

Set Theory II

集合论 II

杨睿之

yangruizhi@fudan.edu.cn

School of Philosophy, Fudan University

Spring 2016

Previously on Set Theory

- $M[G] = \{\tau_G \mid \tau \in M^{\mathbb{P}}\}$, where
$$\tau_G = \{\sigma_G \mid \exists(\sigma, p) \in \tau (p \in G)\}$$
- $\emptyset_G = \emptyset$, $\check{x}_G = x$, $\dot{G}_G = G$
- Pairing: $(\text{up}(\tau, \sigma))_G = \{\tau_G, \sigma_G\}$
- Union: Let $\pi = \{(\sigma, p) \in M^{\mathbb{P}} \times \mathbb{P} \mid \exists(\theta, q) \in \tau \exists r \in \mathbb{P} [p \leq q \wedge p \leq r \wedge (\sigma, r) \in \theta]\}$, then $\pi_G = \bigcup \tau_G$

Forcing

To show that Separation holds $M[G]$:

Given \mathbb{P} -name τ, σ and a formula φ , we want to cook up a

\mathbb{P} -name π in the ground model M such that

$$\pi_G = \{x \in \tau_G \mid \varphi^{M[G]}(x, \tau_G, \sigma_G)\}$$

Forcing

To cook up such a \mathbb{P} -name in M , we must be able to talk about the truth of $M[G]$ within M , which we cannot without the information from G

But still, we can define a forcing language and forcing relation within the ground model M to talk about what $M[G]$ must be or might be even without knowing G

Forcing

To cook up such a \mathbb{P} -name in M , we must be able to talk about the truth of $M[G]$ within M , which we cannot without the information from G

But still, we can define a **forcing language** and **forcing relation** within the ground model M to talk about what $M[G]$ must be or might be even without knowing G

Forcing

To cook up such a \mathbb{P} -name in M , we must be able to talk about the truth of $M[G]$ within M , which we cannot without the information from G

But still, we can define a **forcing language** and **forcing relation** within the ground model M to talk about what $M[G]$ must be or might be even without knowing G

Forcing

Definition

For a forcing poset \mathbb{P} , we define the \mathbb{P} forcing language $\mathcal{FL}_{\mathbb{P}}$ to be the class of logical formulas formed using the binary relation \in and all the \mathbb{P} -names as constant symbols

Forcing

We want to define the relation $p \Vdash \varphi$ for $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}$ such that the following holds

Lemma (The Truth Lemma)

Let M be a c.t.m for ZF, let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing poset, let ψ be a sentence of $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}} \cap M$, and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M . Then

$$M[G] \models \psi \Leftrightarrow \exists p \in G (p \Vdash \psi)$$

Forcing

If the definition of **forcing** works, i.e. assuming the truth lemma we can show

Lemma

The Separation Schema hold in $M[G]$

Proof.

Let

$$\pi = \{(\vartheta, p) \mid \vartheta \in \text{dom } \tau \wedge p \in \mathbb{P} \wedge p \Vdash (\vartheta \in \tau \wedge \varphi(\vartheta, \tau, \sigma))\} \quad \square$$

Forcing

If the definition of **forcing** works, i.e. assuming the truth lemma we can show

Lemma

The Separation Schema hold in $M[G]$

Proof.

Let

$$\pi = \{(\vartheta, p) \mid \vartheta \in \text{dom } \tau \wedge p \in \mathbb{P} \wedge p \Vdash (\vartheta \in \tau \wedge \varphi(\vartheta, \tau, \sigma))\} \quad \square$$

Forcing

Definition (Forcing (atomic formulas))

For \mathbb{P} -names τ, ϑ, π ,

- $p \Vdash \tau = \vartheta$ iff
$$\forall \sigma \in \text{dom } \tau \cup \text{dom } \vartheta \forall q \leq p [q \Vdash \sigma \in \tau \leftrightarrow q \Vdash \sigma \in \vartheta]$$
- $p \Vdash \pi \in \tau$ iff $\{q \leq p \mid \exists (\sigma, r) \in \tau [q \leq r \wedge q \Vdash \pi = \sigma]\}$ is dense below p

Note: Again, this is a definition by recursion

Forcing

Definition

Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing poset and $p \in \mathbb{P}$. We say $D \subset \mathbb{P}$ is dense below p if for each $q \leq p$ there is a $r \leq q$ such that $r \in D$

Fact

If G is \mathbb{P} generic over M , $p \in G$ and $D \in M$ is dense below p , then $G \cap D \neq \emptyset$

Forcing

Lemma

For atomic formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{FL}_{\mathbb{P}}$,

- If $p \Vdash \varphi$ and $q \leq p$, then $q \Vdash \varphi$
- $p \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\{r \leq p \mid r \Vdash \varphi\}$ is dense below p

Note: $\{r \leq p \mid r \Vdash \varphi\}$ is not dense below p iff

$\exists q \leq p \forall r \leq q (r \nVdash \varphi)$

Forcing

Lemma

For atomic formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{FL}_{\mathbb{P}}$,

- If $p \Vdash \varphi$ and $q \leq p$, then $q \Vdash \varphi$
- $p \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\{r \leq p \mid r \Vdash \varphi\}$ is dense below p

Note: $\{r \leq p \mid r \Vdash \varphi\}$ is not dense below p iff

$\exists q \leq p \forall r \leq q (r \nVdash \varphi)$

Forcing

Definition

For atomic formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{FL}_{\mathbb{P}}$ and $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $p \Vdash \neg\varphi$ iff

$$\forall q \leq p (q \nVdash \varphi)$$

Lemma

For atomic formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{FL}_{\mathbb{P}}$ and $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $p \Vdash \varphi$ iff

$$\forall q \leq p (q \nVdash \neg\varphi)$$

Forcing

We continue the definition for complex formulas

Definition

- $p \Vdash \neg\varphi$ iff $\forall q \leq p (q \nVdash \varphi)$
- $p \Vdash \varphi \wedge \psi$ iff $p \Vdash \varphi$ and $p \Vdash \psi$
- $p \Vdash \forall x\varphi(x)$ iff $p \Vdash \varphi(\tau)$ for every \mathbb{P} -name τ

Forcing

Lemma

- $p \Vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ iff $\neg \exists q \leq p (q \Vdash \varphi \wedge q \Vdash \neg \psi)$
- $p \Vdash \varphi \vee \psi$ iff $\{q \mid (q \Vdash \varphi) \vee (q \Vdash \psi)\}$ is dense below p
- $p \Vdash \exists x \varphi(x)$ iff $\{q \mid \exists \tau \in V^{\mathbb{P}} [q \Vdash \varphi(\tau)]\}$ is dense below p

Forcing

Lemma

For all $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}$,

- $p \Vdash \varphi$ and $q \leq p$, then $q \Vdash \varphi$
- $p \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\{q \leq p \mid q \Vdash \varphi\}$ is dense below p
- $p \Vdash \varphi$ iff $\forall q \leq p (q \nVdash \neg\varphi)$

Forcing

Fact (Forcing relation is absolute)

Let M be a c.t.m for ZF and $\mathbb{P} \in M$. Then $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^M = \mathcal{F}\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}} \cap M$,
and for any $p \in M$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^M$,

$$(p \Vdash \varphi)^M \leftrightarrow p \Vdash \varphi$$

Next on Set Theory

- Preserving cardinality
- Consistency of \neg GCH