generic $\mathbb{G}$ on any stationary preserving $\mathbb{P}$ which also preserves Bounded Martin's Maximum. We show that a similar but more general conclusion follows from each of $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_2}$-RcA$^+$ (which is a fragment of a reformulation of the Maximality Principle for $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{H}(\kappa)$), and the existence of the tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically huge cardinal.[1]

While under "$\mathcal{P}$ = all stationary preserving posets", our results are not very much more than Viale's Theorem, for other classes of posets, "$\mathcal{P}$ = all proper posets" or "$\mathcal{P}$ = all ccc posets", for example, our theorems are not at all covered by his theorem.

The assumptions (and hence also the conclusion) of Viale's Theorem are compatible with the GA. In contrast, we show that the assumptions of our theorems (for most of the common settings of $\mathcal{P}$ and with a modification of the large cardinal property involved) imply the negation of the GA. This fact is used to show that fragments of Recurrence Axiom $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_\Gamma$-RcA$^+$ can be different from the corresponding fragments of Maximality Principle $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_\Gamma$ for $\Gamma = \Pi_2$.

§1. Introduction and preliminaries. In the following, we tried very hard to make the present article as self-contained as possible. For notions and notation which remain unexplained, the reader may refer to [23, 24], or [25]. Set-theoretic forcing is treated here just as in [25] with the exception that $\mathbb{P}$-names for a poset $\mathbb{P}$ are represented with an under-tilde, e.g., as $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ or $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{S}}$. We adopt the (fake but consistently interpretable) narration that generic filters "exist" though otherwise we remain in the ZFC narrative so that all classes mentioned here are (meta-mathematically) definable classes.

The main theorem of Viale [32] states the following.

THEOREM 1.1 [(M. Viale, Theorem 1.4 in [32])]. *Assume that* MM^{++} *holds, and there are class many Woodin cardinals. Then, for any stationary preserving poset* $\mathbb{P}$ *with* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "BMM", *we have*

$$\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \quad \textit{for } (\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})\textit{-generic } \mathbb{G}.$$

Received October 20, 2024.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03E45, 03E50, 03E55, 03E57, 03E65.

Key words and phrases. generic large cardinal, Laver-generic large cardinal, Maximality Principles, continuum hypothesis, Ground Axiom.

[1] We use here the definite article since it is known that a tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generic large cardinal, if it exists, is the unique cardinal κ_{refl} $(= \max(\{\aleph_2, 2^{\aleph_0}\}))$ for (almost?) all reasonable non-trivial instances of $\mathcal{P}$ and notions of large cardinal (see [13]).

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Association for Symbolic Logic. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

0022-4812/00/0000-0000
DOI:10.1017/jsl.2025.10131

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Here MM^{++} is the following strengthening of the Martin's Axiom (MM):

(MM^{++}): For any stationary preserving $\mathbb{P}$, any family $\mathcal{D}$ of dense subsets of $\mathbb{P}$ with $|\mathcal{D}| < \aleph_2$, and any family $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathbb{P}$-names of stationary subsets of ω_1 with $|\mathcal{S}| < \aleph_2$, there is a $\mathcal{D}$-generic filter $\mathbb{G}$ on $\mathbb{P}$ such that $\underset{\sim}{S}[\mathbb{G}]$ is a stationary subset of ω_1 for all $\underset{\sim}{S} \in \mathcal{S}$.

BMM is the Bounded Martin's Maximum, a weakening of MM which is an instance of Bounded Forcing Axioms: for a class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets closed under forcing equivalence and a cardinal κ, the *Bounded Forcing Axiom* for $\mathcal{P}$ and $< \kappa$ is the axiom stating:

($\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$): For any complete Boolean[2] $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, and a family $\mathcal{D}$ of maximal antichains in $\mathbb{P}$ such that $|\mathcal{D}| < \kappa$ and $|I| < \kappa$ for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$, there is a $\mathcal{D}$-generic filter $\mathbb{G}$ on $\mathbb{P}$.

The *Bounded Martin's Maximum* (BMM) is $\mathsf{BFA}_{<\aleph_2}$(stationary pres. posets). Bounded Forcing Axioms were introduced by Goldstern and Shelah [18] answering a problem asked by the first author of the present paper in [10].

In Theorem 1.1, the condition "$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$"BMM"" cannot be simply dropped. For example, the formula saying that there is a set which is the power set of ω is Σ_2. Since $\neg\mathsf{CH}$ holds in V under MM, if $\mathbb{P}$ forces CH then $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)^{\mathsf{V}} \not\prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$ for $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic $\mathbb{G}$.

We show that a conclusion similar to and more general than that of Theorem 1.1 follows from each of $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_2}$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$ which is a fragment of Recurrence Axiom (a reformulation of Maximality Principle introduced in [15]) for $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{H}(\kappa)$, see Section 2 below, and the existence of the tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. large cardinal (Theorems 4.1 and 5.7).

The notion of Laver-generic large cardinal is introduced in Fuchino et al., [13]. The definition we give here is the slightly modified version in later papers such as in Fuchino [11].

For an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets (i.e., class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets satisfying (1.2) and (1.3) below) a cardinal κ is said to be (*tightly, resp.*) $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. supercompact if, for any $\lambda > \kappa$ and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, there is a $\mathbb{P}$-name $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$"$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}$", such that for $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}})$-generic $\mathbb{H}$, there are $j, M \subseteq \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]$ such that $j : \mathsf{V} \overset{\prec}{\to}_{\kappa} M$,[3] $j(\kappa) > \lambda, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{H}, j''\lambda \in M$ (and $\mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ is of size $\leq j(\kappa)$, resp.).

This definition can be adopted to many other large cardinal notions other than supercompactness. The reader may refer to [11] for definitions of other variants of Laver-generic large cardinal. Defined as above, it is not obvious at first glance that the Laver-genericity is formalizable in the language $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$ of ZFC. That it is actually the case, is shown in Fuchino and Sakai [14].

A tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generic large cardinal, if it exists, is unique and decided to be $\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}} := \max(\{\aleph_2, 2^{\aleph_0}\})$ for all known reasonable non-trivial instances of $\mathcal{P}$ with a strong enough large cardinal notion (see [13], or [11, 12]). This is the reason why we often simply talk about *the* tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generic large cardinal.

---

[2] We say that a poset $\mathbb{P}$ is *complete Boolean* if $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{B} \setminus \{0_{\mathbb{B}}\}$ for a complete Boolean algebra. Note that the definition of $\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ makes sense only when $\mathbb{P}$ is complete Boolean (since otherwise it can be the case that $\mathbb{P}$ does not have any maximal antichains of size $< \kappa$).

[3] "$j : \mathsf{V} \overset{\prec}{\to}_{\kappa} M$" denotes the condition that j is an elementary embedding of V into a transitive M with the critical point κ.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

While under "$\mathcal{P}$ = all semi-proper posets", our results are not much more than slight variants of Viale's (but without relying on the stationary tower forcing technique), for other classes of posets, for example, "$\mathcal{P}$ = all proper posets" or "$\mathcal{P}$ = all ccc posets", they are not at all covered by Viale's result in [32] nor by its proof.

In the following we shall always assume that the classes $\mathcal{P}$ of posets we consider are *normal*, that is,

(1.1) $\mathcal{P}$ is closed with respect to forcing equivalence, and $\{\mathbb{1}\} \in \mathcal{P}$.

In particular, we assume that for any $\mathbb{P}_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ there is a complete Boolean[3] $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ which is forcing equivalent to $\mathbb{P}_0$. In some cases like the case "$\mathbb{P}$ = all σ-closed posets" where the original class of posets is not normal we just replace $\mathcal{P}$ with its closure with respect to forcing equivalence without mention.

In some cases (like in the definition of Laver-genericity above) it is natural to consider (normal) classes of posets which are closed with respect to two-step iteration. A class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets is called *iterable* if

(1.2) $\mathcal{P}$ is closed with respect to restriction. That is, for $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathbb{p} \in \mathbb{P}$, we always have $\mathbb{P} \restriction \mathbb{p} \in \mathcal{P}$, and

(1.3) For any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, and any $\mathbb{P}$-name $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ of a poset with $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}$", we have $\mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}$.

Viale's Absoluteness Theorem 1.1 is a result built upon the following Theorem 1.2. We shall use the following notation for the formulation of the Theorem. For an ordinal α, let $\alpha^{(+)} := \sup(\{|\beta|^+ : \beta < \alpha\})$. Note that $\alpha^{(+)} = \alpha$ if α is a cardinal. Otherwise, we have $\alpha^{(+)} = |\alpha|^+$.

In Bagaria [3] the following theorem contains the extra assumption that, translated into the context of the following formulation, κ is a successor of a cardinal of uncountable cofinality. However we can eliminate this assumption by slightly modifying the proof in [3].

THEOREM 1.2 (Bagaria's Absoluteness Theorem, Theorem 5 in [3]). *For an uncountable cardinal κ and a class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets closed under forcing equivalence, and restriction (in the sense of (1.2)) the following are equivalent*:

(a) $\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$.
(b) *For any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, Σ_1-formula φ in $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$ and $a \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa)$, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\varphi(a)$" $\Leftrightarrow \varphi(a)$.*
(c) *For any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic $\mathbb{G}$, we have $\mathcal{H}(\kappa)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_1} \mathcal{H}((\kappa^{(+)})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$.*

PROOF. Note that (b) $\Leftrightarrow$ (c) is trivial since ZFC proves that

(1.4) $\mathcal{H}(\mu) \prec_{\Sigma_1} \mathsf{V}$ for any uncountable cardinal μ

(Lévy [27]).

Note also that if $\kappa = 2^{\aleph_0}$, we also have the equivalence of (a), (b), (c) with

(c′) *For any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic $\mathbb{G}$, we have $\mathcal{H}(2^{\aleph_0})^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_1} \mathcal{H}((2^{\aleph_0})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$.*

⊣ (Theorem 1.2)

The following is one of many nice applications of Theorem 1.2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

COROLLARY 1.3. *If $\mathcal{P}$ contains a poset adding a new real then $\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ for $\kappa > \aleph_1$ implies $\neg\mathsf{CH}$.*

PROOF. Assume that $\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ holds for $\kappa > \aleph_1$, but also CH holds in V. Let $a = \mathcal{P}(\omega)$. We have $a \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa)^{\mathsf{V}}$ by CH and $\mathcal{H}(\kappa) \models$ "a is $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$". The statement can be formulated as a Π_1-formula with the parameter a. But if $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ adds a real, $\mathcal{H}(\kappa)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \models$ "a is not $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$". This is a contradiction to Theorem 1.2, (c).

⊣ (Corollary 1.3)

Suppose that $\mathcal{R}$ is a definable class (proper or set). We shall say that a class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets is *provably correct for* $\mathcal{R}$ if the following is provable in ZFC:

(1.5) for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $a(\in \mathsf{V})$, $a \in \mathcal{R} \Leftrightarrow \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$a \in \mathcal{R}$".

Thus if $\mathcal{P}$ is provably correct for $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathbb{G}$ is a $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic for a $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ then $(\mathsf{V}, \in, \mathcal{R}^{\mathsf{V}})$ is a (class) substructure of $(\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}], \in, \mathcal{R}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})$.

Let I_{NS} denote the non stationary ideal over ω_1. Thus

$$I_{\mathsf{NS}} := \{X \subseteq \omega_1 \,:\, X \text{ is non stationary}\}.$$

LEMMA 1.4. *If (we can prove that) all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ are stationary preserving then $\mathcal{P}$ is provably correct for I_{NS}.*

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be (the $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$-definition of) a class. Let $\mathcal{L}_{\in,\underline{\mathcal{R}}}$ be the language which extends $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$ with a new unary predicate symbol $\underline{\mathcal{R}}$ where $M \models \underline{\mathcal{R}}(a)$ is interpreted as $a \in \mathcal{R}^M$ in an $\in$-structure M. In the following, we shall often identify the (definition) of the class $\mathcal{R}$ with the symbol $\underline{\mathcal{R}}$ of $\mathcal{R}$, and simply write $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\in,\mathcal{R}}$ instead of $\underline{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\in,\underline{\mathcal{R}}}$. This also applies when we are talking about I_{NS} and $\mathcal{L}_{\in,I_{\mathsf{NS}}}$.

The following Lemma 1.5 can be proved in the same way as with the corresponding lemma for $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$ formulas.

LEMMA 1.5. *For transitive (sets or classes) M, N with $M \subseteq N$ and a class $\mathcal{R}$ (i.e. an $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$-formula with one single free variable) such that $\mathcal{R}^M = \mathcal{R}^N \cap M$, we have:*

(1) *$\langle M, \in, \mathcal{R}^M\rangle \models \varphi(\overline{a}) \Leftrightarrow \langle N, \in, \mathcal{R}^N\rangle \models \varphi(\overline{a})$ for all Σ_0-formula $\varphi = \varphi(\overline{x})$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\in,\mathcal{R}}$ and $\overline{a} \in M$.*

(2) *$\langle M, \in, \mathcal{R}^M\rangle \models \varphi(\overline{a}) \Rightarrow \langle N, \in, \mathcal{R}^N\rangle \models \varphi(\overline{a})$ for all Σ_1-formula $\varphi = \varphi(\overline{x})$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\in,\mathcal{R}}$ and $\overline{a} \in M$.*

LEMMA 1.6. *For a Σ_1-formula φ in $\mathcal{L}_{\in,I_{\mathsf{NS}}}$ we can find a Σ_2-formula in $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$ with the parameter ω_1 equivalent to φ.*

PROOF. "$x \in I_{\mathsf{NS}}$" can be expressed by a Σ_1-formula in $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$:

$$\exists y\,(y \subseteq \omega_1 \ \wedge\ x \subseteq \omega_1 \ \wedge\ y \text{ is a club in } \omega_1 \ \wedge\ x \cap y = \emptyset).$$

Thus "$x \notin I_{\mathsf{NS}}$" can be expressed by a Π_1-formula in $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$. ⊣ (Lemma 1.6)

LEMMA 1.7 (A special case of Lemma 6.3 in Venturi and Viale [31]). *For a cardinal $\lambda \geq 2^{\aleph_1}$, we have $\langle \mathcal{H}(\lambda), \in, I_{\mathsf{NS}}\rangle \prec_{\Sigma_1} (\mathsf{V}, \in, I_{\mathsf{NS}})$.*

The following Theorem 1.8 is an extension of Bagaria's Absoluteness Theorem 1.2. A special case of this theorem (the case where $\mathcal{P}$ = the stationary preserving posets) is also attributed to Bagaria in [33]. Though Theorem 1.8 in its generality must have been known, we included it here since we could not find any proof in the literature.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We consider the following "plus"-version of Bounded Forcing Axioms: For a (normal) class of posets $\mathcal{P}$,

($\mathsf{BFA}^{+<\kappa}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$): For any complete Boolean $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, a family $\mathcal{D}$ of maximal antichains in $\mathbb{P}$ such that $|\mathcal{D}| < \kappa$ and $|I| < \kappa$ for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$, and for a set $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{P}$-names of cardinality $< \kappa$ such that each $\underset{\sim}{S} \in \mathcal{S}$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-name of a stationary subset of ω_1, there is a $\mathcal{D}$-generic filter $\mathbb{G}$ on $\mathbb{P}$ such that $\underset{\sim}{S}^{\mathbb{G}} \in \mathcal{S}$ are stationary subsets of ω_1.

THEOREM 1.8. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a class of posets closed under forcing equivalence, and restriction (in the sense of (1.2)) such that all elements of $\mathcal{P}$ are stationary preserving and $\kappa = 2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1}$.*[4] *Then the following are equivalent*:

(a) $\mathsf{BFA}^{+<\kappa}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$.

