

COMPUTABLE STRUCTURES IN GENERIC EXTENSIONS

JULIA KNIGHT, ANTONIO MONTALBÁN, AND NOAH SCHWEBER

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we investigate connections between structures present in every generic extension of the universe V and computability theory. We introduce the notion of *generic Muchnik reducibility* that can be used to compare the complexity of uncountable structures; we establish basic properties of this reducibility, and study it in the context of *generic presentability*, the existence of a copy of the structure in every extension by a given forcing. We show that every forcing notion making ω_2 countable generically presents some countable structure with no copy in the ground model; and that every structure generically presentable by a forcing notion that does not make ω_2 countable has a copy in the ground model. We also show that any countable structure \mathcal{A} that is generically presentable by a forcing notion not collapsing ω_1 has a countable copy in V , as does any structure \mathcal{B} generically Muchnik reducible to a structure \mathcal{A} of cardinality \aleph_1 . The former positive result yields a new proof of Harrington’s result that counterexamples to Vaught’s conjecture have models of power \aleph_1 with Scott rank arbitrarily high below ω_2 . Finally, we show that a rigid structure with copies in all generic extensions by a given forcing has a copy already in the ground model.

1. INTRODUCTION

In computable structure theory, one studies the complexity of structures using techniques from computability theory. Almost all of this work concerns countable structures; much less is known about the complexity of uncountable structures. However, the computability theory of uncountable structures has received more attention in the last few years. (See for instance the proceedings volume of the conference Effective Mathematics of the Uncountable [GHHM13].) One idea for studying the complexity of an uncountable structure that seems new is to consider what happens to the structure when its domain is made countable.

Before making this idea more concrete, we recall the notion of *Muchnik reducibility* between countable structures. This is the standard way in computable structure theory to say that one structure is more complicated than another, in the sense that it is harder to compute.

Definition 1.1. Given countable structures \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} we say that \mathcal{A} is *Muchnik reducible* to \mathcal{B} , and we write $\mathcal{A} \leq_w \mathcal{B}$, if, from any copy of \mathcal{B} , we can compute a copy of \mathcal{A} .

On its face, this notion is limited to countable structures. However, by examining generic extensions of the set-theoretic universe, V , we can extend it further:

Definition 1.2 (Schweber). For a pair of structures \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , not necessarily countable in V , we say that \mathcal{A} is *generically Muchnik reducible* to \mathcal{B} , and we write $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{B}$, if for any generic extension $V[G]$ of the set theoretic universe V in which both structures are countable, we have

$$V[G] \models \mathcal{A} \leq_w \mathcal{B}.$$

⁰ Saved: September 23, 2014. Submitted.
Compiled: September 23, 2014

The second author was partially supported by the Packard Fellowship. The third author was partially supported by the Sciobereti Fellowship.

In Section 2.1, we will prove the basic properties of this reducibility. We will show that it coincides with Muchnik reducibility on countable structures; i.e., if \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are countable, then $\mathcal{A} \leq_w \mathcal{B}$ if and only if $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{B}$ (Corollary 2.4). Another important fact is that we do not need to consider all the generic extensions that make \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} countable. We will prove that for any two such generic extensions if $\mathcal{A} \leq_w \mathcal{B}$ holds in one, then it holds in the other (Lemma 2.3). This shows that generic Muchnik reducibility is a very absolute, and hence, natural, notion of computability-theoretic complexity.

We will also show that the equivalence \equiv_w^* , induced from the reducibility \leq_w^* , respects $\mathcal{L}_{\infty\omega}$ -elementary equivalence. In Section 2.3, we will also exhibit some examples of this reducibility. For instance, we show that the countable structures generically Muchnik reducible to the linear order ω_1 are precisely those Muchnik reducible to some countable well-ordering, and that there are two natural structures, with every countable structure generically reducible to each, one of which is strictly below the other under \leq_w^* .

Closely related to generic reducibility is *generic presentability*.

Definition 1.3. Let \mathbb{P} be a poset in V and let \mathcal{A} be a structure that lives and is countable in a model, W , of ZFC extending V . The structure \mathcal{A} is *generically presented by* \mathbb{P} if for any G that is \mathbb{P} -generic over V , there is a copy \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{A} in $V[G]$ with domain ω . (Here, \mathcal{B} is a *copy* of \mathcal{A} in the sense that there is an isomorphism between them in $W[G]$.) A structure is *generically presented* if it is generically presented by some poset $\mathbb{P} \in V$.

Remark 1.4. Throughout this paper we will be considering structures like \mathcal{A} above that do not necessarily live in V , but in some extension of W . This is, of course, the point of generic presentability: to study structures which do not live in V , but which V can nonetheless talk about to a high level of precision. Once we know that \mathcal{A} is generically presentable, we can replace it by its copy inside one of the generic extensions $V[G]$, and, hence, we could have assumed W was $V[G]$ to begin with. In the definition above, we only require the isomorphism between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} to be in $W[G]$; this is because it only makes sense to talk about isomorphisms between copies that live in the same model, and we have $\mathcal{A} \in W$ and $\mathcal{B} \in V[G]$. We will assume this whenever we use the word “copy” in the rest of the paper.

A different point of view some readers might prefer is to consider countable models M of ZFC and define what it means for a countable structure $\mathcal{A} \in V$ to be *generically presented by* \mathbb{P} *over* M . In this case, since M is countable, it is enough to consider generic extensions $M[G]$ that are still included in V , and when we refer to isomorphisms between structures, we just mean isomorphism in V .

For clarity, we will use the term ω -*copy* to mean a copy \mathcal{B} of a structure $\mathcal{A} \in V$ with domain ω which may live in a larger set-theoretic universe. So, for example, the field of real numbers has an ω -copy living in any generic extension where $(2^{\aleph_0})^V$ is countable.

It is well-known that if a set S is in $V[G]$ for every \mathbb{P} -generic G , then S must belong to V already (Solovay [Sol70]). However, the situation for isomorphic copies of a given structure is more complicated. There are cases in which the analogous fact is true, and there are cases in which it is not. This paper is devoted to analyzing this situation, and its connection to uncountable computability. In particular, if $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{B}$, then \mathcal{B} contains all the information necessary to build \mathcal{A} — up to a certain amount of genericity. To what extent is this genericity actually necessary? Ted Slaman formulated this question as follows:

Main Question (Slaman). *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be structures, and suppose \mathcal{B} is in Gödel’s L . Does $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{B}$ imply that there is a copy of \mathcal{A} in L ?*

(Note that the isomorphism between \mathcal{A} and its hypothetical copy is not required to live in \mathcal{L} .)

We begin by studying the role of forcing-theoretic properties in generic presentability. We prove:

Theorem 1.5. *Let \mathcal{A} be a structure that lives and is countable in an extension W of V . If \mathcal{A} is generically presentable by a forcing notion that does not make ω_2 countable, then \mathcal{A} has a copy in V .*

(Note again that, even if the theorem claims the existence of $\mathcal{B} \in V$ isomorphic to \mathcal{A} , the isomorphism between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is only required to belong to W , which is where \mathcal{A} lives. The copy \mathcal{B} given by the theorem might not be countable in V , but it will be countable in W . See Remark 1.4.)

This theorem yields as a corollary a partial positive answer to Slaman’s question.

Corollary 1.6. *Suppose $\mathcal{B} \in V$ and \mathcal{A} belongs to, and is countable in, an extension W of V . If $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{B}$ for some $\mathcal{B} \in V$ with $|\mathcal{B}| = \aleph_1$, then V contains a copy of \mathcal{A} .*

We can apply the corollary above to L and get that if \mathcal{B} lives in L and, within L , has size \aleph_1^L , then \mathcal{A} has a copy in L .

