GENERIC VOPĚNKA'S PRINCIPLE, REMARKABLE CARDINALS, AND THE WEAK PROPER FORCING AXIOM

JOAN BAGARIA, VICTORIA GITMAN, AND RALF SCHINDLER

Abstract. We introduce and study the first-order *Generic Vopěnka's Principle*, which states that for every definable proper class of structures $\mathcal{C}$ of the same type, there exist $B \neq A$ in $\mathcal{C}$ such that B elementarily embeds into A in some set-forcing extension. We show that, for $n \geq 1$, the Generic Vopěnka's Principle fragment for Π_n-definable classes is equiconsistent with a proper class of n-remarkable cardinals. The n-remarkable cardinals hierarchy for $n \in \omega$, which we introduce here, is a natural generic analogue for the $C^{(n)}$-extendible cardinals that Bagaria used to calibrate the strength of the first-order Vopěnka's Principle in [1].

Expanding on the theme of studying set theoretic properties which assert the existence of elementary embeddings in some set-forcing extension, we introduce and study the *weak Proper Forcing Axiom*, wPFA, which states that for every transitive model $\mathcal{M}$ in the language of set theory with some ω_1-many additional relations, if it is forced by a proper forcing $\mathbb{P}$ that $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies some Σ_1-property, then V has a transitive model $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$, which satisfies the same Σ_1-property, and in some set-forcing extension there is an elementary embedding from $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ into $\mathcal{M}$. This is a weakening of a formulation of PFA due to Schindler and Claverie [2], which asserts that the embedding from $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ to $\mathcal{M}$ exists in V. We show that wPFA is equiconsistent with a remarkable cardinal and that wPFA implies $\mathrm{PFA}_{\aleph_2}$, the proper forcing axiom for antichains of size at most ω_2, but it is consistent with $\square_\kappa$ for all $\kappa \geq \omega_2$, and therefore does not imply $\mathrm{PFA}_{\aleph_3}$.

1. Introduction

Vopěnka's Principle is a large cardinal principle which states that for every proper class $\mathcal{C}$ of structures of the same type there are $B \neq A$, both in $\mathcal{C}$, such that B elementarily embeds into A. It can be formalized in first-order set theory[1] as a schema, where for each natural number n in the meta-theory there is a formula

Date: 02/10/2016.

Parts of this research were done while all three authors were visiting fellows at the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, UK, in the programme "Mathematical, Foundational and Computational Aspects of the Higher Infinite" (HIF) funded by EPSRC grant EP/K032208/1 in Sept 2015. The first author would like to thank the support provided by a Simons Foundation fellowship while at the INI. Other parts of this research were done while the third author was visiting the School of Mathematics of the IPM, Tehran, Iran, in Oct 2015; he would like to thank his hosts for their exceptional hospitality. The research work of the first author was partially supported by the Spanish Government under grant MTM2014-59178-P, and by the Generalitat de Catalunya (Catalan Government) under grant SGR 437-2014.

[1]It can be shown that over Gödel-Bernays set theory GBC the second-order formulation of Vopěnka's Principle is stronger than Vopěnka's Principle for definable classes in that there is a model of GBC in which the first-order Vopěnka's Principle holds, but the second-order version for all classes fails [Ham].

expressing that Vopěnka's Principle holds for all Σ_n-definable (with parameters) classes. Following [1], we call $\mathrm{VP}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)$ the fragment of Vopěnka's Principle for Σ_n-definable classes and let $\mathrm{VP}(\Sigma_n)$ be the weaker principle, where parameters are not allowed in the definition of the class (with analogous definitions for Π_n). Bagaria introduced in [1] a family of Vopěnka-like principles $\mathrm{VP}(\kappa, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)$, where κ is a cardinal, which state that for every proper class $\mathcal{C}$ of structures of the same type that is Σ_n-definable with parameters in H_κ (the collection of all sets of hereditary size less than κ), $\mathcal{C}$ reflects below κ, namely for every $A \in \mathcal{C}$ there is $B \in H_\kappa \cap \mathcal{C}$ that elementarily embeds into A. Bagaria established a relationship between Vopěnka's Principle fragments and his family of principles $\mathrm{VP}(\kappa, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)$ and provided a complete characterization of Vopěnka's Principle fragments $\mathrm{VP}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_n)$, as well as the weaker principles $\mathrm{VP}(\Pi_n)$, in terms of the existence of supercompact and $C^{(n)}$-extendible cardinals [1].

Recall that $C^{(n)}$ denotes the class club of ordinals δ such that $V_\delta \prec_{\Sigma_n} V$. A cardinal κ is called *$C^{(n)}$-extendible* if for every $\alpha > \kappa$, there is an elementary embedding $j : V_\alpha \to V_\beta$ with critical point κ and with $j(\kappa) \in C^{(n)}$. Note that every extendible cardinal is 1-extendible. Bagaria [1] showed that the weaker principle $\mathrm{VP}(\Pi_1)$ holds if and only if for some κ, $\mathrm{VP}(\kappa, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2)$ holds, and if and only if there is a supercompact cardinal. Also, for $n \geq 1$, $\mathrm{VP}(\Pi_{n+1})$ holds if and only if for some κ, $\mathrm{VP}(\kappa, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{n+2})$ holds, and if and only if there is a $C^{(n)}$-extendible cardinal. The results generalize to show that the Vopěnka's Principle fragment $\mathrm{VP}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_1)$ holds if and only if $\mathrm{VP}(\kappa, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2)$ holds for a proper class of κ, and if and only if there is a proper class of supercompact cardinals. Also, for $n \geq 1$, $\mathrm{VP}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{n+1})$ holds if and only if $\mathrm{VP}(\kappa, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{n+2})$ holds for a proper class of κ, and if and only if there is a proper class of $C^{(n)}$-extendible cardinals. Thus, Vopěnka's Principle holds precisely when, for every $n \in \omega$, there is a proper class of $C^{(n)}$-extendible cardinals.

In this article, we introduce and study generic versions of Vopěnka's Principle and its variants. The *Generic Vopěnka's Principle* states that for every proper class $\mathcal{C}$ of structures of the same type there are $B \neq A$, both in $\mathcal{C}$, such that B elementarily embeds into A in some set-forcing extension. We call $\mathrm{gVP}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)$ the Generic Vopěnka's Principle fragment for Σ_n-definable (with parameters) classes and we let $\mathrm{gVP}(\Sigma_n)$ be the weaker principle where parameters are not allowed in the definition of the class (with analogous definitions for Π_n). We also call $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)$ the analogous generic version of $\mathrm{VP}(\kappa, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)$.

It turns out that an elementary embedding $j : B \to A$ between first-order structures exists in some set-forcing extension if and only if it already exists in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, B)}$ (Proposition 2.7). We show that to every pair of structures B and A of the same type, we can associate a closed game $G(B, A)$ such that B elementarily embeds into A in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, B)}$ precisely when a particular player has a winning strategy in that game. The game $G(B, A)$ is a variant of an Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé game of length ω, where player I starts out by playing some $b_0 \in B$ and player II responds by playing $a_0 \in A$. Players I and II continue to alternate, choosing elements b_n and a_n from their respective structures at stage n of the game. Player II wins if for every formula $\varphi(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$,

$$B \models \varphi(b_0, \ldots, b_n) \leftrightarrow A \models \varphi(a_0, \ldots, a_n),$$

and otherwise player I wins. Since if player II loses she must do so at some finite stage of the game, the game $G(B, A)$ is closed and hence determined by the Gale-Stewart theorem [5]. Thus, either player I or player II has a winning strategy. We show that player II has a winning strategy precisely when B elementarily embeds into A in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,B)}$ (Proposition 4.1). It follows that each first-order fragment of Generic Vopěnka's Principle is characterized by the existence of certain winning strategies in its associated class of closed games.

The consistency strength of Generic Vopěnka's Principle fragments is measured by a hierarchy of cardinals, the *n-remarkable* cardinals (Definition 3.1) we introduce here, which generalize Schindler's remarkable cardinals analogously to how $C^{(n)}$-extendible cardinals generalize extendible cardinals. A remarkable cardinal (which is 1-remarkable by our definition) is a type of generic supercompact cardinal (see Section 2) and, correspondingly, an n-remarkable cardinal (for $n > 1$) is a type of generic $C^{(n)}$-extendible cardinal (see Section 3). The n-remarkable cardinals sit relatively low in the large cardinal hierarchy. Call a large cardinal *completely remarkable* if it is n-remarkable for every $n \in \omega$. Completely remarkable cardinals can exist in L and the consistency of a completely remarkable cardinal follows from a 2-iterable cardinal (Theorem 3.6). We show that the Generic Vopěnka's Principle fragment $\mathrm{gVP}(\Pi_n)$ is equiconsistent with an n-remarkable cardinal.

Theorem 1.1. *The following are equiconsistent.*

(1) $\mathrm{gVP}(\Pi_n)$.
(2) $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ *for some* κ.
(3) *There is an* n*-remarkable cardinal.*

The result generalizes to the bold-face $\mathrm{gVP}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_n)$ principles.

Theorem 1.2. *The following are equiconsistent.*

(1) $\mathrm{gVP}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_n)$.
(2) $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ *for a proper class of* κ.
(3) *There is a proper class of* n*-remarkable cardinals.*

See Section 5 for proofs.