(b) *For any Σ_1-formula $\varphi = \varphi(x)$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\in, I_{\mathsf{NS}}}$, $a \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa)$, and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, we have*

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \text{“}\varphi(a)\text{”} \Leftrightarrow \varphi(a).$$

(c) *For any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, and $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic $\mathbb{G}$, we have*

$$\langle \mathcal{H}(2^{\aleph_0})^{\mathsf{V}}, \in, I^{\mathsf{V}}_{\mathsf{NS}} \rangle \prec_{\Sigma_1} \langle \mathcal{H}(\left(2^{\aleph_1}\right)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}, \in, I^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}_{\mathsf{NS}} \rangle.$$

PROOF. The equivalence of (b) and (c) follows from Lemma 1.7. ⊣

(a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): Assume that $\mathsf{BFA}^{+<\kappa}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ holds, and let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathbb{P}$ is completely Boolean with $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{B} \setminus \{0_{\mathbb{B}}\}$. Suppose $a \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa)$ and φ is a Σ_1-formula in $\mathcal{L}_{\in, I_{\mathsf{NS}}}$. If $\varphi(a)$ holds in V, then we also have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ “$\varphi(a)$” by Lemma 1.5.

Suppose now that $\varphi = \exists y\, \psi(x, y)$ for a bounded formula ψ in $\mathcal{L}_{\in, I_{\mathsf{NS}}}$, and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ “$\varphi(a)$”. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a \subseteq \mu$ for some cardinal $\mu < \kappa$ (this is because a can be reconstructed from $trcl^+(a)$, and $trcl^+(a)$ can be coded by a subset a^* of $|trcl^+(a)|$). The formula $\varphi(a)$ can be then replaced by another formula saying:

> $\exists x$ (x is the set “a” reconstructed from the transitive set coded by a^* and $\varphi(x)$ holds).

Note that this formula is Σ_1 in $\mathcal{L}_{\in, I_{\mathsf{NS}}}$ with the parameter a^* if φ is Σ_1 in $\mathcal{L}_{\in, I_{\mathsf{NS}}}$.

We may also assume that a is not an ordinal (if necessary, we can replace a with a subset of μ with some redundant complexity to make $a \notin \mathrm{On}$).

Let $\underset{\sim}{b}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ “$\psi(a, \underset{\sim}{b})$”. Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic filter and we work in $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]$. Letting $b = \underset{\sim}{b}[\mathbb{G}]$, we have $\psi(a, b)$.

Working further in $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]$, let λ be large enough such that V_λ satisfies a large enough fragment of ZFC, $a, b \in V_\lambda$, and $V_\lambda \models \psi(a, b)$. Let $M \prec V_\lambda$ be such that $\mu \subseteq M$, $a, b \in M$, and $|M| = \mu < \kappa$. Note that we have $\langle M, \in, I_{\mathsf{NS}} \cap M \rangle \prec \langle V_\lambda, \in, I_{\mathsf{NS}} \rangle$ since I_{NS} is definable in $\langle V_\lambda, \in \rangle$. Let $m : M \xrightarrow{\cong} M_0$ be the Mostowski collapse of M and let $\nu = \mathrm{On} \cap M_0$. Note that we have $m \restriction \mu \cup \{a\} \cup (I_{\mathsf{NS}} \cap M) = id_{\mu \cup \{a\} \cup (I_{\mathsf{NS}} \cap M)}$ and hence $I_{\mathsf{NS}} \cap M = I_{\mathsf{NS}} \cap M_0$.

Let $\mathfrak{M} := \langle \nu + \mu, E, I, f, g \rangle$ be the structure in the language $\mathcal{L} := \{\underset{\sim}{E}, \underset{\sim}{I}, \underset{\sim}{f}, \underset{\sim}{g}\}$ such that there is an isomorphism

[4] Note that this implies $\neg\mathsf{CH}$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1.6) $i : \langle M_0, \in, I_{\mathsf{NS}} \cap M_0, rank, g_0\rangle \stackrel{\cong}{\to} \langle \nu+\mu, E, I, f, g\rangle$ such that $i \restriction \nu = id_{\nu}$, $i(a) = \nu$, and $i(m(b)) = \nu + 1$,

where *rank* is the rank function restricted to M_0 and $g_0 : M_0 \to M_0$ is a mapping such that $g_0 \restriction \mu$ is an enumeration of $(\mathcal{P}(\omega_1) \cap M_0) \setminus I_{\mathsf{NS}}$ (= (the set of all stationary subsets of $\omega_1)^{M_0}$) and $g_0{}''(M_0 \setminus \mu) = \{\emptyset\}$.

Clearly, $\langle \nu+\mu, E, I\rangle \models \psi^*(\nu, \nu+1))$, where ψ^* is the formula obtained from ψ by replacing symbols $\underset{\sim}{\in}$ and $\underset{\sim}{I_{\mathsf{NS}}}$ in ψ by $\underset{\sim}{E}$ and $\underset{\sim}{I}$.

Note that we have

(1.7) $\langle \nu+\mu, E, I, f, g\rangle \models \forall x \subseteq \omega_1\ (I(x) \vee \exists \alpha < \kappa\, (g(\alpha) = x))$.

Let $\underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}}, \underset{\sim}{E}, \underset{\sim}{I}, \underset{\sim}{f}, \underset{\sim}{g} \in \mathsf{V}$ be $\mathbb{P}$-names of $\mathfrak{M}$, E, I, f and g, respectively. By replacing $\mathbb{P}$ with $\mathbb{P} \restriction \mathbb{p}$ for some $\mathbb{p} \in \mathbb{P}$ if necessary, we may assume that

(1.8) all the properties of $\langle \nu+\mu, E, I, f, g\rangle$ used below are forced (as a statement on $\langle \nu+\mu, \underset{\sim}{E}, \underset{\sim}{I}, \underset{\sim}{f}, \underset{\sim}{g}\rangle$) by $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$.

In V, let $\mathcal{D}$ be the family of dense sets in $\mathbb{P}$ generated by the following predense sets in $\mathbb{P}$, each of size $\leq \mu < \kappa$. Note that since $\mathbb{P}$ is assumed to be completely Boolean, each predense subset of $\mathcal{P}$ can be replaced by a maximal antichain of at most the same size.

(1.9) $\{[\![\, \underset{\sim}{f}(\alpha) = \beta \,]\!]_{\mathbb{B}} : \beta < \nu\} \setminus \{\mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{B}}\}$, and $\{[\![\, \underset{\sim}{g}(\alpha) = \beta \,]\!]_{\mathbb{B}} : \beta < \nu+\mu\} \setminus \{\mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{B}}\}$, for all $\alpha \in \nu+\mu$.

(1.10) $\{[\![\, \underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}} \models \theta(a_0, ..., a_{k-1}) \,]\!]_{\mathbb{B}}, [\![\, \underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}} \models \neg\theta(a_0, ..., a_{k-1}) \,]\!]_{\mathbb{B}}\} \setminus \{\mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{B}}\}$, for all Σ_0-formulas θ in $\mathcal{L}$ and $a_0, ..., a_{k-1} \in \nu+\mu$.

(1.11) $\{[\![\, \underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}} \models \eta \wedge \theta(a_0, ..., a_{k-1}) \,]\!]_{\mathbb{B}}, [\![\, \underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}} \models \neg\eta(a_0, ..., a_{k-1}) \,]\!]_{\mathbb{B}}, [\![\, \underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}} \models \neg\theta(a_0, ..., a_{k-1}) \,]\!]_{\mathbb{B}}\} \setminus \{\mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{B}}\}$, for all Σ_0-formulas η, θ in $\mathcal{L}$ and $a_0, ..., a_{k-1} \in \nu+\mu$.

(1.12) $\big(\{[\![\, \neg(\exists x\ \underset{\sim}{E}\ c)\, \eta(x, a_0, ..., a_{k-1}) \,]\!]_{\mathbb{B}}\} \cup \{[\![\, d\ \underset{\sim}{E}\ c \wedge \eta(d, a_0, ..., a_{k-1}) \,]\!]_{\mathbb{B}} : d \in \nu+\mu\}\big) \setminus \{\mathbb{0}_{\mathbb{B}}\}$, for all Σ_1-formulas $\eta = \eta(x, x_0, ..., x_{k-1})$ in $\mathcal{L}$ and $c, a_0, ..., a_{k-1} \in \nu+\mu$.

To see that each of the sets in (1.9) is a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{P}$ of size $\leq \mu$, suppose that $\alpha \in \nu+\mu$ and $\mathbb{p} \in \mathbb{P}$. Then there is $\mathbb{q} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{p}$ which decides "$\underset{\sim}{f}(\alpha) \in \nu$" by (1.8), if follows that $\mathbb{q} \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{f}(\alpha) = \beta$" for some $\beta \in \nu$. For the sets corresponding to $\underset{\sim}{g}$ the argument is the same.

It is clear that elements of each of the sets in (1.9) are pairwise incompatible, and these sets are of size $\leq \mu < \kappa$.

The sets in (1.11) and (1.12) are not necessarily maximal antichains but it can be proved similarly that each of them sums up to $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{B}}$ and is of size $\leq \mu < \kappa$.

By (1.8), we have that

(1.13) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\{\xi \in \omega_1 : \xi\ \underset{\sim}{E}\ \underset{\sim}{g}(\alpha)\}$ is a stationary subset of ω_1".

Now, in V, let $\mathbb{G}$ be $\mathcal{D}$-generic filter such that

(1.14) $\underset{\sim}{g}(\alpha)[\mathbb{G}] := \{\xi \in \omega : \mathbb{p} \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\xi\ \underset{\sim}{E}\ \underset{\sim}{g}(\alpha)$" for some $\mathbb{p} \in \mathbb{G}\}$ is a stationary subset of ω_1 for all $\alpha < \mu$.

$\mathbb{G}$ exists by $\mathsf{BFA}^{+<\kappa}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$, by (1.13), and since $\mathcal{D}$ is a family of dense sets generated by small sets with $|\,\mathcal{D}\,| < \kappa$.

Let

$$\underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}}[\mathbb{G}] := \langle \nu+\mu, \underset{\sim}{E}[\mathbb{G}], \underset{\sim}{I}[\mathbb{G}], \underset{\sim}{f}[\mathbb{G}], \underset{\sim}{g}[\mathbb{G}]\rangle.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where

$$\underset{\sim}{E}[\mathbb{G}] := \{\langle \xi, \eta\rangle : \xi, \eta \in \nu + \mu,\ \mathbb{p} \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \text{“}\langle \xi, \eta\rangle \in \underset{\sim}{E}\text{”} \text{ for some } \mathbb{p} \in \mathbb{G}\},$$
$$\underset{\sim}{I}[\mathbb{G}] := \{\xi : \xi \in \nu + \mu,\ \mathbb{p} \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \text{“}\xi \in \underset{\sim}{I}\text{”} \text{ for some } \mathbb{p} \in \mathbb{G}\},$$
$$\underset{\sim}{f}[\mathbb{G}] := \{\langle \xi, \eta\rangle : \xi, \eta \in \nu + \mu,\ \mathbb{p} \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \text{“}\langle \xi, \eta\rangle \in \underset{\sim}{f}\text{”} \text{ for some } \mathbb{p} \in \mathbb{G}\}, \quad \text{and}$$
$$\underset{\sim}{g}[\mathbb{G}] := \{\langle \xi, \eta\rangle : \xi, \eta \in \nu + \mu,\ \mathbb{p} \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \text{“}\langle \xi, \eta\rangle \in \underset{\sim}{g}\text{”} \text{ for some } \mathbb{p} \in \mathbb{G}\}.$$

Claim 1.8.1

(1) $\underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}}[\mathbb{G}]$ *is an* $\mathcal{L}$*-structure.*

(2) *For each* Σ_1*-formula* $\theta = \theta(x_0, ..., x_{k-1})$ *in* $\mathcal{L}$ *and* $a_0, ..., a_{k-1} \in \nu + \mu$,

(1.15) $[\![\underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}} \models \theta(a_0, ..., a_{k-1})]\!]_{\mathbb{B}} \in \mathbb{G}$ *if and only if* $\underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}}[\mathbb{G}] \models \theta(a_0, ..., a_{k-1})$.

3 $\underset{\sim}{E}[\mathbb{G}]$ *is extensional and well-founded.* $\underset{\sim}{E}[\mathbb{G}]$ *on* $\nu + \mu$ *coincides with the canonical ordering on* $\nu + \mu$.

$\vdash$ (1): *Since the maximal antichains in* (1.9) *are in* $\mathcal{D}$, *we have* $\underset{\sim}{f}[\mathbb{G}] : \nu + \mu \to \nu$ *and* $\underset{\sim}{g}[\mathbb{G}] : \nu + \mu \to \nu + \mu$.

(2): *By induction on the construction of the formula* θ *using* (1.10), (1.11), *and* (1.12).

(3): *By* (1.8), *we have* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ “$\underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}} \models$ *Axiom of Extensionality*”, *and*

($\aleph$1.1) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ “$\underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}} \models \forall x \forall y\, (x \underset{\sim}{E} y \to (y))$”.

By (2), *it follows that* $\underset{\sim}{E}[\mathbb{G}]$ *is extensional and the statement on the structure* $\underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}}[\mathbb{G}]$ *corresponding to* ($\aleph$1.1) *holds. A similar argument shows that the canonical ordering on* ν *coincides with* $\underset{\sim}{E}[\mathbb{G}] \restriction \nu^2$. *This and the property of* $\underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}}[\mathbb{G}]$ *corresponding to* ($\aleph$1.1) *implies that* $\underset{\sim}{E}[\mathbb{G}]$ *is well-founded.* $\dashv$ (Claim 1.8.1)

By Claim 1.8.1, (3), we can take the Mostowski collapse of the structure $\underset{\sim}{\mathfrak{M}}[\mathbb{G}]\, m^* : \langle \nu + \mu, \underset{\sim}{E}[\mathbb{G}], \underset{\sim}{I}[\mathbb{G}]\rangle \xrightarrow{\cong} \langle M_2, \in, I^*\rangle$. Since $\langle \nu + \mu, \underset{\sim}{E}[\mathbb{G}], \underset{\sim}{I}[\mathbb{G}]\rangle \models$ “$\psi^*(\nu, \nu + 1)$” by (1.6), (1.8), and Claim 1.8.1, (2), we have $m^*(\nu) = a$ and hence $\langle M_2, \in, I^*\rangle \models \psi(a, m^*(\nu + 1))$, where the predicate I_{NS} is interpreted as I^*. Thus $\langle M_2, \in, I^*\rangle \models \varphi(a)$. By (1.7), (1.8), (1.14), and Claim 1.8.1, (2), we have $I^* = I_{\mathsf{NS}} \cap M_2$.

Since φ is Σ_1, it follows that $V \models \varphi(a)$ by Lemma 1.5, (2).

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a): Assume that (b) holds, and suppose that $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ is complete Boolean, $\mathcal{D}$ is a set of maximal antichains each of size $< \kappa$ with $|\mathcal{D}| < \kappa$, and $\mathcal{S}$ is a set of $\mathbb{P}$-names of stationary subsets of ω_1 with $|\mathcal{S}| < \kappa$.

By replacing elements of $\mathcal{S}$ by equivalent $\mathbb{P}$-names which are sufficiently nice, we may assume that each element of $\mathcal{S}$ is nice $\mathbb{P}$-name of size $\aleph_1$ (this is possible since we assumed that $\mathbb{P}$ is completely Boolean).

