

Iterated forcing

Part 1: CS iteration

Martin Goldstern

Institute of Discrete Mathematics and Geometry,
Technische Universität Wien

Hejnice, Feb 3, 2016

Outline

Iteration

Properness

CS iterations

Outline

Iteration

Properness

CS iterations

Notation

A forcing notion $(Q, \leq_Q, 1_Q)$ is a preorder with a largest element. (Usually not separative.)

$q \leq p$: q is stronger than p , “has more information than p ”.
(Note: stronger conditions are always alphabetically later.)

$q \leq^* p$ means:

- ▶ $\forall r \leq q$: r is compatible with q .
- ▶ Equivalently: For all generic filters G : $q \in G \Rightarrow p \in G$.
- ▶ Rephrased: $q \Vdash_Q \check{p} \in G_Q$.

Note: If $q \in Q$, and p is a Q -name of a condition in Q , then $q \leq p$ is still well-defined. *Surprisingly, this is useful!*

We write $q =^* p$ for $q \leq^* p$ and $p \leq^* q$.

Composition and Iteration

Forcing notions:

- ▶ $P_0 := \{1\}$.
- ▶ $P_1 := Q_0$. (Really: $P_1 = \{1\} * Q_0$).
- ▶ $P_2 := Q_0 * \underset{\sim}{Q}_1$ (where $\underset{\sim}{Q}_1$ is a Q_0 -name)

$$= \{(p, \underset{\sim}{q}) : p \in Q_0, p \Vdash_{Q_0} \underset{\sim}{q} \in \underset{\sim}{Q}_1\}$$
- ▶ $P_3 := Q_0 * \underset{\sim}{Q}_1 * \underset{\sim}{Q}_2$ ($\underset{\sim}{Q}_2 =$ a $Q_0 * \underset{\sim}{Q}_1$ -name)

$$= \{(p_0, \underset{\sim}{p}_1, \underset{\sim}{p}_2) : \dots\}$$

We identify P_n with a subset of P_{n+1} via

$$(q_0, \dots, q_{n-1}) \mapsto (q_0, \dots, q_{n-1}, 1_{\underset{\sim}{Q}_n}).$$

So: $P_0 \subseteq P_1 \subseteq P_2 \subseteq \dots$.

Composition, continued

P_n = initial segment, Q_n = n -th factor

- ▶ $P_1 := Q_0$
- ▶ $P_2 := Q_0 * Q_1$
- ▶ $P_3 := Q_0 * Q_1 * Q_2$

Universes:

- ▶ $V_0 := V[G_0] = V$, where $G_0 \subseteq P_0$ is trivial.
- ▶ $V_1 := V[G_1]$, $G_1 \subseteq P_1$ is V -generic
- ▶ $V_2 := V[G_2]$, $G_2 \subseteq P_2 = Q_0 * Q_1$ is V -generic.

or: $V_2 := V[G(0)][G(1)] = V[G(0) * G(1)]$, where

- ▶ $G(0) = G_{Q_0} \subseteq Q_0$ is V -generic,
- ▶ $G(1) = G_{Q_1} \subseteq Q_1[G(0)]$ is $V[Q_0]$ -generic.

Definition

A forcing iteration of length γ is a sequence $(P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma)$ (often together with P_γ) where:

- ▶ P_α is a set of partial functions with domain $\subseteq \alpha$
- ▶ \leq_{P_α} is preorder on P_α , defined recursively, see below.
Thus P_α becomes a forcing notion (with largest element \emptyset).
- ▶ For all α , \dot{Q}_α is a P_α -name of a forcing notion
- ▶ For all $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \leq \gamma$: $P_{\alpha_1} \subseteq P_{\alpha_2}$.
- ▶ For $p', p \in P_\alpha$: $p' \leq_{P_\alpha} p$ iff for all $\beta < \alpha$:
 $p' \upharpoonright \beta \Vdash_{P_\beta} p'(\beta) \leq_{Q_\alpha} p(\beta)$.
 (If $p'(\beta)$ and/or $p(\beta)$ are undefined, replace them by 1_{Q_α} .)
- ▶ For all $\alpha < \gamma$: $P_{\alpha+1} = \{p : p \upharpoonright \alpha \in P_\alpha, p \upharpoonright \alpha \Vdash_{P_\alpha} p(\alpha) \in \dot{Q}_\alpha\}$,
 so $P_{\alpha+1} = P_\alpha * \dot{Q}_\alpha$ (up to a natural isomorphism).

