

LECTURE NOTES 11.-13. NOVEMBER 2013

PHILIPP SCHLICHT

1. CONSISTENCY OF MARTIN'S AXIOM

Notation 1.1. (1) If $(P, \leq_P, 1_P)$ is a partial order (if $(B, \leq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ is a complete Boolean algebra), we will simply write P (B) instead.

(2) In an iterated forcing, let $\pi_{\beta\gamma}: P_\beta \rightarrow P_\gamma$, $\pi_{\beta\gamma}((p_\alpha)_{\alpha < \beta}) = (q_\alpha)_{\alpha < \gamma}$, $q_\alpha = p_\alpha$ for $\alpha < \beta$, $q_\alpha = 1$ for $\alpha \geq \beta$, denote the canonical complete embedding. Let $\pi_{\beta\gamma}^*: V^{P_\beta} \rightarrow V^{P_\gamma}$ denote the map induced by $\pi_{\beta\gamma}$.

Theorem 1.2. Suppose that M is a ground model. Suppose that $2^{<\kappa} = \kappa > \omega$ in M . There is a c.c.c. forcing $(P, \leq_P, 1_P)$ in M such that for every M -generic filter G on P , MA and $2^\omega = \kappa$ hold in $M[G]$.

Proof ideas. (1) There are at most $2^{<\kappa} = \kappa$ many counterexamples to MA .

(2) Build $M \subseteq M[G_0] \subseteq M[G_1] \subseteq \dots M[G_\alpha] \dots \subseteq M[G]$ for $\alpha < \kappa$ and eliminate 1 counterexample in each step.

(3) Ensure that $M[G_\alpha] \models 2^{<\kappa} = \kappa$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$.

(4) Every forcing of size $< \kappa$ and every set of size $< \kappa$ of maximal antichains of the forcing is in $M[G_\alpha]$ for some $\alpha < \kappa$, since κ is regular.

□

Proof. We work in M . Let $h: \kappa \times \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ denote Gödel pairing. Then $h(\alpha, \beta) = \gamma$ implies that $\alpha \leq \gamma$, for all $\alpha, \beta < \kappa$. The β^{th} forcing in $M[G_\alpha]$ will be used in step γ .

We define

(1) a finite support iteration $(P_\alpha, \leq_{P_\alpha}, 1_{P_\alpha})_{\alpha \leq \kappa}$ with

(i) P_α c.c.c. and

(ii) $|P_\alpha| < \kappa$

for all $\alpha \leq \kappa$ and

Date: November 13, 2013.

- (2) P_γ -names \dot{F}_γ for all $\gamma < \kappa$ such that $1_{P_\gamma} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \text{''}\dot{F}_\gamma : \kappa \rightarrow V \text{''}$ enumerates all partial orders $(P, \leq_P, 1_P)$ with $P = \lambda$ for some $\lambda < \kappa$ ".
- (3) P_γ -names \dot{Q}_γ for all $\gamma = h(\alpha, \beta) < \kappa$ such that $1_{P_\gamma} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \text{''}$ if $\pi_{\alpha\gamma}(\dot{F}_\alpha)(\beta)$ is c.c.c., then $\dot{Q}_\gamma = \pi_{\alpha\gamma}(\dot{F}_\alpha)(\beta)$, otherwise $|\dot{Q}_\gamma| = 1$ "

Suppose that $\gamma < \kappa$ and $\dot{F}_\gamma, \dot{Q}_\alpha$ are defined for all $\alpha < \gamma$.

To define \dot{F}_γ , note that $1_{P_\gamma} \Vdash_{P_\gamma} 2^{<\kappa} = \kappa$, since there are only $(|P_\gamma|^\omega)^\lambda \leq \kappa$ many nice P_γ -names for subsets of cardinals $\lambda < \kappa$ (as in Lemma 80, Models of Set Theory 1).

Choose \dot{F}_γ with (2) by the Maximality Principle (Problem 36, Models of Set Theory I).

To define \dot{Q}_γ , suppose that $\gamma = h(\alpha, \beta)$. Choose a P_γ -name \dot{Q}_γ with (3) by the Maximality Principle. Since $1_P \Vdash_{P_\gamma} \dot{Q}_\gamma$ has domain $< \kappa$, we can choose a nice name \dot{Q}_γ with $|\dot{Q}_\gamma| < \kappa$.

Now suppose that G is M -generic for P_κ . Let $G_\alpha := \pi_{\alpha\kappa}^{-1}[G]$ for $\alpha < \kappa$.

Claim 1.3. $M[G] \models MA_\lambda$ for all $\lambda < \kappa$.

