

Forcing: How to prove unprovability

The Continuum Hypothesis

Regula Krapf

University of Bonn

July 21, 2016

Content

- 1 The technique of forcing
- 2 Cohen forcing
- 3 Lebesgue measure
- 4 Forcing \neg CH

Motivation

Theorem (Cantor)

There is no surjection from \mathbb{N} onto $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$.

This leads to the study of *infinite cardinals*.

Definition

- \aleph_0 denotes the cardinality of $\omega = \mathbb{N}$.
- \aleph_1 denotes the least uncountable cardinal.
- \aleph_2 denotes the second-least uncountable cardinal.
- $\mathfrak{c} = 2^{\aleph_0}$ denotes the cardinality of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$.

The Continuum Hypothesis

In 1878, Georg Cantor conjectured the *Continuum Hypothesis*:

Conjecture (The Continuum Hypothesis (CH))

There is no cardinal between \aleph_0 and 2^{\aleph_0} , i.e. $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$.

The Continuum Hypothesis was the first of Hilbert's famous list of 23 open Problems.

In 1940, Kurt Gödel constructed a model of ZFC (denoted L) in which the Continuum Hypothesis holds.

In 1963, Paul Cohen proved that CH is actually *independent* of the axioms of ZFC, i.e. both $ZFC + CH$ and $ZFC + \neg CH$ are consistent. The method he used (and developed for this result) is *forcing*.

The Continuum Hypothesis

In 1878, Georg Cantor conjectured the *Continuum Hypothesis*:

Conjecture (The Continuum Hypothesis (CH))

There is no cardinal between \aleph_0 and 2^{\aleph_0} , i.e. $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$.

The Continuum Hypothesis was the first of Hilbert's famous list of 23 open Problems.

In 1940, Kurt Gödel constructed a model of ZFC (denoted L) in which the Continuum Hypothesis holds.

In 1963, Paul Cohen proved that CH is actually *independent* of the axioms of ZFC, i.e. both ZFC + CH and ZFC + \neg CH are consistent. The method he used (and developed for this result) is *forcing*.

The Continuum Hypothesis

In 1878, Georg Cantor conjectured the *Continuum Hypothesis*:

Conjecture (The Continuum Hypothesis (CH))

There is no cardinal between \aleph_0 and 2^{\aleph_0} , i.e. $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$.

The Continuum Hypothesis was the first of Hilbert's famous list of 23 open Problems.

In 1940, Kurt Gödel constructed a model of ZFC (denoted L) in which the Continuum Hypothesis holds.

In 1963, Paul Cohen proved that CH is actually *independent* of the axioms of ZFC, i.e. both $ZFC + CH$ and $ZFC + \neg CH$ are consistent. The method he used (and developed for this result) is *forcing*.

Forcing notions

Definition

A *forcing (notion)* is a non-atomic partial order $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq_{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}})$ with a maximal element $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$, i.e.

- $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ is reflexive, transitive and antisymmetric,
- for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $p \leq_{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$,
- for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ there are $p_0, p_1 \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ which are *incompatible*, i.e. there is no $r \in \mathbb{P}$ with $r \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p_0, p_1$.

Forcing notions

Example (Cohen forcing)

Let $\mathbb{P} = \text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ be the set of partial functions $p : \text{dom}(p) \rightarrow 2$ with $\text{dom}(p) \subseteq \omega$ finite, ordered by reverse inclusion, i.e.

$$p \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q \iff \text{dom}(p) \supseteq \text{dom}(q) \text{ and } p \upharpoonright \text{dom}(q) = q.$$

Furthermore, let $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}} = \emptyset$, the empty function.

Generic filters

Definition

Let M be a countable transitive model of ZFC and $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing notion.

- 1 A subset $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is said to be *dense*, if for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ there is some $q \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ with $q \in D$.
- 2 A subset $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is said to be a \mathbb{P} -*generic filter*, if it has the following properties:
 - If $p \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q$ and $p \in G$, then $q \in G$.
 - If $p, q \in G$ then there is $r \in G$ such that $r \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p, q$.
 - If $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a dense set which is in M , then $G \cap D \neq \emptyset$.

Example

Consider Cohen forcing $\mathbb{P} = \text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$. Then for each $n \in \omega$, the set $D_n = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid n \in \text{dom}(p)\}$ is dense.

Generic filters

Definition

Let M be a countable transitive model of ZFC and $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing notion.

- 1 A subset $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is said to be *dense*, if for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ there is some $q \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ with $q \in D$.
- 2 A subset $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is said to be a \mathbb{P} -*generic filter*, if it has the following properties:
 - If $p \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q$ and $p \in G$, then $q \in G$.
 - If $p, q \in G$ then there is $r \in G$ such that $r \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p, q$.
 - If $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a dense set which is in M , then $G \cap D \neq \emptyset$.

Example

Consider Cohen forcing $\mathbb{P} = \text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$. Then for each $n \in \omega$, the set $D_n = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid n \in \text{dom}(p)\}$ is dense.

Generic filters

Definition

Let M be a countable transitive model of ZFC and $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing notion.

- 1 A subset $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is said to be *dense*, if for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ there is some $q \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ with $q \in D$.
- 2 A subset $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is said to be a \mathbb{P} -*generic filter*, if it has the following properties:
 - If $p \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q$ and $p \in G$, then $q \in G$.
 - If $p, q \in G$ then there is $r \in G$ such that $r \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p, q$.
 - If $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a dense set which is in M , then $G \cap D \neq \emptyset$.

