## 20 Shoenfield Absoluteness

For a tree  $T \subseteq \bigcup_{n < \omega} \kappa^n \times \omega^n$  define

$$p[T] = \{ y \in \omega^{\omega} : \exists x \in \kappa^{\omega} \ \forall n(x \upharpoonright n, y \upharpoonright n) \in T \}.$$

A set defined this way is called  $\kappa$ -Souslin. Thus  $\Sigma_1^1$  sets are precisely the  $\omega$ -Souslin sets. Note that if  $A \subseteq \omega^\omega \times \omega^\omega$  and A = p[T] then the projection of A,  $\{y : \exists x \in \omega^\omega \ (x,y) \in A\}$  is  $\kappa$ -Souslin. To see this let  $<,>: \kappa \times \omega \to \kappa$  be a pairing function. For  $s \in \kappa^n$  let  $s_0 \in \kappa^n$  and  $s_1 \in \omega^n$  be defined by  $s(i) = < s_0(i), s_1(i) >$ . Let  $T^*$  be the tree defined by

$$T^* = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \{ (s,t) \in \kappa^n \times \omega^n : (s_0, s_1, t) \in T \}.$$

Then  $p[T^*] = \{y : \exists x \in \omega^{\omega} (x, y) \in A\}.$ 

**Theorem 20.1** (Shoenfield [96]) If A is a  $\Sigma_2^1$  set, then A is  $\omega_1$ -Souslin set coded in L, i.e. A = p[T] where  $T \in L$ .

proof:

From the construction of  $T^*$  it is clear that is enough to see this for A which is  $\Pi_1^1$ .

We know that a countable tree is well-founded iff there exists a rank function  $r: T \to \omega_1$ . Suppose

$$x \in A \text{ iff } \forall y \exists n \ (x \upharpoonright n, y \upharpoonright n) \not \in T$$

where T is a recursive tree. So defining  $T_x = \{t : (x \upharpoonright |t|, t) \in T\}$  we have that  $x \in A$  iff  $T_x$  is well-founded (Theorem 17.4).

The  $\omega_1$  tree  $\hat{T}$  is just the tree of partial rank functions. Let  $\{s_n : n \in \omega\}$  be a recursive listing of  $\omega^{<\omega}$  with  $|s_n| \leq n$ . Then for every  $N < \omega$ , and  $(r,s) \in \omega_1^N \times \omega^N$  we have  $(r,t) \in \hat{T}$  iff

$$\forall n, m < N \ [(t, s_n), (t, s_m) \in T \ \text{and} \ s_n \subset s_m] \ \text{implies} \ r(n) > r(m).$$

Then  $A = p[\hat{T}]$ . To see this, note that if  $x \in A$ , then  $T_x$  is well-founded and so it has a rank function and therefore there exists r with  $(x,r) \in [\hat{T}]$  and so  $x \in p[\hat{T}]$ . On the other hand if  $(x,r) \in [\hat{T}]$ , then r determines a rank function on  $T_x$  and so  $T_x$  is well-founded and hence  $x \in A$ .

**Theorem 20.2** (Shoenfield Absoluteness [96]) If  $M \subseteq N$  are transitive models of  $ZFC^*$  and  $\omega_1^N \subseteq M$ , then for any  $\Sigma_2^1(x)$  sentence  $\theta$  with parameter  $x \in M$ 

$$M \models \theta \text{ iff } N \models \theta.$$

proof:

If  $M \models \theta$ , then  $N \models \theta$ , because  $\Pi_1^1$  sentences are absolute. On the other hand suppose  $N \models \theta$ . Working in N using the proof of Theorem 20.1 we get a tree  $T \subseteq \omega_1^{<\omega}$  with  $T \in L[x]$  such that T is ill-founded, i.e., there exists  $r \in [T]$ . Note that r codes a witness to a  $\Pi_1^1(x)$  predicate and a rank function showing the tree corresponding to this predicate is well-founded. Since for some  $\alpha < \omega_1$ ,  $r \in \alpha^{\omega}$  we see that

$$T_{\alpha} = T \cap \alpha^{<\omega}$$

is ill-founded. But  $T_{\alpha} \in M$  (since by assumption  $(\omega_1)^N \subseteq M$ ) and so by the absoluteness of well-founded trees, M thinks that  $T_{\alpha}$  is ill-founded. But a branch thru [T] gives a witness and a rank function showing that  $\theta$  is true, and consequently,  $M \models \theta$ .