Proof. We work in $M[G]$. (It is sufficient to prove MA_λ for c.c.c. partial orders with domain λ for cardinals $\lambda < \kappa$, by a previous lemma.)

Suppose that $(P, \leq_P, 1_P)$ is a c.c.c. partial order with $P = \lambda < \kappa$ and that \mathcal{D} is a set of dense subsets of P with $|\mathcal{D}| \leq \lambda$.

Then $P, \mathcal{D} \in M[G_\alpha]$ for some $\alpha < \kappa$ by a previous lemma. Then $P = \dot{F}_\alpha^{G_\alpha}(\beta)$ for some $\beta < \kappa$ by (2).

Let $\gamma = h(\alpha, \beta)$. Note that P is c.c.c. in $M[G_\gamma]$, since P is c.c.c. in $M[G]$. Then $P = \pi_{\alpha\gamma}(\dot{F}_\alpha)^{G_\gamma}(\beta) = \dot{Q}_\gamma^{G_\gamma}$ by (3).

So there is a $M[G_\gamma]$ -generic filter for P in $M[G_\gamma]$. Since $\mathcal{D} \in M[G_\alpha] \subseteq M[G_\gamma]$, the filter is \mathcal{D} -generic. \square

Claim 1.4. $M[G] \models 2^\omega = \kappa$.

Proof. We have $2^{<\kappa} = \kappa$ in $M[G]$, since $|P_\kappa| \leq \kappa$ and hence there are $\leq \kappa$ "nice names" for subsets of $\lambda < \kappa$. Moreover MA_λ implies that $2^\omega = 2^\lambda > \lambda$ for all $\lambda < \kappa$, so $2^\omega \geq \kappa$ in $M[G]$. \square

\square

2. MARTIN'S AXIOM AND GENERIC Σ_1 ABSOLUTENESS OF H_{ω_2}

Definition 2.1. *Suppose that $\kappa > \omega$ is a cardinal and that Γ is a class of partial orders.*

- (i) $BFA_\kappa(\Gamma)$ postulates that for all $P \in \Gamma$, there is a \mathcal{D} -generic filter on P for any set \mathcal{D} of maximal antichains in P of size $\leq \kappa$ with $|\mathcal{D}| \leq \kappa$.
- (ii) If P is a partial order, let $BFA_\kappa(P) := BFA_\kappa(\{P\})$.

Remark 2.2. *Suppose that $\kappa > \omega$ is a cardinal. If Γ is a class of forcings such that every element of Γ has the κ^+ -c.c., then $BFA_\kappa(\Gamma) \iff FA_\kappa(\Gamma)$.*

In particular, $BFA_{\omega_1}(\text{c.c.c.}) \iff FA_{\omega_1}(\text{c.c.c.}) \iff MA_{\omega_1}$.

We will only consider BFA_κ for complete Boolean algebras.

Remark 2.3. (1) *Every partial order P is densely embedded into its Boolean completion $B(P)$ (see Problem 25, Models of Set Theory 1).*

(2) *Suppose that M is a ground model. We work in M . Suppose that B is a complete Boolean algebra, φ a formula, and σ a B^* -name. Let*

$$\llbracket \varphi(\sigma) \rrbracket := \llbracket \varphi(\sigma) \rrbracket_{B^*} := \bigvee \{p \in B^* \mid p \Vdash_{B^*}^M \varphi(\sigma)\}.$$

Then $\llbracket \varphi(\sigma) \rrbracket \Vdash_{B^}^M \varphi(\sigma)$ by Problem 18(c).*

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that B is a complete Boolean algebra and $\kappa > \omega$ is a cardinal. Then $BFA_\kappa(B^*)$ implies that $1_B \Vdash_{B^*} \check{\kappa}$ is a cardinal.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mu < \kappa$ and $p \Vdash_B \dot{f}: \check{\kappa} \rightarrow \check{\mu}$ is injective. Let

$$A_\alpha = \{\llbracket \dot{f}(\check{\alpha}) = \check{\beta} \rrbracket \in B^* \mid \beta < \mu\}.$$

Then each A_β is a maximal antichain. Suppose that G is a filter on B with $G \cap A_\beta \neq \emptyset$ for all $\beta < \kappa$. Let $f: \kappa \rightarrow \mu$, $f(\alpha) = \beta$ if $\llbracket \dot{f}(\check{\alpha}) = \check{\beta} \rrbracket \in G$. Then f is injective, contradiction. \square

We will now use $BFA_\kappa(B(P)^*)$ to reconstruct the first order theory of a structure with domain κ .