Definition

A forcing iteration of length γ is a sequence $(P_\alpha, \mathcal{Q}_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma)$ together with P_γ where ...

Example

An iteration of length 2 is of the form $(P_0, Q_0, P_1, Q_1, P_2)$, where P_2 is “the same” as $Q_0 * Q_1$.

Notation

We will write G_{P_α} or G_α for V -generic filters on P_α , and G_{Q_α} or $G(\alpha)$ for $V[G_\alpha]$ -generic filters on $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha[G_\alpha]$.

Limits, quotients

If $(P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta)$ is an iteration with P_δ undefined (a “topless” iteration), there are several ways to defined P_δ consistently (i.e., such that the definition of iteration is still satisfied):

- ▶ $P_\delta := \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} P_\alpha$, the “direct limit”
- ▶ $P_\delta := \{p \mid \forall \alpha : p \restriction \alpha \in P_\alpha\}$, the “projective limit” or “full limit”
- ▶ others ...

Definition

If $(P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta)$ is an iteration with (some) limit P_δ , then for all $\alpha \leq \delta$ we define a P_α -name P_δ / P_α (also called P_δ / G_α) by

$$P_\delta / P_\alpha := \{p \in P_\delta : p \restriction \alpha \in G_\alpha\}$$

$$\Vdash_{P_\alpha} P_\delta/P_\alpha := \{p \in P_\delta : p \restriction \alpha \in G_\alpha\}$$

This is a P_α -name of a forcing notion. (order: inherited)

Note that “ $p \restriction \alpha$ carries no information (except for ensuring that $p \restriction [\alpha, \delta)$ is in the quotient)”, because they are all compatible. In other words, if $p \restriction [\alpha, \delta) = p' \restriction [\alpha, \delta)$, and both $p \restriction \alpha, p' \restriction \alpha$ are in G_α , then in P_δ/P_α we have $p =^* p'$.

So an alternative definition would be

$$P_\delta/P_\alpha := \{p \restriction [\alpha, \delta) : p \in P_\delta : p \restriction \alpha \in G_\alpha\}.$$

Fact

- ▶ P_δ/P_α is (morally) an iteration of length $\delta - \alpha$.
- ▶ P_δ is canonically (densely) embedded into $P_\alpha * (P_\delta/P_\alpha)$.

(If δ is additively indecomposable, then the remainder iteration will be again of length δ . This allows “bookkeeping arguments”.)

Outline

Iteration

Properness

CS iterations

Let Q be a forcing notion.

Definition

Q is proper iff:

- ▶ for every sufficiently closed countable set N containing Q (usually: N is a countable elementary submodel of a large initial segment of the universe),
- ▶ and for all $p \in Q \cap N$

there is $q \leq p$ which is N -generic.

Definition

“ q is N -generic” means that

For all maximal antichains $A \in N$: $q \Vdash A \cap G \subseteq N$.

(Note that for uncountable antichains A , $A \setminus N$ will be nonempty. q forces that these sets are avoided by G .)

Properness rephrased

“ Q is proper” means:

- ▶ **for all** countable $N \prec V$ (with $P \in N$),
all $p \in Q \cap N$
- ▶ **there is** $q \leq p$ (typically $q \notin N$)
such that:

for all names $\dot{\alpha}$ of ordinals with $\dot{\alpha} \in N$
we have $q \Vdash \dot{\alpha} \in N$.

