

The Forcing Theorem

Goal

Our goal is to prove that $M[G]$ is a c.t.m.,

Goal

Our goal is to prove that $M[G]$ is a c.t.m., assuming that M is c.t.m..

Our goal is to prove that $M[G]$ is a c.t.m., assuming that M is c.t.m.. The strategy will be: to show that Axiom A holds in $M[G]$,

Goal

Our goal is to prove that $M[G]$ is a c.t.m., assuming that M is c.t.m.. The strategy will be: to show that Axiom A holds in $M[G]$, find a statement A' that ‘mirrors’ Axiom A in M ,

Our goal is to prove that $M[G]$ is a c.t.m., assuming that M is c.t.m.. The strategy will be: to show that Axiom A holds in $M[G]$, find a statement A' that ‘mirrors’ Axiom A in M , meaning that M satisfies A' iff $M[G]$ satisfies A.

Goal

Our goal is to prove that $M[G]$ is a c.t.m., assuming that M is c.t.m.. The strategy will be: to show that Axiom A holds in $M[G]$, find a statement A' that ‘mirrors’ Axiom A in M , meaning that M satisfies A' iff $M[G]$ satisfies A . We do this because M satisfies the axioms,

Our goal is to prove that $M[G]$ is a c.t.m., assuming that M is c.t.m.. The strategy will be: to show that Axiom A holds in $M[G]$, find a statement A' that ‘mirrors’ Axiom A in M , meaning that M satisfies A' iff $M[G]$ satisfies A. We do this because M satisfies the axioms, so we have hypotheses to prove things in M which we do not have in $M[G]$.

The Forcing Relation

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order.

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

which is read “ p forces $\varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and M .”

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

which is read “ p forces $\varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and M .” This states that

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

which is read “ p forces $\varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and M .” This states that

$\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing order;

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

which is read “ p forces $\varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and M .” This states that

$\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing order;

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

which is read “ p forces $\varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and M .” This states that

$\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing order, $\mathbb{P} \in M$,

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

which is read “ p forces $\varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and M .” This states that

$\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing order, $\mathbb{P} \in M$, $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$,

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

which is read “ p forces $\varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and M .” This states that

$\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing order, $\mathbb{P} \in M$, $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, $p \in P$,

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

which is read “ p forces $\varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and M .” This states that

$\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing order, $\mathbb{P} \in M$, $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, $p \in P$, and for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M ,

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

which is read “ p forces $\varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and M .” This states that

$\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing order, $\mathbb{P} \in M$, $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, $p \in P$, and for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , if $p \in G$, then the formula $\varphi^{M[G]}(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ (= the relativization of φ to $M[G]$) holds for the elements $\sigma_{0G}, \dots, \sigma_{(m-1)G}$.

The Forcing Relation

Let M be a c.t.m., and let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq, 1) \in M$ be a forcing order. For each formula $\varphi(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ in the language of set theory, we define another formula

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}, M} \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$$

which is read “ p forces $\varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and M .” This states that

$\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing order, $\mathbb{P} \in M$, $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, $p \in P$, and for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , if $p \in G$, then the formula $\varphi^{M[G]}(v_0, \dots, v_{m-1})$ (= the relativization of φ to $M[G]$) holds for the elements $\sigma_{0G}, \dots, \sigma_{(m-1)G}$.

But ...

But ...

To make this work in M , we have to avoid the part that says

But ...

To make this work in M , we have to avoid the part that says “...for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , ...”

But ...

To make this work in M , we have to avoid the part that says “...for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , ...” since the $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filters G need not be elements of M .

But ...

To make this work in M , we have to avoid the part that says “...for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , ...” since the $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filters G need not be elements of M . We address that by finding a different relation $\Vdash^*$ such that

But ...

To make this work in M , we have to avoid the part that says “...for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , ...” since the $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filters G need not be elements of M . We address that by finding a different relation $\Vdash^*$ such that

- $\Vdash^*$ is equivalent to $\Vdash$, and

But ...

To make this work in M , we have to avoid the part that says “...for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , ...” since the $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filters G need not be elements of M . We address that by finding a different relation $\Vdash^*$ such that

- $\Vdash^*$ is equivalent to $\Vdash$, and

But ...

