

XIII

Thirteenth Lecture
Forcing & the Continuum Hypothesis
Saturday 8 March 2025

Recap

Lecture
XII

RECAP FT FORCING THEOREM
 $M[G] \models \varphi \iff \exists p \in G \ p \Vdash \varphi$
 SyFT SYNTACTIC FORCING THEOREM
 $M[G] \models \varphi \iff \exists p \in G \ M \models p \Vdash \varphi$
 DT DEFINABILITY THEOREM
 $p \Vdash \varphi \iff p \Vdash^* \varphi$
 GNT GENERIC MODEL THEOREM
 $M[G] \models ZFC$

Lecture
VIII

EXAMPLE 3.

$\mathbb{F}_u(X \times Y, 2)$

Assume X is infinite.

Consider $E_{y,y'} := \{p \in \mathbb{P}; \exists x \in X \ p(x,y) \neq p(x,y')\}$

This is dense for $y \neq y'$.

$\mathcal{E} := \{E_{y,y'}; y \neq y' \in Y\}$

Lemma 5 If $\mathbb{F}$ is $\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{E}$ -generic, then
there is an injection from Y into $\mathcal{P}(X)$.

Summary If G is $\mathbb{F}_u(\omega \times \aleph_2^M, 2)$ -generic, then
 $M[G] \models ZFC$ + there is an inj. from
 [GNT] $\aleph_2^M$ into $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$.

This implies $M[G] \models ZFC + 2^{\aleph_0} \geq \aleph_2$
 if we have

$$\aleph_1^M = \aleph_1^{M[G]}$$

$$\aleph_2^M = \aleph_2^{M[G]}$$

Goal for
L XIII

REMARK on our metamathematical application.

Lecture VIII:

Paul Cohen



Paul Joseph Cohen was an American mathematician. He is best known for his proofs that the continuum hypothesis and the axiom of choice are independent from Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, for which he was awarded a Fields Medal.

Born: 2 April 1926, Long Branch, New Jersey, United States
Died: 27 March 2007, Stanford, California, United States
Known for: Cohen forcing, Continuum hypothesis, Forcing, Mathematics

Cohen

$\forall T \subseteq \text{ZFC}$ finite $\exists T^* \subseteq \text{ZFC}$ finite
s.t.
(*) if M true of T^* , then there is
 $N \supseteq M$ true of $T + \neg CH$

We have seen (ES#1) that (*) implies
 $\text{Con}(\text{ZFC}) \Rightarrow \text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \neg CH)$.

SIMPLIFIED:

if M true of ZFC , then there
is $N \supseteq M$ true of $\text{ZFC} + \neg CH$

Note that our proof from page 1 is **NOT GOOD ENOUGH**
for the statement (*) from lecture VIII.

For this, we need to look more carefully
at the proof of the GNT:

$$M \models \text{ZFC} \Rightarrow M[G] \models \text{ZFC}.$$

The proof proceeds

AXIOM BY AXIOM

and thus for each $\varphi \in \text{ZFC}$, we find finite S_φ
s.t. $M \models S_\varphi \Rightarrow M[G] \models \varphi$.

Let $S \subseteq \text{ZFC}$ finite s.t. S proves that all relevant
notions (name, value, ...) are well-defined and
absolute. Then for $T \subseteq \text{ZFC}$ finite, define

$$T^* := S \cup \bigcup_{\varphi \in T} S_\varphi.$$

Then, the proof shows
(*).

Let's prove $\neg CH$ in $M[G]$.

Def. We say $\mathbb{P}$ preserves cardinals if $\forall G$
 $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , " κ is a cardinal"
is absolute betw. M & $M[G]$.

Def. We say $\mathbb{P}$ has the countable chain condition
(c.c.c.) if every antichain in $\mathbb{P}$ is
countable.

Theorem 1 If $\mathbb{P}$ has c.c.c., then $\mathbb{P}$ preserves
cardinals.

Theorem 2 $Fu(\omega \times \aleph_2^M, 2)$ has the c.c.c.