Example

Consider Cohen forcing $\mathbb{P} = \text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$. Then for each $n \in \omega$, the set $D_n = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid n \in \text{dom}(p)\}$ is dense.

Names

Definition

Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion. A \mathbb{P} -name is a set whose elements are of the form (σ, p) , where σ is a \mathbb{P} -name and $p \in \mathbb{P}$.

This definition requires *transfinite recursion*.

Example

Let $M \models \text{ZFC}$ and $\mathbb{P} \in M$ a forcing notion.

- \emptyset is a \mathbb{P} -name.
- Let $x \in M$. Then there is a *canonical* \mathbb{P} -name for x given by

$$\check{x} = \{(\check{y}, 1_{\mathbb{P}}) \mid y \in x\}.$$

- The set $\dot{G} = \{(\check{p}, p) \mid p \in \mathbb{P}\}$ is a \mathbb{P} -name, the canonical \mathbb{P} -name for a \mathbb{P} -generic filter.

Names

Definition

Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion. A \mathbb{P} -name is a set whose elements are of the form (σ, p) , where σ is a \mathbb{P} -name and $p \in \mathbb{P}$.

This definition requires *transfinite recursion*.

Example

Let $M \models \text{ZFC}$ and $\mathbb{P} \in M$ a forcing notion.

- \emptyset is a \mathbb{P} -name.
- Let $x \in M$. Then there is a *canonical* \mathbb{P} -name for x given by

$$\check{x} = \{(\check{y}, 1_{\mathbb{P}}) \mid y \in x\}.$$

- The set $\dot{G} = \{(\check{p}, p) \mid p \in \mathbb{P}\}$ is a \mathbb{P} -name, the canonical \mathbb{P} -name for a \mathbb{P} -generic filter.

Names

Definition

Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion. A \mathbb{P} -name is a set whose elements are of the form (σ, p) , where σ is a \mathbb{P} -name and $p \in \mathbb{P}$.

This definition requires *transfinite recursion*.

Example

Let $M \models \text{ZFC}$ and $\mathbb{P} \in M$ a forcing notion.

- \emptyset is a \mathbb{P} -name.
- Let $x \in M$. Then there is a *canonical* \mathbb{P} -name for x given by

$$\check{x} = \{(\check{y}, 1_{\mathbb{P}}) \mid y \in x\}.$$

- The set $\dot{G} = \{(\check{p}, p) \mid p \in \mathbb{P}\}$ is a \mathbb{P} -name, the canonical \mathbb{P} -name for a \mathbb{P} -generic filter.

Evaluations of names

Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion and G a \mathbb{P} -generic filter. We can *evaluate* a \mathbb{P} -name σ as follows:

$$\sigma^G = \{\tau^G \mid \exists p \in G : (\tau, p) \in \sigma\}.$$

Example

- $\emptyset^G = \emptyset$.
- Let $x \in M$. Then

$$\check{x}^G = \{\check{y}^G \mid y \in x\} = x$$

by transfinite induction.

- $\dot{G}^G = \{\check{p}^G \mid p \in G\} = G$.

Evaluations of names

Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion and G a \mathbb{P} -generic filter. We can *evaluate* a \mathbb{P} -name σ as follows:

$$\sigma^G = \{\tau^G \mid \exists p \in G : (\tau, p) \in \sigma\}.$$

Example

- $\emptyset^G = \emptyset$.
- Let $x \in M$. Then

$$\check{x}^G = \{\check{y}^G \mid y \in x\} = x$$

by transfinite induction.

- $\dot{G}^G = \{\check{p}^G \mid p \in G\} = G$.

Evaluations of names

Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion and G a \mathbb{P} -generic filter. We can *evaluate* a \mathbb{P} -name σ as follows:

$$\sigma^G = \{\tau^G \mid \exists p \in G : (\tau, p) \in \sigma\}.$$

Example

- $\emptyset^G = \emptyset$.
- Let $x \in M$. Then

$$\check{x}^G = \{\check{y}^G \mid y \in x\} = x$$

by transfinite induction.

- $\dot{G}^G = \{\check{p}^G \mid p \in G\} = G$.

Generic extensions

Let $M \models \text{ZFC}$, $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a non-trivial forcing notion and G a \mathbb{P} -generic filter. Then we define

$$M[G] = \{\sigma^G \mid \sigma \text{ is a } \mathbb{P}\text{-name}\}.$$

Fact

- 1 $M \cup \{G\} \subseteq M[G]$
- 2 $G \notin M$.
- 3 $M[G] \models \text{ZFC}$.

Proof.

For (2) suppose that $G \in M$. Then the set $D = \mathbb{P} \setminus G$ is in M . Moreover, D is dense: Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Since \mathbb{P} is non-atomic, there are $p_0, p_1 \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ such that p_0 and p_1 are incompatible. But then at least one of p_0, p_1 is not in G . □

Generic extensions

Let $M \models \text{ZFC}$, $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a non-trivial forcing notion and G a \mathbb{P} -generic filter. Then we define

$$M[G] = \{\sigma^G \mid \sigma \text{ is a } \mathbb{P}\text{-name}\}.$$

Fact

- 1 $M \cup \{G\} \subseteq M[G]$
- 2 $G \notin M$.
- 3 $M[G] \models \text{ZFC}$.