To make this work in M , we have to avoid the part that says “...for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , ...” since the $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filters G need not be elements of M . We address that by finding a different relation $\Vdash^*$ such that

- $\Vdash^*$ is equivalent to $\Vdash$, and
- $\Vdash^*$ can be defined in any c.t.m. M .

But ...

To make this work in M , we have to avoid the part that says “...for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , ...” since the $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filters G need not be elements of M . We address that by finding a different relation $\Vdash^*$ such that

- $\Vdash^*$ is equivalent to $\Vdash$, and
- $\Vdash^*$ can be defined in any c.t.m. M .

But ...

To make this work in M , we have to avoid the part that says “...for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , ...” since the $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filters G need not be elements of M . We address that by finding a different relation $\Vdash^*$ such that

- $\Vdash^*$ is equivalent to $\Vdash$, and
- $\Vdash^*$ can be defined in any c.t.m. M .

This will be done by generalizing the usual complete Boolean algebra of truth values $\langle \{0, 1\}; \wedge, \vee, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ for logic to a different complete Boolean algebra $\text{RO}(\mathbb{P}) = \langle \text{RO}(P); \wedge, \vee, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$,

But ...

To make this work in M , we have to avoid the part that says “...for every filter $G \subseteq P$ which is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over M , ...” since the $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filters G need not be elements of M . We address that by finding a different relation $\Vdash^*$ such that

- $\Vdash^*$ is equivalent to $\Vdash$, and
- $\Vdash^*$ can be defined in any c.t.m. M .

This will be done by generalizing the usual complete Boolean algebra of truth values $\langle \{0, 1\}; \wedge, \vee, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ for logic to a different complete Boolean algebra $\text{RO}(\mathbb{P}) = \langle \text{RO}(P); \wedge, \vee, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$, and assigning truth values to formulas in this Boolean algebra.

Regular open sets

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space.

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$,

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O .

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O .

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Exercises.

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Exercises. Show

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Exercises. Show

- 1 $O \mapsto O^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator on X .

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Exercises. Show

- 1 $O \mapsto O^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator on X .

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Exercises. Show

- 1 $O \mapsto O^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator on X . (The closed elements are called *regular open sets*.)

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Exercises. Show

- 1 $O \mapsto O^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator on X . (The closed elements are called *regular open sets*.)
- 2 O is regular iff $O = \text{int}(\text{cl}(O))$.

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Exercises. Show

- 1 $O \mapsto O^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator on X . (The closed elements are called *regular open sets*.)
- 2 O is regular iff $O = \text{int}(\text{cl}(O))$.

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Exercises. Show

- 1 $O \mapsto O^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator on X . (The closed elements are called *regular open sets*.)
- 2 O is regular iff $O = \text{int}(\text{cl}(O))$.
- 3 The algebra $\text{RO}(\mathbb{X}) = \langle \text{RO}(X); \wedge, \vee, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ of regular open sets of $\langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ is a complete Boolean algebra.

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Exercises. Show

- 1 $O \mapsto O^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator on X . (The closed elements are called *regular open sets*.)
- 2 O is regular iff $O = \text{int}(\text{cl}(O))$.
- 3 The algebra $\text{RO}(\mathbb{X}) = \langle \text{RO}(X); \wedge, \vee, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ of regular open sets of $\langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ is a complete Boolean algebra.

Regular open sets

Let $\mathbb{X} = \langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be a topological space. For each open set $O \in \mathcal{T}$, let $O^\perp$ be the union of open sets disjoint from O . $O^\perp$ is then the largest open set in $\mathcal{T}$ that is disjoint from O . Call $O^{\perp\perp}$ the *regularization* of O .

Exercises. Show

- ① $O \mapsto O^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator on X . (The closed elements are called *regular open sets*.)
- ② O is regular iff $O = \text{int}(\text{cl}(O))$.
- ③ The algebra $\text{RO}(\mathbb{X}) = \langle \text{RO}(X); \wedge, \vee, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ of regular open sets of $\langle X; \mathcal{T} \rangle$ is a complete Boolean algebra.
- ④ When $|X| = 1$, $\text{RO}(\mathbb{X})$ is the 2-element BA.

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology.

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.)