Suppose that M is a ground model. We work in M . Suppose that P is a partial order, $\kappa > \omega$ is a cardinal, $(\dot{R}_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is a sequence of P -names for relations on κ , and \dot{M} is a P -name for the structure $(\kappa, \dot{R}_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$.

Definition 2.5. *Suppose that in M , G^* is a filter on P . Let*

- (1) $\dot{R}_\alpha[G^*] = \{s \in \kappa^{<\omega} \mid \exists p \in G^* p \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \dot{R}_\alpha(\check{s}))\}$.
- (2) $\dot{M}[G^*] = (\kappa, \dot{R}_\alpha[G^*])_{\alpha < \kappa}$.

Lemma 2.6. *We work in M . There is a set \mathcal{D}^* of maximal antichains in $B(P)$ of size $\leq \kappa$ with $|\mathcal{D}^*| \leq \kappa$ such that for every \mathcal{D}^* -generic filter G^* on $B(P)$, every formula $\varphi(x_0, \dots, x_n)$, and $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n < \kappa$*

$$\dot{M}[G^*] \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \llcorner \iff \exists p \in G^* p \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \llcorner).$$

Proof. For $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n < \kappa$ and $\ulcorner \varphi^\neg(x_0, \dots, x_n) \llcorner$ let

$$A_{\ulcorner \varphi^\neg, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \llcorner} = \{\llbracket \dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \neg \varphi^\neg(\check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \llcorner \rrbracket, \llbracket \dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \llcorner \rrbracket\}.$$

For $\ulcorner \psi(x_0, \dots, x_n) \llcorner$ and $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n < \kappa$ let

$$A_{\ulcorner \psi, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \llcorner} = \{\llbracket \dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \neg \exists x \psi^\neg(x, \check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \llcorner \rrbracket\} \cup \{\llbracket \dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \psi^\neg(\check{\alpha}, \check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \llcorner \mid \alpha < \kappa \rrbracket\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{D}^* = \{A_{\ulcorner \varphi^\neg, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \llcorner}, A_{\ulcorner \psi, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \llcorner} \mid \ulcorner \varphi^\neg \llcorner \text{ a formula, } \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n < \kappa\}$.

We prove the claim by induction on (codes for) formulas $\ulcorner \varphi^\neg \llcorner$.

For atomic formulas, this holds by the definition of $\dot{M}[G^*]$.

For conjunctions, if $\dot{M}[G^*] \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \wedge \ulcorner \psi^\neg(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_k) \llcorner$, then $\exists p, q \in G^* p \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \llcorner)$, $q \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \psi^\neg(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_k) \llcorner)$. Let $r \leq p, q$ in G^* . Then $r \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \wedge \ulcorner \psi^\neg(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_k) \llcorner)$.

If $p \in G^*$ and $p \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \wedge \ulcorner \psi^\neg(\check{\beta}_0, \dots, \check{\beta}_k) \llcorner)$, then $\dot{M}[G^*] \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \wedge \ulcorner \psi^\neg(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_k) \llcorner$.

For negations, we have $\dot{M}[G^*] \vDash \ulcorner \neg \varphi^\neg(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \llcorner \iff \neg \exists p \in G^* p \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \llcorner) \iff \exists p \in G^* p \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \neg \varphi^\neg(\check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \llcorner)$, since $G^* \cap A_{\ulcorner \varphi^\neg, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \llcorner} \neq \emptyset$.

For existential quantifiers, if $\dot{M}[G^*] \vDash \ulcorner \exists x \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(x, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \llcorner$, then there is some $\alpha < \kappa$ with $\dot{M}[G^*] \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\alpha, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \llcorner$. So there is some $p \in G^*$ with $p \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\check{\alpha}, \check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \llcorner)$ and hence $p \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \exists x \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(x, \check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \llcorner)$.

If $p \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \exists x \ulcorner \psi^\neg(x, \vec{\sigma}) \llcorner)$ for some $p \in G^*$, then there is some $\alpha < \kappa$ with $p \Vdash_P (\dot{M} \vDash \ulcorner \psi^\neg(\check{\alpha}, \check{\alpha}_0, \dots, \check{\alpha}_n) \llcorner)$, since $G^* \cap A_{\ulcorner \psi, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \llcorner} \neq \emptyset$. Then $\dot{M}[G^*] \vDash \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(\alpha, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \llcorner$ by the inductive hypothesis, so $\dot{M}[G^*] \vDash \ulcorner \exists x \ulcorner \varphi^\neg(x, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \llcorner$. \square