The notion of a generic embedding existing in some forcing extension leads naturally to a weak version of the Proper Forcing Axiom PFA, which we introduce and study here. Schindler and Claverie showed in [2] that PFA has the following equivalent formulation.

Theorem 1.3. *The following are equivalent.*

(1) PFA
(2) *If* $\mathcal{M} = (M; \in, (R_i \mid i < \omega_1))$ *is a transitive model,* $\varphi(x)$ *is a* Σ_1*-formula, and* $\mathbb{Q}$ *is a proper forcing such that*

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \varphi(\mathcal{M}),$$

then there is in V *some transitive* $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = (\bar{M}; \in, (\bar{R}_i \mid i < \omega_1))$ *together with some elementary embedding*

$$j : \bar{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}$$

such that $\varphi(\bar{\mathcal{M}})$ *holds.*

By weakening this formulation of PFA to say that the embedding j exists in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,\bar{M})}$, we obtain the *weak Proper Forcing Axiom* wPFA. We show that wPFA is equiconsistent with a remarkable cardinal.

Theorem 1.4.

(1) *If κ is remarkable, then there is a forcing extension in which* wPFA *holds.*
(2) *If* wPFA *holds, then ω_2^V is remarkable in L.*

The principle wPFA implies $\mathrm{PFA}_{\aleph_2}$, the Proper Forcing Axiom for meeting antichains of size $\leq \aleph_2$, but it does not imply $\mathrm{PFA}_{\aleph_3}$. For proofs see Section 6.

2. Remarkable cardinals

Remarkable cardinals were introduced by Schindler, who showed that the assertion that the theory of $L(\mathbb{R})$ cannot be changed by proper forcing is equiconsistent with the existence of a remarkable cardinal [9]. Remarkable cardinals have also found applications in other settings: recently Cheng and Schindler showed that third-order arithmetic together with Harrington's principle is equiconsistent with the existence of a remarkable cardinal [4].

Definition 2.1 (Schindler [9], [11])**.** A cardinal κ is *remarkable* if for every regular cardinal $\lambda > \kappa$, there is a regular cardinal $\bar{\lambda} < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : H_{\bar{\lambda}}^V \to H_\lambda^V$ with $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$.

We can view a remarkable cardinal as a type of generic supercompact cardinal using the following theorem of Magidor.

Theorem 2.2 (Magidor, [8])**.** *A cardinal κ is supercompact if and only if for every regular cardinal $\lambda > \kappa$ there is a regular cardinal $\bar{\lambda} < \kappa$ and an elementary embedding $j : H_{\bar{\lambda}} \to H_\lambda$ with $j(crit(j)) = \kappa$.*

Remarkable cardinals are much weaker than supercompact cardinals. Remarkable cardinals are downward absolute to L and the consistency of a remarkable cardinal follows from a 2-iterable cardinal, which is much weaker than an ω-Erdős cardinal. It is not difficult to see that remarkable cardinals are totally indescribable and ineffable. (See [9] and [7].)

For the rest of the article, we will make the convention that structures of the form H_λ or V_λ always refer to ground model objects, so that we don't have to use superscripts.

If κ is remarkable, then every set a can be put into the range of some remarkability embedding $j : H_{\bar{\lambda}} \to H_\lambda$ in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ with λ arbitrarily large.

Proposition 2.3 (Schindler, [11])**.** *If κ is remarkable, then for every set a and regular λ such that $a \in H_\lambda$, there is a regular $\bar{\lambda} < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : H_{\bar{\lambda}} \to H_\lambda$ with $j(crit(j)) = \kappa$ and $a \in range(j)$.*

Recall that $C^{(n)}$ is the Π_n-definable club proper class of ordinals δ such that $V_\delta \prec_{\Sigma_n} V$. In particular, $C^{(1)}$ is the class of uncountable strong limit cardinals δ such that $V_\delta = H_\delta$ (see [1] for details). Note, more generally, that for every uncountable cardinal δ, $H_\delta \prec_{\Sigma_1} V$.

Proposition 2.4. *The following are equivalent for a cardinal κ.*

(1) *κ is remarkable.*

(2) *For every $\lambda > \kappa$ and every $a \in V_\lambda$, there is $\bar\lambda < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_\lambda$ with $j(crit(j)) = \kappa$ and $a \in range(j)$.*
(3) *For every $\lambda > \kappa$ in $C^{(1)}$ and every $a \in V_\lambda$, there is $\bar\lambda < \kappa$ also in $C^{(1)}$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_\lambda$ with $j(crit(j)) = \kappa$ and $a \in range(j)$.*
(4) *There is a proper class of $\lambda > \kappa$ such that for every λ in the class, there is $\bar\lambda < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_\lambda$ with $j(crit(j)) = \kappa$.*

Proof. Clearly, (3) implies (4).

Let us show (1) implies (2). So, assume κ is remarkable. Fix $\lambda > \kappa$ and $a \in V_\lambda$. Choose a regular δ large enough so that $V_\lambda \in H_\delta$. By Proposition 2.3, there is a regular $\bar\delta < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : H_{\bar\delta} \to H_\delta$ with $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$ and $a, \lambda \in \mathrm{range}(j)$. Let $j(\bar\lambda) = \lambda$. Suppose x is the pre-image of V_λ under j. $H_{\bar\delta}$ thinks that x is $V_{\bar\lambda}$ by elementarity and it must be correct about this since "$x = V_{\bar\lambda}$" is Π_1 expressible, with $\bar\lambda$ as a parameter, and $H_{\bar\delta} \prec_{\Sigma_1} V$. Thus, we can restrict j to $j : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_\lambda$ and the restriction has all the required properties.

For (2) implies (3), it suffices to observe that if $j : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_\lambda$ is elementary and λ is in $C^{(1)}$, then $\bar\lambda$ must be in $C^{(1)}$ as well. Since $\lambda \in C^{(1)}$, λ is an uncountable limit cardinal and $V_\lambda = H_\lambda$. Thus, by elementarity, $\bar\lambda$ is a limit of cardinals and hence a limit cardinal, and then, by elementarity, it must be the case that $V_{\bar\lambda} = H_{\bar\lambda}$.

It only remains to show that (4) implies (1). So, assume that for every λ in some proper class $\mathcal{C}$, there is $\bar\lambda$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_\lambda$ with $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$. Suppose towards a contradiction that κ is not remarkable and let $\lambda > \kappa$ be the least V-regular cardinal witnessing the non-remarkability of κ. By (4), there is some $\delta > \lambda$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and $\bar\delta < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar\delta} \to V_\delta$ with $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$. Note that λ is definable in V_δ as the least regular cardinal witnessing the non-remarkability of κ. So λ is in the image of j and we can let $j(\bar\lambda) = \lambda$, noting that $\bar\lambda$ must be regular by elementarity. Now we restrict j to $j : H_{\bar\lambda} \to H_\lambda$ and note that the restriction has all the desired properties, thus contradicting our assumption on λ. □

Proposition 2.5. *Every remarkable cardinal is in $C^{(2)}$.*

Proof. Suppose κ is remarkable, $\varphi(x, y)$ is a Π_1-formula, $a \in V_\kappa$, and $\exists x\, \varphi(x, a)$ holds in V. Then $V \models \varphi(a, b)$ for some witness b. We must find some witness $\bar b \in V_\kappa$. Let $\delta > \kappa$ be regular such that $b \in H_\delta$ and let $\alpha < \kappa$ be some ordinal above the rank of a. By Proposition 2.3, there is a regular $\bar\delta < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : H_{\bar\delta} \to H_\delta$ with $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$ and $\alpha \in \mathrm{range}(j)$. It follows that $\mathrm{crit}(j)$ is above the rank of a and hence $j(a) = a$. Since $H_\delta \models \varphi(a, b)$, there is some $\bar b \in H_{\bar\delta}$ such that $H_{\bar\delta} \models \varphi(a, \bar b)$, but then $V \models \varphi(a, \bar b)$ as well and $\bar b \in V_\kappa$. □

When working with remarkable cardinals we often appeal to the following folklore result, which asserts that the existence of an embedding of a countable model into another fixed model is absolute.

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose M is a countable first-order structure and $j : M \to N$ is an elementary embedding. If $W \subseteq V$ is a transitive (set or class) model of (some sufficiently large fragment of)* ZFC *such that M is countable in W and $N \in W$, then W has some elementary embedding $j^* : M \to N$. Moreover, if both M and N are transitive $\in$-structures, we can additionally assume that $crit(j^*) = crit(j)$. Also, we can assume that j and j^* agree on some fixed finite number of values.*

The proof proceeds by fixing an enumeration $\{a_i \mid i < \omega\}$ of M in W and constructing in W the tree of all finite partial isomorphisms between M to N with domain some $\{a_i : i < n\}$ for some n. This tree is ill-founded in V, and hence must be ill-founded in W (for details see Lemma 2.7 in [3]). The absoluteness lemma 2.6 immediately gives the equivalence between the assertion that an embedding $j : B \to A$ exists in some set-forcing extension and the assertion that such an embedding exists in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,B)}$.