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $(p]$ is the least open set containing p .

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $(p]$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = (p]^{\perp\perp}$

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $(p]$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = (p]^{\perp\perp}$ = the regularization of the principal downset determined by p .

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $(p]$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = (p]^{\perp\perp}$ = the regularization of the principal downset determined by p . This yields an order-preserving function $e: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$.

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $(p]$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = (p]^{\perp\perp}$ = the regularization of the principal downset determined by p . This yields an order-preserving function $e: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$.

Exercise.

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $(p]$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = (p]^{\perp\perp}$ = the regularization of the principal downset determined by p . This yields an order-preserving function $e: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$.

Exercise.

- 1 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is a chain.

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $(p]$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = (p]^{\perp\perp}$ = the regularization of the principal downset determined by p . This yields an order-preserving function $e: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$.

Exercise.

- 1 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is a chain.

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $(p]$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = (p]^{\perp\perp}$ = the regularization of the principal downset determined by p . This yields an order-preserving function $e: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$.

Exercise.

- 1 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is a chain.
- 2 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is an antichain with a top element adjoined.

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $(p]$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = (p]^{\perp\perp}$ = the regularization of the principal downset determined by p . This yields an order-preserving function $e: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$.

Exercise.

- 1 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is a chain.
- 2 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is an antichain with a top element adjoined.

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $\downarrow p$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = \downarrow p^{\perp\perp}$ = the regularization of the principal downset determined by p . This yields an order-preserving function $e: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$.

Exercise.

- 1 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is a chain.
- 2 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is an antichain with a top element adjoined.

We shall define a Boolean truth value $\llbracket \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket \in \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$ for each formula φ and for $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$.

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $[p]$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = [p]^{\perp\perp}$ = the regularization of the principal downset determined by p . This yields an order-preserving function $e: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$.

Exercise.

- 1 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is a chain.
- 2 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is an antichain with a top element adjoined.

We shall define a Boolean truth value $\llbracket \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket \in \mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$ for each formula φ and for $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$. The relation $e(p) \subseteq \llbracket \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket$ will be denoted $p \Vdash^* \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$.

Mapping $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$

A forcing poset $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ is a topological space under the dual of the Alexandroff topology. (Open sets = Downsets.) For each $p \in P$, the principal downset $[p]$ is the least open set containing p . Define $e(p) = [p]^{\perp\perp}$ = the regularization of the principal downset determined by p . This yields an order-preserving function $e: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$.

Exercise.

- 1 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is a chain.
- 2 Describe the regular open sets when $\mathbb{P}$ is an antichain with a top element adjoined.

We shall define a Boolean truth value $\llbracket \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket \in \mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$ for each formula φ and for $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$. The relation $e(p) \subseteq \llbracket \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket$ will be denoted $p \Vdash^* \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1})$. This relation will mirror the forcing relation in M .

The Forcing Theorem

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem.

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m.,

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m., let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing order,

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m., let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing order, and let $G \subseteq P$ be a $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filter over M .

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m., let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing order, and let $G \subseteq P$ be a $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filter over M . For any formula φ with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m., let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing order, and let $G \subseteq P$ be a $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filter over M . For any formula φ with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$ and for any $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, the following conditions are equivalent:

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m., let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing order, and let $G \subseteq P$ be a $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filter over M . For any formula φ with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$ and for any $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- ① $\varphi(\sigma_{0G}, \dots, \sigma_{(m-1)G})$ holds in $M[G]$.

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m., let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing order, and let $G \subseteq P$ be a $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filter over M . For any formula φ with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$ and for any $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- ① $\varphi(\sigma_{0G}, \dots, \sigma_{(m-1)G})$ holds in $M[G]$.

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m., let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing order, and let $G \subseteq P$ be a $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filter over M . For any formula φ with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$ and for any $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- ① $\varphi(\sigma_{0G}, \dots, \sigma_{(m-1)G})$ holds in $M[G]$.
- ② There is a $p \in G$ such that $(p \Vdash^* \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}))^M$.

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m., let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing order, and let $G \subseteq P$ be a $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filter over M . For any formula φ with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$ and for any $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- ① $\varphi(\sigma_{0G}, \dots, \sigma_{(m-1)G})$ holds in $M[G]$.
- ② There is a $p \in G$ such that $(p \Vdash^* \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}))^M$.

