

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY AND THE INNER MODEL HYPOTHESIS

SY-DAVID FRIEDMAN

There are two standard ways to establish consistency in set theory. One is to prove consistency using *inner models*, in the way that Gödel proved the consistency of GCH using the inner model L . The other is to prove consistency using *outer models*, in the way that Cohen proved the consistency of the negation of CH by enlarging L to a forcing extension $L[G]$.

But we can demand more from the outer model method, and we illustrate this by examining Easton's strengthening of Cohen's result:

THEOREM 1 (Easton's Theorem). *There is a forcing extension $L[G]$ of L in which GCH fails at every regular cardinal.*

Assume that the universe V of all sets is rich in the sense that it contains inner models with large cardinals. Then what is the relationship between Easton's model $L[G]$ and V ? In particular, are these models *compatible*, in the sense that they are inner models of a common third model? If not, then the failure of GCH at every regular cardinal is consistent only in a weak sense, as it can only hold in universes which are incompatible with the universe of all sets. Ideally, we would like $L[G]$ to not only be compatible with V , but to be an inner model of V .

We say that a statement is *internally consistent* iff it holds in some inner model, under the assumption that there are inner models with large cardinals. By specifying what large cardinals are required, we obtain a new type of consistency result. Let $\text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \varphi)$ stand for “ZFC + φ is consistent” and $\text{Icon}(\text{ZFC} + \varphi)$ stand for “there is an inner model of ZFC + φ ”. A typical consistency result takes the form

$$\text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \text{LC}) \rightarrow \text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \varphi)$$

where LC denotes some large cardinal axiom. An *internal* consistency result takes the form

$$\text{Icon}(\text{ZFC} + \text{LC}) \rightarrow \text{Icon}(\text{ZFC} + \varphi).$$

Received February 4, 2006.

The author wishes to thank the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) for its generous support.

© 2006, Association for Symbolic Logic
1079-8986/06/1204-0002/\$2.00