Forcing with ultrafilters

Itay Neeman

Department of Mathematics
University of California Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90095

www.math.ucla.edu/~ineeman

Sofia, August 2009

Use PageDown or the down arrow to scroll through slides.
Press Esc when done.

Outline

Many forcing notions use ultrafilters to control the generic and limit its effects on the universe. We give several examples of such forcing notions, and end with a recent construction of a model where the tree property coexists with failure of the singular cardinal hypothesis.

Outline

Many forcing notions use ultrafilters to control the generic and limit its effects on the universe. We give several examples of such forcing notions, and end with a recent construction of a model where the tree property coexists with failure of the singular cardinal hypothesis.

Singular cardinal combinatorics

Outline

Many forcing notions use ultrafilters to control the generic and limit its effects on the universe. We give several examples of such forcing notions, and end with a recent construction of a model where the tree property coexists with failure of the singular cardinal hypothesis.

Singular cardinal combinatorics

Forcing

Outline

Many forcing notions use ultrafilters to control the generic and limit its effects on the universe. We give several examples of such forcing notions, and end with a recent construction of a model where the tree property coexists with failure of the singular cardinal hypothesis.

Singular cardinal combinatorics

Forcing

Use of ultrafilters

Outline

Many forcing notions use ultrafilters to control the generic and limit its effects on the universe. We give several examples of such forcing notions, and end with a recent construction of a model where the tree property coexists with failure of the singular cardinal hypothesis.

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0$

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0$, $\aleph_1$

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2$

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \ldots, \aleph_\omega$

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \ldots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}$

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \ldots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \ldots.$

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \ldots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \ldots.$

The cofinality of a cardinal κ is the least δ so that there exists $f : \delta \to \kappa$, cofinal. κ is singular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$.

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \ldots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \ldots$.

The cofinality of a cardinal κ is the least δ so that there exists $f : \delta \to \kappa$, cofinal. κ is singular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$.

For example, $\mathrm{Cof}(\aleph_\omega) = \omega$. $\aleph_\omega$ is singular.

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \ldots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \ldots$.

The cofinality of a cardinal κ is the least δ so that there exists $f : \delta \to \kappa$, cofinal. κ is singular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$.

For example, $\mathrm{Cof}(\aleph_\omega) = \omega$. $\aleph_\omega$ is singular.

${}^\kappa 2$ is the set of functions from κ into $2 = \{0, 1\}$.

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \ldots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \ldots.$

The cofinality of a cardinal κ is the least δ so that there exists $f: \delta \to \kappa$, cofinal. κ is singular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$.

For example, $\mathrm{Cof}(\aleph_\omega) = \omega$. $\aleph_\omega$ is singular.

${}^\kappa 2$ is the set of functions from κ into $2 = \{0, 1\}$. Equinumerous with $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$.

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \dots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \dots$.

The cofinality of a cardinal κ is the least δ so that there exists $f : \delta \to \kappa$, cofinal. κ is singular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$.

For example, $\mathrm{Cof}(\aleph_\omega) = \omega$. $\aleph_\omega$ is singular.

${}^\kappa 2$ is the set of functions from κ into $2 = \{0, 1\}$. Equinumerous with $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. $2^\kappa = \mathrm{Card}({}^\kappa 2)$.

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \ldots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \ldots$.

The cofinality of a cardinal κ is the least δ so that there exists $f : \delta \to \kappa$, cofinal. κ is singular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$.

For example, $\mathrm{Cof}(\aleph_\omega) = \omega$. $\aleph_\omega$ is singular.

${}^\kappa 2$ is the set of functions from κ into $2 = \{0, 1\}$. Equinumerous with $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. $2^\kappa = \mathrm{Card}({}^\kappa 2)$.

Continuum Hypothesis (CH): $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \dots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \dots.$

The cofinality of a cardinal κ is the least δ so that there exists $f : \delta \to \kappa$, cofinal. κ is singular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$.

For example, $\mathrm{Cof}(\aleph_\omega) = \omega$. $\aleph_\omega$ is singular.

${}^\kappa 2$ is the set of functions from κ into $2 = \{0, 1\}$. Equinumerous with $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. $2^\kappa = \mathrm{Card}({}^\kappa 2)$.

Continuum Hypothesis (CH): $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1 (= {\aleph_0}^+)$.

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \dots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \dots$.

The cofinality of a cardinal κ is the least δ so that there exists $f : \delta \to \kappa$, cofinal. κ is singular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$.

For example, $\mathrm{Cof}(\aleph_\omega) = \omega$. $\aleph_\omega$ is singular.

${}^\kappa 2$ is the set of functions from κ into $2 = \{0, 1\}$. Equinumerous with $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. $2^\kappa = \mathrm{Card}({}^\kappa 2)$.

Continuum Hypothesis (CH): $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1 (= {\aleph_0}^+)$.

Singular Cardinal Hypothesis (SCH): If κ is singular, 2^κ is as small as it can be, subject to monotonicity and König's theorem ($\mathrm{Cof}(2^\kappa) > \kappa$).

The exponential function

$\aleph_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ lists the infinite cardinals in order.

