$M[G]$

What is $M[G]$?

What is $M[G]$?

Recall:

What is $M[G]$?

Recall: M is a c.t.m.,

What is $M[G]$?

Recall: M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is a forcing order,

What is $M[G]$?

Recall: M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is a forcing order, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$,

What is $M[G]$?

Recall: M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is a forcing order, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{B} \in M$ is the Boolean completion of $\mathbb{P}$,

What is $M[G]$?

Recall: M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is a forcing order, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{B} \in M$ is the Boolean completion of $\mathbb{P}$, and $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ is the collection of $\mathbb{B}$-valued sets.

What is $M[G]$?

Recall: M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is a forcing order, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{B} \in M$ is the Boolean completion of $\mathbb{P}$, and $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ is the collection of $\mathbb{B}$-valued sets.

Generic Model Theorem.

What is $M[G]$?

Recall: M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is a forcing order, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{B} \in M$ is the Boolean completion of $\mathbb{P}$, and $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ is the collection of $\mathbb{B}$-valued sets.

Generic Model Theorem. With the notation as above, there is a transitive model of ZFC, $M[G]$, such that

What is $M[G]$?

Recall: M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is a forcing order, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{B} \in M$ is the Boolean completion of $\mathbb{P}$, and $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ is the collection of $\mathbb{B}$-valued sets.

Generic Model Theorem. With the notation as above, there is a transitive model of ZFC, $M[G]$, such that

1. $M[G]$ is the least transitive model of ZFC satisfying $M \subseteq M[G]$ and $G \in M[G]$, and

What is $M[G]$?

Recall: M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is a forcing order, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{B} \in M$ is the Boolean completion of $\mathbb{P}$, and $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ is the collection of $\mathbb{B}$-valued sets.

Generic Model Theorem. With the notation as above, there is a transitive model of ZFC, $M[G]$, such that

1. $M[G]$ is the least transitive model of ZFC satisfying $M \subseteq M[G]$ and $G \in M[G]$, and

What is $M[G]$?

Recall: M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is a forcing order, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{B} \in M$ is the Boolean completion of $\mathbb{P}$, and $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ is the collection of $\mathbb{B}$-valued sets.

Generic Model Theorem. With the notation as above, there is a transitive model of ZFC, $M[G]$, such that

1. $M[G]$ is the least transitive model of ZFC satisfying $M \subseteq M[G]$ and $G \in M[G]$, and
2. $M[G]$ and M have the same ordinals.

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G.

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,
2. $x^G = \{y^G \mid (\exists p \in G)[p \leqslant x(y)]\}$,

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,
2. $x^G = \{y^G \mid (\exists p \in G)[p \leqslant x(y)]\}$,

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,
2. $x^G = \{y^G \mid (\exists p \in G)[p \leqslant x(y)]\}$,
3. $M[G] = \{x^G \mid x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}\}$.

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,
2. $x^G = \{y^G \mid (\exists p \in G)[p \leqslant x(y)]\}$,
3. $M[G] = \{x^G \mid x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}\}$.

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,
2. $x^G = \{y^G \mid (\exists p \in G)[p \leqslant x(y)]\}$,
3. $M[G] = \{x^G \mid x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}\}$.

$M[G]$ is a transitive class in M.

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,
2. $x^G = \{y^G \mid (\exists p \in G)[p \leqslant x(y)]\}$,
3. $M[G] = \{x^G \mid x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}\}$.

$M[G]$ is a transitive class in M.

If $x \in M$, then $\hat{x} \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, and an inductive proof shows that $x = \hat{x}^G \in M[G]$.

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,
2. $x^G = \{y^G \mid (\exists p \in G)[p \leqslant x(y)]\}$,
3. $M[G] = \{x^G \mid x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}\}$.

$M[G]$ is a transitive class in M.

If $x \in M$, then $\hat{x} \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, and an inductive proof shows that $x = \hat{x}^G \in M[G]$.

There is a "name for G" in $M^{\mathbb{B}}$, $\dot{G}$.

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,
2. $x^G = \{y^G \mid (\exists p \in G)[p \leqslant x(y)]\}$,
3. $M[G] = \{x^G \mid x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}\}$.

$M[G]$ is a transitive class in M.

If $x \in M$, then $\hat{x} \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, and an inductive proof shows that $x = \hat{x}^G \in M[G]$.

There is a "name for G" in $M^{\mathbb{B}}$, $\dot{G}$. It is the $\mathbb{B}$-valued function with domain $\mathbb{B}$ defined by $\dot{G}(\hat{u}) = u$ for $u \in \mathbb{B}$.

How is $M[G]$ constructed?

We want to define $M[G]$ in terms of $M^{\mathbb{B}}$ and G. Given $x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, a corresponding element of $M[G]$ will be written x^G.

Definition. ($M[G]$)

1. $\varnothing^G = \varnothing$,
2. $x^G = \{y^G \mid (\exists p \in G)[p \leqslant x(y)]\}$,
3. $M[G] = \{x^G \mid x \in M^{\mathbb{B}}\}$.