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m., let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing order, and let $G \subseteq P$ be a $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filter over M . For any formula φ with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$ and for any $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- ① $\varphi(\sigma_{0G}, \dots, \sigma_{(m-1)G})$ holds in $M[G]$.
- ② There is a $p \in G$ such that $(p \Vdash^* \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}))^M$.

The Forcing Theorem

Theorem. Let M be a c.t.m., let $\mathbb{P} \in M$ be a forcing order, and let $G \subseteq P$ be a $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filter over M . For any formula φ with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$ and for any $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in M^P$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- ① $\varphi(\sigma_{0G}, \dots, \sigma_{(m-1)G})$ holds in $M[G]$.
- ② There is a $p \in G$ such that $(p \Vdash^* \varphi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}))^M$.

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem.

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem. Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ be a forcing order,

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem. Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ be a forcing order, and $e(p) = (p]^\perp{}^\perp$.

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem. Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ be a forcing order, and $e(p) = (p]^\perp{}^\perp$. There exist two class functions $\mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \mathbf{RO}(\mathbb{P})$,

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem. Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ be a forcing order, and $e(p) = (p]^\perp{}^\perp$. There exist two class functions $\mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$, denoted

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem. Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ be a forcing order, and $e(p) = (p]^\perp{}^\perp$. There exist two class functions $\mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$, denoted

$$(\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma = \tau \rrbracket \quad \text{and} \quad (\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma \in \tau \rrbracket, \quad (*)$$

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem. Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ be a forcing order, and $e(p) = (p]^\perp{}^\perp$. There exist two class functions $\mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$, denoted

$$(\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma = \tau \rrbracket \quad \text{and} \quad (\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma \in \tau \rrbracket, \quad (*)$$

such that the following hold for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbf{V}^P$:

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem. Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ be a forcing order, and $e(p) = (p]^\perp{}^\perp$. There exist two class functions $\mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$, denoted

$$(\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma = \tau \rrbracket \quad \text{and} \quad (\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma \in \tau \rrbracket, \quad (*)$$

such that the following hold for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbf{V}^P$:

$$\llbracket \sigma = \tau \rrbracket = \bigwedge_{(\xi, p) \in \tau} (e(p) \rightarrow \llbracket \xi \in \sigma \rrbracket) \wedge \bigwedge_{(\eta, q) \in \sigma} (e(q) \rightarrow \llbracket \eta \in \tau \rrbracket), \quad (\dagger)$$

$$\llbracket \sigma \in \tau \rrbracket = \bigvee_{(\xi, p) \in \tau} (e(p) \wedge \llbracket \sigma = \xi \rrbracket). \quad (\ddagger)$$

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem. Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ be a forcing order, and $e(p) = (p]^{\perp\perp}$. There exist two class functions $\mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$, denoted

$$(\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma = \tau \rrbracket \quad \text{and} \quad (\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma \in \tau \rrbracket, \quad (*)$$

such that the following hold for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbf{V}^P$:

$$\llbracket \sigma = \tau \rrbracket = \bigwedge_{(\xi, p) \in \sigma} (e(p) \rightarrow \llbracket \xi \in \sigma \rrbracket) \wedge \bigwedge_{(\eta, q) \in \tau} (e(q) \rightarrow \llbracket \eta \in \tau \rrbracket), \quad (\dagger)$$

$$\llbracket \sigma \in \tau \rrbracket = \bigvee_{(\xi, p) \in \tau} (e(p) \wedge \llbracket \sigma = \xi \rrbracket). \quad (\ddagger)$$

These two functions have to be defined simultaneously by recursion. This may be accomplished with a single function $\mathbf{F}: 2 \times \mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$ defined by recursion,