$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \ldots, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \ldots$.

The cofinality of a cardinal κ is the least δ so that there exists $f : \delta \to \kappa$, cofinal. κ is singular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) < \kappa$.

For example, $\mathrm{Cof}(\aleph_\omega) = \omega$. $\aleph_\omega$ is singular.

${}^\kappa 2$ is the set of functions from κ into $2 = \{0, 1\}$. Equinumerous with $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. $2^\kappa = \mathrm{Card}({}^\kappa 2)$.

Continuum Hypothesis (CH): $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1 (= {\aleph_0}^+)$.

Singular Cardinal Hypothesis (SCH): If κ is singular, 2^κ is as small as it can be, subject to monotonicity and König's theorem ($\mathrm{Cof}(2^\kappa) > \kappa$).
For κ singular strong limit ($\tau < \kappa \to 2^\tau < \kappa$), $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$.

Trees

A tree is a partial order $(T; <_T)$ so that $(\forall x \in T)$ $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$ is wellordered by $<_T$.

Trees

A tree is a partial order $(T; <_T)$ so that $(\forall x \in T)$ $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$ is wellordered by $<_T$.

The height of x in T is the order type of $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$.

Trees

A tree is a partial order $(T; <_T)$ so that $(\forall x \in T)$ $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$ is wellordered by $<_T$.

The height of x in T is the order type of $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$. The height of T is $\sup\{\mathrm{Height}(x) + 1 \mid x \in T\}$.

Trees

A tree is a partial order $(T; <_T)$ so that $(\forall x \in T)$ $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$ is wellordered by $<_T$.

The height of x in T is the order type of $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$. The height of T is $\sup\{\mathrm{Height}(x) + 1 \mid x \in T\}$. Level α of T consists of $\{x \mid \mathrm{Height}(x) = \alpha\}$.

Trees

A tree is a partial order $(T; <_T)$ so that $(\forall x \in T)$ $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$ is wellordered by $<_T$.

The height of x in T is the order type of $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$. The height of T is $\sup\{\mathrm{Height}(x) + 1 \mid x \in T\}$. Level α of T consists of $\{x \mid \mathrm{Height}(x) = \alpha\}$.

T is a κ-tree if $\mathrm{Height}(T) = \kappa$, and each level of T has size $< \kappa$.

Trees

A tree is a partial order $(T; <_T)$ so that $(\forall x \in T)$ $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$ is wellordered by $<_T$.

The height of x in T is the order type of $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$. The height of T is $\sup\{\mathrm{Height}(x) + 1 \mid x \in T\}$. Level α of T consists of $\{x \mid \mathrm{Height}(x) = \alpha\}$.

T is a κ-tree if $\mathrm{Height}(T) = \kappa$, and each level of T has size $< \kappa$.

The tree property at κ asserts that every κ tree has a cofinal branch.

Trees

A tree is a partial order $(T; <_T)$ so that $(\forall x \in T)$ $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$ is wellordered by $<_T$.

The height of x in T is the order type of $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$. The height of T is $\sup\{\mathrm{Height}(x) + 1 \mid x \in T\}$. Level α of T consists of $\{x \mid \mathrm{Height}(x) = \alpha\}$.

T is a κ-tree if $\mathrm{Height}(T) = \kappa$, and each level of T has size $< \kappa$.

The tree property at κ asserts that every κ tree has a cofinal branch.

Holds at $\aleph_0$ (König).

Trees

A tree is a partial order $(T; <_T)$ so that $(\forall x \in T)$ $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$ is wellordered by $<_T$.

The height of x in T is the order type of $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$. The height of T is $\sup\{\mathrm{Height}(x) + 1 \mid x \in T\}$. Level α of T consists of $\{x \mid \mathrm{Height}(x) = \alpha\}$.

T is a κ-tree if $\mathrm{Height}(T) = \kappa$, and each level of T has size $< \kappa$.

The tree property at κ asserts that every κ tree has a cofinal branch.

Holds at $\aleph_0$ (König). Fails at $\aleph_1$ (Aronszajn).

Trees

A tree is a partial order $(T; <_T)$ so that $(\forall x \in T)$ $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$ is wellordered by $<_T$.

The height of x in T is the order type of $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$. The height of T is $\sup\{\mathrm{Height}(x) + 1 \mid x \in T\}$. Level α of T consists of $\{x \mid \mathrm{Height}(x) = \alpha\}$.

T is a κ-tree if $\mathrm{Height}(T) = \kappa$, and each level of T has size $< \kappa$.

The tree property at κ asserts that every κ tree has a cofinal branch.

Holds at $\aleph_0$ (König). Fails at $\aleph_1$ (Aronszajn). More generally fails at κ^+ if ${}^{<\kappa}\kappa = \kappa$.

Trees

A tree is a partial order $(T; <_T)$ so that $(\forall x \in T)$ $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$ is wellordered by $<_T$.

The height of x in T is the order type of $\{z \mid z <_T x\}$. The height of T is $\sup\{\mathrm{Height}(x) + 1 \mid x \in T\}$. Level α of T consists of $\{x \mid \mathrm{Height}(x) = \alpha\}$.