We also give a new proof of the following result of Harrington.

Theorem 1.7 (Harrington). *If T is a counter-example to Vaught’s conjecture, then it has models of arbitrarily high Scott rank below ω_2 .*

On the other hand, making ω_2 countable always introduces structures with universe ω that do not have copies in V . This provides an exact dichotomy among structures generically presentable, and a negative answer to Slaman’s question in general.

Theorem 1.8. *There is a structure \mathcal{M} in an extension of V such that \mathcal{M} is generically presentable by any notion of forcing that makes ω_2 countable, but \mathcal{M} has no copy in V . Moreover, this \mathcal{M} is generically Muchnik reducible to the ordering $(\omega_2, <)$.*

We close with a structural approach to the question: what properties ensure that generic presentability implies existence in the ground model? We show that this occurs at least when the structures involved are as “set-like” as possible. In Section 4, we show the following.

Theorem 1.9. *Suppose \mathcal{A} is rigid and is generically presentable. Then there is an isomorphic copy of \mathcal{A} already in V .*

2. GENERIC REDUCIBILITY

2.1. Basic properties. The key result for analyzing generic presentability and generic reducibility is the Shoenfield Absoluteness Theorem (see [Jec03]). The version we state below is slightly weaker than the actual theorem, but it is all we will need here:

Theorem 2.1 (Shoenfield). *Suppose φ is a Π_2^1 sentence, with real parameters. Then, for every forcing extension W of V , $V \models \varphi \iff W \models \varphi$.*

An easy fact about (countable) Muchnik reducibility of structures is the following.

Observation 2.2. Basic facts about \leq_w are invariant under forcing. Specifically, we have the following.

- (1) The relation “ \leq_w ” is Π_2^1 .
- (2) For countable \mathcal{A} , the predicate “ $\geq_w \mathcal{A}$ ” is Δ_1^1 in a Scott sentence of \mathcal{A} .

Together with Theorem 2.1, this implies that much of the theory of \leq_w^* is absolute. In particular, we have the next lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Fix arbitrary structures \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} in V . If there is some generic extension in which \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} are countable and $\mathcal{M} \leq_w \mathcal{N}$, then $\mathcal{M} \leq_w^* \mathcal{N}$.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise. Then there must exist posets \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 in V such that forcing with either collapses both \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} ,

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_0} \mathcal{M} \leq_w \mathcal{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_1} \mathcal{M} \not\leq_w \mathcal{N}.$$

Let $G = H_0 \times H_1$ be $\mathbb{P}_0 \times \mathbb{P}_1$ -generic over V . Let \mathcal{M}_0 and \mathcal{N}_0 be reals in $V[H_0]$ coding copies of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} with domain ω , and let \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{N}_1 be reals in $V[H_1]$ coding copies of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} with domain ω . Then, in $V[H_0]$, $\mathcal{M}_0 \leq_w \mathcal{N}_0$, while in $V[H_1]$, $\mathcal{M}_1 \not\leq_w \mathcal{N}_1$. By Shoenfield's absoluteness, this is still true in $V[H_0][H_1]$. This gives us a contradiction because, in $V[H_0][H_1]$, \mathcal{M}_0 is isomorphic to \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{N}_0 to \mathcal{N}_1 . \square

As an immediate corollary of Lemma 2.3, we get the following.

Corollary 2.4. *For structures \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} countable in V , we have $\mathcal{A} \leq_w \mathcal{B}$ if and only if $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{B}$.*

2.2. Potential isomorphism. Generic Muchnik reducibility also has strong connections with infinitary logic.

Definition 2.5. Let \mathcal{L} be a language; that is, a set of relation and operation symbols.

- $\mathcal{L}_{\infty\omega}$ is the collection of formulas obtained from the atomic \mathcal{L} -formulas by closing under arbitrary set-sized Boolean combinations and single instances of quantification. See [Kei71] for a treatment of the basic properties of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty\omega}$.
- For structures \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} of arbitrary cardinality, we say that \mathcal{A} is $\mathcal{L}_{\infty\omega}$ -elementary equivalent to \mathcal{B} , and we write $\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\infty\omega} \mathcal{B}$, if the structures satisfy the same $\mathcal{L}_{\infty\omega}$ sentences.

There is a structural characterization of $\equiv_{\infty\omega}$, due to Carol Karp:

Definition 2.6. Suppose I is a set of partial maps. We say that I has the *back-and-forth property* if $\langle \emptyset, \emptyset \rangle \in I$ and for every $\langle \bar{a}, \bar{b} \rangle \in I$,

- (1) \bar{a} and \bar{b} satisfy the same atomic formulas,
- (2) for every $c \in \mathcal{A}$, there is $d \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $(\bar{a}c, \bar{b}d) \in I$, and
- (3) for every $d \in \mathcal{B}$, there is $c \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $(\bar{a}c, \bar{b}d) \in I$.

An I with the back-and-forth property is called a *back-and-forth system* between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .

Theorem 2.7 ([Kar65]). *$\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\infty\omega} \mathcal{B}$ iff there is a back-and-forth system between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .*

It is then not hard to see that for \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} countable, we have that $\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\infty\omega} \mathcal{B}$ if and only if $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}$. Since Karp's characterization shows that $\equiv_{\infty\omega}$ is absolute, we get that, for uncountable structures, $\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\infty\omega} \mathcal{B}$ iff they are isomorphic when they are made countable:

Lemma 2.8 (Essentially Barwise [Bar73]). *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\infty\omega} \mathcal{B}$,
- (2) on every generic extension where \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are countable, $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}$,
- (3) on some generic extension where \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are countable, $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}$.

As an immediate corollary, we have the following.

Corollary 2.9. *$\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\infty\omega} \mathcal{B}$ implies $\mathcal{A} \equiv_w^* \mathcal{B}$.*

This lets us connect $\equiv_{\infty\omega}$ -equivalence and generic Muchnik reducibility in a strong way:

Lemma 2.10. *Let \mathcal{A} be a structure. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{B}$ for some countable structure \mathcal{B} .

- (2) $\mathcal{A} \equiv_w^* \mathcal{B}$ for some countable structure \mathcal{B} .
 (3) $\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\infty\omega} \mathcal{B}$ for some countable structure \mathcal{B} .

Proof. Clearly (3) implies (2) and (2) implies (1). To see that (1) implies (3), suppose $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{B}$ for \mathcal{B} countable, let B be a copy of \mathcal{B} in V , and let $V[G]$ be a generic extension in which \mathcal{A} is countable. Then in $V[G]$, there is some index e such that, for the e th Turing machine Φ_e , $\Phi_e^B \cong \mathcal{A}$. This means that in V , Φ_e^B must be total, and so Φ_e^B is a copy of \mathcal{A} which lives in V . \square

2.3. Examples. We present below some examples of uncountable structures whose complexity in terms of \leq_w^* we have been able to analyze.

Example 2.11. Let \mathcal{U} be the structure with domain $\omega \sqcup \mathcal{P}(\omega)$, with signature consisting of only the \in -relation on $\omega \times \mathcal{P}(\omega)$.

Proposition 2.12. $\mathcal{U} \equiv_w^* 0$, where 0 is the empty structure.

Proof. We will show there is a computable structure \mathcal{S} that is $\equiv_{\infty\omega}$ -equivalent to \mathcal{U} . By the absoluteness of $\equiv_{\infty\omega}$, we will then have that in any generic extension that makes \mathcal{U} countable, \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{U} are still $\equiv_{\infty\omega}$ -equivalent, and, hence, isomorphic.