Proposition 2.7. *The following are equivalent for structures B and A in the same language.*

(1) *There is a complete Boolean algebra $\mathbb{B}$ such*

$$V^{\mathbb{B}} \models \text{"There exists an elementary embedding } j : B \to A\text{."}$$

(2) *In $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,B)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : B \to A$.*

(3) *For every complete Boolean algebra $\mathbb{B}$,*

$$V^{\mathbb{B}} \models \text{"}|B| = \aleph_0 \to \text{There exists an elementary embedding } j : B \to A\text{."}$$

Moreover, if B and A are transitive $\in$-structures, we can assume that the embeddings have the same critical point and agree on finitely many fixed values.

Proof. Clearly (2) implies (1) and (3) implies (2).

Let's show (1) implies (2). So suppose a forcing extension $V[G]$ has an elementary embedding $j : B \to A$ and let $|B|^V = \delta$. Let $H \subseteq \mathrm{Coll}(\omega, \delta)$ be $V[G]$-generic. Since j exists in $V[G][H]$ and B is countable in $V[H] \subseteq V[G][H]$, by Lemma 2.6, there is some elementary embedding $j^* : B \to A$ in $V[H]$ satisfying the "moreover" conditions.

Finally, let's show (2) implies (3). So suppose a forcing extension $V[G]$ satisfies $|B| = \aleph_0$ and let $|B|^V = \delta$. Let $H \subseteq \mathrm{Coll}(\omega, \delta)$ be $V[G]$-generic. Then, by (2), $V[H]$ has an elementary embedding $j : B \to A$, and hence so does $V[G][H]$. But then by Lemma 2.6, since B is countable in $V[G]$, it must have some $j^* : B \to A$ as desired. □

In particular, we can rephrase the definition of a remarkable cardinal κ to say that for every regular $\lambda > \kappa$, there is some regular $\bar{\lambda} < \kappa$ such that some set-forcing extension has an elementary embedding $j : H_{\bar{\lambda}} \to H_\lambda$ with $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$.

3. n-REMARKABLE CARDINALS

We generalize remarkable cardinals to obtain the notion of n-remarkable cardinal, for $n > 0$. We show that the n-remarkable cardinals form a hierarchy of strength and, for $n \geq 2$, they can be viewed as a type of a generic $C^{(n-1)}$-extendible cardinal.

Definition 3.1. A cardinal κ is *n-remarkable*, for $n > 0$, if for every $\lambda > \kappa$ in $C^{(n)}$, there is $\bar{\lambda} < \kappa$ also in $C^{(n)}$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$, there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar{\lambda}} \to V_\lambda$ with $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$. A cardinal κ is *completely remarkable* if it is n-remarkable for every $n > 0$.

By Proposition 2.4, remarkable cardinals are precisely the 1-remarkable cardinals. The argument that yields Proposition 2.3 gives the same result for n-remarkable cardinals.

Proposition 3.2. *If κ is n-remarkable, then for every $\lambda > \kappa$ in $C^{(n)}$ and $a \in V_\lambda$, there is $\bar{\lambda} < \kappa$ also in $C^{(n)}$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar{\lambda}} \to V_\lambda$ with $j(\mathit{crit}(j)) = \kappa$ and $a \in \mathit{range}(j)$.*

An analogous argument as given for Proposition 2.5 gives the following.

Proposition 3.3. *Every n-remarkable cardinal is in $C^{(n+1)}$.*

Theorem 3.4. *Every $n+1$-remarkable cardinal is a limit of n-remarkable cardinals.*

Proof. First, observe that being n-remarkable is a Π_{n+1}-property. Suppose that κ is $n+1$-remarkable and fix $\alpha < \kappa$. We will show that there is an n-remarkable cardinal between α and κ. In $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ fix some elementary $j : V_{\bar{\lambda}} \to V_\lambda$ with $\lambda > \kappa$, $\bar{\lambda} < \kappa$ both in $C^{(n+1)}$ and $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$. Let $j(\bar{\kappa}) = \kappa$, and note that by putting a large enough ordinal into the range of j we can assume that $\bar{\kappa} > \alpha$. Since $\lambda \in C^{(n+1)}$, V_α satisfies that κ is n-remarkable, and so by elementarity $V_{\bar{\lambda}}$ satisfies that $\bar{\kappa}$ is n-remarkable. But $\bar{\lambda}$ is also in $C^{(n+1)}$, and so $\bar{\kappa}$ is truly n-remarkable in V. $\square$

It follows that the n-remarkable cardinals form a hierarchy of strength bounded above by completely remarkable cardinals.

Theorem 3.5. *If $0^\#$ exists, then every Silver indiscernible is completely remarkable in L.*

Proof. Suppose $0^\#$ exists and let κ be a Silver indiscernible. Fix $\alpha > \kappa$ such that $L_\alpha \prec_{\Sigma_n} L$. Let $\delta > \alpha$ be a Silver indiscernible and let $j : L \to L$ be an elementary embedding generated by a shift of indiscernibles such that $\mathrm{crit}(j) = \kappa$ and $j(\kappa) = \delta$. The embedding j restricts to $j : L_\alpha \to L_{j(\alpha)}$. It follows, by Lemma 2.6, that there is $\bar{\alpha} < j(\kappa)$ (namely $\bar{\alpha} = \alpha$) such that in $L^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<j(\kappa))}$ there is an elementary embedding $j^* : L_{\bar{\alpha}} \to L_{j(\alpha)}$ with $j^*(\mathrm{crit}(j^*)) = j(\kappa)$ and $L_{\bar{\alpha}} \prec_{\Sigma_n} L$. So by elementarity via j, L satisfies that in $L^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is $\bar{\alpha} < \kappa$ and an elementary embedding $j^* : L_{\bar{\alpha}} \to L_\alpha$ such that $j^*(\mathrm{crit}(j^*)) = \kappa$ and $L_{\bar{\alpha}} \prec_{\Sigma_n} L$. $\square$

Thus, the consistency of a completely remarkable cardinal follows from $0^\#$, but in fact the assertion is much weaker, and already follows from a 2-iterable cardinal. A cardinal κ is said to be *α-iterable*, for some $1 \leq \alpha \leq \omega_1$, if every $A \subseteq \kappa$ can be put into a weak κ-model[2] M for which there is a weakly amenable M-ultrafilter[3] on κ with α-many well-founded iterated ultrapowers. For a finite n, an n-iterable cardinal is stronger than a completely ineffable cardinal but weaker than an ω-Erdős cardinal. If κ is (at least) 2-iterable, it can be shown that every $A \subseteq \kappa$ can be put into a weak κ-model $M \models \mathrm{ZFC}$ with an elementary embedding $j : M \to N$ such that N is well-founded, $\mathrm{crit}(j) = \kappa$, $M \prec N$, and $M = V^N_{j(\kappa)}$. (See [7] for details.)

---

[2]A transitive model $M \models \mathrm{ZFC}^-$ is called a *weak κ-model* if it has size κ and height above κ.

[3]If M is a transitive model of ZFC^- and κ is a cardinal in M, then $U \subseteq \mathcal{P}^M(\kappa)$ is called an *M-ultrafilter* if the structure $\langle M, \in, U\rangle$ with a predicate for U satisfies that U is a normal ultrafilter. An M-ultrafilter is *weakly amenable* if for every $A \in M$ with $|A|^M = \kappa$, $A \cap U \in M$. Weak amenability makes it possible to carry out the iterated ultrapowers construction with an external ultrafilter.

Theorem 3.6. *If κ is 2-iterable, then V_κ is a model of proper class many completely remarkable cardinals.*

Proof. Suppose κ is 2-iterable. Fix a weak κ-model $M \models$ ZFC containing V_κ for which there is an elementary embedding $j : M \to N$ such that N is well-founded, $\mathrm{crit}(j) = \kappa$, $M \prec N$, and $M = V^N_{j(\kappa)}$. To show that V_κ is a model of proper class many completely remarkable cardinals, it suffices to show that κ is completely remarkable in $M = V^N_{j(\kappa)}$. So, fix n and fix $\alpha > \kappa$ in M such that $V^M_\alpha \prec_{\Sigma_n} M$. Note that, since $M \prec N$ and $M = V^N_{j(\kappa)}$, $V^M_\alpha = V^N_\alpha \prec_{\Sigma_n} N$ as well. Consider the restriction $j : V^M_\alpha \to V^N_{j(\alpha)}$. By Lemma 2.6, N satisfies that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<j(\kappa))}$ there is $\bar\alpha < j(\kappa)$ and an elementary embedding $j^* : V_{\bar\alpha} \to V_{j(\alpha)}$ such that $j^*(\mathrm{crit}(j^*)) = j(\kappa)$ and $V_{\bar\alpha} \prec_{\Sigma_n} N$. By elementarity, M satisfies that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is $\bar\alpha < \kappa$ and an elementary embedding $j^* : V_{\bar\alpha} \to V_\alpha$ such that $j^*(\mathrm{crit}(j^*)) = \kappa$ and $V_{\bar\alpha} \prec_{\Sigma_n} M$. Thus, κ is n-remarkable in M, for every $n \in \omega$. □

If we assume, for a cardinal κ, that the embeddings characterizing a supercompact cardinal given by Magidor's theorem exist in some set-forcing extension, then we get a remarkable cardinal. In [6], Gitman and Schindler apply this procedure to obtain generic variants of other large cardinals including extendible, huge, and rank-into-rank. We will show that 2-remarkable cardinals are precisely the *virtually extendible* cardinals defined in this manner and that more generally, the n-remarkable cardinals, for $n > 1$ correspond to virtually $C^{(n-1)}$-extendible cardinals.