Let $X = \bigcup \mathcal{D}$ then $|X| < \kappa$. Let $\mu := \max\{|X|, |\mathcal{S}|\}$. Let λ be sufficiently large with $V_\lambda \prec_{\Sigma_n} \mathsf{V}$ for sufficiently large n. Let $M \prec V_\lambda$ be such that $|M| = \mu$, (1.16) $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathcal{D}$, X, $\mathcal{S} \in M$, and $\mu + 1 \subseteq M$. Note that (1.16) implies $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{S} \subseteq M$ and $I, \underset{\sim}{S} \in \mathcal{S}$.

Let $m : M \xrightarrow{\cong} M_0$ be the Mostowski collapse and $\langle \mathbb{P}_0, \leq_{\mathbb{P}_0}\rangle := m(\langle \mathbb{P}, \leq_{\mathbb{P}}\rangle)$. Let $\mathcal{S}_0 := \{m(\underset{\sim}{S}) : \underset{\sim}{S} \in \mathcal{S}\}$.

Since $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic filter $\mathbb{G}$ generates an $(M_0, \mathbb{P}_0)$-generic filter, we have

$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ “there is a $(M_0, \mathbb{P}_0)$-generic filter which realizes each element of $\mathcal{S}_0$ to be a stationary subset of ω_1”.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

By the assumption (b), it follows that

$\mathsf{V} \models$ " there is a $(M_0, \mathbb{P}_0)$-generic filter which realizes each element of $\mathcal{S}_0$ to be a stationary subset of ω_1".

Let $\mathbb{G}_0$ be such a filter. Then $m^{-1}{}''\mathbb{G}_0$ generates a $\mathcal{D}$-generic filter $\mathbb{G}_1$ on $\mathbb{P}$ which realizes each element of $\mathcal{S}$ to be a stationary subset of ω_1. $\dashv$ (Theorem 1.8)

§2. Recurrence Axioms and the Ground Axiom (GA).

2.1. Hierarchies of Recurrence and Maximality. The term "Recurrence Axiom" was coined in Fuchino and Usuba [15] (see also Fuchino [11]). The Recurrence Axiom for a (normal) class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, a set A of parameters, and a set Γ of $\mathcal{L}_\in$-formulas ($(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$-RcA, for short) is the statement (2.1) below.

A *ground of a* (transitive set or class) *model* W (of some set theory) is an inner model W_0 of W such that there is a poset $\mathbb{P} \in \mathsf{W}_0$ such that W is a $\mathbb{P}$-generic extension of W_0. For a class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, a ground W_0 of W is a $\mathcal{P}$-ground of W if there is a poset $\mathbb{P} \in \mathsf{W}_0$ such that $\mathsf{W}_0 \models$ "$\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$" and W is a $\mathbb{P}$-generic extension of W_0.

The Recurrence Axiom $(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$-RcA is the following statement formulated in an axiom scheme in $\mathcal{L}_\in$ (that this axiom is not formalizable in a single formula is discussed in [12]).

(2.1) For any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, $\varphi(\overline{x}) \in \Gamma$, and $\overline{a} \in A$, if $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\varphi(\overline{a}^{\check{}})$", then there is a ground W of V such that $\overline{a} \in \mathsf{W}$ and $\mathsf{W} \models \varphi(\overline{a})$.

The definition of a stronger variant $(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$-RcA$^+$ of $(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$-RcA is obtained when we replace "ground" in (2.1) by "$\mathcal{P}$-ground". If $\Gamma = \mathcal{L}_\in$, we simply drop Γ and talk about $(\mathcal{P}, A)$-RcA$(^+)$.

For definability of these axioms in the language of ZFC, see the paragraphs around Lemma 3.5.

As we have already followed these conventions without explanations, we often identify check names of sets with the sets themselves and drop the symbol "$\check{}$". Also we shall often replace tuples $\overline{a}$ of parameters by a single parameter a for simplicity (actually without loss of generality in most of the cases).

Recurrence Axioms are almost identical with Maximality Principles introduced in [20] with the same parameters. For $\mathcal{P}$, A as above, the Maximality Principle for $\mathcal{P}$ and A (MP$(\mathcal{P}, A)$ for short) is defined as below.

For a class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, an $\mathcal{L}_\in$-formula $\varphi(\overline{a})$ with parameters $\overline{a}$ ($\in \mathsf{V}$) is said to be a $\mathcal{P}$-button if there is $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that for any $\mathbb{P}$-name $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ of poset with $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}$", we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}*\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}}$ "$\varphi(\overline{a}^{\check{}})$".

If $\varphi(\overline{a})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-button then we call $\mathbb{P}$ as above a *push of the $\mathcal{P}$-button* $\varphi(\overline{a})$.

For a class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets and a set A (of parameters), the *Maximality Principle for $\mathcal{P}$ and A* (MP$(\mathcal{P}, A)$, for short) is the following assertion which is formulated as an axiom scheme in $\mathcal{L}_\in$.

MP$(\mathcal{P}, A)$: For any $\mathcal{L}_\in$-formula $\varphi(\overline{x})$ and $\overline{a} \in A$, if $\varphi(\overline{a})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-button then $\varphi(\overline{a})$ holds.

Similarly to the restricted versions of Recurrence Axiom, we define, for a set Γ of $\mathcal{L}_\in$-formulas.

MP$(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$: For any $\varphi(\overline{x}) \in \Gamma$ and $\overline{a} \in A$, if $\varphi(\overline{a})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-button then $\varphi(\overline{a})$ holds.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROPOSITION 2.1 (Barton et al. [6], see also Proposition 2.2 in [15]). *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a class of posets and A a set (of parameters).*

(1) $(\mathcal{P}, A)$-RcA$^+$ *is equivalent to* MP$(\mathcal{P}, A)$.
(2) $(\mathcal{P}, A)$-RcA *is equivalent to the following assertion*:

(2.2) *For any $\mathcal{L}_\in$-formula $\varphi(\overline{x})$ and $\overline{a} \in A$, if $\varphi(\overline{a})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-button then $\varphi(\overline{a})$ holds in a ground of* V.

See Lemma 3.4 in Section 3 below and its proof.

Recurrence Axiom ($\Leftrightarrow$ Maximality Principle) can be also characterized as the ZFC version of Sy-David Friedman's Inner Model Hypothesis [9] (see Barton et al [6], see also Fuchino and Usuba [15] or Fuchino [11]).

In contrast to the proposition above, $(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$-RcA$^+$ is not necessarily equivalent to MP$(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$ for some set Γ of formulas. In the next section, we prove that (under the consistency of certain large cardinal axioms) MP$(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Sigma_2}$ does not imply $(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Sigma_2}$-RcA and MP$(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_2}$ does not imply $(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_2}$-RcA (see Corollary 3.12).

Later we shall also consider a restricted form of (2.2) which we will call MP$^-(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$.

MP$^-(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$: For any $\varphi(\overline{x}) \in \Gamma$ and $\overline{a} \in A$, if $\varphi(\overline{a})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-button then $\varphi(\overline{a})$ holds in a ground of V.

Writing MP$^-(\mathcal{P}, A)$ for MP$^-(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\mathcal{L}_\in}$, the assertion of Proposition 2.1, (2) is reformulated as $(\mathcal{P}, A)$-RcA $\Leftrightarrow$ MP$^-(\mathcal{P}, A)$.

While Recurrence Axioms are assertions about the richness of the grounds of the universe V, their characterizations as Maximality Principles may be seen as a variation of generic absoluteness.

The following is an immediate consequence of Bagaria's Absoluteness Theorem 1.2.

THEOREM 2.2 (Ikegami and Trang (reformulated for our hierarchy of restricted Recurrence Axioms) [22]). *For a (normal) class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets and a cardinal κ, the following are equivalent*:

(a) $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_1}$-RcA$^+$.
(b) $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_1}$-RcA.
(c) BFA$_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$.

PROOF. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): is trivial.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c): Assume that $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_1}$-RcA holds, and suppose that $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, φ is a Σ_1-formula in $\mathcal{L}_\in$ and $a \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa)$. By Bagaria's Absoluteness Theorem 1.2, it is enough to show that $\Vdash_\mathbb{P}$ "$\varphi(a)$" $\Leftrightarrow \varphi(a)$ holds.

$\Vdash_\mathbb{P}$ "$\varphi(a)$" $\Leftarrow \varphi(a)$: is clear since φ is Σ_1.

$\Vdash_\mathbb{P}$ "$\varphi(a)$" $\Rightarrow \varphi(a)$: Assume that $\Vdash_\mathbb{P}$ "$\varphi(a)$". By $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_1}$-RcA, there is a ground W of V such that $a \in$ W and W $\models \varphi(a)$. Since φ is Σ_1 it follows that V $\models \varphi(a)$.

(c) $\Rightarrow$ (a): Assume that BFA$_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ holds. Suppose that $\Vdash_\mathbb{P}$ "$\varphi(a)$" for $\mathbb{P}$, φ, a as above. Then, by Bagaria's Absoluteness Theorem 1.2, we have $\varphi(a)$. In particular, since $\{\mathbb{1}\} \in \mathcal{P}$ (remember the convention set at (1.1)), $\varphi(a)$ holds in a $\mathcal{P}$-ground of V (namely, V itself). $\dashv$ (Theorem 2.2)

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

According to Joel Hamkins [20] it is an observation of his former PhD student George Leibman that MA follows from Maximality Principle for $\mathcal{P} =$ ccc posets, and the set of parameters $\mathcal{H}(2^{\aleph_0})$. Actually the corresponding statement had been proved much earlier by Stavi and Väänänen [30] (see also the introduction of [30]). This observation is now a part of Theorem 2.2, since MA is equivalent to $\mathsf{BFA}_{<2^{\aleph_0}}(\mathcal{P})$ for this $\mathcal{P}$.

Strictly speaking, Theorem 2.2 is different from the original theorem in Ikegami–Trang [22] (Theorem 1.13 there) in that Ikegami and Trang are talking about the Σ_n, Π_n-hierarchy $\mathsf{MP}(\cdots)_\Gamma$ for $\Gamma = \Sigma_n$, Π_n etc., which is shown to be different from $(\cdots)_\Gamma$-RcA^+ hierarchy (see Corollary 3.12 and the remark before the corollary). The proof above together with the proof of Theorem 1.13 in [22] actually shows that for a normal class of posets, $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2))_{\Sigma_1}$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$ coincides with $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2))_{\Sigma_1}$ (see Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2).

$(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2))_\Gamma$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$ and $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2))_\Gamma$ in general can be different principles. We will address to this subtle difference in the next Section 3, and show that these two hierarchies can split up drastically on the Π_2 and Σ_2 levels (see Corollary 3.12).

2.2. (In)compatibility of Recurrence and Maximality with GA. The *GA* is the axiom asserting that there is no proper ground of the universe V. The axiom is introduced by Joel Hamkins and Jonas Reitz. Its basic properties including the formalizability of the axiom in $\mathcal{L}_\in$ are proved in Reitz [28].

The relative consistency of GA with PFA is proved in [28] (see also the proof of Theorem 3.8 below; actually GA is even consistent with MM^{++}, see Theorem 6.3). In particular, this and Ikegami–Trang Theorem 2.2 imply the following.

THEOREM 2.3. GA *is relatively consistent with* $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2))_{\Sigma_1}$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$ *for a class of posets* $\mathcal{P}$ *whose elements are proper.*

Since the Recurrence Axiom implies that there are "many" different grounds, it is clear that Proposition 2.3 cannot be generalized for $(\cdots)_\Gamma$-RcA for arbitrary Γ. In particular, since GA itself is formalizable in a Π_3-sentence in $\mathcal{L}_\in$ (see the remark after Lemma 3.4), and it is not true in any non-trivial generic extension of the ground model, we obtain the following.

THEOREM 2.4. *Suppose* $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_3}$-RcA *holds for a non-trivial class* $\mathcal{P}$ *of posets. Then* GA *does not hold.*

$\mathsf{MP}^-(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_3}$ *for a non-trivial* $\mathcal{P}$ *also implies* $\neg$GA.

PROOF. Assume toward a contradiction that $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_3}$-RcA holds for a non-trivial class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, and GA also holds. Let ψ be the Π_3-sentence expressing that the universe does not have a non-trivial ground. Let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ be non-trivial forcing. Then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\neg\psi$". Since $\neg\psi$ is a Σ_3-sentence, $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_3}$-RcA implies that there is a ground W of V such that $\mathsf{W} \models \neg\psi$. Since we also assumed GA, W must be identical with V. Thus $\mathsf{V} \models \neg\psi$. This is a contradiction.

Since ψ above is a $\mathcal{P}$-button, the same proof leads to a contradiction under $\mathsf{MP}^-(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_3}$. ⊣ (Proposition 2.4)

Actually we also have the following delimitation, which shows that Theorem 2.3 is optimal in many instances of $\mathcal{P}$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the following, we use a variant of the cardinal invariant $\mathfrak{b}^*$ introduced in Eda et al. [8]:

$$\mathfrak{b}^{**} := \min\{\kappa \in \mathit{Card} \ : \ \text{for any } B \subseteq {}^{\omega}\omega, \text{ if } B \text{ is unbounded in } {}^{\omega}\omega \text{ with respect to } \leq^* \text{, then there is } B' \subseteq B \text{ with } |B'| \leq \kappa \text{ such that } B' \text{ is unbounded in } B\}.$$

LEMMA 2.5.

(1) $\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$ *can be formulated as a* Σ_2*-sentence* φ *in* $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$.
(2) $\mathfrak{b}^{**} = \aleph_1$ *can be formulated as a* Π_2*-sentence* ψ *in* $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$.
(3) $\mathfrak{b} < \mathfrak{d}$ *can be formulated as a* Π_2*-sentence* η *in* $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$.

PROOF. (1): The following formula φ will do:

$$\exists B\, \exists R\, \exists F\, (\, B \subseteq {}^{\omega}\omega \wedge \text{“}R \text{ is an } \omega_1\text{-like linear ordering on } B \text{ which is witnessed by } F\text{”} \wedge \forall f\, (f \in {}^{\omega}\omega \rightarrow (\exists g \in B)\, (g \not<^* f)))\,.$$

(2): The following formula ψ will do:

$$\forall B\, (\overbrace{B \subseteq {}^{\omega}\omega}^{\Sigma_0} \wedge \overbrace{B \text{ is unbounded in } {}^{\omega}\omega}^{\Pi_1 \text{ and hence its negation is } \Sigma_1} \rightarrow \exists B'\, \exists R\, \exists F\, (\overbrace{B' \subseteq B}^{\Sigma_0} \wedge \overbrace{B' \text{ is unbounded in } B}^{\Sigma_0} \wedge \underbrace{R \text{ is } \omega_1\text{-like order on } B' \text{ which is witnessed by } F}_{\Sigma_0}))\,.$$

(3): “$\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d}$” is characterized by the existence of a bounding family $\subseteq {}^{\omega}\omega$ which is well ordered with respect to $\leq^*$. Similarly to above, this can be formulated by a Σ_2-sentence. Hence, the negation of the equality ($\Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{b} < \mathfrak{d}$) is Π_2 in $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$.

⊣ (Lemma 2.5)

LEMMA 2.6. $\mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{b}^{**} \leq \mathfrak{d}$.

PROOF. Let $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{b}\rangle$ be such that $f_\alpha \leq^* f_{\alpha'}$ for all $\alpha < \alpha' < \mathfrak{b}$, and $\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{b}\}$ is unbounded in ${}^{\omega}\omega$ (this can be done by letting $\{g_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{b}\}$ be an unbounded subset of ${}^{\omega}\omega$, and defining f_α, $\alpha < \mathfrak{b}$ inductively such that we have $g_\alpha \leq^* f_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \mathfrak{b}$). Let $B = \{f_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{b}\}$. Then no $B' \subseteq B$ with $|B'| < |B| = \mathfrak{b}$ is unbounded in $\mathcal{B}$.