We note that the orbit in \mathcal{U} of a tuple of sets \bar{X} is determined by the cardinalities of the Boolean combinations of the sets X_i . To guarantee that we have a back-and-forth family of finite partial isomorphisms, we let \mathcal{S} consist of ω together with a family of sets P having the following properties:

- P is an algebra of sets; i.e., it is closed under union, intersection, and complement,
- P includes all finite sets,
- if $X \in P$ is infinite, then there are disjoint $Y, Z \in P$, both infinite, such that $Y \cup Z = X$.

We can easily find such an \mathcal{S} which is computable. We could, for example, take the family of primitive recursive sets. \square

Similarly, the field of complex numbers is essentially computable.

Example 2.13. Let $\mathcal{C} = (\mathbb{C}; +, \times)$. This is $\equiv_{\infty\omega}$ -equivalent to the algebraically closed field of countably infinite transcendence degree and characteristic zero. By a well-known result of Rabin [Rab60], this has a computable copy. Then \mathcal{C} has minimal complexity; that is, \mathcal{C} has a computable copy in every generic extension in which it is countable.

If we consider a variant of \mathcal{U} in which the elements of ω have names, we reach the opposite end of the complexity spectrum:

Example 2.14. Let \mathcal{W} be the expansion of \mathcal{U} including the successor relation on ω . Then any ω -copy (1.4) of \mathcal{W} computes every real in the ground model V , so given any countable $\mathcal{A} \in V$ we have $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{W}$.

The situation is the same with respect to the real numbers.

Example 2.15. The field of real numbers $\mathcal{R} = (\mathbb{R}; +, \times)$ is, like \mathcal{W} , maximally complicated with respect to countable structures: for every countable structure \mathcal{A} , we have $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{R}$. To see this, suppose $V[G]$ is a generic extension in which \mathcal{R} has an ω -copy, \mathbb{R} . First, note that the standard ordering $<_{\mathbb{R}}$ is both Σ_1 and Π_1 over \mathcal{R} , and so the corresponding relation on \mathbb{R} is computable relative to \mathbb{R} .¹

Now fix a real in the ground model $b \in \mathcal{R}$ and let $\hat{b} \in \mathbb{R}$ be the corresponding element of the ω -copy. Since $<_{\mathbb{R}}$ is computable from the atomic diagram of \mathbb{R} , so is the cut corresponding to

¹That is, $<_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a *relatively intrinsically computable* relation.

b , so every real in the ground model is computable from the atomic diagram of \mathbf{R} . Since \mathbf{R} was an arbitrary ω -copy of \mathcal{R} in an arbitrary generic extension, it follows that $\mathcal{R} \geq_w^* \mathcal{A}$ for every countable $\mathcal{A} \in V$.

We would now like to compare the structures \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{W} under \leq_w^* . It is east to show the following.

Proposition 2.16. $\mathcal{R} \geq_w^* \mathcal{W}$

Proof. We can use the elements of \mathcal{R} in the interval $[0, 1)$ to enumerate the subsets of ω in V . To each real r in the interval, we associate the set A_r consisting of those n such that the n^{th} term in the binary expansion of r is 1. Minimal care has to be taken for double binary representations: if we assume no binary expansion ends up in an infinite string of 1s, we then need to add those sets. \square

Question 1. Do we have $\mathcal{W} \geq_w^* \mathcal{R}$?

For an elementary extension \mathcal{M} of \mathcal{R} that is ω -saturated, we have $\mathcal{W} \geq_w^* \mathcal{M}$. More generally, we have the following.

Proposition 2.17. *Let \mathcal{M} be an ω -saturated model of a decidable complete elementary first order theory T . Then $\mathcal{W} \geq_w^* \mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. Macintyre and Marker [MM84] showed that for an enumeration \mathcal{E} of a Scott set \mathcal{S} , and an elementary first order theory T in \mathcal{S} , \mathcal{E} computes the complete diagram of a recursively saturated model of T realizing exactly the types in \mathcal{S} that are consistent with T . After we collapse the cardinal so that \mathcal{W} becomes computable, it computes an enumeration \mathcal{E} of the Scott set \mathcal{S} consisting of the subsets of ω in \mathcal{W} . Now, the theory of \mathcal{M} is in \mathcal{S} , and the types realized in \mathcal{M} are exactly those in \mathcal{S} that are consistent with T . Then the result of Macintyre and Marker yields a recursively saturated model realizing exactly these types. This model is isomorphic to the collapse of \mathcal{M} . \square

Finally, uncountable well-orderings live strictly between the two extremes.

Example 2.18. The linear order $\omega_1 = (\omega_1, <)$ computes precisely those countable structures which are Muchnik reducible to some countable well-ordering. One direction is obvious; in the other direction, suppose $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \omega_1$ is countable, and let $V[G]$ be a forcing extension in which ω_1 is countable. Then $V[G]$ satisfies “ \mathcal{A} is weakly reducible to a countable well-ordering,” which is Σ_2^1 via 2.2, and so already true in V by Shoenfield absoluteness.

Proposition 2.19. $\mathcal{R} >_w^* \omega_1$ strictly.

Proof. To see that $\mathcal{R} \not\leq_w^* \omega_1$, fix some non-computable real $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Then the cut corresponding to r , and hence r itself, is computable in any ω -copy \mathbf{R} of \mathcal{R} in any generic extension since the ordering relation is both Σ_1 and Π_1 . On the other hand, by a result of Richter [Ric81], the only sets computable in all copies of a countable linear ordering are the computable sets, so in any generic extension in which ω_1 is countable there will be ω -copies of ω_1 whose atomic diagrams do not compute r .

To see that $\omega_1 \leq_w^* \mathcal{R}$, suppose $V[G]$ is a generic extension in which \mathcal{R} is countable, and let $\mathbf{R} \in V[G]$ be a copy of \mathcal{R} with domain ω . Now \mathbf{R} computes an enumeration of the sets coded by the cuts in \mathcal{R} —the reals in V . Some of the reals code linear orderings. For an ordering r coded in \mathbf{R} , if r is not a well ordering, this is witnessed by a decreasing sequence d , also coded in \mathbf{R} . A countable well ordering in V is isomorphic to a countable ordinal, so it stays well ordered in $V[G]$. Using \mathbf{R}'' , we get an ω -sequence of well-orderings: For $a \in \mathbf{R}$, we take the ordering coded by a , if this is a well ordering, and otherwise, we have a finite ordering.

The result is an ordering of type ω_1^V . Now, we apply in $V[G]$ the theorem saying that, for any set X and any linear order \mathcal{L} , if X'' computes a copy of \mathcal{L} then X computes a copy of $\omega \cdot \mathcal{L}$ ([AK00], Theorem 9.11). Since $\omega_1^V \cong \omega \cdot \omega_1^V$, our R computes a copy of ω_1^V . \square

By a similar argument, we also have $\mathcal{W} >_w^* \omega_1$.

2.4. Generic presentability. We end this section with some basic results about generic presentability, which will be used in the remaining sections. First, we recall Solovay's proof that every generically presentable set is already present in the ground model.