Proof.

For (2) suppose that $G \in M$. Then the set $D = \mathbb{P} \setminus G$ is in M . Moreover, D is dense: Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Since \mathbb{P} is non-atomic, there are $p_0, p_1 \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ such that p_0 and p_1 are incompatible. But then at least one of p_0, p_1 is not in G . □

Generic extensions

Let $M \models \text{ZFC}$, $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a non-trivial forcing notion and G a \mathbb{P} -generic filter. Then we define

$$M[G] = \{\sigma^G \mid \sigma \text{ is a } \mathbb{P}\text{-name}\}.$$

Fact

- 1 $M \cup \{G\} \subseteq M[G]$
- 2 $G \notin M$.
- 3 $M[G] \models \text{ZFC}$.

Proof.

For (2) suppose that $G \in M$. Then the set $D = \mathbb{P} \setminus G$ is in M . Moreover, D is dense: Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Since \mathbb{P} is non-atomic, there are $p_0, p_1 \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ such that p_0 and p_1 are incompatible. But then at least one of p_0, p_1 is not in G . □

Where do generic filters live?

Suppose that $V \models \text{ZFC}$ and V contains countable, transitive models $M \in V$ of ZFC. Let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing notion. We extend M to $M[G]$, where G is a \mathbb{P} -generic filter contained in V , i.e. G is a filter which intersects all dense subsets of \mathbb{P} which lie in M .

Fact

For every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ there is a \mathbb{P} -generic filter G in V with $p \in G$.

Proof.

Since M is countable, M contains only countably many dense subsets of \mathbb{P} . Let $(D_n \mid n \in \omega)$ enumerate them (in V). Now we inductively construct a sequence of conditions $(p_n \mid n \in \omega)$ by

- $p_0 = p$
- Given p_n , let $p_{n+1} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p_n$ with $p_{n+1} \in D_n$.

Then $G = \{q \in \mathbb{P} \mid \exists n \in \omega (p_n \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q)\}$ is a \mathbb{P} -generic filter over M . □

Where do generic filters live?

Suppose that $V \models \text{ZFC}$ and V contains countable, transitive models $M \in V$ of ZFC. Let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing notion. We extend M to $M[G]$, where G is a \mathbb{P} -generic filter contained in V , i.e. G is a filter which intersects all dense subsets of \mathbb{P} which lie in M .

Fact

For every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ there is a \mathbb{P} -generic filter G in V with $p \in G$.

Proof.

Since M is countable, M contains only countably many dense subsets of \mathbb{P} . Let $(D_n \mid n \in \omega)$ enumerate them (in V). Now we inductively construct a sequence of conditions $(p_n \mid n \in \omega)$ by

- $p_0 = p$
- Given p_n , let $p_{n+1} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p_n$ with $p_{n+1} \in D_n$.

Then $G = \{q \in \mathbb{P} \mid \exists n \in \omega (p_n \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q)\}$ is a \mathbb{P} -generic filter over M . □

Where do generic filters live?

Suppose that $V \models \text{ZFC}$ and V contains countable, transitive models $M \in V$ of ZFC. Let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing notion. We extend M to $M[G]$, where G is a \mathbb{P} -generic filter contained in V , i.e. G is a filter which intersects all dense subsets of \mathbb{P} which lie in M .

Fact

For every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ there is a \mathbb{P} -generic filter G in V with $p \in G$.

Proof.

Since M is countable, M contains only countably many dense subsets of \mathbb{P} . Let $(D_n \mid n \in \omega)$ enumerate them (in V). Now we inductively construct a sequence of conditions $(p_n \mid n \in \omega)$ by

- $p_0 = p$
- Given p_n , let $p_{n+1} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p_n$ with $p_{n+1} \in D_n$.

Then $G = \{q \in \mathbb{P} \mid \exists n \in \omega (p_n \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q)\}$ is a \mathbb{P} -generic filter over M . □

The idea behind names

Every element of $M[G]$ has a \mathbb{P} -name $\sigma \in M$ but M does not know how σ will be evaluated. This is similar to the case of *extensions of fields*:

Consider \mathbb{Q} and an algebraic closure $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ of \mathbb{Q} .

- In \mathbb{Q} , the polynomial $X^2 - 2$ *names* the root $\sqrt{2} \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$.
- If we extend \mathbb{Q} to $\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{2}]$, then $\sqrt{2}$ is the *evaluation* of $X^2 - 2$.

The idea behind names

Every element of $M[G]$ has a \mathbb{P} -name $\sigma \in M$ but M does not know how σ will be evaluated. This is similar to the case of *extensions of fields*:

Consider \mathbb{Q} and an algebraic closure $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ of \mathbb{Q} .

- In \mathbb{Q} , the polynomial $X^2 - 2$ *names* the root $\sqrt{2} \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$.
- If we extend \mathbb{Q} to $\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{2}]$, then $\sqrt{2}$ is the *evaluation* of $X^2 - 2$.

Cohen forcing

Let \mathbb{P} denote $\text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M . In $M[G]$, consider the function

$$c = \bigcup G. \quad (c \text{ is called a } \textit{Cohen real})$$

Fact

- 1 c is a function $\omega \rightarrow 2$.
- 2 If $f \in M$ is a function $f : \omega \rightarrow 2$ then $f \neq c$.

Proof.