Note that the sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{b}\rangle$ as above also shows that $\mathfrak{b}$ is a regular cardinal.

This proves that $\mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{b}^{**}$.

To show that $\mathfrak{b}^{**} \leq \mathfrak{d}$, suppose that $D \subseteq {}^{\omega}\omega$ is dominating in ${}^{\omega}\omega$ (with respect to $\leq^*$), and $|D| = \mathfrak{d}$.

For any unbounded $B \subseteq {}^{\omega}\omega$, and for each $d \in D$ let $b_d \in B$ be such that $b_d \not\leq^* d$. Then $B' = \{b_d : d \in D\} \subseteq B$ is unbounded in ${}^{\omega}\omega$ and hence also unbounded in B and is of cardinality $\leq \mathfrak{d}$. This shows that $\mathfrak{b}^{**} \leq \mathfrak{d}$. ⊣ (Lemma 2.6)

In the following, we denote with $\mathbb{C}_\kappa$ the finite support κ-product of Cohen forcing, and with $\mathbb{D}$ the finite support iteration of Hechler forcing of length ω_1. It is easy to see that (over an arbitrary ground model V) we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\kappa}$ “$\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1, \mathfrak{d} \geq \kappa$” for any regular $\kappa \geq \aleph_1$, and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{D}}$ “$\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_1$”. More generally, letting $\mathbb{D}_\kappa$ be the FS-iteration of Hechler forcing of length κ for regular κ, we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{D}_\kappa}$ “$\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d} = \kappa$”.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROPOSITION 2.7. *Suppose $\mathcal{P}$ is a class of posets with $\mathbb{D} \in \mathcal{P}$ and* (2.3) $\mathfrak{b} > \aleph_1$ *holds.*

(1) *If $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_2}$-*RcA *holds, then* GA *does not hold.*
(2) *If $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Pi_2}$-*RcA *holds, then* GA *does not hold.*

PROOF. Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is as above, and (2.3) holds.

(1): Suppose that $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_2}$-RcA and GA hold.

Since we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{D}}$ "$\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$", and since "$\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$" is expressible in a Σ_2-sentence in $\mathcal{L}_\in$ by Lemma 2.5, (1), it follows by $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_2}$-RcA, that there is a ground W_0 with $\mathsf{W}_0 \models$ "$\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$". Since $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{W}_0$ by GA, this is a contradiction to (2.3).

(2): Suppose that $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Pi_2}$-RcA and GA hold.

Note that by (2.3) and Lemma 2.6, we have (2.4) $\mathsf{V} \models \mathfrak{b}^{**} > \aleph_1$.

Since we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{D}}$ "$\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_1$", we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{D}}$ "$\mathfrak{b}^{**} = \aleph_1$" by Lemma 2.6. Since "$\mathfrak{b}^{**} = \aleph_1$" is expressible in a Π_2-sentence in $\mathcal{L}_\in$ by Lemma 2.5, (2), it follows by $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Pi_2}$-RcA, that there is a ground W_0 with $\mathsf{W}_0 \models$ "$\mathfrak{b}^{**} = \aleph_1$". Since $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{W}_0$ by GA, it follows that $\mathsf{V} \models$ "$\mathfrak{b}^{**} = \aleph_1$". This is a contradiction to (2.4).

⊣ (Proposition 2.7)

The following can be proved similarly to Proposition 2.7, (1).

PROPOSITION 2.8. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a class of posets with $\mathbb{C}_{\aleph_1} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathfrak{b} \geq \aleph_2$ holds. Then $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_2}$-*RcA *implies that* GA *does not hold.*

LEMMA 2.9. CH *can be formulated both as Σ_2-sentence and Π_2-sentence in $\mathcal{L}_\in$ without parameters.*

PROPOSITION 2.10.

(1) *Suppose that* ¬CH *holds and $\mathcal{P}$ contains a poset collapsing $2^{\aleph_0}$ to $\aleph_1$ without adding reals. Then each of $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_2}$-*RcA *and $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Pi_2}$-*RcA *implies* ¬GA.
(2) *Suppose that* CH *holds and $\mathcal{P}$ contains a poset $\mathbb{Q}$ adding $\geq \aleph_2$ reals without collapsing cardinals $\leq \aleph_2$. Then each of $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_2}$-*RcA *and $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Pi_2}$-*RcA *implies* ¬GA.
(3) *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ contains sufficiently many ccc posets (containing enough CS-iterations of Cohen and Hechler posets would suffice), then each of $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_2}$-*RcA *and $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Pi_2}$-*RcA *implies* ¬GA.

PROOF. Similarly to the proof of Proposition 2.7 using Lemma 2.9. For (3), we consider cases where (a) $\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d}$, (b) $\aleph_1 < \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d}$, or (c) $\aleph_1 < \mathfrak{b} < \mathfrak{d}$, and apply Lemma 2.5 in all of the cases. ⊣ (Proposition 2.10)

2.3. Incompatibility of Laver genericity with GA. In the following we want to discuss the impact of the results we obtained above on axioms stating that there is a Laver-generic large cardinal (Laver-gen. large cardinal axioms).

The strongest variant of Laver-generic large cardinal axiom which has been considered so far, is the tightly super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically hyperhuge cardinal (see Fuchino and Usuba [15]).

Here, a cardinal κ is said to be (*tightly*, resp.) *super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically hyperhuge* if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for any $\lambda_0 > \kappa$ and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, there are $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ with $V_\lambda \prec_{\Sigma_n} \mathsf{V}$, and $\mathbb{P}$-name $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}$" such that for $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}})$-generic $\mathbb{H}$, there are

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

j, $M \subseteq \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]$ with $j : \mathsf{V} \overset{\prec}{\to}_\kappa M$, $j(\kappa) > \lambda$, $j''j(\lambda)$, $\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{H} \in M$, ${V_{j(\lambda)}}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]} \prec_{\Sigma_n} \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]$ (and $\mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ is of size $\leq j(\kappa)$, resp.).[5]

We can also define (tightly) super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver gen. large cardinal analogously for notions of large cardinal other than hyperhugeness (see [15] or [11]). For an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets which also permits transfinite iteration with some suitable support, we can prove that the existence of the tightly super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver gen. hyperhuge cardinal is consistent under a 2-huge cardinal [15].

Note that we cannot formulate the (genuine) large cardinal property corresponding to (tightly) super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically large cardinal in $\mathcal{L}_\in$. However, for a natural class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets like proper posets, semiproper posets, ccc posets, etc. we can formulate the notion of (tightly) super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically hyperhugeness in an axiom scheme in $\mathcal{L}_\in$. This is because $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically hyperhugeness of a cardinal κ implies $\kappa = \kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$ $(:= \max\{\aleph_2, 2^{\aleph_0}\})$ for these classes $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, and hence we can formulate the (tightly) super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically hyperhugeness of such κ in infinitely many formulas without introducing a new constant symbol for the cardinal.

In Fuchino and Usuba [15], it is proved that if κ is tightly super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically ultrahuge, then $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$ holds. Here the tightly super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically ultrahugeness is apparently much weaker than tightly super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically hyperhugeness.

Note that $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$ is also an assertion formalizable only in infinitely many formulas. In contrast, it is proved in [12], that, in a sense, Laver-genericity without "super-$C^{(\infty)}$" details never implies the full $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$.

By the result mentioned above and by Theorem 2.4, it follows immediately that:

PROPOSITION 2.11. *For any iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, if κ is tightly super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically ultrahuge, then* GA *does not hold.*

In [15], it is proved that if κ is tightly $\mathcal{P}$-generically hyperhuge (not necessarily Laver-generic) then there is the bedrock (i.e., the ground satisfying GA) and κ is hyperhuge in the bedrock.

On the other hand, it is shown in [11] that a tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically ultrahuge cardinal for nice iterable $\mathcal{P}$ is $\leq \kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$. Here an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets is said to be *nice* if the following is provable in ZFC: either $\mathcal{P}$ preserves ω_1 and $\mathrm{Col}(\omega_1, \{\omega_2\}) \in \mathcal{P}$, or $\mathcal{P}$ contains a poset which adds a new real. Actually the following lemma is one of the main rationales of the definition of the cardinal $\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$.

LEMMA 2.12. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a nice iterable class of posets. If κ is $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. supercompact, then $\kappa \leq \kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$.*

PROOF. By Lemma 6., (2) and (3) in [11]. ⊣(Lemma 2.12)

Thus we obtain the following.

PROPOSITION 2.13. *For a nice iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, suppose that there is a tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically hyperhuge cardinal. Then the bedrock exists and it is different from* V. *In particular,* GA *does not hold.*

[5] When we say "a poset $\mathbb{P}$ is of cardinality $\leq \mu$" we actually mean that there is a poset $\mathbb{Q}$ forcing equivalent to $\mathbb{P}$ such that $|\mathbb{Q}| \leq \mu$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROOF. By Lemma 2.12, the tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically hyperhuge cardinal is $\leq \kappa_{\mathrm{refl}}$ (in V) while κ is hyperhuge in the bedrock $\overline{\mathsf{W}}$. This implies that $\mathsf{V} \neq \overline{\mathsf{W}}$. In particular, GA does not hold. ⊣ (Proposition 2.13)

At the moment we do not know if the existence of a tightly $\mathcal{P}$-generically hyperhuge in theorem in [15] mentioned above can be weakened to the existence of some tight generic large cardinal of lower consistency strength. However, in [11], it is proved that for an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, if κ is tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. ultrahuge then $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_2}$-RcA$^+$ holds ([11, Theorem 21]). Note that ultrahuge cardinal is apparently much weaker than hyperhuge cardinal.

THEOREM 2.14. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is an iterable class of posets satisfying one of the conditions in Proposition 2.10.*

If κ_{refl} is tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. ultrahuge then GA *does not hold.*

PROOF. If κ is tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. ultrahuge then $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_2}$-RcA$^+$ holds by Theorem 21 in [11]. Thus if $\mathbb{D} \in \mathcal{P}$ then (by Proposition 5.5 below and) by Proposition 2.7,(1), it follows that GA does not hold.

Other cases can treated similarly by applying other assertions of Proposition 2.10. ⊣ (Theorem 2.14)

§3. Hierarchies of restricted Recurrence Axioms and Maximality Principles. The proof of Theorem 2.2 can be reused almost without any change to prove the following generalization of Theorem 1.13 in Ikegami–Trang [22].

THEOREM 3.1 (Generalization of the original Ikegami–Trang Theorem). *For a (normal) class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, and a cardinal κ the following are equivalent*:

(a) $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_1}$.
(b) $\mathsf{MP}^-(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_1}$.
(c) $\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$.

COROLLARY 3.2. *For a class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets and for an infinite cardinal κ, we have*

$$\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_1}, \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{MP}^-(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_1}, \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P}),$$
$$\Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_1}\text{-RcA}, \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_1}\text{-RcA}^+.$$

PROOF. By Theorems 2.2 and 3.1. ⊣ (Corollary 3.2)

The following lemma holds since Π_1-formulas are downward absolute.

LEMMA 3.3. *For any class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, and any set A, $(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_1}$-RcA$^+$ and $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_1}$ hold (in* ZFC*). In particular, we have*

$$(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_1}\text{-RcA} \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_1}\text{-RcA}^+ \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{MP}^-(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_1} \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_1}.$$

In the following, we show that the equivalence in Lemma 3.3 does not hold for Π_2.

Nevertheless, we have the following implications.

LEMMA 3.4. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a (normal) class of posets defined by a Σ_m-formula without parameters for some number m, and A a set.*[6]

[6]Note that "x is ccc poset", "x is proper posets", "x is semi-proper poset" are all Σ_2-statements. In case of "x is (semi-)proper poset", this can be seen in the formulation:

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1) $(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_n}$-RcA$^+ \Rightarrow \mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_n}$, *for all* $n \geq \max\{m, 1\}$.
(2) $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Sigma_n} \Rightarrow (\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Sigma_n}$-RcA$^+$, *for all* $n \geq \max\{m, 3\}$.

Proof. The following proofs are just re-examinations of the easy proof of Proposition 2.1, (1) (e.g., the one given in Fuchino and Usuba [15]).

(1): Note that, for $n = 1$, the claim also follows from Lemma 3.3.

Assume that $(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_n}$-RcA$^+$ holds for $n \geq \max\{m, 2\}$. To show that $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_n}$ holds, suppose that $\varphi = \varphi(\overline{x})$ is a Π_n-formula, $\overline{a} \in A$, and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ is such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\forall P \in \mathcal{P}\,(\Vdash_P$ "$\varphi(\overline{a})$"$)$" holds in V.

"$\forall P \in \mathcal{P}\,(\Vdash_P$ "$\varphi(\overline{x})$"$)$" is Π_n by the choice of n. Let us denote this formula by φ^*. Thus, we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\varphi^*(\overline{a})$".

By $(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_n}$-RcA$^+$, it follows that there is a $\mathcal{P}$-ground W of V such that $\overline{a} \in \mathsf{W}$ and $\mathsf{W} \models \varphi^*(\overline{a})$. By the definition of φ^*, and since W is a $\mathcal{P}$-ground, it follows that $\mathsf{V} \models \varphi(\overline{a})$. (2): Assume that $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Sigma_n}$ holds. Suppose that φ is Σ_n-formula, $\overline{a} \in A$, and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ is such that

(3.1) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\varphi(\overline{a})$".

Then we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\varphi(\overline{a})$ holds in a $\mathcal{P}$-ground".

The assertion

(3.2) "$\varphi(\overline{x})$ holds in a $\mathcal{P}$-ground"

can be expressed in a Σ_n-formula $\varphi^{**} = \varphi^{**}(\overline{x})$ (see the remark after the proof of the present lemma). By (3.1) and by the definition (3.2) of φ^{**} we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}*\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}}$ "$\varphi^{**}(\overline{a})$" for all $\mathbb{P}$-names $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}$". Thus, by $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Sigma_n}$, it follows that $\mathsf{V} \models \varphi^{**}(\overline{a})$. By the definition of φ^{**}, it follows that there is a $\mathcal{P}$-ground W_0 such that $\mathsf{W}_0 \models \varphi(\overline{a})$. ⊣ (Lemma 3.4)

The fact that (3.2) can be formulated in a Σ_n-formula for $n \geq \max\{m, 3\}$, can be seen as follows.

First, let us notice the fact formulated in Lemma 3.5 below.

In the following, for formulas φ and $\psi = \psi(x, \overline{y})$ we denote by $\varphi^{\psi(x;\overline{y})}$ the formula φ restricted to $\psi(x, \overline{y})$ where $\psi(x, \overline{y})$ is thought to be the definition of the class $\mathcal{A}_{\overline{y}} = \{x : \psi(x, \overline{y})\}$ with parameters (or, more precisely, place holders for parameters) $\overline{y}$. The semi-colon in "$\varphi^{\psi(x;\overline{y})}$" should remind this allocation of roles among the free variables of ψ.

Thus $\varphi^{\psi(x;\overline{y})}$ corresponds to the informal statement: $\mathcal{A}_{\overline{y}} \models \varphi$.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that* $\psi = \psi(x, \overline{y})$ *is a* Σ_m*-formula and* φ *is* Σ_n*-formula* (Π_n*-formula, resp.*). *Then* $\varphi^{\psi(x;\overline{y})}$ *is a* $\Sigma_{max\{m,n\}}$*-formula* (*a* $\Pi_{max\{m,n\}}$*-formula, resp.*).

Proof. For quantifier free formula φ, the claim of the Lemma is true since $\varphi^{\psi} = \varphi$.