Theorem 2.20 (Solovay [Sol70]). *Suppose S is a set present in every generic extension of V by \mathbb{P} . Then $S \in V$.*

Proof. Let us start by proving that there is a single name ν such that $\nu[G] = S$ for every \mathbb{P} -generic G . Fix a generic H so that we can talk about S within $V[H]$. If there is no single name ν such that $\nu[G] = S$ for every \mathbb{P} -generic G , then for every name $\nu \in V^{\mathbb{P}}$ there is some generic G over $V[H]$ with $\nu[G] \neq S$. Then, for each $\nu \in V^{\mathbb{P}}$, the set $\{p \in \mathbb{P} : p \Vdash \nu \neq S\}$ is dense and is in $V[H]$ since $S \in V[H]$. But then, if G is \mathbb{P} -generic over $V[H]$, $S \notin V[G]$, so S is not generically presentable.

Let us now go back to the proof of the theorem. Suppose $S \notin V$. Let S be a counterexample of minimal rank α . Then each element of S is in V , and in particular in the set V_α . Let

$$\hat{S} = \{x \in V_\alpha : \exists p \in \mathbb{P}(p \Vdash x \in \nu)\}.$$

Then clearly $\hat{S} = S$, and so $S \in V$. \square

The goal of this paper is to investigate the extent to which Solovay's theorem holds for structures, and, in particular, to understand how it interacts with computability in generic extensions. As we will see in Section 3.3, the proof of Solovay's theorem cannot be naively extended to structures. However, one key step still holds, and this greatly simplifies arguments involving generic presentability.

Lemma 2.21. *Suppose \mathcal{N} is generically presentable by \mathbb{P} . Then there is some name $\nu \in V^{\mathbb{P}}$ such that $\nu[G] \cong \mathcal{N}$ for every \mathbb{P} -generic G .*

If \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{N} , and ν are as above, we say that \mathcal{N} is *generically presentable by \mathbb{P} via ν* .

Proof. This is a generalization of the first paragraph of the proof of Solovay's Theorem (Theorem 2.20). Fix H_0 \mathbb{P} -generic over V . Since \mathcal{N} is generically presentable, there is a name μ such that $\mu[H_0] \cong \mathcal{N}$. Looking at the product forcing \mathbb{P}^2 , there exist a condition $p \in H_0$ and a name ν such that

$$(p, 1) \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}^2} \mu[g_0] \cong \nu[g_1].$$

We claim that ν names a copy of \mathcal{N} in all generic extensions. To see this, fix a \mathbb{P} -generic filter G_1 . We can find G_0, H_1 such that

- $p \subseteq G_0$ and G_0 is \mathbb{P} -generic over $V[G_1]$,
- H_1 is \mathbb{P} -generic over $V[H_0]$, and
- $G_0 \times H_1$ is \mathbb{P}^2 -generic over V .

Then we have

$$\nu[G_1] \cong \mu[G_0] \cong \nu[H_1] \cong \mu[H_0] \cong \mathcal{N}. \quad \square$$

Finally, although it is not directly useful to the results of this paper, we note that being “generically generically presentable” is the same as being generically presentable.

Proposition 2.22. *If \mathcal{A} is generically presentable over $V[G]$ for every \mathbb{P} -generic filter G , then \mathcal{A} is generically presentable over V .*

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of Lemma 2.21 above, except that instead of a name ν for \mathcal{A} , we work with a name $\hat{\nu}$ for a pair $\langle \mathbb{Q}, \mu \rangle$ where \mathbb{Q} is a poset and μ is a \mathbb{Q} -name; this is just the “two-step iteration” version of Lemma 2.21. \square

3. GENERIC PRESENTABILITY AND ω_2

In this section and the next, we address the question “when do generically presentable structures have copies in V ?” This section focuses on a forcing-theoretic aspect of the question. For which forcing notions \mathbb{P} do we have copies in V for all structures generically presentable by \mathbb{P} with universe ω ? Surprisingly, this is entirely determined by how \mathbb{P} affects cardinals: ω_2 remains uncountable after forcing with \mathbb{P} if and only if every structure generically presentable by \mathbb{P} on ω has a copy in V .

As a consequence of proving the left-to-right direction of this result, we also give a new proof of the result due to Harrington that counterexamples to Vaught’s conjecture must have models of arbitrarily high Scott rank in ω_2 . The right-to-left direction follows from a construction of Laskowski and Shelah [LS93].

3.1. Scott Analysis. We begin by reviewing the *Scott analysis* of a structure. Scott [Sco65] proved that for every countable structure \mathcal{A} , there is an infinitary sentence σ of $L_{\omega_1\omega}$ such that the countable models of σ are exactly the isomorphic copies of \mathcal{A} . Such a sentence is called a *Scott sentence*.

There are several definitions of *Scott rank* in the literature (see, in particular, [Bar75], [AK00], [MS08], [CKM06], and [Mon]). The definitions give slightly different values. However, all of the definitions assign countable Scott ranks to countable structures. In general, the complexity of the Scott sentence is only a little greater than the Scott rank of the structure. If one definition assigns a computable ordinal Scott rank, then the other definitions do as well, and then there is a Scott sentence that is Σ_α , for some computable ordinal α . The definition that we give below is the one used by Sacks [Sac07]. We begin by defining a family of definable expansions of \mathcal{A} .

Definition 3.1. We first have to review the Scott analysis of a structure. (See [Sac07].) For each α , we define a fragment $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$ of $L_{\infty,\omega}$ as follows:

- Let $\mathfrak{L}_0^{\mathcal{A}}$ consists of the first order formulas.
- Given $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$, for each complete non-principal type $\Phi(x) \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$ realized in \mathcal{A} , add the formula $\bigwedge \Phi(x)$ to $\mathfrak{L}_{\alpha+1}^{\mathcal{A}}$, and close under first order connectives and quantifiers.
- At limit levels, take unions.

For each α there is a natural way to expand \mathcal{A} to a $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$ -structure \mathcal{A}_α ; we will abuse notation by omitting the subscript, since no confusion will arise.

At some step α , \mathcal{A} becomes $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$ -atomic, in the sense that all $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$ -types are principal.

Definition 3.2. The *Scott rank* of \mathcal{A} , $sr(\mathcal{A})$, is the least ordinal α such that \mathcal{A} is an $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$ -atomic structure.

Lemma 3.3. *If \mathcal{A} is generically presentable, then, for every ordinal β , $\mathfrak{L}_\beta^{\mathcal{A}} \in V$.*

Proof. First, let us remark that we can code the formulas in $\mathfrak{L}_\beta^{\mathcal{A}}$ by sets: for instance, we code an infinitary conjunction of formulas ψ_i by a pair, the first element being a code that means “conjunction” and the second element being the set of codes for the formulas ψ_i — say, by defining $code(\bigwedge_{i \in I} \psi_i(x)) = \langle 17, \{code(\psi_i(x)) : i \in I\} \rangle$. This is quite standard, so we let the reader fill in the details.

The one important detail is that we are not coding infinitary conjunctions using sequences of formulas, but using sets where the order of the formulas does not matter. The key point is

that if we have different presentations of a structure \mathcal{A} , the types realized in each presentation are the same as sets. We can then prove by induction on β , that $\mathfrak{L}_\beta^{\mathcal{A}}$ is a set that is independent of the presentation of \mathcal{A} . Since \mathcal{A} is generically presentable, say by a forcing notion \mathbb{P} , the language $\mathfrak{L}_\beta^{\mathcal{A}}$ belongs to all \mathbb{P} -forcing extensions of V , and so by Solovay's Theorem 2.20, we get that $\mathfrak{L}_\beta^{\mathcal{A}}$ belongs to V . \square

Definition 3.4. Given a structure \mathcal{A} , let $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ be the language containing a relation symbol for each formula in $\mathfrak{L}_{sr(\mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{A}}$ (the *Morleyization* of $\mathfrak{L}_{sr(\mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{A}}$), and let $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ be the natural expansion of \mathcal{A} to the language $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$. Note that if \mathcal{A} is generically presentable, then $\hat{\mathcal{L}} \in V$ since $\mathfrak{L}_{sr(\mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{A}} \in V$.