(1) Let $n \in \omega$. If there are $p, q \in G$ such that $n \in \text{dom}(p) \cap \text{dom}(q)$ and $p(n) \neq q(n)$, then p and q are incompatible.

To see that $\text{dom}(c) = \omega$, note that $D_n = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid n \in \text{dom}(p)\}$ is dense. Let $p \in G \cap D_n$. Then $n \in \text{dom}(c)$ and $c(n) = p(n)$. \square

Cohen forcing

Let \mathbb{P} denote $\text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M . In $M[G]$, consider the function

$$c = \bigcup G. \quad (c \text{ is called a } \textit{Cohen real})$$

Fact

- 1 c is a function $\omega \rightarrow 2$.
- 2 If $f \in M$ is a function $f : \omega \rightarrow 2$ then $f \neq c$.

Proof.

(1) Let $n \in \omega$. If there are $p, q \in G$ such that $n \in \text{dom}(p) \cap \text{dom}(q)$ and $p(n) \neq q(n)$, then p and q are incompatible.

To see that $\text{dom}(c) = \omega$, note that $D_n = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid n \in \text{dom}(p)\}$ is dense. Let $p \in G \cap D_n$. Then $n \in \text{dom}(c)$ and $c(n) = p(n)$. \square

Cohen forcing

Let \mathbb{P} denote $\text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M . In $M[G]$, consider the function

$$c = \bigcup G. \quad (c \text{ is called a } \textit{Cohen real})$$

Fact

- 1 c is a function $\omega \rightarrow 2$.
- 2 If $f \in M$ is a function $f : \omega \rightarrow 2$ then $f \neq c$.

Proof.

(1) Let $n \in \omega$. If there are $p, q \in G$ such that $n \in \text{dom}(p) \cap \text{dom}(q)$ and $p(n) \neq q(n)$, then p and q are incompatible.

To see that $\text{dom}(c) = \omega$, note that $D_n = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid n \in \text{dom}(p)\}$ is dense. Let $p \in G \cap D_n$. Then $n \in \text{dom}(c)$ and $c(n) = p(n)$. \square

Cohen forcing

Let \mathbb{P} denote $\text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M . In $M[G]$, consider the function

$$c = \bigcup G. \quad (c \text{ is called a } \textit{Cohen real})$$

Fact

- 1 c is a function $\omega \rightarrow 2$.
- 2 If $f \in M$ is a function $f : \omega \rightarrow 2$ then $f \neq c$.

Proof.

(1) Let $n \in \omega$. If there are $p, q \in G$ such that $n \in \text{dom}(p) \cap \text{dom}(q)$ and $p(n) \neq q(n)$, then p and q are incompatible.

To see that $\text{dom}(c) = \omega$, note that $D_n = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid n \in \text{dom}(p)\}$ is dense. Let $p \in G \cap D_n$. Then $n \in \text{dom}(c)$ and $c(n) = p(n)$. \square

Cohen forcing

Let \mathbb{P} denote $\text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M . In $M[G]$, consider the function

$$c = \bigcup G. \quad (c \text{ is called a } \textit{Cohen real})$$

Fact

- 1 c is a function $\omega \rightarrow 2$.
- 2 If $f \in M$ is a function $f : \omega \rightarrow 2$ then $f \neq c$.

Proof.

(2) Consider $D_f = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \exists n \in \text{dom}(p) : p(n) \neq f(n)\}$. We claim that D_f is a dense subset of \mathbb{P} . Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Since $\text{dom}(p)$ is finite, there is $n \in \omega \setminus \text{dom}(p)$. Then $q = p \cup \{(n, 1 - f(n))\} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ and $q \in D_f$.

Take $p_0 \in G \cap D_f$ and let $n_0 \in \text{dom}(p_0)$ such that $p_0(n_0) \neq f(n_0)$. Then $c(n_0) = p_0(n_0)$ and so $c \neq f$. □

Cohen forcing

Let \mathbb{P} denote $\text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M . In $M[G]$, consider the function

$$c = \bigcup G. \quad (c \text{ is called a } \textit{Cohen real})$$

Fact

- 1 c is a function $\omega \rightarrow 2$.
- 2 If $f \in M$ is a function $f : \omega \rightarrow 2$ then $f \neq c$.

Proof.

(2) Consider $D_f = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \exists n \in \text{dom}(p) : p(n) \neq f(n)\}$. We claim that D_f is a dense subset of \mathbb{P} . Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Since $\text{dom}(p)$ is finite, there is $n \in \omega \setminus \text{dom}(p)$. Then $q = p \cup \{(n, 1 - f(n))\} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ and $q \in D_f$.

Take $p_0 \in G \cap D_f$ and let $n_0 \in \text{dom}(p_0)$ such that $p_0(n_0) \neq f(n_0)$. Then $c(n_0) = p_0(n_0)$ and so $c \neq f$. □

Cohen forcing

Let \mathbb{P} denote $\text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M . In $M[G]$, consider the function

$$c = \bigcup G. \quad (c \text{ is called a } \textit{Cohen real})$$

Fact

- 1 c is a function $\omega \rightarrow 2$.
- 2 If $f \in M$ is a function $f : \omega \rightarrow 2$ then $f \neq c$.

Proof.

(2) Consider $D_f = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \exists n \in \text{dom}(p) : p(n) \neq f(n)\}$. We claim that D_f is a dense subset of \mathbb{P} . Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Since $\text{dom}(p)$ is finite, there is $n \in \omega \setminus \text{dom}(p)$. Then $q = p \cup \{(n, 1 - f(n))\} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ and $q \in D_f$.