(i.e., for all generic G containing q : $\dot{\alpha}[G] \in N$.)

We have: $\text{ccc} \Rightarrow \text{proper} \Rightarrow \omega_1^V$ stays uncountable.

All forcing notions considered in this talk will satisfy the \aleph_2 -cc (using CH and the Δ -lemma), so no cardinals will be collapsed.

Properness via games

For any forcing notion Q and all $p \in Q$, the game $G(Q, p)$ is defined as follows:

- ▶ There are ω many innings (rounds).
- ▶ In the k -th inning, player I (=bad player) first plays a name \tilde{A}_k of a countable set of ordinals. Player II (=good player) then responds with a countable set B_k of ordinals.
- ▶ At the end, player II wins if there is a condition $q \leq p$ forcing $\bigcup_k \tilde{A}_k \subseteq B_k$.

Lemma

Q is proper iff player II has a winning strategy for each $G(Q, p)$.

Equivalent variants: Either/Both players play only singletons.

Properness game: Player I plays a name $\check{\alpha}_k$ of an ordinal, player II responds with a countable set B_k of ordinals. Player II wins if at the end there is a condition q forcing

$$\forall k : \check{\alpha}_k \in \bigcup_n B_n$$

Proper⁺ness, a strong variant of properness (related to $(\omega, 1)$ -properness)

- ▶ In the k -th inning, player I plays a name $\check{\alpha}_k$ of an ordinal. Player II responds with a **countable** set B_k of ordinals.
- ▶ At the end, player II wins if there is a condition $q \leq p$ forcing $\forall k : \check{\alpha}_k \in B_k$.

Even stronger (because it implies ω^ω -bounding): each B_k is **finite**.

Outline

Iteration

Properness

CS iterations

An iteration $(P_\alpha, Q_\alpha : \alpha < \delta)$ is called a countable support iteration (CS iteration) iff:

- ▶ For each limit $\varepsilon < \delta$ of cofinality ω , P_ε is the full limit of $(P_\alpha, Q_\alpha : \alpha < \varepsilon)$.
- ▶ For each limit $\varepsilon < \delta$ of uncountable cofinality, P_ε is the direct limit of $(P_\alpha, Q_\alpha : \alpha < \varepsilon)$.

For any such iteration we define its countable support limit P_δ in the obvious way (depending on $cf(\delta)$, as a direct or full limit).

Equivalently: P_δ is the set of all partial functions p with countable domain such that for all α , $p \upharpoonright \alpha \Vdash p(\alpha) \in Q_\alpha$.

For simplicity, in this talk we consider iterations $(P_n, Q_n : n < \omega)$ (with CS limit P_ω) only.

Iteration theorem for CSI

Theorem (Properness preservation, weak version)

Let $(P_n, \dot{Q}_n : n < \omega)$ be a CS iteration with CS limit P_ω , and assume that $\Vdash_{P_n} \text{“}\dot{Q}_n \text{ is proper”}$. Then P_ω is proper.

($\forall N \forall p \in P_\omega \cap N \exists q \leq p, (P_\omega, N)$ -generic.)

Theorem (Properness preservation, strong version)

Let $P_n, \dot{Q}_n, P_\omega, N$ be as above. Assume that $n_0 < \omega$.

Let p be a P_{n_0} -name. Assume that $q_{n_0} \in P_{n_0}$ is (P_{n_0}, N) -generic, and $q_{n_0} \leq^* p \restriction n_0$. (I.e., $q_{n_0} \Vdash p \restriction n_0 \in G_{n_0}$.)

Then for all k with $n_0 \leq k \leq \omega$ there is a $q_k \leq^* p \restriction k$ such that:

1. $q_k \restriction n_0 = q_{n_0}$. (Moreover $\forall i < j: q_i = q_j \restriction i$)
2. q_k is (P_k, N) -generic.

Easy to prove for successor steps $k \mapsto k + 1$.