Notice that $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is atomic in a very strong way: each $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ -type is generated by a quantifier-free $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ -formula.

Remark 3.5. Throughout this section we will tacitly assume that \mathcal{L} (and hence $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ as well) is no larger than \mathcal{A} ; that is, that the statement “ $|\mathcal{L}| \leq |\mathcal{A}|$ ” is true in every forcing extension by \mathbb{P} (where \mathbb{P} is a forcing generically presenting \mathcal{A}). This assumption is used, for example, in 3.7 below, and is necessary for straightforwardly applying the facts about amalgamation we will prove in section 3.2. Note that this assumption holds for the vast majority of natural structures.

Lemma 3.6. *If \mathcal{A} is generically presentable, then so is $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. We already showed that $\mathfrak{L}_{sr(\mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{A}} \in V$, so $\hat{\mathcal{L}} \in V$. There is only one way to expand \mathcal{A} to the $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ -structure $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$. So, $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ has a presentation with domain ω in every generic extension of V where \mathcal{A} does. \square

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose \mathcal{A} is generically presentable by a forcing notion that does not collapse ω_1 . Then \mathcal{A} has a copy in V with domain ω .*

Proof. Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion that does not collapse ω_1 , and for which \mathcal{A} is generically presentable. Since $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is generically presentable, and $\hat{\mathcal{L}} \in V$, we have that $Th_{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}(\hat{\mathcal{A}})$, the $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ -theory of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$, is a set of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ sentences that belongs to all \mathbb{P} -generic extensions. Thus, $Th_{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}(\hat{\mathcal{A}}) \in V$.

In all of these extensions, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ is countable (because \mathcal{A} is), and, hence, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ cannot be uncountable in V . Otherwise, there would be an injection from ω_1 into $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$, and since \mathbb{P} does not collapse ω_1 , $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ would stay uncountable in $V[G]$.

Now, in each of these generic extensions, $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is the unique countable atomic model of $Th_{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}(\hat{\mathcal{A}})$. The existence of such a model is a Σ_1^1 statement with $Th_{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}(\hat{\mathcal{A}})$ as parameter. By absoluteness, this must be true in V too, and by the uniqueness of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ in $V[G]$, this model must be isomorphic to $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$. \square

3.2. Keeping ω_2 uncountable. We now turn to the *Fraïssé limit* construction, first used in [Fra00]:

Definition 3.8. Fix a relational language \mathcal{L} . For an \mathcal{L} -structure \mathcal{B} , we denote by $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{B}}$ the set of finite substructures of \mathcal{B} , and we call $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{B}}$ the *age* of \mathcal{B} . For \mathbf{K} a set of finite structures and \mathcal{A} a structure, we say that \mathcal{A} is the *Fraïssé limit* of \mathbf{K} if $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbf{K}$ and the set of isomorphisms between finite substructures of \mathcal{A} has the back-and-forth property.

It is clear from the definition that if \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are countable Fraïssé limits for the same age \mathbf{K} , then $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}$. A given age may have non-isomorphic uncountable Fraïssé limits. For example, if \mathbf{K} is the set of finite linear orderings, the Fraïssé limits are the dense linear orderings without endpoints, and there are many — in fact, 2^{\aleph_1} many, the most possible — non-isomorphic ones of cardinality \aleph_1 .

Lemma 3.9. *If \mathcal{A} is generically presentable, then $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}} \in V$.*

Proof. This follows from Solovay’s Theorem 2.20: $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a set of finite structures that is independent of the presentation of \mathcal{A} . \square

Using the same argument as in Proposition 3.7, we get a bound on the size of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}$:

Corollary 3.10. *If \mathcal{A} is generically presentable by a forcing not making ω_2 countable, then $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}$ have size $\leq \aleph_1$ in V .*

Fraïssé [Fra00] proved that if \mathbf{K} is a countable set of finite structures satisfying the Hereditary Property (HP), the Joint Embedding Property (JEP) and the Amalgamation Property (AP), then it has a Fraïssé limit (see 6.1 of [Hod97] for definitions). The next lemma says that this is still the case when \mathbf{K} has size \aleph_1 . The earliest reference we know is Delhomme, Pouzet, Sagi, and Sauer [DPSS09, Corollary 2, p. 1378]. We give the proof because we want to make clear that the result does not automatically generalize to ages of size $> \aleph_1$; and indeed, we will see in the next subsection that there is an age of size \aleph_2 with no limit (3.18).

Lemma 3.11. *Let \mathbf{K} be a family of \aleph_1 finite structures on a relational language \mathcal{L} of size $\leq \aleph_1$. If \mathbf{K} has HP, JEP, and AP, then there is a Fraïssé limit \mathcal{A} with age \mathbf{K} .*

Proof. The key is the following:

Claim: Suppose we have embeddings $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ where $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbf{K}$ and \mathcal{C} is countable and its age is a subset of \mathbf{K} . Then there is a countable structure \mathcal{D} , whose age is a subset of \mathbf{K} , and which amalgamates these embeddings.

To prove the claim, write \mathcal{C} as the union of an increasing sequence $\{\mathcal{C}_n : n \in \omega\}$ where each $\mathcal{C}_n \in \mathbf{K}$, and with $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathcal{A}$. Let $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{B}$, and note that we have an embedding from \mathcal{C}_0 to \mathcal{D}_0 . Given \mathcal{D}_n , by induction we will have an embedding from \mathcal{C}_n into \mathcal{D}_n , and \mathcal{D}_n will be an element of \mathbf{K} ; and by definition we have an embedding from \mathcal{C}_n into \mathcal{C}_{n+1} . We then form \mathcal{D}_{n+1} by amalgamating the embeddings $\mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{n+1}$ and $\mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_n$ within \mathbf{K} . The direct limit \mathcal{D} of the \mathcal{D}_i is the desired amalgamation.

Now we prove the lemma. Suppose \mathbf{K} is such a family of finite structures. There is a sequence $(\mathcal{A}_\xi)_{\xi \in \omega_1}$ of structures such that:

- $\xi_0 < \xi_1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\xi_0} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\xi_1}$;
- each \mathcal{A}_ξ is countable and its age is a subset of \mathbf{K} ; and
- for every $\xi \in \omega_1$ and $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{K}$ and every pair of embeddings $\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\xi$, there is $\gamma > \xi$ and an embedding $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\gamma$ compatible with the inclusion $\mathcal{A}_\xi \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\gamma$.

The union \mathcal{A} of the \mathcal{A}_ξ clearly has age \mathbf{K} . It is clear from the construction that the set of finite partial isomorphisms has the back-and-forth property. \square

Note that the limit \mathcal{A} constructed above need not be \aleph_1 -homogeneous or unique.