$M[G]$ is a transitive class in M.

If $x \in M$, then $\hat{x} \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$, and an inductive proof shows that $x = \hat{x}^G \in M[G]$.

There is a "name for G" in $M^{\mathbb{B}}$, $\dot{G}$. It is the $\mathbb{B}$-valued function with domain $\mathbb{B}$ defined by $\dot{G}(\hat{u}) = u$ for $u \in \mathbb{B}$. With this definition $G = \dot{G}^G \in M[G]$.

What is true in $M[G]$?

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$.

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{successor}}(x)$

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{successor}}(x)$

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{successor}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{omega}}(x)$

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{successor}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{omega}}(x)$

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{successor}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{omega}}(x)$

Fact.

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{successor}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{omega}}(x)$

Fact. Suppose that $\varphi_{\text{cardinal}}(x)$ expresses that x is an initial ordinal.

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{successor}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{omega}}(x)$

Fact. Suppose that $\varphi_{\text{cardinal}}(x)$ expresses that x is an initial ordinal. This formula is not equivalent to a Δ_0-formula.

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{successor}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{omega}}(x)$

Fact. Suppose that $\varphi_{\text{cardinal}}(x)$ expresses that x is an initial ordinal. This formula is not equivalent to a Δ_0-formula.

(Dependent on G)

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{successor}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{omega}}(x)$

Fact. Suppose that $\varphi_{\text{cardinal}}(x)$ expresses that x is an initial ordinal. This formula is not equivalent to a Δ_0-formula.

(Dependent on G)
Theorem 14.29, Jech.

What is true in $M[G]$?

What is true in $M[G]$? (Depends on the choice of G!)

(Independent of G)
Any Δ_0-formula has the same meaning in M and $M[G]$. In particular, the following formulas define the same sets/classes in these models.

- $\varphi_{\text{empty set}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{transitive}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{ordinal}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{successor}}(x)$
- $\varphi_{\text{omega}}(x)$

Fact. Suppose that $\varphi_{\text{cardinal}}(x)$ expresses that x is an initial ordinal. This formula is not equivalent to a Δ_0-formula.

(Dependent on G)
Theorem 14.29, Jech. For $x_i \in M^{\mathbb{B}}$

$$M[G] \models \varphi(x_1^G, \ldots, x_n^G) \Leftrightarrow [\![\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)]\!]^{\mathbb{B}} \in G.$$

c.c.c forcing

c.c.c forcing

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Theorem 14.34, Jech.

c.c.c forcing

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Theorem 14.34, Jech. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. poset, then M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals, and these have the same cofinalities.

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Theorem 14.34, Jech. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. poset, then M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals, and these have the same cofinalities.

Example.

c.c.c forcing

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Theorem 14.34, Jech. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. poset, then M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals, and these have the same cofinalities.

Example. The forcing poset for $f^{\text{inj}}\colon \omega_2 \to 2^{\omega}$ has the c.c.c.

c.c.c forcing

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Theorem 14.34, Jech. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. poset, then M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals, and these have the same cofinalities.

Example. The forcing poset for $f^{\text{inj}} : \omega_2 \to 2^\omega$ has the c.c.c.

Corollary.

c.c.c forcing

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Theorem 14.34, Jech. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. poset, then M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals, and these have the same cofinalities.

Example. The forcing poset for $f^{\text{inj}}\colon \omega_2 \to 2^\omega$ has the c.c.c.

Corollary. If M is a c.t.m.,

c.c.c forcing

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Theorem 14.34, Jech. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. poset, then M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals, and these have the same cofinalities.

Example. The forcing poset for $f^{\text{inj}} \colon \omega_2 \to 2^\omega$ has the c.c.c.

Corollary. If M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is the forcing poset of the Example,

c.c.c forcing

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Theorem 14.34, Jech. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. poset, then M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals, and these have the same cofinalities.

Example. The forcing poset for $f^{\text{inj}}\colon \omega_2 \to 2^\omega$ has the c.c.c.

Corollary. If M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is the forcing poset of the Example, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$,

c.c.c forcing

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Theorem 14.34, Jech. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. poset, then M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals, and these have the same cofinalities.

Example. The forcing poset for $f^{\text{inj}}\colon \omega_2 \to 2^\omega$ has the c.c.c.

Corollary. If M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is the forcing poset of the Example, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$, then $\bigcup G \in M[G]$ is a 1-1 function from ω_2 into 2^ω.

c.c.c forcing

Definition of c.c.c. goes here.

Theorem 14.34, Jech. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. poset, then M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals, and these have the same cofinalities.

Example. The forcing poset for $f^{\text{inj}}: \omega_2 \to 2^\omega$ has the c.c.c.

Corollary. If M is a c.t.m., $\mathbb{P} \in M$ is the forcing poset of the Example, G is a generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$, then $\bigcup G \in M[G]$ is a 1-1 function from ω_2 into 2^ω. Therefore CH fails in $M[G]$.