Properness of P_ω

Given: $(P_n, Q_n : n \in \omega)$, $N \prec V$, $p \in P_\omega \cap V$, $q_0 \leq p \upharpoonright n_0$, q_0 is $(N, P_{n_0}$ -generic.

Want: $q \in P_\omega$, $q \leq p$, N -generic, q continues q_0 .

For notational simplicity let $n_0 := 0$.

- Strategy 1** Extend $q_0 \in P_0$ to $q_1 \in P_1$, still generic, and below $p \upharpoonright (1)$. Then to q_2 , etc.
- Strategy 2** Start with an enumeration $(\alpha_k : k \in \omega)$ of all ordinal names in N . In step k , make sure that q_k forces α_k into N .
- Strategy 3** (blackboard, next slide)

Properness of P_ω , continued

GIVEN: $p_0 \in P_\omega \cap V$. WANT: $q \in P_\omega$, $q \leq p_0$, N -generic.

Proof.

Start with an enumeration $(\alpha_k : k \in \omega)$ of all ordinal names in N . Find in N a Q_0 -name of a condition $\tilde{p}_1 \in P_\omega/P_1$ such that the following is forced:

If $p \upharpoonright 1 \in G_1$, then $p_1 \leq p_0$.

*Moreover, p_1 decides (in P_ω/P_1) the value of α_1 as $\tilde{\beta}_1$.
(Recall: P_ω -name, P_1 -name.)*

Now find $q_1 \in P_1$, generic, stronger than $p_0 \upharpoonright 1$.

q_1 forces: $\tilde{\beta}_1 \in N$, $p_1 \leq p_0$, $p_1 \in P_\omega/P_1$.

Continue by first finding $p_2 \in P_\omega/P_2$, then q_2 extending q_1 .

Check that $q_\omega = \bigcup_n q_n$ is P_ω -generic.

Properness preservation using games

Start with a condition p .

Player I plays a P_ω -name α_0 , player II plays a condition $p_0 \leq p$ forcing $\alpha_0 = \beta_{00}$.

Player I plays a P_ω -name α_1 , player II plays (in V^{P_1} , assuming $p_0 \upharpoonright 1 \in G_1$) a condition $p_1 \in P_\omega/P_1$, $p_1 \leq p_0$, forcing $\alpha_1 = \beta_{11}$.
NOTE: p_1, β_{11} are P_1 -names!

Moreover, player II starts the game $G(Q_0, p_0(0))$ and replies to the Q_0 -name β_{11} with an ordinal β_{10} .

Player I plays a P_ω -name α_2 , player II plays (in V^{P_2} , assuming $p_1 \upharpoonright 2 \in G_2$) a condition $p_2 \in P_\omega/P_2$, $p_2 \leq p_1$, forcing $\alpha_2 = \beta_{22}$.

Moreover, player II starts (in V^{P_1}) the game $G(Q_1, p_2(2))$ and replies to the $Q_0 * Q_1$ -name β_{22} with a Q_0 -name β_{21} . Finally, replies in $G(Q_0, p_1(1))$ to β_{21} with an ordinal β_{20} .

Etc. Winning all games yields a generic condition.

WARNING:

Sometimes theorems are important.

Sometimes proofs are important.

This proof is important, because many later proofs of stronger theorems are just more sophisticated versions of this proof.

(Compare: proof of forcing theorem.)

Preservation theorems

Let P_ω be the CS-limit of $(P_n, Q_n : n < \omega)$.

Theorem (weak version, P/P)

If all P_n are nice, then P_ω is nice.

Theorem (strong version, Q/P)

IF $\forall n : \Vdash_{P_n}$ “ Q_n is nice”, THEN P_ω is nice.

Note: Necessary for this to work: the condition

*If Q_0 is nice and $\Vdash_{Q_0} Q_1$ is nice, then $Q_0 * \dot{Q}_1$ is nice*

should be trivial. (Or at least: true.)

These theorems are true for many versions of “nice”, such as: “ ω^ω -bounding”, or “Laver property”.