Definition 3.7 ([6])**.** A cardinal κ is *virtually extendible* if for every $\alpha > \kappa$, in some set-forcing extension (equivalently in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,V_\alpha)}$) there is $j : V_\alpha \to V_\beta$ such that $\mathrm{crit}(j) = \kappa$ and $j(\kappa) > \alpha$. A cardinal κ is virtually $C^{(n)}$-extendible if additionally $j(\kappa) \in C^{(n)}$.

Note that virtually extendible cardinals are $C^{(1)}$-extendible because $j(\kappa)$ must be inaccessible in V.

Theorem 3.8. *A cardinal κ is virtually extendible if and only if it is 2-remarkable. More generally, κ is virtually $C^{(n)}$-extendible if and only if it is $n+1$-remarkable.*

Proof. Let us first show that if κ is virtually extendible, then it is 2-remarkable. Fix $\lambda > \kappa$ in $C^{(2)}$ and let $\alpha > \lambda$ also be in $C^{(2)}$. By virtual extendibility, in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,V_\alpha)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_\alpha \to V_\beta$ with $\mathrm{crit}(j) = \kappa$ and $j(\kappa) > \alpha$. Consider the restriction of j to $j : V_\lambda \to V_{j(\lambda)}$. Let's argue that $V_\lambda \prec_{\Sigma_2} V_{j(\lambda)}$. Since $\lambda \in C^{(1)}$, and j is elementary, $j(\lambda) \in C^{(1)}$ as well. So suppose $V_{j(\lambda)}$ satisfies $\exists x\, \varphi(x,a)$, where φ is Π_1 and $a \in V_\lambda$. Then $V_{j(\lambda)}$ satisfies $\varphi(b,a)$ for some witness b. So V satisfies $\varphi(b,a)$ as well. Hence V satisfies $\exists x\, \varphi(x,a)$ and V_λ must agree because $\lambda \in C^{(2)}$.

So V_β satisfies that there is $\bar\lambda < j(\kappa)$ such that $V_{\bar\lambda} \prec_{\Sigma_2} V_{j(\lambda)}$, and in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<j(\kappa))}$ there is an elementary embedding $j^* : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_{j(\lambda)}$ with $j^*(\mathrm{crit}(j^*)) = j(\kappa)$. So V_α satisfies that there is $\bar\lambda < \kappa$ such that $V_{\bar\lambda} \prec_{\Sigma_2} V_\lambda$, and in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is $j^* : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_\lambda$ such that $j^*(\mathrm{crit}(j^*)) = \kappa$. Since $\lambda \in C^{(2)}$, it follows that $\bar\lambda \in C^{(2)}$ as well, completing the argument.

Let us now show that every 2-remarkable κ is virtually extendible. It follows from 2-remarkability, that there must be some $\bar\lambda < \kappa$ in $C^{(2)}$ such that for cofinally many $\lambda > \kappa$ in $C^{(2)}$, in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is $j_\lambda : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_\lambda$ with $j_\lambda(\mathrm{crit}(j_\lambda)) = \kappa$. We can also assume that $\mathrm{crit}(j_\lambda)$ is some fixed $\bar\kappa$ for all λ. Let us argue that $\bar\kappa$ is virtually extendible in $V_{\bar\lambda}$. Fix $\beta < \bar\lambda$ above $\bar\kappa$. The embedding j_λ restricts to $j_\lambda : V_\beta \to V_{j_\lambda(\beta)}$. Thus, in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,V_\beta)}$ there is some ξ and an elementary embedding $j^* : V_\beta \to V_\xi$ such that $\mathrm{crit}(j^*) = \bar\kappa$ and $j^*(\bar\kappa) > \beta$. But this is a Σ_2 fact. So it holds true in $V_{\bar\lambda}$. So $\bar\kappa$ is virtually extendible in $V_{\bar\lambda}$, but then since there are embeddings from $V_{\bar\lambda}$ into cofinally many V_λ, with $\lambda \in C^{(2)}$, we have that $\kappa = j_\lambda(\bar\kappa)$ is virtually extendible in V.

The arguments just given easily generalize to show that for $n > 1$, the $n+1$-remarkable cardinals are precisely the $C^{(n)}$-virtually extendible cardinals. □

4. Remarkable games

The main theme of this article is studying assertions of the form that an elementary embedding between two structures exists in some set-forcing extension. It turns out that such assertions can be reformulated in terms of the existence of winning strategies in a class of Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé-like games.

Let B and A be two structures in the same language. We consider a two-player game, denoted by $G(B,A)$, where in the n-th move player I chooses $b_n \in B$ and player II chooses $a_n \in A$. Player II wins the game if for every formula $\varphi(x_0,\ldots,x_n)$,

$$B \models \varphi(b_0,\ldots,b_n) \leftrightarrow A \models \varphi(a_0,\ldots,a_n),$$

and otherwise player I wins. Since if player II loses she has to lose by some finite stage, the game is closed and hence determined by the Gale-Stewart Theorem [5].

Proposition 4.1. *The following are equivalent for structures B and A in the same language.*

(1) *Player II has a winning strategy in $G(B,A)$.*
(2) *In $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,B)}$, there is an elementary embedding $j : B \to A$.*
(3) *There is a complete Boolean algebra $\mathbb{B}$ such that*

$$V^{\mathbb{B}} \models \text{“There exists an elementary embedding } j : B \to A.\text{”}$$

(4) *For every complete Boolean algebra $\mathbb{B}$,*

$$V^{\mathbb{B}} \models \text{“}|B| = \aleph_0 \to \text{There is an elementary embedding } j : B \to A.\text{”}$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.7, it suffices to show only that (1) and (2) are equivalent.

Let's show (1) implies (2). So, suppose σ is a winning strategy for player II and G is $\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,B)$-generic over V. In $V[G]$, we fix an enumeration $\{b_i \mid i < \omega\}$ of the universe of B. Notice that, in $V[G]$, σ is still a winning strategy for player II, because the game is a closed game and there are no new finite sets in $V[G]$. So, by playing according to σ against the moves b_n of player I given by the fixed enumeration, player II obtains the desired elementary embedding $j : B \to A$.

Next, we show (2) implies (1). So, suppose that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,B)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : B \to A$. Let τ be a $\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,B)$-name for j. The following is a winning strategy for player II: When player I plays some b_0 at stage $n = 0$, choose some $p_{\langle b_0\rangle}$ which forces $\tau(b_0) = a_0$ and play a_0. When player I plays b_1 at stage $n = 1$, choose some $p_{\langle b_0,b_1\rangle} \leq p_{\langle b_0\rangle}$ which forces $\tau(b_1) = a_1$ and play a_1. Continuing in this manner, at stage $n+1$ of the game, to every sequence of plays $\langle b_0,\ldots,b_n\rangle$ of player I, we have associated a condition $p_{\langle b_0,\ldots,b_n\rangle}$ which forces $\tau(b_i) = a_i$ and the a_i are the plays according to the strategy. So when player I plays b_{n+1} at stage

$n+1$, we choose a condition $p_{\langle b_0,\ldots,b_n,b_{n+1}\rangle} \leq p_{\langle b_0,\ldots,b_n\rangle}$ which forces $\tau(b_{n+1}) = a_{n+1}$ and play a_{n+1}. □

5. Generic Vopěnka's Principle

We introduce the *Generic Vopěnka's Principle* which states that for every proper class $\mathcal{C}$ of structures of the same type, there are $B \neq A$, both in $\mathcal{C}$, such that B elementarily embeds into A in some set-forcing extension; equivalently, by Proposition 4.1, player II has a winning strategy in $G(B, A)$. We will study fragments of Generic Vopěnka's Principle for Σ_n-definable classes, as well as similarly defined generic variants of other Vopěnka-like principles, such as $\mathrm{VP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_n)$.

Definition 5.1.

(1) The principle $\mathrm{gVP}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_n)$ asserts that for every Σ_n-definable with parameters proper class $\mathcal{C}$ of structures of the same type, there are $B \neq A$, both in $\mathcal{C}$, such that B elementarily embeds into A in some set-forcing extension. The principle $\mathrm{gVP}(\Sigma_n)$ is defined analogously but does not allow parameters in the definition of the class. The principles $\mathrm{gVP}(\mathbf{\Pi}_n)$ and $\mathrm{gVP}(\mathbf{\Pi}_n)$ are defined analogously.

(2) The principle $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_n)$, where κ is a cardinal, asserts that every Σ_n-definable with parameters from H_κ class $\mathcal{C}$ of structures of the same type *generically reflects below* κ, meaning that for every $A \in \mathcal{C}$, there is $B \in H_\kappa$ such that B elementarily embeds into A in some set-forcing extension.