Corollary 3.12. *Let \mathcal{B} be an \mathcal{L} -structure that lives in an extension of the universe and is ω -homogeneous in the sense that the family of isomorphisms between finite substructures has the back-and-forth property. Suppose \mathcal{B} is generically presentable, and $|\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{B}}|, |\mathcal{L}| \leq \aleph_1$ in V . Then in V there is a structure $\infty\omega$ -equivalent to \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. Since \mathcal{B} is generically presentable, we have that $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{B}} \in V$ by Lemma 3.9. Since \mathcal{B} is ω -homogeneous, $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{B}}$ has HP, JEP and AP in any model where \mathcal{B} lives; in particular, $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{B}}$ has these properties in V . Since $|\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{B}}| \leq \aleph_1$ and $|\mathcal{L}| \leq \aleph_1$ in V , by Lemma 3.11 we have that $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{B}}$ has a Fraïssé limit \mathcal{F} in V . In a generic extension presenting \mathcal{B} , the age $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{B}}$ —and, hence, the Fraïssé limit \mathcal{F} —will be countable. Then $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{B}$, by the uniqueness of countable Fraïssé limits, so \mathcal{F} is the required structure $\infty\omega$ -equivalent to \mathcal{B} which lives in V . \square

We are now ready to prove the main positive result of this section.

Theorem 3.13. *Let \mathcal{A} be a structure in an extension W of V , and assume \mathcal{A} is countable in W . Suppose \mathcal{A} is generically presentable by a forcing notion that does not make ω_2 countable. Then there is a copy of \mathcal{A} in V , with cardinality at most \aleph_1 in V .*

(Recall that the conclusion of the theorem should be read as: there is a structure $\mathcal{B} \in V$ of cardinality at most \aleph_1 in V , which is isomorphic to \mathcal{A} in W . See Remark 1.4.)

Proof. Let \mathcal{L} be the language of \mathcal{A} . Since \mathcal{A} is generically presentable, by Lemma 3.3, we know that $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ is in V and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is generically presentable. Consider some generic extension $V[G]$ by a forcing which generically presents \mathcal{A} and which does not make ω_2 countable. Using in $V[G]$ the fact that Scott ranks of countable structures are countable, since ω_2^V is still uncountable in $V[G]$ the language $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ has size $\leq \aleph_1$ in V . This implies that $\mathbf{K}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}$ is in V by Lemmas 3.6 and 3.9 and has size $\leq \aleph_1$ in V by 3.10. Now, we can apply Corollary 3.12 to get a copy of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ which lives in V (of course, $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ need not be countable in V). Intuitively, we now want to take the reduct of this copy to \mathcal{L} , but $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ need not include \mathcal{L} (for instance, if two \mathcal{L} -symbols have the same interpretation); instead, from $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ we can now “decode” the correct interpretations of each of the symbols in \mathcal{L} , and thus produce a copy of \mathcal{A} itself. \square

Note that Theorem 3.13 does not directly imply Remark 3.7, since the latter concludes that the generically presentable structure in question has a *countable* copy in V .

We may apply Theorem 3.13 to prove the following.

Theorem 3.14 (Harrington, unpublished). *If T is a counterexample to Vaught’s Conjecture, then for each $\alpha < \omega_2$, T has a model of size \aleph_1 with Scott rank $\geq \alpha$.*

Proof. Recall that if T is a counterexample to Vaught’s conjecture it has countable models of arbitrary Scott rank below ω_1 . Being a counterexample to Vaught’s conjecture is a Π_2^1 property ([Mor70]; see also [Sac07], Proposition 5.1) and hence absolute.

Let $\mathbb{P} = \omega_1^{<\omega}$ be the usual Levy collapse of ω_1 and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic. Since T is a counterexample to Vaught’s conjecture, in $V[G]$ we have a countable model \mathcal{B} of Scott rank $\geq \alpha$. We claim that \mathcal{B} is generically presentable over V by \mathbb{P} . This would give us the claimed result: since \mathbb{P} does not collapse ω_2 , by Theorem 3.13, we would have a copy of \mathcal{B} of size \aleph_1 in V , and since Scott rank is absolute, this copy is as wanted.

Let us now prove that \mathcal{B} is indeed generically presentable over V by \mathbb{P} . Fix a \mathbb{P} -generic G , and a name $\nu \in V$ for \mathcal{B} in $V[G]$. The idea is to show that whenever we have two mutually generics, ν gives us non-isomorphic models of T , and hence if we add continuum many mutually generics, we get continuum many different countable models of T . It is enough to show that for every H which is \mathbb{P} -generic over $V[G]$, there is a structure in $V[H]$ that is isomorphic within $V[G][H]$ to $\nu[G]$. Suppose this is not the case. Then, there is some \mathbb{P} condition q forcing, in $V[G]$, that there is no copy of \mathcal{B} in $V[H]$ for every extension H of q . Since this sentence is invariant under finite changes in H , we can assume q is the empty condition. Now, since G is generic over V , there is a $p \subset G$ which forces this. Assume that p also forces that $\nu[G]$ is a model of T . So, we get that, the $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}$ -condition (p, p) forces that $\nu[G]$ and $\nu[H]$ are not isomorphic in $V[G][H]$, and are both countable models of T .

Now, consider a forcing notion \mathbb{Q} that adds perfectly many \mathbb{P} -generics. (This is quite standard: for instance let \mathbb{Q} be the set of finite partial maps from $2^{<\omega}$ to $\omega_1^{<\omega}$ and then obtain the \mathbb{P} generics by concatenating the $\omega_1^{<\omega}$ -strings along each path in 2^ω .) In this generic extension of V , we get continuum many countable models of T . Since being a counterexample to Vaught’s conjecture is absolute, this is a contradiction. \square

Remark 3.15. Recently, Baldwin, S.-D. Friedman, Koerwien, and Laskowski [BFKL] have given a new proof of Harrington’s result using similar genericity arguments; their proof uses a generic version of the Morley tree, which they show is invariant across forcing extensions.

Finally, we can use Theorem 3.13 to give a partial positive answer to Slaman’s question:

Corollary 3.16. *Suppose \mathcal{A} lives in an extension of the universe and $\mathcal{A} \leq_w^* \mathcal{B}$ for some $\mathcal{B} \in V$ with cardinality $\leq \aleph_1$. Then \mathcal{A} has a copy in V .*

Proof. Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion that collapses ω_1 while keeping ω_2 uncountable, such as $\mathbb{P} = \omega_1^{<\omega}$. Let $V[G]$ be a generic extension by \mathbb{P} . Then \mathcal{B} is countable in $V[G]$, and, a fortiori, there is a copy of \mathcal{A} in $V[G]$. It follows that \mathcal{A} is \mathbb{P} -generically presentable. Then by Theorem 3.13, there is a copy of \mathcal{A} in V . \square

3.3. Collapsing ω_2 to ω . We close this section by presenting a strong negative result, coming from a construction due to Shelah and Laskowski [LS93]. Throughout the rest of this section, we abbreviate the linear order $(\omega_2, <)$ by “ ω_2 .”

Theorem 3.17. *There is a structure \mathcal{A} , generically presentable by any forcing making ω_2 countable, but with no copy in V .*

Proof. Laskowski and Shelah [LS93] gave an example of an elementary first order theory T , in a countable language, such that:

- (1) The language has a sort \mathbf{V} such that, for every model \mathcal{M} of T and every subset $A \subseteq \mathbf{V}^{\mathcal{M}}$, $T(A)$ has an atomic model if and only if $|A| \leq \aleph_1$.
- (2) T has a countable model \mathcal{M}_0 such that $\mathbf{V}^{\mathcal{M}_0}$ is totally indiscernible in the sense that any permutation of $\mathbf{V}^{\mathcal{M}_0}$ extends to an automorphism of \mathcal{M}_0 . Furthermore, \mathcal{M}_0 is atomic over $\mathbf{V}^{\mathcal{M}_0}$.