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem. Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ be a forcing order, and $e(p) = (p]^{\perp\perp}$. There exist two class functions $\mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$, denoted

$$(\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma = \tau \rrbracket \quad \text{and} \quad (\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma \in \tau \rrbracket, \quad (*)$$

such that the following hold for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbf{V}^P$:

$$\llbracket \sigma = \tau \rrbracket = \bigwedge_{(\xi, p) \in \tau} (e(p) \rightarrow \llbracket \xi \in \sigma \rrbracket) \wedge \bigwedge_{(\eta, q) \in \sigma} (e(q) \rightarrow \llbracket \eta \in \tau \rrbracket), \quad (\dagger)$$

$$\llbracket \sigma \in \tau \rrbracket = \bigvee_{(\xi, p) \in \tau} (e(p) \wedge \llbracket \sigma = \xi \rrbracket). \quad (\ddagger)$$

These two functions have to be defined simultaneously by recursion. This may be accomplished with a single function $\mathbf{F}: 2 \times \mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$ defined by recursion, and $\llbracket x = y \rrbracket$ means $\mathbf{F}(0, x, y)$

Assigning truth values to formulas: atomic formulas

Theorem. Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P; \leq, 1 \rangle$ be a forcing order, and $e(p) = (p]^\perp{}^\perp$. There exist two class functions $\mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$, denoted

$$(\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma = \tau \rrbracket \quad \text{and} \quad (\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \llbracket \sigma \in \tau \rrbracket, \quad (*)$$

such that the following hold for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbf{V}^P$:

$$\llbracket \sigma = \tau \rrbracket = \bigwedge_{(\xi, p) \in \tau} (e(p) \rightarrow \llbracket \xi \in \sigma \rrbracket) \wedge \bigwedge_{(\eta, q) \in \sigma} (e(q) \rightarrow \llbracket \eta \in \tau \rrbracket), \quad (\dagger)$$

$$\llbracket \sigma \in \tau \rrbracket = \bigvee_{(\xi, p) \in \tau} (e(p) \wedge \llbracket \sigma = \xi \rrbracket). \quad (\ddagger)$$

These two functions have to be defined simultaneously by recursion. This may be accomplished with a single function $\mathbf{F}: 2 \times \mathbf{V}^P \times \mathbf{V}^P \rightarrow \text{RO}(\mathbb{P})$ defined by recursion, and $\llbracket x = y \rrbracket$ means $\mathbf{F}(0, x, y)$ while $\llbracket x \in y \rrbracket$ means $\mathbf{F}(1, x, y)$.

Assigning truth values to formulas: arbitrary formulas

Assigning truth values to formulas: arbitrary formulas

For arbitrary formulas ϕ, ψ (with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$) and for all $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in \mathbf{V}^P$, define Boolean truth values by recursion:

Assigning truth values to formulas: arbitrary formulas

For arbitrary formulas ϕ, ψ (with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$) and for all $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in \mathbf{V}^P$, define Boolean truth values by recursion:

$$\textcircled{1} \quad \llbracket \neg\phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket := \llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket'.$$

Assigning truth values to formulas: arbitrary formulas

For arbitrary formulas ϕ, ψ (with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$) and for all $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in \mathbf{V}^P$, define Boolean truth values by recursion:

$$\textcircled{1} \quad \llbracket \neg\phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket := \llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket'.$$

Assigning truth values to formulas: arbitrary formulas

For arbitrary formulas ϕ, ψ (with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$) and for all $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in \mathbf{V}^P$, define Boolean truth values by recursion:

- 1 $\llbracket \neg\phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket := \llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket'.$
- 2 $\llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \wedge \psi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket := \llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket \psi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket.$

Assigning truth values to formulas: arbitrary formulas

For arbitrary formulas ϕ, ψ (with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$) and for all $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in \mathbf{V}^P$, define Boolean truth values by recursion:

- 1 $\llbracket \neg \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket := \llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket'.$
- 2 $\llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \wedge \psi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket := \llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket \psi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket.$

Assigning truth values to formulas: arbitrary formulas

For arbitrary formulas ϕ, ψ (with all free variables among $v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$) and for all $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1} \in \mathbf{V}^P$, define Boolean truth values by recursion:

- 1 $\llbracket \neg \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket := \llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket'.$
- 2 $\llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \wedge \psi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket := \llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket \psi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}) \rrbracket.$
- 3 $\llbracket (\forall x) \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}, x) \rrbracket := \bigwedge_{\tau \in \mathbf{V}^P} \llbracket \phi(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}, \tau) \rrbracket.$