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose that in M , $BFA_\kappa(B(P)^*)$ holds and that $1_P \Vdash_P (\check{\kappa}, \dot{R}_0)$ is wellfounded. Then there is a set \mathcal{D}^* of maximal antichains in P of size $\leq \kappa$ with $|\mathcal{D}^*| \leq \kappa$ such that for every \mathcal{D}^* -generic filter G^* on P , $(\kappa, \dot{R}_0[G^*])$ is wellfounded.*

Proof. We work in M . For each $\alpha < \kappa$, let \dot{r}_α denote a name for the rank function on $(\alpha, \dot{R}_0 \cap (\alpha \times \alpha))$, i.e.

$$1_P \Vdash_P \dot{r}_\gamma: \check{\gamma} \rightarrow Ord, \forall \beta < \gamma \dot{r}_\gamma(\beta) = \sup\{\dot{r}_\gamma(\alpha) + 1 \mid (\alpha, \beta) \in \dot{R}_0\}.$$

Since $BFA_\kappa(B(P)^*)$ implies that $1_P \Vdash_P \check{\kappa} \in Card$, we have $1_P \Vdash_P \dot{r}_\alpha: \check{\alpha} \rightarrow \check{\kappa}$. Let

$$A_{\alpha, \beta} = \{\llbracket \dot{r}_\alpha(\check{\beta}) = \check{\gamma} \rrbracket \mid \gamma < \kappa\}$$

for $\alpha, \beta < \kappa$. Let $\mathcal{D}^* = \{A_{\alpha, \beta} \mid \alpha, \beta < \kappa\}$.

Suppose that G^* is a \mathcal{D}^* -generic filter on P . Then

$$\dot{r}_\alpha[G^*] = \{(\beta, \gamma) \mid \beta < \alpha, \llbracket \dot{r}_\alpha(\check{\beta}) = \check{\gamma} \rrbracket \in G^*\}.$$

Since $G^* \cap A_{\alpha, \beta} \neq \emptyset$ for all $\beta < \kappa$, $\dot{r}_\alpha[G^*]: \alpha \rightarrow \kappa$ is a well-defined function. Then $\dot{r}_\alpha[G^*]$ is order preserving from $(\alpha, \dot{R}_0[G^*] \cap (\alpha \times \alpha))$ to $(\kappa, <)$ for each $\alpha < \kappa$, by the last equation.

Since $\text{cof}(\kappa) > \omega$, this implies that $(\kappa, \dot{R}_0[G^*])$ is wellfounded. \square

Definition 2.8. (1) *A formula φ is*

- (i) $\Delta_0 = \Sigma_0 = \Pi_0$ if all its quantifiers are bounded.
- (ii) Π_n if it is logically equivalent to a formula of the form $\neg\psi$, where ψ is a Σ_n formula.
- (iii) Σ_{n+1} if it is logically equivalent to a formula of the form

$$\exists x_0, \dots, x_m \psi(x_0, \dots, x_m, y_0, \dots, y_l),$$

where ψ is a Π_n formula.

(2) *Suppose that $(M, R_\alpha, f_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ and $(N, S_\alpha, g_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ are structures with $M \subseteq N$ and Ψ is a set of (coded) formulas.*

- (i) *Let $(M, R_\alpha, f_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa} \prec_\Psi (N, S_\alpha, g_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ if for every (coded) formula $\ulcorner \varphi(x_0, \dots, x_m) \urcorner \in \Psi$ and all $y_0, \dots, y_m \in M$,*

$$(M, R_\alpha, f_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa} \models \ulcorner \varphi(y_0, \dots, y_m) \urcorner \iff (N, S_\alpha, g_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa} \models \ulcorner \varphi(y_0, \dots, y_m) \urcorner.$$

- (ii) *Let $M \prec N$ if $M \prec_{\Sigma_n} N$ for all $n < \omega$.*

Lemma 2.9. *Suppose that $\kappa \geq \omega$ is a cardinal. There is a $\Sigma_1^{H_{\kappa^+}}$ definable surjection $h: \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \rightarrow H_{\kappa^+}$.*

Proof. Let $g: \kappa \times \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ denote Gödel pairing. Let $f(x)$ denote $\pi(0)$, where $\pi: \kappa \rightarrow V$ is the transitive collapse of $(\kappa, g^{-1}[x])$, if this is wellfounded, and let $f(x) = 0$ otherwise. Then $h: \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \rightarrow H_{\kappa^+}$ is a $\Sigma_1^{H_{\kappa^+}}$ definable surjection. \square

Theorem 2.10 (Bagaria). *Suppose that M is a ground model. Suppose that P is a partial order and that $\kappa > \omega$ is a cardinal in M . The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) $BFA_\kappa(B(P)^*)$ holds in M , and
- (2) $H_{\kappa^+} \prec_{\Sigma_1} H_{\kappa^+}^{M[G]}$ for all M -generic filters G on P .