Theorem 5.2. *If κ is n-remarkable, then* $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ *holds.*

Proof. We prove the case $n = 1$, for remarkable κ, and note that the general case is completely analogous.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a proper class of structures Σ_2-definable from $a \in H_\kappa$. Fix $A \in \mathcal{C}$ and fix a cardinal $\lambda > \kappa$ in $C^{(2)}$ with $A \in V_\lambda$. By Proposition 2.4, there is $\bar{\lambda} < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar{\lambda}} \to V_\lambda$ with $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$ and $A \in \mathrm{range}(j)$. By also putting the rank of a into the range of j, we can assume that $j(a) = a$. Let $j(B) = A$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is Σ_2-definable and $\lambda \in C^{(2)}$, we have that $V_\lambda \models$ "$A \in \mathcal{C}$". Since $j(a) = a$ by assumption, it follows that $V_{\bar{\lambda}} \models B \in \mathcal{C}$. And since $\bar{\lambda} \in C^{(1)}$, it follows that truly $B \in \mathcal{C}$. Thus, the restriction $j : B \to A$ is the desired elementary embedding. □

Theorem 5.3. *If for some cardinal κ,* $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ *holds, then either there is an n-remarkable cardinal or there is a transitive model of* ZFC *with a proper class of n-remarkable cardinals.*

Proof. We first prove the case $n = 1$.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the Π_1-definable class of structures of the form $\langle V_\theta, \in\rangle$. By $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_2)$, for every $\theta > \kappa$, there is $\bar{\theta} < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, V_{\bar{\theta}})}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar{\theta}} \to V_\theta$. Let $\bar{\theta} < \kappa$ be the least such that for a proper class of θ, in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, V_{\bar{\theta}})}$ there is an elementary embedding $j_\theta : V_{\bar{\theta}} \to V_\theta$. Notice that $\bar{\theta}$ must be a limit ordinal by minimality. If j_θ is the identity map for a proper class of θ, then $V_{\bar{\theta}}$ is elementary in V, which is impossible since $\bar{\theta}$ is definable. So, let $\bar{\alpha}$ be least such that for a proper class of θ, in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, V_{\bar{\theta}})}$ there is an elementary embedding $j_\theta : V_{\bar{\theta}} \to V_\theta$ having $\bar{\alpha}$ as its critical point. For a proper class of such θ, the ordinals $j_\theta(\bar{\kappa})$ must be the same, for otherwise we would have $V_{\bar{\alpha}} \prec V$, and this is impossible because $\bar{\alpha}$ is definable. So, let α be the least such that for a proper class $\mathcal{K}$ of ordinals $\theta > \kappa$, in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,V_{\bar\theta})}$ there exists an elementary embedding $j_\theta : V_{\bar\theta} \to V_\theta$ with $\mathrm{crit}(j_\theta) = \bar\alpha$, and $j_\theta(\bar\alpha) = \alpha$.

It is not difficult to see that $\bar\alpha$ must be inaccessible. If for some $\beta < \kappa$ $f : \beta \to \bar\alpha$ is cofinal, then $f \in V_{\bar\theta}$, and so by elementarity, $j(f) : \beta \to \alpha$ is cofinal, but $j(f) = f$. Thus, $\bar\alpha$ is regular. If for some $\beta < \bar\alpha$ there is an injection $f : \bar\alpha \overset{1-1}{\to} \mathcal{P}(\beta)$, then $f \in V_{\bar\theta}$ and $j(f)$ is an injection by elementarity, but $j(f)(\bar\alpha) = A \subseteq \beta$ must already appear in the image of $f \subseteq j(f)$ by elementarity. Thus, $\bar\alpha$ is a strong limit.

First, let's suppose that $\bar\theta < \alpha$. We claim that, in this case, α is remarkable. If not, then there is a least regular $\lambda > \alpha$ witnessing the non-remarkability of α. Fix $\theta > \lambda$ in $\mathcal{K}$, so that V_θ sees that λ is least witnessing the non-remarkability of α. Then λ is definable in V_θ from α, and so λ is in the range of j_θ. Let $j_\theta(\bar\lambda) = \lambda$ and note that $\bar\lambda$ is regular by elementarity. Consider the restriction $j_\theta : H_{\bar\lambda} \to H_\lambda$, which has $j_\theta(\mathrm{crit}(j_\theta)) = \alpha$. Such an embedding exists in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\alpha)}$ since $V_{\bar\lambda}$ is countable there (by Proposition 2.7). But this contradicts our assumption that λ is a witness to the non-remarkability of κ, and so α must be remarkable.

Now suppose alternatively that $\alpha \le \bar\theta$. First, we claim that $\bar\alpha$ is remarkable in V_α. To see this, fix some $\lambda < \alpha$. In $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,V_{\bar\theta})}$, fix some $j_\theta : V_{\bar\theta} \to V_\theta$ with $\theta > \kappa$ and consider the restriction $j_\theta : V_\lambda \to V_{j_\theta(\lambda)}$, which has $j_\theta(\mathrm{crit}(j_\theta)) = j_\theta(\bar\alpha)$. By Proposition 2.7, in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<j_\theta(\bar\alpha))}$ there is some $j^* : V_\lambda \to V_{j_\theta(\lambda)}$, which has $j^*(\mathrm{crit}(j^*)) = j_\theta(\bar\alpha)$ and V_θ sees this. Thus, by elementarity, $V_{\bar\theta}$ satisfies that there is some $\bar\lambda < \bar\alpha$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\bar\alpha)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j^* : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_\lambda$, which has $j^*(\mathrm{crit}(j^*)) = \bar\alpha$. By Proposition 2.4, this completes the argument that $\bar\alpha$ is remarkable in V_α . But now it easily follows using elementarity that $V_{\bar\alpha}$ is a model of proper class many remarkable cardinals.

For the general case, where we consider $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$, let $\mathcal{C}$ be the Π_n-definable class of structures of the form $\langle V_\theta, \in\rangle$ with $\theta \in C^{(n)}$. We argue analogously to case of $n = 1$. As in that proof, we fix minimal $\bar\theta < \kappa$, $\bar\alpha$, and α, such that for a proper class $\mathcal{K} \subseteq C^{(n)}$ of ordinals above κ, for every $\theta \in \mathcal{K}$, there is an embedding $j_\theta : V_{\bar\theta} \to V_\theta$ with $\mathrm{crit}(j_\theta) = \bar\alpha$ and $j_\theta(\bar\alpha) = \alpha$. First, suppose $\bar\alpha < \bar\theta$ and assume towards a contradiction that $\lambda > \kappa$ is least in $C^{(n)}$ witnessing that κ is not n-remarkable. Since $\theta \in C^{(n)}$, V_θ is correct about this property of λ and so λ is in the range of j_θ with $j_\theta(\bar\lambda) = \lambda$. Since $V_\lambda \prec_{\Sigma_n} V_\theta$, it follows by elementarity that $V_{\bar\lambda} \prec_{\Sigma_n} V_{\bar\theta}$. The restricted embedding $j_\theta : V_{\bar\lambda} \to V_\lambda$ thus witnesses a contradiction, showing that α is indeed n-remarkable. Next, suppose alternatively that $\bar\alpha \ge \theta$. As before, we argue that $\bar\alpha$ is n-remarkable in V_α. Fix $\lambda < \alpha$ above $\bar\alpha$ such that $V_\lambda \prec_{\Sigma_n} V_\alpha$ and consider the restriction $j_\theta : V_\lambda \to V_{j_\theta(\lambda)}$. The requirement $V_\lambda \prec_{\Sigma_n} V_\alpha$ translates via elementarity into the assertion that $V_{\bar\lambda} \prec_{\Sigma_n} V_{\bar\alpha}$, since $j_\theta(\bar\alpha) = \alpha$. But then $V_{\bar\lambda} \prec_{\Sigma_n} V_\alpha$ as well since $V_{\bar\alpha} \prec V_\alpha$. The rest of the argument proceeds analogously. □

Theorem 5.4.

(1) *If* $\mathrm{gVP}(\Pi_n)$ *holds, then either there is an* n*-remarkable cardinal or there is a transitive model of* ZFC *with a proper class of* n*-remarkable cardinals.*
(2) *If* $\mathrm{gVP}(\mathbf{\Pi}_n)$ *holds, then either there is a proper class of* n*-remarkable remarkable cardinals or there is a transitive model of* ZFC *with a proper class of* n*-remarkable cardinals.*

Proof. We will say that a cardinal κ is *remarkable up to* $\lambda > \kappa$ if for every $\kappa < \eta < \lambda$, there is $\bar\eta < \kappa$ and such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding

$j : V_{\bar{\eta}} \to V_\eta$ with $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$, and we will make an analogous definition for n-remarkable κ.

We start with the case $n = 1$.

First, we prove (1). We follow the proof of Theorem 4.3(1) in [1]. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the class of structures of the form $\langle V_{\lambda+2}, \in, \alpha, \lambda\rangle$, where λ is the least limit ordinal greater than α such that no $\kappa \leq \alpha$ is remarkable up to λ. It is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{C}$ is Π_1-definable without parameters. Observe that if there are no remarkable cardinals, then $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper class. So, let's assume that there are no remarkable cardinals. By gVP(Π_1) applied to $\mathcal{C}$, there exist structures

$$\langle V_{\lambda+2}, \in, \alpha, \lambda\rangle \neq \langle V_{\mu+2}, \in, \beta, \mu\rangle$$

such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, V_{\lambda+2})}$ there is an elementary embedding

$$j : \langle V_{\lambda+2}, \in, \alpha, \lambda\rangle \to \langle V_{\mu+2}, \in, \beta, \mu\rangle.$$

If j was the identity, then we would have $\lambda = \mu$ and $\alpha = \beta$, which is impossible since we assumed $\langle V_{\lambda+2}, \in, \alpha, \lambda\rangle \neq \langle V_{\mu+2}, \in, \beta, \mu\rangle$. So j has a critical point, call it κ.