Suppose that, for a Σ_n-formula $\varphi_0 = \varphi_0(x_0, \overline{x})$ (Π_n-formula $\varphi_1 = \varphi_1(x_0, \overline{x})$), ${\varphi_0}^{\psi(x;\overline{y})}$ is Σ_k (${\varphi_1}^{\psi(x;\overline{y})}$ is Π_k resp.).

"$\exists \underline{\kappa}\, \exists F$ ($\underline{\kappa}$ is a cardinal $\wedge$ F "codes" the fact "$\underline{\kappa} \geq (\beth_\omega)^+(|\,x\,|)$" $\wedge$ $\cdots$)."

Here, the underline to κ is added to suggest that the symbol does not denote a constant symbol but rather a variable in the language $\mathcal{L}_\in$. We shall keep this convention in the following.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Then

$(\forall x_0)(\psi(x_0, \overline{y}) \to \varphi_0{}^{\psi(x;\overline{y})})$ is $\Pi_{\max\{m,k+1\}}$, and
$(\exists x_0)(\psi(x_0, \overline{y}) \wedge \varphi_1{}^{\psi(x;\overline{y})})$ is $\Sigma_{\max\{m,k+1\}}$.

Using this fact, the claim of the Lemma can be proved now by induction on n.
$\dashv$ (Lemma 3.5)

An examination of [5, 28] reveals a construction of a Π_2-formula $\Phi(x, \underline{P}, \underline{\delta}, r, \underline{G})$ which says that

> $\underline{P}$ is a poset, $\underline{\delta}$ is a regular cardinal in V, there is a uniquely determined inner model $\mathcal{M}$ with $\underline{\delta}$-cover and $\underline{\delta}$-approximation properties such that $r = (\check{\underline{\delta}} > 2)^{\mathcal{M}}$, $\underline{P} \in \mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M} \neq \mathsf{V}$, $\underline{G}$ is an $(\mathcal{M}, \underline{P})$-generic set such that $\mathsf{V} = \mathcal{M}[\underline{G}]$, and $x \in \mathcal{M}$.

Let $\psi = \psi(x)$ be a Σ_m-formula expressing "$x \in \mathcal{P}$". Then, for a Σ_n-formula $\varphi = \varphi(\overline{x})$ for $n \geq \max\{m, 3\}$, the formula $\varphi^{**}(\overline{x})$ defined as

$$\exists \underline{P} \exists \underline{\delta} \exists r \exists \underline{G}\, (\Phi(\emptyset, \underline{P}, \underline{\delta}, r, \underline{G}) \wedge \psi^{\Phi(x;\cdots)}(\underline{P}) \wedge \varphi^{\Phi(x;\cdots)}(\overline{x}))$$

is Σ_n by Lemma 3.5, and $\varphi^{**}(\overline{a})$ expresses "$\varphi(\overline{a})$ holds in a $\mathcal{P}$-ground".

We shall also use the following variant of Maximality Principle. Let $\mathcal{P}$, A, Γ be as before.

$\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$: For $\varphi \in \Gamma$, and $\overline{a} \in A$, if $\varphi(\overline{a})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-button, then $\{\mathbb{1}\}$ is a push of the $\mathcal{P}$-button $\varphi(\overline{a})$.

As before, we drop the subscript Γ from $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$ if $\Gamma = \mathcal{L}_\in$.

Lemma 3.6.

(1) $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma \Rightarrow \mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$.
(2) (*Hamkins* [20]) *For an iterable* $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, A) \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)$. *More precisely, if* $\mathcal{P}$ *is* Σ_m*-definable, then for any* $n \geq \max\{m, 1\}$, *we have* $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_n} \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\Pi_n}$.
(3) *For an iterable* $\mathcal{P}$, *if* $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$, *then for any* $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, *we have* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$".

Proof. (1): is clear by definition.

(2): By (1), it is enough to show "$\Leftarrow$", Assume that $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)$ holds, and suppose that $\varphi(\overline{a})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-button for an $\mathcal{L}_\in$-formula φ and $\overline{a} \in A$. Then $\varphi^* := \forall Q\, (Q \in \mathcal{P} \to \Vdash_Q$ "$\varphi(\overline{a})$") is a $\mathcal{P}$-button. Hence, by $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)$, φ^* holds in V. But this means that $\{\mathbb{1}\}$ is a push for the button φ.

(3): Suppose that $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$ holds (in V). For $\varphi \in \Gamma$, and $\overline{a} \in A$, let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ be such that it forces that $\varphi(\overline{a})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-button. By Maximal Principle (of forcing), there is a $\mathbb{P}$-name $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ of a poset such that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \text{"}\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P} \wedge \Vdash_{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}} \text{"}\forall R\, (R \in \mathcal{P} \to \Vdash_R \text{"}\varphi(\overline{a})\text{"})\text{""}.$$

Since $\mathcal{P}$ is iterable, it follows that $\varphi(\overline{a})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-button over V. Thus, by $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$, $\{\mathbb{1}\}$ is a push of the $\mathcal{P}$-button $\varphi(\overline{a})$ (in V).

Again since $\mathcal{P}$ is iterable, it follows that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\{\mathbb{1}\}$ is a push of the $\mathcal{P}$-button $\varphi(\overline{a})$".
$\dashv$ (Lemma 3.6)

The following should be folklore.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LEMMA 3.7. (1) *If α is a limit ordinal and V_α satisfies a sufficiently large finite fragment of* ZFC, *then for any $\mathbb{P} \in V_\alpha$ and $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic $\mathbb{G}$, we have $V_\alpha[\mathbb{G}] = {V_\alpha}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$.*

(2) *If α is a limit ordinal and V_α satisfies a sufficiently large finite fragment of* ZFC, *then for any direct limit $\mathbb{P}$ of an iteration of length On^{V_α} in V_α, which is definable and preserving cardinals in V_α, if $\mathbb{G}$ is $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic, then we have*

$$V_\alpha[\mathbb{G}] = {V_\alpha}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}.$$

(3) *For each natural number k, there is a sufficiently large $k' > k$ such that for any $\alpha \in On$ if $V_\alpha \prec_{\Sigma_{k'}} \mathsf{V}$ (i.e., α is $\Sigma_{k'}$-correct), then for any poset $\mathbb{P} \in V_\alpha$ and $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic $\mathbb{G}$, ${V_\alpha}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \prec_{\Sigma_k} \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]$.*

(4) *Suppose that $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha : \alpha \in On \rangle$ is an Easton support class iteration of increasingly directed closed posets and $\mathfrak{P}$ is the class direct limit of the iteration. If k is a natural number and κ is a regular cardinal which is $\Sigma_{k'}$-correct for a sufficiently large $k' > k$, then we have ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]} \prec_{\Sigma_k} \mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$ for any $(\mathsf{V}, \mathfrak{P})$-generic $\mathfrak{G}$ and $\mathbb{G}_\kappa = \mathfrak{G} \cap \mathbb{P}_\kappa$.*

PROOF. (1): See, e.g., Lemma 3.2 in [15]. (2): follows from (1).

(3): See the proof of Lemma 4.8, (1) in the extended version of [15].

(4): Let $\Phi = \Phi(x)$ be an $\mathcal{L}_\in$-formula which defines $\mathfrak{P}$. Then by the choice of κ, we have $\mathbb{P}_\kappa = \Phi^{{V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}}}$. The claim (4) follows from this fact with an argument practically identical to that for (3). ⊣ (Lemma 3.7)

By Theorem 2.4, we cannot replace Π_2 in the next theorem by Σ_3.

THEOREM 3.8. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a Σ_2-definable iterable class of posets containing all σ-closed posets, and that $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Pi_2}$ holds. Suppose further that there is a proper class $\mathcal{K}$ of supercompact cardinals.*

If $\mathfrak{P}$ is the class poset for Laver preparation for $\mathcal{K}$ (see the proof below for more details), then we have

$$\Vdash_{\mathfrak{P}} \text{“}\mathsf{GA} \ + \ \mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Pi_2} \\ + \textit{ there are class many supercompact cardinals”}.$$

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{K}$ be as above.

Let $f : \mathrm{On} \to \mathsf{V}$ be a universal Laver function for $\mathcal{K}$. I.e., a class function f such that

(3.3) for any $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$, we have $f \restriction \kappa : \kappa \to V_\kappa$, and for any $x \in \mathsf{V}$ and any $\lambda \geq \max\{\kappa, |trcl(x)|\}$, there is a normal ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}_{\kappa,\lambda,x}$ over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$ and associated elementary embedding $j_{\kappa,\lambda,x} : \mathsf{V} \overset{\prec}{\to}_\kappa M$ with $j_{\kappa,\lambda,x}(f)(\kappa) = x$.

We may also assume that

(3.4) $f(\alpha) = 0$ for all $\alpha < \kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$.

Note that $f \restriction \kappa, \kappa \in \mathcal{K}$ are uniformly definable across V_κ $(= \mathcal{H}(\kappa))$ for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$.

A universal Laver function exists (see, e.g., Apter [1, Lemma 1]).

Let $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathrm{On} \rangle$ be the Laver preparation along with f making supercompactness of all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$ indestructible by κ-directed closed forcing. That is, $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathrm{On} \rangle$ is defined as the iterative part of the Easton support iteration $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathrm{On} \rangle$ with a control sequence $\langle \lambda_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathrm{On} \rangle$ of cardinals defined recursively by the following.

(3.5) If $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ is a limit and closed with respect to $\langle \lambda_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$, $f(\alpha) = \langle \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}, \lambda \rangle$ with $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$ “$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ is α-directed closed poset”, then $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha = \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\lambda_\alpha = \lambda$.

(3.6) Otherwise $\lambda_\alpha = \sup\{\lambda_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$ “$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha = \{\mathbb{1}\}$”.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let $\mathfrak{P}$ be the class forcing which is the direct limit of $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathrm{On} \rangle$. For each $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$, let $\mathfrak{P}_{>\kappa}$ be (the class $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$-name of) the κ-directed closed tail part of the iteration. Thus $\mathfrak{P} \sim \mathbb{P}_\kappa * \mathfrak{P}_{>\kappa}$ and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\kappa}$ "$\mathfrak{P}_{>\kappa}$ is a κ-directed closed class poset".

Let $\mathfrak{G}$ be $(\mathsf{V}, \mathfrak{P})$-generic. For each $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$, let $\mathbb{G}_\kappa = \mathfrak{G} \cap \mathbb{P}_\kappa$. Each $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$ is made indestructible under κ-directed closed forcing by $\mathbb{P}_\kappa$ (see, e.g., [26]). In particular, κ remains supercompact in $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\lambda]$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}$. It follows that κ remains supercompact also in $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$.

$\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \mathsf{GA}$. This is because $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$ satisfies Continuum Coding Axiom (CCA), and GA follows from it (see [28, Theorem 3.2]). That $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$ satisfies CCA follows from the fact that in $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$ there are cofinally many indestructible supercompact cardinals.

Thus, it is enough to show that $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Pi_2}$. Note that we have

(3.7) $\mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}})^{\mathsf{V}} = \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]} = \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]}$

by $\min(\mathcal{K})$-directed closedness of $\mathfrak{P}$, and (3.4). Also

(3.8) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]} = {V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]}$

for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$ by κ-directed closedness of $\mathfrak{P}_{>\kappa}$ and Lemma 3.7, (2).

Working in $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$, suppose that $\varphi = \varphi(\overline{x})$ is a Π_2-formula and $\overline{a} \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}})$ $(= \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}})^{\mathsf{V}})$.

Further in $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$, suppose that $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{P}$ is such that

(3.9) $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \Vdash_{\mathbb{S}}$ "$\forall T \in \mathcal{P}\,(\Vdash_T$ "$\varphi(\overline{a})$"$)$".

We want to show that $\varphi(\overline{a})$ holds (in $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$).

By replacing V by $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_{\kappa_0}]$, and $\mathcal{K}$ by $\mathcal{K} \setminus \kappa_0 + 1$ for a large enough $\kappa_0 \in \mathcal{K}$ with $\mathbb{S} \in \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_{\kappa_0}]$, we may assume that $\mathbb{S} \in {V_{\kappa_0}}^{\mathsf{V}}$ for a $\kappa_0 < \min(\mathcal{K})$. Let $\mathbb{g}$ be $(\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}], \mathbb{S})$-generic. Since $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{P}$ and since $\mathcal{P}$ is iterable, we have

(3.10) $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}][\mathbb{g}] \models \forall T \in \mathcal{P}\,(\Vdash_T$ "$\varphi(\overline{a})$"$)$.

By (3.8) (and Lemma 3.7, (2)), we have

(3.11) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathbb{g}]} = {V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}][\mathbb{g}]}$,

for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$.

Note that each $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$ remains supercompact in all of $V[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]$, $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathbb{g}]$, $V[\mathfrak{G}]$, and $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}][\mathbb{g}]$. Thus,

(3.12) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$,

(3.13) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}][\mathbb{g}]} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}][\mathbb{g}]$,

(3.14) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]$, and

(3.15) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathbb{g}]} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathbb{g}]$,

for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$. By (3.8) and (3.12), we have

(3.16) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$,

for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$. Similarly

(3.17) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathbb{g}]} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}][\mathbb{g}]$

holds for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$ by (3.11) and (3.13),

"$\forall T \in \mathcal{P}\,(\Vdash_T$ "$\varphi(\overline{a})$"$)$" is Π_2 (note that we need Σ_2-definability of $\mathcal{P}$ for this). Hence ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathbb{g}]} \models \forall T \in \mathcal{P}\,(\Vdash_T$ "$\varphi(\overline{a})$"$)$ by (3.10) and (3.17). By (3.15), it follows that $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathbb{g}] \models \forall T \in \mathcal{P}\,(\Vdash_T$ "$\varphi(\overline{a})$"$)$. This implies that $\varphi(\overline{a})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-button in $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Similarly, since $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\mathcal{P}$ is Σ_2, we have $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa] \models \mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{P}$ by (3.16) and (3.14).

Since we have $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa] \models \mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Pi_2}$ by Lemma 3.6, (3), it follows that $V[\mathbb{G}_\kappa] \models \varphi(\overline{a})$ for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$.

Since φ is Π_2 and $\mathcal{K}$ is cofinal in On, it follows that $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \varphi(\overline{a})$ by (3.16).

This shows that $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Pi_2}$ holds. ⊣ (Theorem 3.8)

If we start from a ground model with a proper class $\mathcal{K}$ of $C^{(n)}$-supercompact cardinals (see Bagaria [4]) for sufficiently large n, we can improve the condition "$\mathcal{P}$ is Σ_2-definable" in Theorem 3.8 by "$\mathcal{P}$ is Σ_3-definable" (see the remark after the proof of Proposition 3.10).

"Π_2" and "$\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Pi_2}$" in Theorem 3.8 can be also replaced by "Δ_3" and "$\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Delta_3}$" which is not covered by $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Pi_2}$ (Proposition 3.10).

In the following, we quickly review the definition and some needed facts about the variation $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$ of the Maximality Principle which will be further studied in Gappo and Lietz [16].

For an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, a set A of parameters, and a set Γ of $\mathcal{L}_\in$-formulas, let $(\Gamma)^*_{\mathcal{P}}$ be the set of provably $\mathcal{P}$-persistent formulas in Γ. That is, the collection of all formulas $\varphi \in \Gamma$, $\varphi = \varphi(\overline{x})$ such that the $\mathcal{L}_\in$-sentence

$$(3.18)\quad (\varphi)^*_{\mathcal{P}} := \forall \overline{x}\, (\varphi(\overline{x}) \to \forall \underline{\mathbb{P}} \in \mathcal{P}\, (\, \Vdash_{\underline{\mathbb{P}}} \text{“}\varphi(\overline{x})\text{”}))$$

is provable in ZFC.