Corollary If G is $Fu(\omega \times \aleph_2^M, 2)$ -generic
over M , then

$$M[G] \models ZFC + 2^{\aleph_0} \geq \aleph_2.$$

Lemma (for Thm 1) $M \models \mathbb{P}$ has c.c.c., $X, Y \in M$,
 G $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M $f: X \rightarrow Y$, $f \in M[G]$.
Then there is $F \in M$ s.t. $\forall x \in X$ $F(x) \subseteq Y$
 $\forall x \in X$ $f(x) \in F(x)$ (*)

Proof of Thm 1 from Lemma

Suppose $M \models \kappa$ is a cardinal, $M[G] \models \kappa$ is not a cardinal, so there is $\lambda < \kappa$
and $f \in M[G]$, $f: \lambda \rightarrow \kappa$, f is a surjection. Apply Lemma
and get F . Define $R := \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} F(\alpha)$. By (*), $R = \kappa$.

But $M \models |R| = \aleph_0 \cdot \lambda = \lambda < \kappa$. But then $M \models \kappa$ is not
a cardinal.
Contradiction. q.e.d.

Lemma

$M \models \mathcal{P}$ has c.c.c., $X, Y \in M$

$G \mathcal{P}$ -gen. / M , $f: X \rightarrow Y$, $f \in M[G]$

Then there is $F \in M$ s.t.

$$\forall x \in X \quad f(x) \in F(x) \quad (1)$$

$$F(x) \subseteq Y \quad (2)$$

$$M \models F(x) \text{ is countable.} \quad (3)$$

Proof. Let $F(x) := \{y \in Y; \exists p \in \mathcal{P} \ p \Vdash \tau(\check{x}) = \check{y}\}$
Fix τ , a name for f . By DT, $F \in M$.

(2) follows from definition.

(1) follows from FT.

Let's look at (3): Since $M[G] \models \mathcal{P}$ is a function,

find $q \Vdash \tau$ is a function. with $q \in G$.

For each $y \in F(x)$, pick $p_y \leq q$ s.t.

$$p_y \Vdash \tau(\check{x}) = \check{y}.$$

Note that if $y \neq y'$, then $p_y \perp p_{y'}$.

Thus $\{p_y; y \in F(x)\}$ is an antichain,
thus countable in M . So $F(x)$ is countable in M .

q.e.d.

Theorem 2 $\mathcal{F}_\omega(\omega \times \mathbb{N}_2^M, 2)$ has c.c.c.

Much more: If Y is countable, then $\mathcal{F}_\omega(X, Y)$ has c.c.c.

Proof. Δ -systems from Example (33) are also called quasi-disjoint families

Δ SL Any uncountable family of finite sets contains an uncountable Δ -system.

Example Sheet #3:

(33) A family of finite sets $\mathcal{D}$ is called a Δ -system if there is a finite set R (called the root of the Δ -system) such that for all $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}$, if $D \neq D'$, then $D \cap D' = R$. Show that any uncountable family of finite sets contains an uncountable Δ -system.

(Hint. Argue that you can assume w.l.o.g. that all elements of the family have the same size and prove the claim by induction on the size of the elements of the family.)

Take any $A \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ uncountable and prove that it's not an antichain.

If $p \in A$, then $\text{dom}(p) \subseteq X$ finite.

Consider $S := \{\text{dom}(p) \mid p \in A\}$. That's an uncountable family of finite sets, so by Δ SL find Δ S $\mathcal{D} \subseteq S$ uncountable.

Let $r \subseteq X$ finite be the root of $\mathcal{D}$.

Since Y is countable, there are only countably many functions $g: r \rightarrow Y$. Since $\mathcal{D}$ is uncountable, by P+P, there are p, q s.t. $\text{dom}(p), \text{dom}(q) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $p \upharpoonright r = q \upharpoonright r$. But since $\text{dom}(p) \cap \text{dom}(q) = r$, p and q are compatible. So A is not an antichain. q.e.d.

Next time

We got $M[G] \models 2^{\aleph_0} \geq \aleph_2$.

What is the size of $2^{\aleph_0}$ in $M[G]$?

Remember

(LAST ES#4.

$ZFC \vdash 2^{\aleph_0} \neq \aleph_{\omega}$.)

What if $\aleph_2$ was one of the forbidden values.

Note

Obtaining $M[G] \models 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2$ cannot be quite as general as this proof: if $M \models 2^{\aleph_0} > \aleph_2$, then this will remain true in $M[G]$.

Note 2

If G is $\text{Fn}(\omega \times \aleph_\alpha^M, 2)$ -generic over M , then

$$M[G] \models 2^{\aleph_0} \geq \aleph_\alpha.$$