Let's argue that $\alpha < \beta$, and hence $\kappa \leq \alpha$. If $\lambda = \mu$, then this must be the case because j is not the identity. If $\lambda < \mu$, then it must also be the case because no $\xi \leq \alpha$ is remarkable up to λ (by definition of $\mathcal{C}$) and there is some $\xi \leq \beta$ which is remarkable up to λ, by minimality of μ. Let's argue next that $j(\kappa) < \lambda$. If not, then we claim κ is remarkable up to λ, which is impossible. Fix some $\delta > \kappa$ below λ. Consider the restriction $j : V_\delta \to V_{j(\delta)}$, which has $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = j(\kappa)$. By Proposition 2.7 and our assumption that $\delta < j(\kappa)$, there is some $j^* : V_\delta \to V_{j(\delta)}$ with $j^*(\mathrm{crit}(j^*)) = j(\kappa)$ in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, <j(\kappa))}$ and $V_{\mu+2}$ sees this. Thus, by elementarity, $V_{\lambda+2}$ satisfies that there is some $\bar{\delta} < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j^* : V_{\bar{\delta}} \to V_\delta$ with $j^*(\mathrm{crit}(j^*)) = \kappa$. So we verified that $j(\kappa) < \lambda$. We claim that κ is remarkable in $V_{j(\kappa)}$. Fix $\delta > \kappa$ below $j(\kappa)$. Consider the restriction $j : V_\delta \to V_{j(\delta)}$ and argue as above. Thus, by elementarity, V_κ is a model with proper class many remarkable cardinals.

Next, we prove (2). We follow the proof of Theorem 4.3(2) in [1]. For an ordinal ξ, we will show that either there is a remarkable cardinal above ξ or there is a transitive ZFC-model with a proper class of remarkable cardinals. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the class of structures of the form $\langle V_{\lambda+2}, \in, \alpha, \lambda, \{\gamma\}_{\gamma\leq\xi}\rangle$, where $\alpha > \xi$ and λ is the least limit ordinal greater than α such that no $\kappa \leq \alpha$ and above ξ is remarkable up to λ. The class $\mathcal{C}$ is Π_1-definable in the parameter ξ and if there is no remarkable cardinal above ξ, then $\mathcal{C}$ is a proper class. An analogous argument to (1) now shows that, in this case, there is a transitive ZFC-model with a proper class of remarkable cardinals.

For the general case with gVP(Π_n), let $\mathcal{C}$ the be the class of structures of the form $\langle V_{\lambda+2}, \in, \alpha, \lambda\rangle$, where λ is least in $C^{(n)}$ such that all $\kappa \leq \alpha$ are not n-remarkable up to λ. The class $\mathcal{C}$ is Π_n-definable and if there is no n-remarkable cardinal, then it is proper. The rest of the argument proceeds analogously. □

Putting together the above results, we get that the principles gVP(Π_n) and gVP($\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1}$) are equiconsistent with an n-remarkable cardinal.

Theorem 5.5. *The following are equiconsistent.*

1. gVP(Π_n).
2. gVP($\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1}$) *for some* κ.

(3) *There is an n-remarkable cardinal.*

Proof. If there is a model with $\mathrm{gVP}(\Pi_n)$, then there is a model with an n-remarkable cardinal by Theorem 5.4 (1). If there is a model with $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$, then there is a model with an n-remarkable cardinal by Theorem 5.3. If there is an n-remarkable cardinal, then $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ holds by Theorem 5.3 and $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ trivially implies $\mathrm{gVP}(\Pi_n)$. $\square$

Theorem 5.6. *The following are equiconsistent.*

(1) $\mathrm{gVP}(\mathbf{\Pi}_n)$.
(2) $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ *for a proper class of* κ.
(3) *There is a proper class of n-remarkable cardinals.*

Proof. If there is a model with $\mathrm{gVP}(\mathbf{\Pi}_n)$, then there is a model with proper class many remarkable cardinals by Theorem 5.4 (2). If μ is an ordinal and $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ holds for some $\kappa > \mu$, then by using structures $\langle V_\theta, \in, \{\xi\}_{\xi \leq \mu}\rangle$, we can ensure that α, in the proof of Theorem 5.3, is as large as desired. Thus, if there is a model with $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ for a proper class of κ, then there is a model with proper class many n-remarkable cardinals. If there is a proper class of n-remarkable cardinals, then $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ holds for a proper class of κ by Theorem 5.3 and if $\mathcal{C}$ is a Π_n-definable class in some parameter a, then $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ with κ above the rank of a trivially implies the Generic Vopěnka's Principle for this class. $\square$

We don't know whether equiconsistency can be replaced by direct implication in Theorems 5.5 and 5.6, as in the case of Vopěnka's Principle fragments and supercompact and $C^{(n)}$-extendible cardinals. The chief obstacle to obtaining direct implications seems to be that the "virtual" version of Kunen's inconsistency does not hold, namely, it is consistent that for some cardinal δ, in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, V_\delta)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_\delta \to V_\delta$ with, say, $\delta = \lambda^+$, where λ is the supremum of the critical sequence for j.

Question 5.7.

(1) If $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ holds for some κ, holds does it follows that there is an n-remarkable cardinal?
(2) If $\mathrm{gVP}(\Pi_n)$ holds, does it follow that there is an n-remarkable cardinal?

Bagaria showed in [1] that the least κ for which $\mathrm{VP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_2)$ holds is the least supercompact and, for $n > 1$, the least κ for which $\mathrm{VP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ holds is the least $C^{(n)}$-extendible. We can obtain analogous results for a potentially stronger variant of Generic Vopěnka's Principle and an analogous strengthening of $\mathrm{gVP}(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_n)$.

Definition 5.8. Suppose B and A are transitive $\in$-structures and $j : B \to A$ is an elementary embedding. We say that j is *overspilling* if j has a critical point and $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) > \mathrm{rank}(B)$.

Definition 5.9. The principle $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\Sigma_n)$ asserts for every Σ_n-definable, without parameters, proper class $\mathcal{C}$ of transitive $\in$-structures, that there are $B \neq A$ in $\mathcal{C}$ such that there is an overspilling elementary embedding $j : B \to A$ in some set-forcing extension. The principles $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\Pi_n)$, $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\mathbf{\Pi}_n)$, and $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_n)$ are defined analogously.

Theorem 5.10. *The following are equivalent for a cardinal κ.*

(1) κ *is the least for which* $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ *holds.*

(2) *κ is the least n-remarkable cardinal.*

Proof. Since $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ holds for n-remarkable κ by the proof of Theorem 5.2, it follows that the least κ of (2) is at least as large as the least κ of (1). Thus, it suffices to show that the least κ in (1) is n-remarkable. By the proof of Theorem 5.3, and following its notation, we have that α is n-remarkable. Since κ is least such that $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\kappa, \Sigma_{n+1})$ holds, we cannot have that $\alpha < \kappa$. So assume towards a contradiction that $\alpha > \kappa$. Since α is n-remarkable, and therefore $V_\alpha \prec_{\Sigma_{n+1}} V$ by Proposition 3.3, V_α satisfies that $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\kappa, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ holds. And since $V_{\bar\alpha} \prec V_\alpha$, there exists some ordinal $\gamma < \alpha$ such that $V_{\bar\alpha}$ satisfies that $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\gamma, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ holds. Hence, again because $V_{\bar\alpha} \prec V_\alpha$, V_α satisfies that $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\gamma, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1})$ holds, but then so does V, which contradicts the minimality of κ. □

Theorem 5.11.

(1) *If $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\Pi_n)$ holds, then there is an n-remarkable cardinal.*
(2) *If $\mathrm{gVP}^*(\mathbf{\Pi}_n)$ holds, then there is a proper class of n-remarkable cardinals.*

6. A weak version of the Proper Forcing Axiom

In the spirit of investigating principles which assert the existence of elementary embeddings in a set-forcing extension, we introduce and study a weakening of PFA, the Proper Forcing Axiom, based on the notion that the embeddings arising from PFA exist in a set-forcing extension. As we noted in the introduction, the proof of [2, Theorem 1.3] produces the following characterization of PFA.

Theorem 6.1. *The following are equivalent.*

(1) PFA
(2) *If $\mathcal{M} = (M; \in, (R_i \mid i < \omega_1))$ is a transitive model, $\varphi(x)$ is a Σ_1-formula, and $\mathbb{Q}$ is a proper forcing such that*
$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \varphi(\mathcal{M}),$$
then there is in V some transitive $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = (\bar M; \in, (\bar R_i \mid i < \omega_1))$ together with some elementary embedding
$$j \colon \bar{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}$$
such that $\varphi(\bar{\mathcal{M}})$ holds.