Note that if Γ is closed with respect to equivalence (which is provable in ZFC) and has a recursive representatives (modulo the equivalence), then the same holds for $(\Gamma)^*_{\mathcal{P}}$ (as far as $\mathcal{P}$ is a definable class but this is always assumed).

Now $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$ is defined as the axiom scheme consisting of formulas of the form

$$(3.19)_\varphi\quad (\forall \underline{\mathbb{P}} \in \mathcal{P})\, (\forall \overline{x} \in A)\, (\, \Vdash_{\underline{\mathbb{P}}} \text{“}\varphi(\overline{x})\text{”} \;\to\; \varphi(\overline{x})),$$

for each $\varphi \in (\Gamma)^*_{\mathcal{P}}$.

Similarly to the $\mathsf{MP}(\cdots)_\Gamma$ and $(\cdots)_\Gamma$-RcA^+ hierarchies, we write $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, A)$ for $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, A)_{\mathcal{L}_\in}$. $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(2^{\aleph_0}))$ of the family $\mathcal{P}$ consisting of ccc posets corresponds to the principles considered in Stavi and Väänänen [30].

The main point of the definition of $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$ is that the persistence is coded in the collection $(\Gamma)^*_{\mathcal{P}}$ so that each formula $(3.19)_\varphi$ in $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$ remains at about the same complexity of φ.

The following is easy to prove.

Lemma 3.9. *For an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, arbitrary set A of parameters and set Γ of formulas, the following are equivalent*:
(*a*) $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, A)_{(\Gamma)^*_{\mathcal{P}}}$, (*b*) $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, A)_{(\Gamma)^*_{\mathcal{P}}}$, (*c*) $(\mathcal{P}, A)_{(\Gamma)^*_{\mathcal{P}}}$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$,
(*d*) $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$.

The hierarchy of this type of restricted Maximality Principles also appears in Goodman [19]. Our $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, A)_\Gamma$ is called "Γ-$\mathsf{MP}_{\mathcal{P}}(A)$" in [19]. Though the choice of symbols in [19] is so that letter Γ is used to denote the class of posets and Φ to denote the class of formulas.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The hierarchy of MP^* is actually a special case of the hierarchy of "$\mathsf{BFA}(\mathcal{P},\Gamma)_{\kappa,\lambda}$" in Asperó [2] (see [16]).[7]

The proof of Lemma 3.4, (2), shows also the implication.

(2′) $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P},A)_{\Sigma_n} \Rightarrow (\mathcal{P},A)_{\Sigma_n}$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$, for all $n \geq \max\{m,3\}$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is Σ_m.

Thus, by Theorem 2.4, $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P},A)_{\Sigma_n}$ for $n \geq \max\{m,3\}$ for m as above implies $\neg\mathsf{GA}$. In particular, for Σ_3-definable $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P},A)_{\Sigma_3}$ implies $\neg\mathsf{GA}$. This shows that the condition Δ_3 in the following proposition is (almost) optimal.

Proposition 3.10. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a Σ_3-definable iterable class of posets containing all σ-closed posets, and that $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Delta_3}$ holds. Suppose further that there is a proper class $\mathcal{K}$ of $C^{(n)}$-supercompact cardinals for a sufficiently large n and $\mathfrak{P}$ is the class poset defined as in the proof of Theorem 3.8 for this $\mathcal{K}$.*

Then we have

$$\Vdash_{\mathfrak{P}} \text{“}\mathsf{GA} \ + \ \mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Delta_3}\text{”}.$$

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathfrak{P}$ are as above and $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Delta_3}$ holds.

Let $\mathfrak{G}$ be a $(\mathsf{V},\mathfrak{P})$-generic filter.

As it has been already shown in the proof of Theorem 3.8, we have $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \mathsf{GA}$.

So we prove $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Delta_3}$. Working in $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$, suppose that $\varphi = \varphi(\overline{x})$ is a $(\Delta_3)^*_{\mathcal{P}}$-formula and $\overline{a} \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}})$ $(= \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}})^{\mathsf{V}})$.

Further in $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$, suppose that $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{P}$ is such that

(3.20) $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \Vdash_{\mathbb{S}} \text{“}\varphi(\overline{a})\text{”}$.

We want to show that $\varphi(\overline{a})$ holds (in $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$).

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 3.8, we may assume that $\mathbb{S} \in {V_{\kappa_0}}^{\mathsf{V}}$ for a $\kappa_0 < \min(\mathcal{K})$. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be $(\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}],\mathbb{S})$-generic. By the choice (3.20) of $\mathbb{S}$, we have

(3.21) $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}][\mathfrak{g}] \models \varphi(\overline{a})$.

By the choice of the "sufficiently large" n (in terms of Lemma 3.7, (4) and (3)), and by (3.8),

(3.22) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]} \prec_{\Sigma_3} \mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$,

(3.23) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathfrak{g}]} \prec_{\Sigma_3} \mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}][\mathfrak{g}]$,

and, since κ remains supercompact in $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]$ and $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathfrak{g}]$,

(3.24) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]$,

(3.25) ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathfrak{g}]} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathfrak{g}]$,

for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$.

By (3.22), $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{P}$ (in $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}]$), and since $\mathcal{P}$ is Σ_3, ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]} \models \mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{P}$. Hence, by (3.24), $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa] \models \mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{P}$.

Since φ is Δ_3, (3.21) and (3.23) implies ${V_\kappa}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathfrak{g}]} \models \varphi(\overline{a})$. This and (3.25) imply $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathfrak{g}] \models \varphi(\overline{a})$.

By $\varphi \in (\Delta_3)^*_{\mathcal{P}}$, it follows that $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa][\mathfrak{g}] \models \forall \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}\,(\Vdash_{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}} \text{“}\varphi(\overline{a})\text{”})$. Thus $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa] \models \exists \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{S}} \in \mathcal{P}\,(\forall \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}\,(\Vdash_{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{S}}} \text{“}\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \Vdash_{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}} \text{“}\varphi(\overline{a})\text{””}))$.

Since $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa] \models \mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Delta_3}$ by Lemma 3.6, (3) (and since $\{\mathbb{1}\} \in \mathcal{P}$), it follows that

[7] These principles are related but different from the Bounded Forcing Axioms $\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(3.26) $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa] \models \varphi(\overline{a})$.

Since φ is Δ_3, and hence Π_3 in particular, $V_\kappa^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}_\kappa]} \models \varphi(\overline{a})$ by (3.24). Thus, by (3.26), it follows that $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \varphi(\overline{a})$.

This shows that $\mathsf{V}[\mathfrak{G}] \models \mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Delta_3}$ holds. ⊣ (Proposition 3.10)

The first half of the proof of Proposition 3.10 can be applied to the proof of Theorem 3.8 to obtain the following.

(A variant of Theorem 3.8) Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a Σ_3-definable iterable class of posets containing all σ-closed posets, and that $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Pi_2}$ holds. Suppose further that there is a proper class $\mathcal{K}$ of $C^{(n)}$-supercompact cardinals for a sufficiently large n.

If $\mathfrak{P}$ is the class poset for Laver preparation for $\mathcal{K}$, then we have

$\Vdash_{\mathfrak{P}}$ "GA + $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Pi_2}$ + there are class many supercompact cardinals".

The following theorem is also obtained by combining the proofs of Theorem 3.8 and Proposition 3.10 taking Lemma 3.9 into account.

THEOREM 3.11. (1) *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a Σ_2-definable iterable class of posets containing all σ-closed posets such that $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_\Gamma$ holds where Γ denotes here the set of all formulas representable as the conjunction of a Σ_2-formula and a $(\Delta_3)^*_{\mathcal{P}}$-formula. Suppose further that there is a proper class $\mathcal{K}$ of supercompact cardinals and $\mathfrak{P}$ is the class poset defined as in the proof of Theorem 3.8 for this $\mathcal{K}$.*

Then we have

$\Vdash_{\mathfrak{P}}$ "GA + $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_\Gamma$".

(2) *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a Σ_3-definable iterable class of posets containing all σ-closed posets such that $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_\Gamma$ holds where Γ is the set of formulas defined as in* (1). *Suppose further that there is a proper class $\mathcal{K}$ of $C^{(n)}$-supercompact cardinals for a sufficiently large n, and $\mathfrak{P}$ is the class poset defined as in the proof of Theorem 3.8 for this $\mathcal{K}$.*

Then we have

$\Vdash_{\mathfrak{P}}$ "GA + $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_\Gamma$".

The following corollary shows in particular that the implication in Lemma 3.4, (1) for $n = 2$ cannot be reversed.

COROLLARY 3.12. (1) *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a Σ_2-definable iterable class of posets containing all σ-closed posets, and also a poset adding a real. Assume further that there is a proper class $\mathcal{K}$ of supercompact cardinals, and $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_\Gamma$ holds where Γ is defined just as in Theorem 3.11. Then, there is a class poset $\mathfrak{P}$ such that we have*

$\Vdash_{\mathfrak{P}}$ "$\neg(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Pi_2}$-$\mathsf{RcA}$, $\neg(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_2}$-$\mathsf{RcA}$ *and* $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_\Gamma$".

(2) *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a Σ_3-definable iterable class of posets containing all σ-closed posets, and a poset adding a real. Assume further that there is a proper class $\mathcal{K}$ of $C^{(n)}$-supercompact cardinals for sufficiently large n, and $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_\Gamma$ holds for the set of formulas Γ as defined in Theorem 3.11. Then, there is a class poset $\mathfrak{P}$ such that we have*

$\Vdash_{\mathfrak{P}}$ "$\neg(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Pi_2}$-$\mathsf{RcA}$, $\neg(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)_{\Sigma_2}$-$\mathsf{RcA}$ *and* $\mathsf{MP}^*(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_\Gamma$".

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROOF. Note that $\mathsf{MP}^+(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))_{\Sigma_1}$ for $\mathcal{P}$ as here implies $\neg\mathsf{CH}$ (see Fuchino and Usuba [15, Theorem 3.3]).

(1): By Proposition 2.10, (1) and Proposition 3.11, (1).

(2): By Proposition 2.10, (1) and Theorem 3.11, (2). ⊣ (Corollary 3.12)

Typical instances of $\mathcal{P}$ in Corollary 3.12 are when $\mathcal{P}$ is the class of all proper posets, the class of all semi-proper posets, or the class of all stationary preserving posets.

PROBLEM 3.13. *Do some theorems hold which would imply certain non-implications similar to those in Corollary 3.12 for $\mathcal{P} = \sigma$-closed posets, or $\mathcal{P} =$ ccc posets*?

§4. Generic absoluteness under Recurrence Axioms. The conclusion of the following Theorem 4.1 generalizes that of Viale's Theorem 1.1 ([32, Theorem 1.4]). Note that the assumption in our Theorem 4.1, the Recurrence Axiom $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$ for an uncountable cardinal κ and an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, namely, is of much lower consistency strength than the assumptions in Viale's Theorem for some instances of $\mathcal{P}$. Actually the assumption of Theorem 4.1 is even compatible with $V = L$ for many "natural" classes $\mathcal{P}$ of posets including the cases "$\mathcal{P} =$ all ccc posets" or "$\mathcal{P} =$ all proper posets" (see [20, Theorems 5.6 and 5.10]). For "$\mathcal{P} =$ all stationary preserving posets", Theorem 1.6 in Ikegami and Trang [22] proves that the existence of proper class many strongly compact cardinals plus a reflecting cardinal is an upper bound of the consistency strength of the Maximality Principle for the $\mathcal{P}$.

Known lower bound of this Recurrence Axiom is also large. By Ikegami–Trang Theorem 2.2, (stationary preserving, $\mathcal{H}(2^{\aleph_0})$)-RcA is equivalent with BMM. Schindler [29] shows that BMM implies that there is an inner model with a strong cardinal.

In contrast, the Maximality Principle for $\mathcal{P} =$ semi-proper posets, the consistency strength is much lower than this by Asperó [2]. Note that, in general, semi-proper and stationary preserving are not identical notions.

The existence of the tightly super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. hyperhuge cardinal κ is the known Laver-generic large cardinal axiom which implies the full Recurrence Axiom for $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{H}(\kappa)$ (see Fuchino and Usuba [15]).

There is practically no (consistent) generic large cardinal axiom formalizable in a single formula which also implies $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)$-RcA for any sufficiently general class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets ([12]).

In [15], it is proved that for an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, the existence of the tightly super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. hyperhuge cardinal κ with $\kappa = \kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$ implies $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}))$-$\mathsf{RcA}^+$ where $\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$ is defined as $\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}} := \max\{2^{\aleph_0}, \aleph_2\}$. Note that this does not contradict what we mentioned in the last paragraph since the tightly super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. hyperhugeness of $\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$ is only expressed by an axiom schema. Note that by [15] we know the exact consistency strength of this principle (as that of $\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$ being super-$C^{(\infty)}$ hyperhuge in the bedrock).

In Section 5 we show that the generalization of the conclusion of Viale's Theorem 1.1 (like that of the following Theorem 4.1) already follows from tight $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. hugeness. This assumption is still much stronger than that of Viale's Theorem 1.1

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but the upper bound of the consistency strength of this Laver-genericity is far below the consistency strength of a tight super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. hyperhuge cardinal.

THEOREM 4.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is an iterable Σ_n-definable class of posets for $n \geq 2$ and $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_n \cup \Gamma}$-RcA$^+$ holds for an uncountable cardinal κ where Γ is the set of all formulas which are conjunction of a Σ_2-formula and a Π_2-formula. Then, for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$",*

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathcal{H}(\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \quad \textit{holds for all } \mu < \kappa \textit{ and for } (\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})\textit{-generic } \mathbb{G}.$$

Thus, we have $\mathcal{H}(\kappa)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathcal{H}((\kappa^{(+)})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$.

PROOF. Suppose that $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ is such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$" and $\mathbb{G}$ is a $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic filter. Let $\varphi = \varphi(x)$ be a Σ_2-formula in $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$, and $\varphi(x) = \exists y\, \psi(x, y)$ for a Π_1-formula ψ in $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$. Let $\mu < \kappa$ and $a \in \mathcal{H}(\mu^+)$ $(\subseteq \mathcal{H}(\kappa))$. We have to show that $\mathcal{H}(\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}} \models \varphi(a) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \models \varphi(a)$.

Suppose first that $\mathcal{H}(\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}} \models \varphi(a)$. Let $b \in \mathcal{H}(\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}}$ be such that $\mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}})^{\mathsf{V}} \models \psi(a, b)$. Since we have $\mathsf{V} \models \mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ by Ikegami–Trang Theorem 2.2, it follows that $\mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \models \psi(a, b)$ by Bagaria's Absoluteness Theorem 1.2, and thus $\mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \models \varphi(a)$.

Note that we did not use the assumption "$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$"$\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$"" for this direction.

Suppose now $\mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \models \varphi(a)$. By $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_n \cup \Gamma}$-RcA$^+$, there is a $\mathcal{P}$-ground W of V such that

(4.1) $\mathsf{W} \models$"$\mathsf{BFA}_{<\mu^+}(\mathcal{P}) \wedge \mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \varphi(a)$".

Note that the formula in (4.1) is Σ_n if $n \geq 3$ and Γ if $n = 2$.

Let $b \in \mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{W}})^{\mathsf{W}}$ be such that $\mathsf{W} \models$"$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \psi(a, b)$". By Bagaria's Absoluteness Theorem 1.2, and since V is a $\mathcal{P}$-generic extension of W, it follows that $\mathsf{V} \models$"$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \psi(a, b)$" and hence $\mathcal{H}(\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}} \models \varphi(a)$.

For the last statement of the present theorem, let φ be a Σ_2-formula, and $a \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa)$. If $\mathcal{H}(\kappa) \models \varphi(a)$, then, by (1.4), there is $\mu < \kappa$ such that $\mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \varphi(a)$. By the first part of the theorem, it follows that $\mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \models \varphi(a)$. Thus $\mathcal{H}((\kappa^{(+)})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \models \varphi(a)$ by (1.4).