Take $p_0 \in G \cap D_f$ and let $n_0 \in \text{dom}(p_0)$ such that $p_0(n_0) \neq f(n_0)$. Then $c(n_0) = p_0(n_0)$ and so $c \neq f$. □

A nice application: Cantor's Theorem

Theorem (Cantor)

There is no surjection from ω onto $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$.

Proof.

Suppose the contrary. Observe that $\mathbb{P} = \text{Fn}(\omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ is countable. Then so is $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$, so we can enumerate (in M) all dense subsets of \mathbb{P} . But then we can construct in M a \mathbb{P} -generic filter over M . \square

The Cantor space

We identify \mathbb{R} with ${}^\omega 2$, the space of functions $\omega \rightarrow 2$.

Observation

If \mathbb{P} is a forcing notion and G is \mathbb{P} -generic over M , then \mathbb{R}^M and $\mathbb{R}^{M[G]}$ do not have to be the same.

The Cantor space

We identify \mathbb{R} with ${}^\omega 2$, the space of functions $\omega \rightarrow 2$.

Observation

If \mathbb{P} is a forcing notion and G is \mathbb{P} -generic over M , then \mathbb{R}^M and $\mathbb{R}^{M[G]}$ do not have to be the same.

Intervals in the Cantor space

We define intervals in the following way: For $s \in {}^{<\omega}2 = \{t : \text{dom}(t) \rightarrow 2 \mid \text{dom}(t) \in \omega\}$ we define

$$I_s = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid s \subseteq x\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$$

and we define $\mu(I_s) = 2^{-\text{dom}(s)}$.

Definition

We say that a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ has *measure zero*, if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a sequence $(I_n \mid n \in \omega)$ of intervals in \mathbb{R} such that $X \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \omega} I_n$ and $\sum_{n \in \omega} \mu(I_n) < \varepsilon$.

Intervals in the Cantor space

We define intervals in the following way: For $s \in {}^{<\omega}2 = \{t : \text{dom}(t) \rightarrow 2 \mid \text{dom}(t) \in \omega\}$ we define

$$I_s = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid s \subseteq x\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$$

and we define $\mu(I_s) = 2^{-\text{dom}(s)}$.

Definition

We say that a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ has *measure zero*, if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a sequence $(I_n \mid n \in \omega)$ of intervals in \mathbb{R} such that $X \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \omega} I_n$ and $\sum_{n \in \omega} \mu(I_n) < \varepsilon$.

Theorem

Let $M[G]$ be a generic extension of M by Cohen forcing, and let $c \in M[G]$ be the canonical Cohen real. Then in $M[G]$, \mathbb{R}^M has measure zero.

Proof.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, let $k \in \omega$ such that $\varepsilon > 2^{-k}$. For $n \in \omega$ define

$$s_n : k + n + 1 \rightarrow 2, s_n(l) = c(n + l).$$

Now define $I_n = I_{s_n}$. Then

$$\sum_{n \in \omega} \mu(I_n) = \sum_{n \in \omega} 2^{-(k+n+1)} = 2^{-k} < \varepsilon.$$



Theorem

Let $M[G]$ be a generic extension of M by Cohen forcing, and let $c \in M[G]$ be the canonical Cohen real. Then in $M[G]$, \mathbb{R}^M has measure zero.

Proof.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, let $k \in \omega$ such that $\varepsilon > 2^{-k}$. For $n \in \omega$ define

$$s_n : k + n + 1 \rightarrow 2, s_n(l) = c(n + l).$$

Now define $I_n = I_{s_n}$. Then

$$\sum_{n \in \omega} \mu(I_n) = \sum_{n \in \omega} 2^{-(k+n+1)} = 2^{-k} < \varepsilon.$$



Theorem

Let $M[G]$ be a generic extension of M by Cohen forcing, and let $c \in M[G]$ be the canonical Cohen real. Then in $M[G]$, \mathbb{R}^M has measure zero.

Proof.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, let $k \in \omega$ such that $\varepsilon > 2^{-k}$. For $n \in \omega$ define

$$s_n : k + n + 1 \rightarrow 2, s_n(l) = c(n + l).$$

Now define $I_n = I_{s_n}$. Then

$$\sum_{n \in \omega} \mu(I_n) = \sum_{n \in \omega} 2^{-(k+n+1)} = 2^{-k} < \varepsilon.$$



Proof, continued.

$s_n : k + n + 1 \rightarrow 2$, $s_n(l) = c(n + l)$, $I_n = I_{s_n}$.

It remains to check: $\mathbb{R}^M \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \omega} I_n$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Then

$$D_x = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \exists n \in \omega \forall l < k + n + 1 : n + l \in \text{dom}(p) \\ \wedge p(n + l) = x(l)\} \in M$$

is a dense subset of Cohen forcing \mathbb{P} . Take $p \in G \cap D_x$ and $n \in \omega$ which witnesses that $p \in D_x$. Then

$$\forall l < k + n + 1 : s_n(l) = c(n + l) = p(n + l) = x(l)$$

and so $s_n \subseteq x$ and $x \in I_n$. □

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

We have used Cohen forcing to add one real c which is not an element of the ground model M . What happens if we add \aleph_2 -many Cohen reals in this way?