For instance, to see that (2) implies PFA, suppose that $\mathbb{Q}$ is a proper poset and $\langle D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \omega_1\rangle$ is a sequence of dense sets of $\mathbb{Q}$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ have the form $\langle H_\lambda, \in, \mathbb{Q}, (D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \omega_1)\rangle$, where H_λ is sufficiently large that it contains all subsets of $\mathbb{Q}$. Clearly $\mathbb{Q}$ forces the Σ_1-assertion about $\mathcal{M}$ that there is a filter for $\mathbb{Q}$ meeting all the D_α. So by (2), V has an elementary embedding $j : \bar{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}$ for some transitive model $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = (\bar M; \in, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}, (\bar D_\alpha \mid \alpha < \omega_1)$ and V has a filter $\bar G$ for $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ meeting all the $\bar D_\alpha$. Let G be the point-wise image of $\bar G$ under j. Clearly G is a filter on $\mathbb{P}$ meeting all the D_α as required by PFA.

PFA is weakened to the *weak Proper Forcing Axiom*, wPFA, by asserting that the embedding $j : \bar{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}$ exists in some set-forcing extension.

Definition 6.2. The *weak Proper Forcing Axiom* wPFA asserts that if $\mathcal{M} = (M; \in, (R_i \mid \xi < \omega_1))$ is a transitive model, $\varphi(x)$ is a Σ_1-formula, and $\mathbb{Q}$ is a proper forcing such that
$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \varphi(\mathcal{M}),$$

then there is in V some transitive $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = (\bar{M}; \in, (\bar{R}_i \mid i < \omega_1))$ such that $\varphi(\bar{\mathcal{M}})$ holds and inside some set-forcing extension (equivalently in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,\bar{M})}$) there is an elementary embedding

$$j : \bar{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}.$$

We will show that wPFA is equiconsistent with a remarkable cardinal.

Let us first show that wPFA is consistent relative to a remarkable cardinal. The proof uses a remarkable Laver function which is the analogue of a Laver function on a supercompact cardinal.

Suppose κ is a cardinal and $\ell : \kappa \to V_\kappa$ is a partial function. We say that a set $x \in V_\lambda$ with $\lambda > \kappa$ is λ-*anticipated* by ℓ if there is $\bar{\lambda} < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$, there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar{\lambda}} \to V_\lambda$ with $\mathrm{crit}(j) = \xi$ and $j(\xi) = \kappa$ so that $\ell \restriction \xi + 1 \in V_{\bar{\lambda}}$, $j(\ell \restriction \xi) = \ell$, and $j(\ell(\xi)) = x$. The function ℓ is called a *remarkable Laver function* if whenever $x \in V_\lambda$ with $\lambda > \kappa$, then x is λ-anticipated by ℓ. Gitman showed in [3] that every remarkable cardinal has a remarkable Laver function.

Theorem 6.3. *Let κ be remarkable. Then* wPFA *holds in a forcing extension by a proper poset.*

Proof. We imitate the standard argument which produces PFA in a forcing extension of a ground model with a supercompact cardinal.

Let $\ell : \kappa \to V_\kappa$ be a remarkable Laver function. We define a countable support κ-length iteration $\mathbb{P}$, where at stage ξ, if $\ell(\xi) = (\dot{\mathbb{Q}}, M)$ for some set M and $\mathbb{P}_\xi$-name $\dot{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\xi}$ "$\dot{\mathbb{Q}}$ is proper", then we force with $\dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\xi = \dot{\mathbb{Q}}$, and with the trivial forcing otherwise. The iteration $\mathbb{P}$ is proper and therefore preserves ω_1.

Let G be $\mathbb{P}$-generic over V. We claim that wPFA holds in $V[G]$. To this end, let $\mathcal{M} = (M; \in, (R_i \mid i < \omega_1)) \in V[G]$ be a transitive model, let $\varphi(x)$ be a Σ_1-formula, and let $\mathbb{Q} \in V[G]$ be a proper forcing such that, in $V[G]$, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \varphi(\mathcal{M})$ holds.

Let $\dot{\mathbb{Q}}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name for $\mathbb{Q}$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\dot{\mathbb{Q}}$ is proper", let τ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name for $\mathcal{M}$, and let $x = (\dot{\mathbb{Q}}, \tau)$. Let $\lambda > \kappa$ be sufficiently large such that $x \in V_\lambda$, V_λ satisfies that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\dot{\mathbb{Q}}$ is proper", and $V_\lambda[G]$ satisfies that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \varphi(\mathcal{M})$. This is possible because if λ is large enough, then $V_\lambda[G]$ has a sufficiently large $H_\delta^{V[G]}$ and a club of models in $[H_\delta^{V[G]}]^\omega$ witnessing the properness of $\mathbb{Q}$ and $V_\lambda[G]$ has a $\mathbb{Q}$-name witnessing the Σ_1-formula $\varphi(\mathcal{M})$. By the properties of ℓ, there is some $\bar{\lambda} < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar{\lambda}} \to V_\lambda$ with $\mathrm{crit}(j) = \xi$ and $j(\xi) = \kappa$ so that $\ell \restriction \xi + 1 \in V_{\bar{\lambda}}$, $j(\ell \restriction \xi) = \ell$, and $j(\ell(\xi)) = (\dot{\mathbb{Q}}, \tau)$. It follows by elementarity that $\ell(\xi) = (Q, \bar{\tau})$ and $V_{\bar{\lambda}}$ satisfies that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\xi}$ "Q is proper". But then it must truly be the case that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\xi}$ "Q is proper" because any $\mathbb{P}_\xi$-generic extension of $V_{\bar{\lambda}}$ would provide the necessary witnessing club of models. By the definition of $\mathbb{P}$, it follows that $\dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\xi = Q$.

Note that j fixes all elements of $\mathbb{P}_\xi \subseteq V_\xi$ and, since $j(\ell \restriction \xi) = \ell$, it follows that $j(\mathbb{P}_\xi) = \mathbb{P}$. Thus, inside $V[G]^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,<\kappa)}$, we may lift j to an elementary embedding $j : V_{\bar{\lambda}}[G \restriction \xi] \to V_\lambda[G]$ by setting $j(\sigma_{G\restriction\xi}) = j(\sigma)_G$ for every $\mathbb{P}_\xi$-name $\sigma \in V_{\bar{\lambda}}$. In particular, setting $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = (\bar{M}; \in, (\bar{R}_i \mid i < \omega_1)) = \bar{\tau}_{G\restriction\xi}$, $\bar{\mathcal{M}} \in V[G \restriction \xi] \subseteq V[G]$ and

$$j \restriction \bar{M} \colon \bar{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}$$

is an elementary embedding. By Lemma 2.6 such an embedding then also exists in $V[G]^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,\bar{M})}$. Note that we used the preservation of ω_1 to conclude that $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ has ω_1-many relations.

Since $V_\lambda[G]$ satisfies that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \varphi(\mathcal{M})$, we will now clearly have that

$$V_\lambda[G_{\xi+1}] \models \varphi(\bar{\mathcal{M}}),$$

so that because $\varphi(x)$ is Σ_1,

$$V[G] \models \varphi(\bar{\mathcal{M}}).$$

We have verified that wPFA holds true in $V[G]$. $\square$

Next, we show that if wPFA holds, then ω_2^V is remarkable in L.

Theorem 6.4. *Assume* wPFA. *Then* ω_2^V *is remarkable in* L.

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that $0^\#$ does not exist, as otherwise all cardinals of V are remarkable in L. We shall exploit an argument of Todorcevic from [14], which shows that $\square_\kappa$ fails under PFA for all uncountable κ. In what follows, we shall make references to the proof of [12, Theorem 11.64].

Let us write $\kappa = \omega_2^V$. Let $\alpha > \kappa$ be an L-cardinal. It suffices to find some L-cardinal $\beta < \kappa$ such that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,\beta)}$ there is some elementary embedding $j\colon J_\beta \to J_\alpha$ with $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \kappa$. This suffices by Proposition 2.3, because for any infitite L-cardinal γ, $J_\gamma = L_\gamma = H_\gamma^L$.

By way of notation, if J_γ is a model of ZFC^- with the largest cardinal, say γ', then by $(C_\xi^\gamma : \xi < \gamma)$ we mean the canonical $\square_{\gamma'}$–sequence as being constructed in J_γ as in the proof of [12, Theorem 11.64]. In particular, if γ is an L-cardinal, then γ' will also be an L-cardinal and $(C_\xi^\gamma : \xi < \gamma)$ is the canonical $\square_{\gamma'}$-sequence of L.