If $\mathcal{H}((\kappa^{(+)})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \models \varphi(a)$, then there is $\mu < \kappa$ such that $\mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \models \varphi(a)$ (this is also shown using (1.4)). Hence $\mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}}) \models \varphi(a)$ by the first part of the theorem. ⊣ (Theorem 4.1)

Note that by Lemma 1.6, the conclusion (4.1) of Theorem 4.1 can be yet strengthened to

(4.2) $\langle \mathcal{H}(\mu^+), \in, I_{\mathsf{NS}} \rangle^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \langle \mathcal{H}(\mu^+), \in, I_{\mathsf{NS}} \rangle^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$ holds for all $\mu < \kappa$ and for $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic $\mathbb{G}$.

§5. Generic absoluteness under Laver-genericity. Laver-genericity also implies a conclusion similar to that of Viale's Theorem 1.1. Although this fact does not have an advantage in terms of consistency strength in comparison with Theorem 4.1, the Laver-generic large cardinal we need in Theorem 5.7 below is much weaker than the tight super-$C^{(\infty)}\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generic hyperhugeness, the generic large cardinal property which is known to imply the corresponding Recurrence Axiom used in Theorem 4.1 (see [12, 15]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Viale [32], the absoluteness statement of his Theorem 1.1 is also discussed in connection with the Resurrection Axiom (see Theorem 5.2).

Adopting the generalized setting introduced in Fuchino [12], we define the Resurrection Axiom as follows: for an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets and a definition $\mu^\bullet$ of an uncountable cardinal (e.g., as $\aleph_1$, $\aleph_2$, $2^{\aleph_0}$, $(2^{\aleph_0})^+$, $\kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$ etc.),[8] *the Resurrection Axiom* for $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mu^\bullet$ is the statement.

$\mathrm{RA}(\mathcal{P}, \mu^\bullet)$: For any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, there is a $\mathbb{P}$-name $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ of a poset such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}$" and $\mathcal{H}(\mu^\bullet)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec \mathcal{H}(\mu^\bullet)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]}$ for any $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}})$-generic $\mathbb{H}$.[9]

Lemma 5.1 (Hamkins, and Johnstone [21]). *Assume that $\mathcal{P}$ is an iterable class of posets, $\mu^\bullet$ is a definition of an uncountable cardinal, and* $\mathrm{RA}(\mathcal{P}, \mu^\bullet)$ *holds. Then*

(1) $\mathsf{BFA}_{<\mu^\bullet}(\mathcal{P})$ *holds.*

(2) *If all elements of $\mathcal{P}$ preserve stationarity of subsets of ω_1, $2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1}$, and $\mu^\bullet =$ "$2^{\aleph_0}$", then $\mathsf{BFA}^{+<\mu^\bullet}_{<\mu^\bullet}(\mathcal{P})$ holds.*

Proof. (1): It is easy to check that (c) of Bagaria's Theorem 1.2 holds.[10]

(2): Similarly to (1) using (c) of Theorem 1.8.[11] ⊣ (Lemma 5.1)

Theorem 5.2 (A generalization of Theorem 5.1 in Viale [32]). *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is an iterable class of posets, $\mu^\bullet$ is a definition of an uncountable cardinal and* $\mathrm{RA}(\mathcal{P}, \mu^\bullet)$ *holds. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu^\bullet)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathcal{H}(\mu^\bullet)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]},$$

for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathsf{BFA}_{<\mu^\bullet}(\mathcal{P})$", and $(\mathsf{V}, \mathcal{P})$-generic $\mathbb{G}$.

Proof. An argument similar to that of Lemma 5.1 will do. ⊣ (Theorem 5.2)

In [12], the boldface version of the following is proved:

Theorem 5.3 (Fuchino [12]). *For an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, and a definition $\mu^\bullet$ of a cardinal, if $\mu^\bullet$ is tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver gen. superhuge, then* $\mathrm{RA}(\mathcal{P}, \mu^\bullet)$ *holds.*

Corollary 5.4. *For an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, and a definition $\mu^\bullet$ of a cardinal, if $\mu^\bullet$ is tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver gen. superhuge, then we have*

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu^\bullet)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathcal{H}(\mu^\bullet)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]},$$

for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathsf{BFA}_{<\mu^\bullet}(\mathcal{P})$" and $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic $\mathbb{G}$.

Proof. By Theorems 5.2 and 5.3. ⊣ (Corollary 5.4)

Note that for many cases (with natural setting of $\mathcal{P}$ and the notion of large cardinal), if κ is $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. large cardinal, then $\kappa = \kappa_{\mathfrak{refl}}$ (see Fuchino et al. [13]).

---

[8] More precisely, when we say "$\mu^\bullet$ is a definition of an uncountable cardinal" we mean that ZF or ZFC proves the statement "$\mu^\bullet$ uniquely exists and $\mu^\bullet$ is an uncountable cardinal".

[9] Here we mean with "$\mathcal{H}(\mu^\bullet)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec \mathcal{H}(\mu^\bullet)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]}$" the elementarity $\mathcal{H}((\mu^\bullet)^{\mathsf{V}})^{\mathsf{V}} \prec \mathcal{H}((\mu^\bullet)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]}$.

[10] Actually we do not need this condition in this part of the proof and hence we can obtain the Bounded Forcing Axiom under a weaker notion of Resurrection Axiom in which the second step $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ may be anything.

[11] Note that for this proof, the weaker variant of $\mathrm{RA}(\mathcal{P})$ as in the proof of (1) is apparently not sufficient.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the following, we show in a direct proof, that Corollary 5.4 can be yet slightly improved (see Theorem 5.7 below).

It is known that Laver-gen. large cardinal axiom proves strong forms of double-plus forcing axioms (see [13, Theorem 5.7]). In the Proposition 5.5 below we only recap a part of this result needed for the following argument.

For a class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, and cardinals κ and λ,

$\mathsf{FA}^{+<\lambda}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$: For any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, any family $\mathcal{D}$ of dense subsets of $\mathcal{P}$ with $|\mathcal{D}| < \kappa$, and any family $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathbb{P}$-names of stationary subsets of ω_1 with $|\mathcal{S}| < \lambda$, there is a $\mathcal{D}$-generic filter $\mathbb{G}$ on $\mathbb{P}$ such that $\underset{\sim}{S}[\mathbb{G}]$ is a stationary subset of ω_1 for all $\underset{\sim}{S} \in \mathcal{S}$.

Note that MM^{++} is just $\mathsf{FA}^{+<\aleph_2}_{<\aleph_2}$(stationary preserving posets). $\mathsf{FA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ is the principle we obtain by dropping the mention about $\mathcal{S}$ from the definition of $\mathsf{FA}^{+<\lambda}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$.

Proposition 5.5. (1) *Suppose that κ is $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. supercompact. Then $\mathsf{FA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ holds.*

(2) *If all elements of the class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets are stationary preserving and κ is $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. supercompact, then $\mathsf{FA}^{+<\kappa}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ holds.*

Proof. We prove (2). (1) can be shown by a subset of this proof.

Assume that κ is a $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. supercompact cardinal, and let $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{S}$ be as in the definition of $\mathsf{FA}^{+<\kappa}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$. Let D_α, $\alpha < \mu$ and $\underset{\sim}{S}_\alpha$, $\alpha < \mu'$ be enumerations of $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{S}$, respectively.

Let $\lambda = |\mathbb{P}|$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\lambda > \kappa$ and the underlying set of $\mathbb{P}$ is λ. Let $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name with $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}$" and such that for any $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}})$-generic $\mathbb{H}$, there are j, $M \subseteq \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]$ such that $j : \mathsf{V} \overset{\prec}{\to}_\kappa M$, $j(\kappa) > \lambda$, $j''\lambda$, $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\mathbb{H} \in M$.

Let $\mathbb{G}$ be the $\mathbb{P}$ part of $\mathbb{H}$. Then, since $j(\mu) = \mu$, $j(\mu') = \mu'$, $j(\mathcal{D}) = \{j(D_\alpha) : \alpha < \mu\}$, and $j(\mathcal{S}) = \{j(\underset{\sim}{S}_\alpha) : \alpha < \mu\}$, we have

(5.1) $M \models$ " $j''\mathbb{G}$ generates a filter on $j(\mathbb{P})$ which is $j(\mathcal{D})$-generic, and realizes elements of $j(\mathcal{S})$ to be stationary".

Note that we need here the condition that $\mathcal{P}$ is stationary preserving since otherwise the stationary set $\underset{\sim}{S}[\mathbb{G}]$ in $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]$ might be no more stationary in $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]$.

(5.1) implies that

$M \models$ " there is a $j(\mathcal{D})$-generic filter on $j(\mathbb{P})$ which realizes all elements of $j(\mathcal{S})$ to be stationary".

By elementarity, it follows that

$\mathsf{V} \models$ " there is a $\mathcal{D}$-generic filter on $\mathbb{P}$ which realizes all elements of $\mathcal{S}$ to be stationary".

⊣ (Proposition 5.5)

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose that κ is $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. supercompact for an iterable $\mathcal{P}$. Then we have $\mathcal{H}(\kappa)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_1} \mathcal{H}((\kappa^{(+)})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$ for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic $\mathbb{G}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.5, (1) and Bagaria's Absoluteness Theorem 1.2.

⊣ (Lemma 5.6)

The following theorem improves Corollary 5.4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THEOREM 5.7. *For an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets, suppose that $\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ holds, and κ is tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. huge.*[12] *Then, for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$",*

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathcal{H}(\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \quad \textit{holds for all } \mu < \kappa \textit{ and for } (\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})\textit{-generic } \mathbb{G}.$$

Thus, we have $\mathcal{H}(\kappa)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathcal{H}((\kappa^{(+)})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$.

PROOF. Suppose that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \varphi(\overline{a})$" for $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$", $\mu < \kappa$, Σ_2-formula φ and for $\overline{a} \in \mathcal{H}(\mu^+)$. Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$-generic filter. Then we have

(5.2) $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}] \models$ "$\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P}) \wedge \mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \varphi(\overline{a})$".

Let $\varphi = \exists y \psi(\overline{x}, y)$ where ψ is a Π_1-formula in $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$. Let $b \in \mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$ be such that $\mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]} \models \psi(\overline{a}, b)$.

Let $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name with $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}$" such that, for $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}})$-generic $\mathbb{H}$ with

(5.3) $\mathbb{G} \subseteq \mathbb{H}$ (under the identification $\mathbb{P} \lessdot \mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$),

there are j, $M \subseteq \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]$ such that $j : \mathsf{V} \overset{\prec}{\to}_{\kappa} M$,

(5.4) $|\mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}| \leq j(\kappa)$ (by tightness),

(5.5) $\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{H} \in M$, and

(5.6) $j''j(\kappa) \in M$.

By (5.2), (5.3), and Bagaria's Absoluteness Theorem 1.2 (applied to $V[\mathbb{G}]$), we have $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}] \models$ "$\psi(\overline{a}, b)$" and hence $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}] \models$ "$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \psi(\overline{a}, b)$".

By (5.4), and (5.6), there is a $\mathbb{P}$-name of b in M. By (5.5), it follows that $b \in M$. By similar argument, we have $\mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]} \subseteq M$ and hence $\mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]})^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]} = \mathcal{H}((\mu^+)^M)^M \in M$. Thus we have $M \models$ "$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \psi(\overline{a}, b)$".

By elementarity, it follows that $\mathsf{V} \models$ "$(\exists \underline{b} \in \mathcal{H}(\mu^+))\ \mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \psi(\overline{a}, \underline{b})$", and hence $\mathsf{V} \models$ "$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \varphi(\overline{a})$" as desired.

Suppose now that $\mathbb{P}$, μ, φ, $\overline{a}$ are as above and assume that $\mathsf{V} \models$ "$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \varphi(\overline{a})$" holds. For a Π_1-formula ψ as above, let $b \in \mathcal{H}(\mu^+)^{\mathsf{V}}$ be such that $V \models$ "$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \psi(\overline{a}, b)$".

Since $\mathsf{V} \models \mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ by assumption, it follows that $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}] \models \psi(\overline{a}, b)$ by Bagaria's Absoluteness Theorem 1.2, and hence $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}] \models$ "$\mathcal{H}(\mu^+) \models \varphi(\overline{a})$".

The last assertion of the theorem follows by the same argument as that given at the end of the proof of Theorem 4.1. ⊣ (Theorem 5.7)

§6. Some more remarks and open questions. In this final section we collect some observations we could not put in the appropriate places in previous sections, and mention some open questions.

Since most of the claims in this section are easy consequences of known results, some of them may be already known.

6.1. Restricted Recurrence Axioms under Laver-genericity. As we already mentioned at the end of Section 2, the existence of a tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver gen. ultrahuge

[12] Note that by Proposition 5.5, $\mathsf{BFA}_{<\kappa}(\mathcal{P})$ follows from the assumption that κ is $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generic supercompact. Thus the conclusion of the theorem follows from the combination of the assumption κ being $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generic supercompact and tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. huge. Note also that this combination follows from the tight $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. superhugeness of κ.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cardinal κ implies $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_{\Sigma_2}$-RcA$^+$ ([11, Theorem 21]). This result can be slightly improved so that its conclusion stands in line with the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 for the case of $n = 2$.

THEOREM 6.1 (A slightly improved version of Theorem 21 in Fuchino [11]). *Suppose that κ is tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-generically ultrahuge for an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets. Then $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_\Gamma$-RcA$^+$ holds where Γ is the set of all formulas which are conjunctions of a Σ_2-formula and a Π_2-formula.*

PROOF. A slight modification of the proof given in [11] will do. Nevertheless, we present the proof here because of the subtlety of the modification of the proof around (6.8) below.

Assume that κ is tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver generically ultrahuge for an iterable class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets.

Suppose that $\varphi = \varphi(\overline{x})$ is Σ_2 formula (in $\mathcal{L}_\in$), $\psi = \psi(\overline{x})$ is Π_2 formula (in $\mathcal{L}_\in$), $\overline{a} \in \mathcal{H}(\kappa)$, and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ is such that

(6.1) $\mathsf{V} \models \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\varphi(\overline{a}) \wedge \psi(\overline{a})$".

Let $\lambda > \kappa$ be such that $\mathbb{P} \in \mathsf{V}_\lambda$ and

(6.2) $V_\lambda \prec_{\Sigma_n} \mathsf{V}$ for a sufficiently large n.

In particular, we may assume that we have chosen the n above so that a sufficiently large fragment of ZFC holds in V_λ ("sufficiently large" means here, in particular, in terms of Lemma 3.7, (1) and that the argument at the end of this proof is possible).

Let $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathcal{P}$", and for $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}})$-generic $\mathbb{H}$, there are j, $M \subseteq \mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]$ with

(6.3) $j : \mathsf{V} \overset{\prec}{\to}_\kappa M$,

(6.4) $j(\kappa) > \lambda$,

(6.5) $\mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{H}$, ${V_{j(\lambda)}}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]} \in M$, and

(6.6) $|\mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}| \leq j(\kappa)$.

By (6.6), we may assume that the underlying set of $\mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ is $j(\kappa)$ and $\mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \in {V_{j(\lambda)}}^{\mathsf{V}}$.

Let $\mathbb{G} := \mathbb{H} \cap \mathbb{P}$. Note that $\mathbb{G} \in M$ by (6.5). We have

(6.7) ${V_{j(\lambda)}}^{M} \underbrace{=}_{\text{by (6.5)}} {V_{j(\lambda)}}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]} \overbrace{=} {V_{j(\lambda)}}^{\mathsf{V}}[\mathbb{H}]$.