Definition

Let $\text{Fn}(\aleph_2^M \times \omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ denote the set of finite partial functions from $\aleph_2^M \times \omega \rightarrow 2$, ordered by reverse inclusion.

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

We have used Cohen forcing to add one real c which is not an element of the ground model M . What happens if we add \aleph_2 -many Cohen reals in this way?

Definition

Let $\text{Fn}(\aleph_2^M \times \omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ denote the set of finite partial functions from $\aleph_2^M \times \omega \rightarrow 2$, ordered by reverse inclusion.

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Let \mathbb{P} denote $\text{Fn}(\aleph_2^M \times \omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M .

Lemma

The following statements hold:

- ① $F = \bigcup G$ is a function $F : \aleph_2^M \times \omega \rightarrow 2$.
- ② For each $\alpha < \aleph_2^M$, let $c_\alpha(n) = F(\alpha, n)$. Then for all $\alpha < \beta < \aleph_2^M$, $c_\alpha \neq c_\beta$.

Proof.

(1) Follows from the density of the sets

$$D_{\alpha,n} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid (\alpha, n) \in \text{dom}(p)\}$$

for all $\alpha < \aleph_2^M$ and $n \in \omega$. □

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Let \mathbb{P} denote $\text{Fn}(\aleph_2^M \times \omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M .

Lemma

The following statements hold:

- ① $F = \bigcup G$ is a function $F : \aleph_2^M \times \omega \rightarrow 2$.
- ② For each $\alpha < \aleph_2^M$, let $c_\alpha(n) = F(\alpha, n)$. Then for all $\alpha < \beta < \aleph_2^M$, $c_\alpha \neq c_\beta$.

Proof.

(1) Follows from the density of the sets

$$D_{\alpha,n} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid (\alpha, n) \in \text{dom}(p)\}$$

for all $\alpha < \aleph_2^M$ and $n \in \omega$. □

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Let \mathbb{P} denote $\text{Fn}(\aleph_2^M \times \omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ and let G be \mathbb{P} -generic over M .

Lemma

The following statements hold:

- ① $F = \bigcup G$ is a function $F : \aleph_2^M \times \omega \rightarrow 2$.
- ② For $\alpha < \beta < \aleph_2^M$, let $c_\alpha(n) = F(\alpha, n)$. Then for all $\alpha < \beta < \aleph_2^M$, $c_\alpha \neq c_\beta$.

Proof.

(2) For all $\alpha < \beta < \aleph_2^M$ consider

$$D_{\alpha\beta} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \exists n \in \omega : (\alpha, n), (\beta, n) \in \text{dom}(p) \text{ and } p(\alpha, n) \neq p(\beta, n)\}.$$

Then $D_{\alpha\beta}$ is dense in \mathbb{P} . By genericity, take $p \in G \cap D_{\alpha\beta}$ and $n \in \omega$ such that $(\alpha, n), (\beta, n) \in \text{dom} p$ with $p(\alpha, n) \neq p(\beta, n)$. Then

$$c_\alpha(n) = F(\alpha, n) = p(\alpha, n) \neq p(\beta, n) = F(\beta, n) = c_\beta(n).$$



Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

The previous lemma shows that there are at least \aleph_2^M many reals in $M[G]$, so if we can show that $\aleph_2^M = \aleph_2^{M[G]}$ then in $M[G]$

$$(2^{\aleph_0})^{M[G]} = |\mathbb{R}^{M[G]}| \geq \aleph_2^M = \aleph_2^{M[G]}.$$

Definition

Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion.

- 1 An *antichain* in \mathbb{P} is a subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with the property that all elements of A are incompatible, i.e. for all $p, q \in A$, there is no $r \in \mathbb{P}$ with $r \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p, q$.
- 2 \mathbb{P} satisfies the *countable chain condition (ccc)*, if every antichain in \mathbb{P} is at most countable.

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

The previous lemma shows that there are at least \aleph_2^M many reals in $M[G]$, so if we can show that $\aleph_2^M = \aleph_2^{M[G]}$ then in $M[G]$

$$(2^{\aleph_0})^{M[G]} = |\mathbb{R}^{M[G]}| \geq \aleph_2^M = \aleph_2^{M[G]}.$$

Definition

Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion.

- 1 An *antichain* in \mathbb{P} is a subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with the property that all elements of A are incompatible, i.e. for all $p, q \in A$, there is no $r \in \mathbb{P}$ with $r \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p, q$.
- 2 \mathbb{P} satisfies the *countable chain condition (ccc)*, if every antichain in \mathbb{P} is at most countable.

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

The previous lemma shows that there are at least \aleph_2^M many reals in $M[G]$, so if we can show that $\aleph_2^M = \aleph_2^{M[G]}$ then in $M[G]$

$$(2^{\aleph_0})^{M[G]} = |\mathbb{R}^{M[G]}| \geq \aleph_2^M = \aleph_2^{M[G]}.$$

Definition

Let \mathbb{P} be a forcing notion.

- 1 An *antichain* in \mathbb{P} is a subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with the property that all elements of A are incompatible, i.e. for all $p, q \in A$, there is no $r \in \mathbb{P}$ with $r \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p, q$.
- 2 \mathbb{P} satisfies the *countable chain condition (ccc)*, if every antichain in \mathbb{P} is at most countable.