Let us assume that $\alpha = (\alpha')^{+L}$. By the Jensen Covering Lemma, $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) \geq |\alpha'| \geq \omega_2$ in V. There is then by [14] some proper forcing $\mathbb{P}$ such that if g is $\mathbb{P}$–generic over V, then in $V[g]$, $|\alpha| = \aleph_1$ and there is a pair (C, F) such that

(1) $C \subseteq \alpha$ is a club subset of α of order type ω_1,
(2) $F : C \to \omega$ is such that if $\eta < \xi$ are both in C and η is a limit point of C_ξ^α, then $F(\xi) \neq F(\eta)$.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ have the form $\langle H_\lambda, \in, \mathbb{P}, \alpha, (\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1)\rangle$ for a sufficiently large $\lambda > \alpha$ and consider the Σ_1-assertion about $\mathcal{M}$ that there exists a pair (C, F) as above. By wPFA, there is in V some some transitive model $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = \langle \bar{M}, \in, \bar{\mathbb{P}}, \beta, (\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1)\rangle$ and a pair (c, f) such that

(1) $c \subseteq \beta$ is a club subset of β of order type ω_1,
(2) $f : c \to \omega$ such that if $\eta < \xi$ are both in c and η is a limit point of C_ξ^β, then $f(\xi) \neq f(\eta)$,

and inside $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,\bar{M})}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : \bar{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}$.

We must have $j \restriction (\omega_1^V) + 1 = \mathrm{id}$ because we included constants for countable ordinals of V in our language. Let's consider the restriction $j \restriction J_\beta : J_\beta \to J_\alpha$ and let β' be largest cardinal of J_β, which exists by elementarity, since α' was the largest cardinal of J_α.

It remains to verify that β is an L-cardinal. If not, then let $\gamma > \beta$ be least such that $\rho_\omega(J_\gamma) \leq \beta'$. Let $\rho_{n+1}(J_\gamma) \leq \beta' < \rho_n(J_\gamma)$. Let $d \subset \beta$ be the set of all $\xi < \beta$ such that $J_\xi \prec J_\beta$ and if $\nu > \xi$ is least with $\rho_\omega(J_\nu) = \beta'$, then $\rho_{n+1}(J_\nu) = \beta' < \rho_n(J_\nu)$ and there is a weakly $r\Sigma_n$ elementary embedding

$$\sigma : J_\nu \to J_\gamma$$

with $\sigma \restriction \xi = \mathrm{id}$ and $\sigma(\xi) = \bar{\alpha}$. By the proof of [12, Theorem 11.64], there is a club $e \subset d \cap c$ in β such that if $\xi \in e$, then $C_\xi^\beta \cap e = e \cap \xi$. Let e' be the set of limit points of e. We now have that if $\eta < \xi$ are both in e', then η is a limit point of C^β_ξ, so that $f(\eta) \neq f(\xi)$. This gives that $f \restriction e' \to \omega$ is injective, which contradicts $\mathrm{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$.

We note that we now must have $\beta < \omega_2^V = \kappa$ by the Jensen Covering Lemma. It follows, since $j(\beta) = \alpha$, that the critical point of j is below ω_2^V, and hence $j(\mathrm{crit}(j)) = \omega_2^V = \kappa$ as desired. $\square$

For a cardinal κ, let us write PFA_κ for the statement that if $\mathbb{B}$ is any proper complete Boolean algebra and if $\langle A_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\rangle$ is any family of maximal antichains in $\mathbb{B}$ with $|A_\xi| \leq \kappa$ for each $\xi < \omega_1$, then there is some filter $G \subseteq \mathbb{B}$ such that $G \cap A_\xi \neq \emptyset$ for all $\xi < \omega_1$. $\mathrm{PFA}_{\aleph_1}$ is then BPFA, the Bounded Proper Forcing Axiom. The proof of [2, Theorem 1.3] easily shows that PFA_κ can be characterized analogously to PFA as in Theorem 6.1 with the restriction that $|M| = \kappa$, where M is the universe of $\mathcal{M}$.

The axiom wPFA implies $\mathrm{PFA}_{\aleph_2}$, but it does not imply $\mathrm{PFA}_{\aleph_3}$.

Theorem 6.5.

(1) wPFA *implies* $\mathrm{PFA}_{\aleph_2}$.
(2) *The assertion* "wPFA $\wedge \forall\kappa \geq \aleph_2\, \square_\kappa$" *is consistent relative to a remarkable cardinal.*
(3) wPFA *does not imply* $\mathsf{PFA}_{\aleph_3}$.

Proof. Let's prove (1). So assume that $\mathbb{P}$ is a proper poset and $\langle A_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\rangle$ is a sequence of maximal antichains of $\mathbb{P}$ such that each A_ξ has size at most ω_2. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be a subposet of $\mathbb{P}$ of size ω_2 containing all the A_ξ and preserving compatibility from $\mathbb{P}$, so that if p and q are compatible in $\mathbb{P}$, they remain compatible in $\mathbb{Q}$. By taking an isomorphic copy, we can assume without loss of generality that $\mathbb{Q}$ has universe ω_2. Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the structure $\langle H_{\omega_2}, \mathbb{Q}, (A_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1)\rangle$. Now let $\mathcal{M}$ be an elementary substructure of H_{ω_3} with predicates for $\mathcal{N}$. In any forcing extension by $\mathbb{P}$ there is a filter for $\mathbb{Q}$ meeting all the A_ξ. Thus, by wPFA, there is a transitive model $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = (\bar{M}; \bar{N}, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}, (\bar{A}_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1)\rangle$ and a filter for $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ meeting all the $\bar{A}_\xi$ so that in $V^{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega,M)}$ there is an elementary embedding $j : \bar{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}$. By including constants for all countable ordinals in $\mathcal{M}$, we can assume without loss of generality that j fixes ω_1. Since $\mathcal{M}$ knows that $N \subseteq H_{\omega_2}$, by elementarity, $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ knows that $\bar{N} \subseteq H_{\omega_2}$. But now it follows that j fixes all elements of $\bar{N}$. Thus, the restriction $j : \bar{N} \to N$ is the identity map, and so we have a filter for $\mathbb{Q}$ meeting all the A_ξ. Closing this filter downwards gives a filter for $\mathbb{P}$ meeting all the A_ξ.

Assertion (2) follows from the proof of Theorem 6.3 by starting with a remarkable κ in L. Recall that κ is the ω_2 of the forcing extension, and so because the forcing iteration does not collapse any cardinals above κ, for $\delta \geq \kappa$, the old square sequences from L witness that $\square_\delta$ holds.

Assertion (3) follows by the proof of [13, Theorem 1], which shows that $\mathrm{PFA}_{\aleph_3}$ implies the failure of $\square_{\omega_2}$, whereas by (2), wPFA is compatible with $\square_{\omega_2}$. $\square$

References

[1] Bagaria, J., $C^{(n)}$*-cardinals*. Archive for Mathematical Logic, Arch. Math. Logic (2012) 51:213-240 DOI 10.1007/s00153-011-0261-8
[2] Claverie, B., and Schindler, R., *Woodin's axiom* $(*)$*, bounded forcing axioms, and precipitous ideals on* ω_1, Journal of Symbolic Logic 77, 2 (2012), 475 – 498.
[3] Cheng, Y. and Gitman, V. *Indestructibility properties of remarkable cardinals.* Preprint.

[4] Yong Cheng and Ralf Schindler. Harrington's principle in higher order arithmetic. *J. Symb. Log.*, 80(2):477–489, 2015.
[5] D. Gale and F. M. Stewart. Infinite games with perfect information. *Ann. Math. Studies*, 28:245–266, 1953.
[6] Victoria Gitman and Ralf Schindler. Virtual large cardinals. In preparation.
[7] Victoria Gitman and Philip D. Welch. Ramsey-like cardinals II. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 76(2):541–560, 2011.
[Ham] Joel David Hamkins (http://mathoverflow.net/users/1946/joel-david-hamkins). Can Vopěnka's Principle be violated definably? `http://mathoverflow.net/questions/45602/can-vopenkas-principle-be-violated-definably/46538#46538`.
[8] M. Magidor. On the role of supercompact and extendible cardinals in logic. *Israel J. Math.*, 10:147–157, 1971.
[9] Schindler, R. *Proper forcing and remarkable cardinals*, Bull. Symbolic Logic **6** (2000), 176 –184.
[10] Schindler, R. *Proper forcing and remarkable cardinals II*, J. Symbolic Logic **66** (2001), 1481–1492.
[11] Schindler, R. *Remarkable cardinals.* In Infinity, Computability, and Metamathematics: Festschrift in honour of the 60th birthdays of Peter Koepke and Philip Welch, Series: Tributes. College publications, London, GB, 2014.
[12] Schindler, R., *Set theory. Exploring independence and truth*, Springer–Verlag 2014.
[13] Todorcevic, S., *A note on the proper forcing axiom*, Cont. Math. **31** (1984), pp. 209–218.
[14] Todorcevic, S., *Localized reflection and fragments of PFA*, in: "Logic and scientific methods," volume 259 of DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci., (2002) 145–155.

(J. Bagaria) ICREA (Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats) and Departament de Lògica, Història i Filosofia de la Ciència, Universitat de Barcelona. Montalegre 6, 08001 Barcelona, Catalonia (Spain).
E-mail address: `joan.bagaria@icrea.cat`

(V. Gitman) The City University of New York, CUNY Graduate Center, Mathematics Program, 365 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10016, USA
E-mail address: `vgitman@nylogic.org`
URL: `http://boolesrings.org/victoriagitman`

(R. Schindler) Institut für mathematische Logik und Grundlagenforschung, Fachbereich Mathematik und Informatik, Universität Münster, Einsteinstrasse 62, 48149 Münster, Germany
E-mail address: `rds@wwu.de`
URL: `http://wwwmath.uni-muenster.de/u/rds/`