For \mathcal{C} a countable structure, let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$ be the two-sorted structure with one sort corresponding to a copy of \mathcal{C} , one sort corresponding to a copy of \mathcal{M}_0 , and with a function symbol f providing a bijection between \mathcal{C} and $\mathbf{V}_0^{\mathcal{M}}$. Since the elements of $\mathbf{V}^{\mathcal{M}_0}$ are totally indiscernible, any two choices of f yield isomorphic structures, so $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is well-defined.

Now consider the “structure” \mathcal{M}_{ω_2} which lives in any extension of the universe where ω_2 is countable. Thus, \mathcal{M}_{ω_2} is generically presentable by $Col(\omega_2, \omega)$. However, there is no copy of \mathcal{M}_{ω_2} in V : Since if the first sort is really ω_2 , of size \aleph_2 , then in the second sort, the predicate \mathbf{V} has size \aleph_2 . But, by the assumption on \mathcal{M}_0 , $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is always atomic over \mathcal{C} (a fact that is absolute), and by the assumption on T , $T(\mathbf{V}^{\mathcal{M}_{\omega_2}})$ has no atomic models. \square

The structure of Laskowski and Shelah also provides a counterexample to a natural extension of Lemma 3.11.

Corollary 3.18. *There is an age S of size \aleph_2 with the Hereditary, Joint Embedding, and Amalgamation properties but for which there is no Fraïssé limit.*

Proof. Consider the theory $T(A) = Th(\mathcal{M}_0, a_{a \in A})$, where $A = A^{\mathcal{M}}$ has size \aleph_2 . The principal types are dense, but $T(A)$ has no atomic model. We add predicate symbols for the principal types. For $B \subseteq A$ of size up to \aleph_1 , there is an atomic model of the corresponding theory $T(B) = Th(\mathcal{M}_0, a_{a \in B})$. Let K consist of the finite substructures of the atomic models of the theories $T(B)$. In total, what we have is appropriate to be the age for an atomic model of $T(A)$. That is, we have the Hereditary, Joint Embedding, and Amalgamation properties (essentially [LS93], pg. 3). However, any Fraïssé limit of S would yield an atomic model of $T(A)$, so the Fraïssé limit cannot exist. \square

4. GENERICALLY PRESENTABLE RIGID STRUCTURES

In the previous section, we gave a complete characterization of those posets \mathbb{P} with the property that every structure generically presentable by \mathbb{P} has a copy already in the ground model. In this section, we examine the dual question: what properties of *structures* ensure that generic presentability implies the existence of a copy in the ground model? Specifically, we extend Solovay's Theorem 2.20 to structures that are sufficiently "set-like:"

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose \mathcal{N} is a rigid structure with language \mathcal{L} , generically presentable by \mathbb{P} . Then there is a copy of \mathcal{N} in V .*

Proof. We assume \mathcal{L} is relational; note that since \mathcal{N} is generically presentable, and \mathcal{L} is a set, we have $\mathcal{L} \in V$. By Lemma 2.21, there is a single name ν which names a copy of \mathcal{N} in any generic extension by \mathbb{P} . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\Vdash \text{dom}(\nu) = \omega$. On $\omega \times \mathbb{P}$, we then define the relation \equiv as follows:

$$(a, p) \equiv (b, q) \iff (p, q) \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}^2} \text{"}\{(a, b)\} \text{ extends to an isomorphism } \nu[g_0] \cong \nu[g_1].\text{"}$$

If $(a, p) \equiv (a, p)$, we say a is *stable* in p , and we write \mathbb{M} for the set $\{(a, p) : a \text{ is stable in } p\}$.

Lemma 4.2. *The relation \equiv is an equivalence relation on \mathbb{M} .*

Proof. Symmetry is clear, and reflexivity is immediate from the definition of \mathbb{M} . For transitivity, suppose $(a, p) \equiv (b, q) \equiv (c, r)$, and let $G_0 \times G_1$ be \mathbb{P}^2 -generic over V with $p \in G_0, r \in G_1$; and let H be \mathbb{P} -generic over $V[G_0 \times G_1]$ -generic, with $q \in H$. Then clearly in $V[G_0 \times G_1][H]$, there is an isomorphism between $\nu[G_0]$ and $\nu[G_1]$ taking a to c ; but this is a Σ_1^1 property, and so already true in $V[G_0 \times G_1]$. Thus, $(a, p) \equiv (c, r)$. \square

Now let M be the set of \equiv -classes of elements of \mathbb{M} . The basic properties of M , which parallel the properties of ages needed for Fraïssé constructions, are:

Lemma 4.3. *For $p \in \mathbb{P}, a \in \omega$,*

- (1) **(Extension)** *if a is stable in p and $q \leq p$, then a is stable in q and $(a, p) \equiv (a, q)$;*
- (2) **(Genericity)** *there is some $q \leq p$ with a stable in q ; and*
- (3) **(Amalgamation)** *for $(a_1, p_1), \dots, (a_n, p_n) \in M$, and $s \in \mathbb{P}$, there is some condition $r \in \mathbb{P}$ with $r \leq s$ and $c_1, \dots, c_n \in X$ such that $(c_1, r), \dots, (c_n, r) \in M$ and $(c_1, r) \equiv (a_1, p_1), \dots, (c_n, r) \equiv (a_n, p_n)$.*

Proof. (1): That a is stable in q is immediate from the definition of stability. To see that $(a, p) \equiv (a, q)$, note that any pair of generics H_0, H_1 witnessing the failure of $(a, p) \equiv (a, q)$ would also witness the instability of (a, p) .

(2): Consider the condition $(p, p) \in \mathbb{P}^2$. By our assumption on ν , there must be some condition $(q, q') \leq (p, p)$ and $a' \in X$ such that

$$(q, q') \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}^2} \{(a, a')\} \text{ extends to an isomorphism } \nu[g_0] \cong \nu[g_1].$$

It now follows that a is stable in q : given $G_0 \times G_1$ \mathbb{P}^2 -generic over V extending (q, q') , fix some H which is \mathbb{P} -generic over $V[G_0 \times G_1]$ with $q' \in H$. Then, clearly, in $V[G_0 \times G_1][H]$ there is an isomorphism between $\nu[G_0]$ and $\nu[G_1]$ extending $\{(a, a')\}$; but this is a Σ_1^1 fact, so already true in $V[G_0 \times G_1]$.

(3): For simplicity, assume $s = \emptyset$ and $n = 2$. Working in \mathbb{P}^3 , by our assumption on ν we can find conditions $p'_1, p'_2, r' \in \mathbb{P}$ and $c_1, c_2 \in X$ with $p'_1 \leq p_1, p'_2 \leq p_2$, and

$$(p'_1, p'_2, r') \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}^3} \{(a_1, c_1)\} \text{ and } \{(a_2, c_2)\} \text{ extend to } \nu[G_0] \cong \nu[G_2] \text{ and } \nu[G_1] \cong \nu[G_2],$$

respectively. Applying Lemma 4.3(2) twice to r' then yields an $r \leq r'$ with c_1, c_2 stable in r , so that $(c_1, r), (c_2, r) \in M$, and it is easily checked that $(c_1, r) \equiv (a_1, p_1)$ and $(c_2, r) \equiv (a_2, p_2)$. \square

Finally, the following result is where rigidity is used. Intuitively, rigidity plays the role in our proof that ω -homogeneity plays in standard Fraïssé limit constructions.