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Theorem

If \mathbb{P} satisfies the ccc then \mathbb{P} preserves all cardinals, i.e. $|\kappa|^{M[G]} = \kappa$ in every \mathbb{P} -generic extension $M[G]$. In particular, $\aleph_2^{M[G]} = \aleph_2^M$.

How can it happen that \aleph_2^M is collapsed?

Forcing \neg CH

Theorem

If \mathbb{P} satisfies the ccc then \mathbb{P} preserves all cardinals, i.e. $|\kappa|^{M[G]} = \kappa$ in every \mathbb{P} -generic extension $M[G]$. In particular, $\aleph_2^{M[G]} = \aleph_2^M$.

How can it happen that \aleph_2^M is collapsed?

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Theorem

If \mathbb{P} satisfies the ccc then \mathbb{P} preserves all cardinals, i.e. $|\kappa|^{M[G]} = \kappa$ in every \mathbb{P} -generic extension $M[G]$. In particular, $\aleph_2^{M[G]} = \aleph_2^M$.

Example

Consider the forcing notion

$$\text{Col}(\omega, \aleph_2^M) = \{p : \text{dom}(p) \rightarrow \omega_2^M \mid \text{dom}(p) \subseteq \omega \text{ finite}\}$$

ordered by reverse inclusion. If G is $\text{Col}(\omega, \aleph_2^M)$ -generic, then $F = \bigcup G$ is a function $\omega \rightarrow \aleph_2^M$. Then F is surjective because for each $\alpha < \aleph_2^M$ the set

$$D_\alpha = \{p \in \text{Col}(\omega, \aleph_2^M) \mid \exists n \in \text{dom}(p) : p(n) = \alpha\}$$

is dense. So in $M[G]$ we have $\aleph_2^M = \aleph_0$.

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Theorem

If \mathbb{P} satisfies the ccc then \mathbb{P} preserves all cardinals, i.e. $|\kappa|^{M[G]} = \kappa$ in every \mathbb{P} -generic extension $M[G]$. In particular, $\aleph_2^{M[G]} = \aleph_2^M$.

Example

Consider the forcing notion

$$\text{Col}(\omega, \aleph_2^M) = \{p : \text{dom}(p) \rightarrow \omega_2^M \mid \text{dom}(p) \subseteq \omega \text{ finite}\}$$

ordered by reverse inclusion. If G is $\text{Col}(\omega, \aleph_2^M)$ -generic, then $F = \bigcup G$ is a function $\omega \rightarrow \aleph_2^M$. Then F is surjective because for each $\alpha < \aleph_2^M$ the set

$$D_\alpha = \{p \in \text{Col}(\omega, \aleph_2^M) \mid \exists n \in \text{dom}(p) : p(n) = \alpha\}$$

is dense. So in $M[G]$ we have $\aleph_2^M = \aleph_0$.

Forcing \neg CH

Lemma

$\mathbb{P} = \text{Fn}(\aleph_2^M \times \omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ has the ccc.

Proof.

Suppose that $(p_i \mid i < \aleph_1^M)$ enumerates an uncountable antichain. Then there is a set $X \subseteq \aleph_1^M$ of size \aleph_1^M and $n \in \omega$ such that

$$\forall i \in X \mid \text{dom}(p_i) \mid = n.$$

Now let $m \leq n$ be maximal such that there is a set b with $\mid b \mid = m$ and $Y \subseteq X$ of size \aleph_1^M such that for all $i \in Y$, $b \subseteq \text{dom}(p_i)$. We claim that for all $x \notin b$ there is $i(x) < \aleph_1^M$ such that for all $i > i(x)$ in Y , $x \notin \text{dom}(p_i)$. This holds because otherwise $b \cup \{x\}$ would contradict the maximality of m . □

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Lemma

$\mathbb{P} = \text{Fn}(\aleph_2^M \times \omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ has the ccc.

Proof.

Suppose that $(p_i \mid i < \aleph_1^M)$ enumerates an uncountable antichain. Then there is a set $X \subseteq \aleph_1^M$ of size \aleph_1^M and $n \in \omega$ such that

$$\forall i \in X \text{ } |\text{dom}(p_i)| = n.$$

Now let $m \leq n$ be maximal such that there is a set b with $|b| = m$ and $Y \subseteq X$ of size \aleph_1^M such that for all $i \in Y$, $b \subseteq \text{dom}(p_i)$. We claim that for all $x \notin b$ there is $i(x) < \aleph_1^M$ such that for all $i > i(x)$ in Y , $x \notin \text{dom}(p_i)$. This holds because otherwise $b \cup \{x\}$ would contradict the maximality of m . □

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Lemma

$\mathbb{P} = \text{Fn}(\aleph_2^M \times \omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ has the ccc.

Proof.

Suppose that $(p_i \mid i < \aleph_1^M)$ enumerates an uncountable antichain. Then there is a set $X \subseteq \aleph_1^M$ of size \aleph_1^M and $n \in \omega$ such that

$$\forall i \in X \quad |\text{dom}(p_i)| = n.$$

Now let $m \leq n$ be maximal such that there is a set b with $|b| = m$ and $Y \subseteq X$ of size \aleph_1^M such that for all $i \in Y$, $b \subseteq \text{dom}(p_i)$. We claim that for all $x \notin b$ there is $i(x) < \aleph_1^M$ such that for all $i > i(x)$ in Y , $x \notin \text{dom}(p_i)$. This holds because otherwise $b \cup \{x\}$ would contradict the maximality of m . □

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Lemma

$\mathbb{P} = \text{Fn}(\aleph_2^M \times \omega, 2, \aleph_0)$ has the ccc.