Since ${V_{j(\lambda)}}^{M} (= V^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{H}]}_{j(\lambda)})$ satisfies a sufficiently large fragment of ZFC by elementarity of j, and by Lemma 3.7, (1)

Thus, by (6.5) and by the definability of grounds, we have ${V_{j(\lambda)}}^{\mathsf{V}} \in M$ and ${V_{j(\lambda)}}^{\mathsf{V}}[\mathbb{G}] \in M$. We may assume that $V^{\mathsf{V}}_{j(\lambda)}$ as a ground of $V^M_{j(\lambda)}$ satisfies a large enough fragment of ZFC.

CLAIM 6.1.1. ${V_{j(\lambda)}}^{\mathsf{V}}[\mathbb{G}] \models \varphi(\overline{a}) \wedge \psi(\overline{a})$.

$\vdash$ By Lemma 3.7, (1), ${V_\lambda}^{\mathsf{V}}[\mathbb{G}] = {V_\lambda}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$, and ${V_{j(\lambda)}}^{\mathsf{V}}[\mathbb{G}] = {V_{j(\lambda)}}^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$. By (6.2), both ${V_\lambda}^{\mathsf{V}}[\mathbb{G}]$ and $V^{\mathsf{V}}_{j(\lambda)}[\mathbb{G}]$ satisfy still large enough fragment of ZFC. Thus, by Lemma 6.2 below, it follows that

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(6.8) $V_\lambda^{\mathsf{V}}[\mathbb{G}] \prec_{\Sigma_1} V_{j(\lambda)}^{\mathsf{V}}[\mathbb{G}] \prec_{\Sigma_1} V[\mathbb{G}]$.

By (6.1) and (6.2), we have $V_\lambda^{\mathsf{V}}[\mathbb{G}] \models \varphi(\overline{a})$ and $\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}] \models \psi(\overline{a})$. By (6.8) and since φ is Σ_2, and ψ is Π_2, it follows that $V_{j(\lambda)}^{\mathsf{V}}[\mathbb{G}] \models \varphi(\overline{a}) \wedge \psi(\overline{a})$. ⊣ ⊣ (Claim 6.1.1)

Thus we have

(6.9) $M \models$ "there is a $\mathcal{P}$-ground N of $V_{j(\lambda)}$ with $N \models \varphi(\overline{a}) \wedge \psi(\overline{a})$".

By the elementarity (6.3), it follows that

(6.10) $\mathsf{V} \models$ "there is a $\mathcal{P}$-ground N of V_λ with $N \models \varphi(\overline{a}) \wedge \psi(\overline{a})$".

Now by (6.2), it follows that there is a $\mathcal{P}$-ground W of V such that $\mathsf{W} \models \varphi(\overline{a}) \wedge \psi(\overline{a})$. ⊣ (Theorem 6.1)

We used the following variation of (1.4) in the proof of Theorem 6.1 to obtain (6.8).

LEMMA 6.2. *Suppose that δ, $\delta' \in On$, $\delta < \delta'$ and both V_δ and $V_{\delta'}$ satisfy a sufficiently large fragment of* ZFC. *Then we have $V_\delta \prec_{\Sigma_1} V_{\delta'} \prec_{\Sigma_1} \mathsf{V}$.*

PROOF. Suppose that $\overline{a} \in V_\delta$ and $\psi(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$ is a bounded formula in $\mathcal{L}_\in$.

If $V_\delta \models \exists \overline{y} \psi(\overline{a}, \overline{y})$, then there are $\overline{b} \in V_\delta$ such that $V_\delta \models \psi(\overline{a}, \overline{b})$. It follows that $V_{\delta'} \models \psi(\overline{a}, \overline{b})$ and hence $V_{\delta'} \models \exists \overline{y} \psi(\overline{a}, \overline{y})$.

Suppose now that $V_{\delta'} \models \exists \overline{y} \psi(\overline{a}, \overline{y})$. Since $V_{\delta'}$ satisfies a sufficiently large fragment of ZFC, there is $M \in V_{\delta'}$ such that

$V_{\delta'} \models$ " $|\, trcl(\overline{a}) \,| = |\, M \,|$, M is transitive, $\overline{a} \in M$, there are $\overline{b} \in M$ such that $M \models \psi(\overline{a}, \overline{b})$".

But then such M as above must be an element of V_δ and thus

$V_\delta \models$ " $|\, trcl(\overline{a}) \,| = |\, M \,|$, M is transitive, $\overline{a} \in M$, there are $\overline{b} \in M$ such that $M \models \psi(\overline{a}, \overline{b})$".

It follows that $V_\delta \models \exists \overline{y}\, \psi(\overline{a}, \overline{y})$.

The argument above shows that $V_\delta \prec_{\Sigma_1} V_{\delta'}$. $V_{\delta'} \prec_{\Sigma_1} \mathsf{V}$ can be shown with practically the same argument. ⊣ (Lemma 6.2)

6.2. Separation of some other axioms and assertions. In Section 3, we separated some instances of $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_\Gamma$-RcA and $\mathsf{MP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}(\kappa))_\Gamma$ by compatibility with the GA. The same idea can be also used to separate some other principles and axioms.

THEOREM 6.3. *"MM^{++}+ there are class many supercompact cardinals"* (*or even class many extendible cardinals*) *is consistent with* GA.

PROOF. Sean Cox [7] proved that MM^{++} is preserved by ω_2-directed closed forcing ([7,Theorem 4.7]). Starting from a model with cofinally many supercompact cardinals, use the first supercompact to force MM^{++}. Then the class forcing just like that in the proof of Theorem 3.8 (or like the one in [17]) will produce a desired model. ⊣ (Theorem 6.3)

COROLLARY 6.4. MM^{++} *or even* MM^{++}+ *"there are class many super compact cardinals" does not imply that the continuum is a tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver gen. ultrahuge cardinal for any of the large enough subclass $\mathcal{P}$ of the class of all semiproper posets.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{P} =$ semiproper posets. Note that, if κ is $\mathcal{P}$-Laver generically supercompact, then $\kappa = 2^{\aleph_0}$ follows (see, e.g., Fuchino [11, Theorem 5 and Lemma 6]).

If κ is the tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver generically ultrahuge continuum, then Theorem 6.1 together with each one of the Propositions 2.7, 2.8, and 2.10 implies that GA does not hold. Thus the model of $\mathsf{MM}^{++}+$ "there are class many super compact cardinals" $+$ GA of Theorem 6.3 witnesses the desired non-implication. $\dashv$ (Corollary 6.4)

Note that Corollary 6.4 with "tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver gen. ultrahuge" replaced by "tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver gen. hyperhuge" is trivial. This is because consistency strength of the existence of the tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver gen. hyperhuge cardinal is known to be that of the existence of a (genuinely) hyperhuge cardinal (see the remark right after Proposition 2.11).

Our Theorems 4.1 and 5.7 generalize Viale's Theorem 1.1 in terms of possible instances of the class $\mathcal{P}$ not covered by Theorem 1.1 and also in terms of the cardinal κ in the conclusion of the theorems which can be strictly bigger than $\aleph_2$ (which can really happen if e.g., $\mathcal{P}$ is the class of ccc posets).

On the other hand, the premise of Viale's Theorem 1.1 is consistent with GA by Theorem 6.3 while this is not the case with Theorem 4.1 for many natural instances of $\mathcal{P}$ by Propositions 2.7, 2.8, and 2.10 and unclear in case of $\mathcal{P} =$ stationary preserving posets with Theorem 5.7.

Viale's Theorem 1.1 in particular, implies the following.

COROLLARY 6.5 (to Viale's Theorems 1.1 and 6.3). *The assertion*

$\mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)^{\mathsf{V}} \prec_{\Sigma_2} \mathcal{H}(\aleph_2)^{\mathsf{V}[\mathbb{G}]}$ *for any stationary preserving poset* $\mathbb{P}$ *with* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "BMM", *and* $(\mathsf{V}, \mathbb{P})$*-generic* $\mathbb{G}$.

is consistent with GA.

Concerning Theorem 5.7, it is open at the moment if the existence of a tightly $\mathcal{P}$-Laver-gen. huge cardinal is inconsistent with GA. However some of its strengthenings do contradict GA for many instances of the class $\mathcal{P}$ of posets as we saw in Proposition 2.13 and Theorem 2.14.

The positive answer to the following question would give a clear separation of Laver-genericity from the corresponding forcing axiom with double plus.

PROBLEM 6.6. *Does the* (*tightly*) $\mathcal{P}$*-Laver gen. supercompact cardinal axiom* (*i.e., the existential statement of such a cardinal, e.g. for* $\mathcal{P}$ *as in Corollary* 3.12) *imply the negation of* GA?

Though Corollary 6.4 makes the positive answer to the following problem rather unpromising, Theorem 2.53 of Woodin [33] and its variants (e.g., [7, Theorem 4.5]) seem to suggest a positive answer.

PROBLEM 6.7. *Is there any reasonable assumption under which* MM^{++} *and* (*tightly*) $\mathcal{P}$*-Laver gen. supercompact cardinal axiom are equivalent*?

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank Gabriel Goldberg, Daisuke Ikegami, and Hiroshi Sakai for helpful remarks and comments. The authors also would like to thank Andreas Lietz for pointing out a flaw in the proof of an earlier

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

version of Theorem 3.8. A part of the statement of the original version of this theorem is now recovered in Theorem 3.10 and in the subsequent remark. They would like to thank as well the anonymous referee for pointing out numerous slips.

Funding statement. The research of the first author was supported by Kakenhi Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) 20K03717. For the second author, this research was funded in whole, or in part, by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) (Grant No. I6087). The third author is an International Research Fellow of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

REFERENCES

[1] A. W. Apter, *Laver indestructibility and the class of compact cardinals*. ***The Journal of Symbolic Logic***, vol. 63 (1998), no.1, pp. 149–157.

[2] D. Asperó, *A maximal bounded forcing axiom*. ***The Journal of Symbolic Logic***, vol. 67 (2002), no. 1, pp. 130–142.

[3] J. Bagaria, *Bounded forcing axioms as principles of generic absoluteness*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic***, vol.39 (2000), pp. 393–401.

[4] ———, $C^{(n)}$*-cardinals*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic***, vol. 51 (2012), pp. 213–240.

[5] J. Bagaria and J. D. Hamkins, *Konstantinos Tsaprounis, Toshimichi Usuba, Superstrong and other large cardinals are never Laver indestructible*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic***, vol. 55 (2016), pp. 19–35.

[6] N. Barton, A. E. Caicedo, G. Fuchs, J. D. Hamkins, J. Reitz, and R. Schindler, *Inner-model reflection principles*. ***Studia Logica***, vol. 108 (2020), pp. 573–595.

[7] S. D. Cox, *Forcing axioms, approachability, and stationary set reflection*. ***The Journal of Symbolic Logic***, vol. 86 (2021), no. 2, pp. 499–530.

[8] K. Eda, M. Kada, and Y. Yuasa, *The tightness about sequential fans and combinatorial properties*. ***Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan***, vol. 49 (1997), no. 1, pp. 181–187.

[9] S.-D. Friedman, *Internal consistency and the inner model hypothesis*. ***The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic***, vol. 12 (2006), no. 4, pp. 591–600.

[10] S. Fuchino, *On potential embedding and versions of Martin's axiom*. ***Notre Dame Journal of Logic***, vol. 33 (1992), no. 4, pp. 481–492.

[11] ———, Reflection and Recurrence, ***Model Theory, Computer Science, and Graph Polynomials Festschrift in Honor of Johann A. Makowsky*** (K. Meer, A. Rabinovich, E. Ravve, and A. Villaveces, editors), Birkhäuser, Cham (2025).

[12] ———, *Maximality principles and resurrection axioms in light of a Laver-generic large cardinal*, preprint. https://fuchino.ddo.jp/papers/RIMS2022-RA-MP-x.pdf

[13] S. Fuchino, M. Rodrigues, and H.Sakai, *Strong downward Löwenheim-Skolem theorems for stationary logics, II—Reflection down to the continuum*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic***, vol. 60 (2021), nos. 3–4, pp. 495–523. https://fuchino.ddo.jp/papers/SDLS-II-x.pdf

[14] S. Fuchino and H. Sakai, *The first-order definability of generic large cardinals*, submitted. Extended version of the paper, 2020. https://fuchino.ddo.jp/papers/definability-of-glc-x.pdf

[15] S. Fuchino and T. Usuba, *On recurrence axioms*. ***Annals of Pure and Applied Logic***, vol. 176 (2025), no. 10. https://fuchino.ddo.jp/papers/recurrence-axioms-x.pdf

[16] T. Gappo and A. Lietz, *Separating maximality principles*, preprint.

[17] G. Goldberg, *Usuba's theorem is optimal*. ***Journal of Mathematical Logic***, (forthcoming).

[18] M. Goldstern and S. Shelah, *The bounded proper forcing axiom*. ***The Journal of Symbolic Logic***, vol.60 (1995), no.1, pp. 58–73.

[19] B. P. Goodman, *Sigma_n-correct forcing axioms*, CUNY Academic Works, 2024. https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/5808/

[20] J. D. Hamkins, *A simple maximality principle*. ***The Journal of Symbolic Logic***, vol. 68 (2003), no. 7, pp. 527–550.

[21] J. D. Hamkins and T. A. Johnstone, *Resurrection axioms and uplifting cardinals*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic***, vol. 53 (2014), nos. 3–4, pp. 463–485.

[22] D. Ikegami and N. Trang, *On a class of maximality principles*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic***, vol. 57 (2018), pp. 713–725.

[23] T. Jech, ***Set Theory, The Third Millennium Edition***, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[24] A. Kanamori, ***The Higher Infinite***, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1994/2003.

[25] K. Kunen, ***Set Theory***, College Publications, 2011.

[26] R. Laver, *Making the supercompactness of κ indestructible under κ-directed closed forcing*. ***Israel Journal of Mathematics***, vol. 29 (1978), no. 4, pp. 385–388.

[27] A. Lévy, ***A hierarchy of formulas in set theory***. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, vol. 57, American Mathematical Society, Providence, (1965).

[28] J. Reitz, *The ground axiom*. ***The Journal of Symbolic Logic***, vol. 72 (2007), no. 4, pp. 1299–1317.

[29] R. Schindler, *Bounded Martin's maximum and strong cardinals*, ***Set Theory Centre de Recerca Matemàtica Barcelona, 2003–2004*** (J. Bagaria and S. Todorcevic, editors), Birkhäuser, Basel, 2006, pp. 401–406.

[30] J. Stavi, and J. Väänänen, *Reflection principles for the continuum*, ***Logic and Algebra, 59–84***, (Y. Zhang, editor), Contemporary Mathematics, 302, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2002.

[31] G. Venturi, and M. Viale, *Second order arithmetic as the model companion of set theory*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic***, vol. 62 (2023), pp. 29–53.

[32] M. Viale, *Martin's maximum revisited*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic***, vol. 55 (2016), pp. 295–317.

[33] H. Woodin, ***The Axiom of Determinacy, Forcing Axioms, and the Nonstationary Ideal***, 2nd rev. ed., De Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 2010.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SYSTEM INFORMATICS
KOBE UNIVERSITY
ROKKO-DAI 1-1
NADA, 657-8501
JAPAN
E-mail: fuchino@diamond.kobe-u.ac.jp
E-mail: francesco.parente@people.kobe-u.ac.jp

INSTITUT FÜR DISKRETE MATHEMATIK UND GEOMETRIE
WIEDNER HAUPTSTRASSE
AUSTRIA
E-mail: takehiko.gappo@tuwien.ac.at

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2025.10131 Published online by Cambridge University Press