Proof. Suppose that $BFA_\kappa(B(P)^*)$ holds in M . Suppose that

$$1_P \Vdash_P^M (H_{\kappa^+} \models \ulcorner \exists x \varphi^\neg(x, y_0, \dots, y_n) \urcorner),$$

where φ is a Δ_0 formula and $y_0, \dots, y_n \in H_{\kappa^+}^M$.

Suppose that $h: \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^M \rightarrow H_{\kappa^+}^M$ is a $\Sigma_1^{H_{\kappa^+}^M}$ definable surjection in M . Suppose that $x_i \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^M$ and $h(x_i) = y_i$ for all $i \leq n$. Then

$$1_P \Vdash_P^M (H_{\kappa^+} \models \ulcorner \exists x \varphi^\neg(x, h(\check{x}_0), \dots, h(\check{x}_n)) \urcorner).$$

Let \dot{N} denote a name for the transitive closure of $\{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and a witness for the statement $\ulcorner \exists x \varphi^\neg(x, h(\check{x}_0), \dots, h(\check{x}_n)) \urcorner$ in $H_{\kappa^+}^{M[\dot{G}]}$, where \dot{G} is a name for the M -generic filter on P . Suppose that $\dot{\pi}$ is a P -name for an isomorphism $\dot{\pi}: (\dot{N}, \in) \rightarrow (\check{\kappa}, \dot{E})$ such that $1_P \Vdash_P \dot{\pi}(\check{\alpha}) = 2 \cdot \check{\alpha}$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$. Let $\bar{x} := \{2 \cdot \alpha \mid \alpha \in x\}$ for $x \subseteq \kappa$.

Then $1_P \Vdash_P^M (\check{\kappa}, \dot{E})$ is wellfounded and

$$1_{B(P)^*} \Vdash_{B(P)^*}^M (\dot{N} \models \ulcorner \exists x \varphi^\neg(x, h(\check{\bar{x}}_0), \dots, h(\check{\bar{x}}_n)) \urcorner).$$

We choose a set \mathcal{D}^* of maximal antichains in $B(P)^*$ of size $\leq \kappa$ with $|\mathcal{D}^*| \leq \kappa$ by the previous lemmas. There is a \mathcal{D}^* -generic filter G^* in M , since $BFA_\kappa(B(P)^*)$ holds in M . Then

- (1) $\bar{\kappa}$ is an initial segment of $Ord^{(\check{\kappa}, \dot{E}[G^*])}$,
- (2) $(\check{\kappa}, \dot{E}[G^*]) \models \ulcorner \exists x \varphi^\neg(x, h(\check{\bar{x}}_0), \dots, h(\check{\bar{x}}_n)) \urcorner$ by Lemma 2.6, and
- (3) the structure $(\check{\kappa}, \dot{E}[G^*])$ is wellfounded, by Lemma 2.7.

Then $\ulcorner \exists x \varphi \urcorner(x, x_0, \dots, x_n)$ holds in the transitive collapse $N \in M$ of $(\kappa, \dot{E}[G^*])$. Since $N \prec_{\Sigma_1} H_{\kappa^+}^M$, the proof is complete.

For the other direction, suppose that in M , \mathcal{D} is a set of maximal antichains in $B(P)^*$ of size $\leq \kappa$ with $|\mathcal{D}| \leq \kappa$. Suppose that Q is an elementary substructure of the Boolean algebra $B(P)$ with $\bigcup \mathcal{D} \subseteq Q$ and $|Q| \leq \kappa$. Suppose that $\pi: \bar{Q} \rightarrow Q$ is elementary and $\bar{Q}, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{D}) \in H_{\kappa^+}^M$.

Suppose that G is M -generic for $B(P)^*$. Since Q is a Boolean subalgebra of $B(P)^*$, it is easy to check that $H := G \cap Q$ is a \mathcal{D} -generic filter on Q . Then $\bar{H} := \pi^{-1}[H]$ is a $\pi^{-1}[\mathcal{D}]$ -generic filter on \bar{Q} . Since the existence of such a filter is a Σ_1 statement over H_{κ^+} , there is such a filter $\bar{I} \in M$. Then the upwards closure $I = \{q \in B(P)^* \mid \exists p \in \bar{I} \pi(p) \leq q\}$ of $\pi[\bar{I}]$ is a \mathcal{D} -generic filter in M . \square