Proof.

Suppose that $(p_i \mid i < \aleph_1^M)$ enumerates an uncountable antichain. Then there is a set $X \subseteq \aleph_1^M$ of size \aleph_1^M and $n \in \omega$ such that

$$\forall i \in X \mid \text{dom}(p_i) \mid = n.$$

Now let $m \leq n$ be maximal such that there is a set b with $|b| = m$ and $Y \subseteq X$ of size \aleph_1^M such that for all $i \in Y$, $b \subseteq \text{dom}(p_i)$. We claim that for all $x \notin b$ there is $i(x) < \aleph_1^M$ such that for all $i > i(x)$ in Y , $x \notin \text{dom}(p_i)$. This holds because otherwise $b \cup \{x\}$ would contradict the maximality of m . □

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Proof, continued.

- $Y \subseteq \aleph_1$ of size \aleph_1^M with $b \subseteq \text{dom}(p_i)$ for all $i \in Y$.
- for all $x \notin b$, $i(x) < \aleph_1^M$ with $x \notin \text{dom}(p_i)$ for all $i > i(x)$ in Y .

We construct an increasing sequence $(i_\xi \mid \xi < \aleph_1)$ with $i_\xi \in Y$ by recursion: Suppose that $(i_\xi \mid \xi < \zeta)$ has already been defined. Then let i_ζ be the minimal ordinal $i \in Y$ such that

$$i > \sup\{i(x) \mid \exists \xi < \zeta : x \in \text{dom}(p_\xi)\}.$$

Now let $\xi < \zeta < \aleph_1^M$. We claim that $\text{dom}(p_{i_\xi}) \cap \text{dom}(p_{i_\zeta}) \subseteq b$. Let $x \in \text{dom}(p_{i_\xi}) \cap \text{dom}(p_{i_\zeta})$ and $x \notin b$. Then $i_\zeta > i(x)$ and so $x \notin \text{dom}(p_{i_\zeta})$. But there are only finitely many possibilities for $p_{i_\xi} \upharpoonright b$, so there must be some $\xi \neq \zeta$ such that p_{i_ξ} and p_{i_ζ} are compatible. \square

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Proof, continued.

- $Y \subseteq \aleph_1^M$ of size \aleph_1^M with $b \subseteq \text{dom}(p_i)$ for all $i \in Y$.
- for all $x \notin b$, $i(x) < \aleph_1^M$ with $x \notin \text{dom}(p_i)$ for all $i > i(x)$ in Y .

We construct an increasing sequence $(i_\xi \mid \xi < \aleph_1)$ with $i_\xi \in Y$ by recursion: Suppose that $(i_\xi \mid \xi < \zeta)$ has already been defined. Then let i_ζ be the minimal ordinal $i \in Y$ such that

$$i > \sup\{i(x) \mid \exists \xi < \zeta : x \in \text{dom}(p_\xi)\}.$$

Now let $\xi < \zeta < \aleph_1^M$. We claim that $\text{dom}(p_{i_\xi}) \cap \text{dom}(p_{i_\zeta}) \subseteq b$. Let $x \in \text{dom}(p_{i_\xi}) \cap \text{dom}(p_{i_\zeta})$ and $x \notin b$. Then $i_\zeta > i(x)$ and so $x \notin \text{dom}(p_{i_\zeta})$. But there are only finitely many possibilities for $p_{i_\xi} \upharpoonright b$, so there must be some $\xi \neq \zeta$ such that p_{i_ξ} and p_{i_ζ} are compatible. \square

Forcing $\neg\text{CH}$

Proof, continued.

- $Y \subseteq \aleph_1$ of size \aleph_1^M with $b \subseteq \text{dom}(p_i)$ for all $i \in Y$.
- for all $x \notin b$, $i(x) < \aleph_1^M$ with $x \notin \text{dom}(p_i)$ for all $i > i(x)$ in Y .

We construct an increasing sequence $(i_\xi \mid \xi < \aleph_1)$ with $i_\xi \in Y$ by recursion: Suppose that $(i_\xi \mid \xi < \zeta)$ has already been defined. Then let i_ζ be the minimal ordinal $i \in Y$ such that

$$i > \sup\{i(x) \mid \exists \xi < \zeta : x \in \text{dom}(p_\xi)\}.$$

Now let $\xi < \zeta < \aleph_1^M$. We claim that $\text{dom}(p_{i_\xi}) \cap \text{dom}(p_{i_\zeta}) \subseteq b$. Let $x \in \text{dom}(p_{i_\xi}) \cap \text{dom}(p_{i_\zeta})$ and $x \notin b$. Then $i_\zeta > i(x)$ and so $x \notin \text{dom}(p_{i_\zeta})$. But there are only finitely many possibilities for $p_{i_\xi} \upharpoonright b$, so there must be some $\xi \neq \zeta$ such that p_{i_ξ} and p_{i_ζ} are compatible. \square

Forcing \neg CH

Thus we have proved

Theorem (Gödel, Cohen)

CH is independent of the axioms of ZFC.

Thank you for your attention!

Forcing \neg CH

Thus we have proved

Theorem (Gödel, Cohen)

CH is independent of the axioms of ZFC.

Thank you for your attention!