Lemma 4.4. (Simultaneity) *Suppose $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ and $i_1, \dots, i_n: \subseteq \omega \rightarrow \omega$ are partial maps in V with disjoint domains which are each forced by (p, q) in \mathbb{P}^2 to extend to isomorphisms $j_1, \dots, j_n: \nu[G_0] \cong \nu[G_1]$. Then*

$$(p, q) \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}^2} \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq n} i_j \text{ extends to an isomorphism } \nu[G_0] \cong \nu[G_1].$$

Note that this result immediately implies the seemingly stronger result in which disjointness of domains is not assumed.

Proof. We will prove the lemma in the case where $n = 2$, $p = q$, $i_1 = \{(a, a)\}$ and $i_2 = \{(b, b)\}$ for some distinct $a, b \in \omega$; the general result is no different. Note that the assumption on i_j in this case means just that a and b are stable in p .

Let $G_0 \times G_1$ be \mathbb{P}^2 -generic extending (p, p) . Then, forced by (p, p) , there are isomorphisms $j_1, j_2: \nu[G_0] \cong \nu[G_1]$ with $j_1(a) = a$ and $j_2(b) = b$. Consider the map $j = j_1 \circ j_2^{-1}$. This is an automorphism of $\nu[G_1]$, and hence by rigidity must be the identity; so $j_1(b) = b$, since $j_2^{-1}(b) = b$ by assumption on j_2 . But then j_1 is an isomorphism extending $\{(a, a), (b, b)\}$, so (p, p) forces that there is an isomorphism between $\nu[G_0]$ and $\nu[G_1]$ extending $\{(a, a), (b, b)\}$. \square

Now we come to the body of the proof of Theorem 4.1. We can turn \mathbb{M} into an \mathcal{L} -structure, \mathcal{M} , as follows: writing (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{p}) for the equivalence class of $(a, p) \in \mathbb{M}$, for each n -ary relation symbol $R \in \mathcal{L}$ we let $R^{\mathcal{M}}$ be the set of tuples $((\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{p}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{p}_n))$ such that

$$\exists q \in \mathbb{P}, c_1, \dots, c_n \text{ stable in } q \ (\forall i \leq n [(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{p}_i) = (\mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{q})] \wedge q \Vdash \nu \models R(c_1, \dots, c_n)).$$

Informally, this definition ensures that each relation R holds whenever it ought to hold; we will also need the converse result, that each R fails whenever it ought to fail, and this is where Simultaneity will come in.

Lemma 4.5. *Let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over V . Then $V[G] \models \nu[G] \cong \mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. For $a \in \nu[G]$, let $Stab_a^G = \{p \in G : (a, p) \in \mathbb{M}\}$. Then for every $p, q \in Stab_a^G$, we must have $(a, p) \equiv (a, q)$: since $p, q \in G$, there must be a common strengthening $r \leq p, q$; by 4.3(1), we have $(a, p) \equiv (a, r)$ and $(a, q) \equiv (a, r)$, and hence $(a, p) \equiv (a, q)$ by transitivity. So the set $\{(a, p) : p \in Stab_a^G\}$ is contained in a single \equiv -class, and hence corresponds to a single element of \mathcal{M} .

Consider the map $i: \nu[G] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}: a \mapsto \{(a, p) : p \in Stab_a^G\}$; We claim that i is an isomorphism. Surjectivity is an immediate consequence of Genericity 4.3(2), and injectivity follows from the rigidity of $\nu[G]$.

Finally, we must show that i is a homomorphism. For R a relation symbol in \mathcal{L} and $\bar{a} \in \nu[G]$, by 4.3(3) we have

$$(\nu[G] \models R(\bar{a})) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{M} \models R(i(\bar{a}))).$$

Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{M} \models R(i(\bar{a}))$ and fix $p \in \bigcap_{a \in \bar{a}} Stab_a^G$. Then we must have some \bar{c} , \bar{q} , \bar{b} , and r such that $(c_i, q_i) \equiv (a_i, p)$, $(c_i, q_i) \equiv (b_i, r)$, and $r \Vdash \nu \models R(\bar{b})$. But then by Simultaneity 4.4, since $(a_i, p) \equiv (b_i, r)$, we must have $p \Vdash R(\bar{a})$, and hence $\nu[G] \models R(\bar{a})$. \square

This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

REFERENCES

- [AK00] Chris Ash and Julia Knight. *Computable structures and the hyperarithmetical hierarchy*, volume 144 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 2000.
- [Bar73] Jon Barwise. Back and forth through infinitary logic. In *Studies in model theory*, pages 5–34. MAA Studies in Math., Vol. 8. Math. Assoc. Amer., Buffalo, N.Y., 1973.
- [Bar75] Jon Barwise. *Admissible sets and structures*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975. An approach to definability theory, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic.
- [BFKL] John Baldwin, Sy-David Friedman, Martin Koerwien, and M. Chris Laskowski. Three red herrings around Vaught’s conjecture. To appear.
- [CKM06] Wesley Calvert, Julia Knight, and Jessica Millar. Computable trees of Scott rank ω_1^{CK} , and computable approximation. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 71(1):283–298, 2006.
- [DPSS09] Christian Delhommé, Maurice Pouzet, Gábor Sági, and Norbert Sauer. Representation of ideals of relational structures. *Discrete Math.*, 309(6):1374–1384, 2009.
- [Fra00] Roland Fraïssé. *Theory of relations*, volume 145 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, revised edition, 2000. With an appendix by Norbert Sauer.
- [GHHM13] Noam Greenberg, Joel David Hamkins, Denis Hirschfeldt, and Russell Miller. *Effective Mathematics of the Uncountable*. Lecture Notes in Logic. Cambridge Univ, 2013.
- [Hod97] Wilfred Hodges. *A shorter model theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [Jec03] Thomas Jech. *Set theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded.
- [Kar65] Carol Karp. Finite-quantifier equivalence. In *Theory of Models (Proc. 1963 Internat. Sympos. Berkeley)*, pages 407–412. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1965.
- [Kei71] H. Jerome Keisler. *Model theory for infinitary logic. Logic with countable conjunctions and finite quantifiers*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-London, 1971. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Vol. 62.
- [LS93] M. Chris Laskowski and Saharon Shelah. On the existence of atomic models. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 58(4):1189–1194, 1993.
- [MM84] Angus Macintyre and David Marker. Degrees of recursively saturated models. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 282(2):539–554, 1984.
- [Mon] Antonio Montalbán. A robust Scott rank. submitted for publication.
- [Mor70] Michael Morley. The number of countable models. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 35:14–18, 1970.
- [MS08] Jessica Millar and Gerald Sacks. Atomic models higher up. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 155(3):225–241, 2008.
- [Rab60] Michael Rabin. Computable algebra, general theory and theory of computable fields. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 95:341–360, 1960.
- [Ric81] Linda Richter. Degrees of structures. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 46(4):723–731, 1981.
- [Sac07] Gerald Sacks. Bounds on weak scattering. *Notre Dame J. Formal Logic*, 48(1):5–31, 2007.
- [Sco65] Dana Scott. Logic with denumerably long formulas and finite strings of quantifiers. In *Theory of Models (Proc. 1963 Internat. Sympos. Berkeley)*, pages 329–341. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1965.
- [Sol70] Robert Solovay. A model of set-theory in which every set of reals is Lebesgue measurable. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 92:1–56, 1970.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, USA

E-mail address: `Julia.F.Knight.1@nd.edu`

URL: <http://math.nd.edu/people/faculty/julia-f-knight/>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, USA

E-mail address: `antonio@math.berkeley.edu`

URL: www.math.berkeley.edu/~antonio

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, USA

E-mail address: `schweber@math.berkeley.edu`

URL: <http://www.math.berkeley.edu/~schweber>