T is a κ-tree if $\mathrm{Height}(T) = \kappa$, and each level of T has size $< \kappa$.

The tree property at κ asserts that every κ tree has a cofinal branch.

Holds at $\aleph_0$ (König). Fails at $\aleph_1$ (Aronszajn). More generally fails at κ^+ if ${}^{<\kappa}\kappa = \kappa$. Can hold at $\aleph_2$ (Mitchell).

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Using the elementarity of π, can show κ is a cardinal,

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Using the elementarity of π, can show κ is a cardinal, is a limit cardinal,

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi : V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Using the elementarity of π, can show κ is a cardinal, is a limit cardinal, is a strong limit cardinal,

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Using the elementarity of π, can show κ is a cardinal, is a limit cardinal, is a strong limit cardinal, and $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Using the elementarity of π, can show κ is a cardinal, is a limit cardinal, is a strong limit cardinal, and $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Example

Suppose κ is measurable. Then every κ-tree has a cofinal branch.

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Using the elementarity of π, can show κ is a cardinal, is a limit cardinal, is a strong limit cardinal, and $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Example

Suppose κ is measurable. Then every κ-tree has a cofinal branch.

Proof.

Let T be a κ-tree. Consider $\pi(T)$, a tree of height $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Using the elementarity of π, can show κ is a cardinal, is a limit cardinal, is a strong limit cardinal, and $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Example

Suppose κ is measurable. Then every κ-tree has a cofinal branch.

Proof.

Let T be a κ-tree. Consider $\pi(T)$, a tree of height $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$. Let x be a node on level κ of $\pi(T)$.

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi \colon V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Using the elementarity of π, can show κ is a cardinal, is a limit cardinal, is a strong limit cardinal, and $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Example

Suppose κ is measurable. Then every κ-tree has a cofinal branch.

Proof.

Let T be a κ-tree. Consider $\pi(T)$, a tree of height $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$. Let x be a node on level κ of $\pi(T)$. Look at the branch $b = \{z \mid z <_{\pi(T)} x\}$ of $\pi(T)$ leading to x.

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Using the elementarity of π, can show κ is a cardinal, is a limit cardinal, is a strong limit cardinal, and $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Example

Suppose κ is measurable. Then every κ-tree has a cofinal branch.

Proof.

Let T be a κ-tree. Consider $\pi(T)$, a tree of height $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$. Let x be a node on level κ of $\pi(T)$. Look at the branch $b = \{z \mid z <_{\pi(T)} x\}$ of $\pi(T)$ leading to x. Since $\kappa = \mathrm{Crit}(\pi)$ and $|\mathrm{Level}_\alpha(T)| < \kappa$ for $\alpha < \kappa$, T and $\pi(T)$ are "the same" on levels $\alpha < \kappa$.

Trees

Tree property is a remnant of large cardinals.

Definition

κ is measurable if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$. ($\pi \restriction \kappa = Id$, $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$.)

Using the elementarity of π, can show κ is a cardinal, is a limit cardinal, is a strong limit cardinal, and $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Example

Suppose κ is measurable. Then every κ-tree has a cofinal branch.

Proof.

Let T be a κ-tree. Consider $\pi(T)$, a tree of height $\pi(\kappa) > \kappa$. Let x be a node on level κ of $\pi(T)$. Look at the branch $b = \{z \mid z <_{\pi(T)} x\}$ of $\pi(T)$ leading to x. Since $\kappa = \mathrm{Crit}(\pi)$ and $|\mathrm{Level}_\alpha(T)| < \kappa$ for $\alpha < \kappa$, T and $\pi(T)$ are “the same” on levels $\alpha < \kappa$. So b is a branch of T. $\square$

Tree property at successor of singular

Tree property at successor of singular

Definition

κ is λ-supercompact if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$ with $\pi(\kappa) > \lambda$ and ${}^{\lambda}M \subseteq M$ (M closed under λ sequences in V).

Tree property at successor of singular

Definition

κ is λ-supercompact if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$ with $\pi(\kappa) > \lambda$ and ${}^{\lambda}M \subseteq M$ (M closed under λ sequences in V). κ is supercompact if it is λ-supercompact for all λ.

Tree property at successor of singular

Definition

κ is λ-supercompact if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$ with $\pi(\kappa) > \lambda$ and ${}^{\lambda}M \subseteq M$ (M closed under λ sequences in V). κ is supercompact if it is λ-supercompact for all λ.

Theorem (Magidor–Shelah)

Suppose τ is a singular limit of supercompact cardinals. Then every τ^+-tree has a cofinal branch.

Tree property at successor of singular

Definition

κ is λ-supercompact if it is the critical point of an elementary $\pi\colon V \to M$ with $\pi(\kappa) > \lambda$ and ${}^{\lambda}M \subseteq M$ (M closed under λ sequences in V). κ is supercompact if it is λ-supercompact for all λ.

Theorem (Magidor–Shelah)

Suppose τ is a singular limit of supercompact cardinals. Then every τ^+-tree has a cofinal branch.

Get tree property at τ^+.

Additional principles

τ in rest of talk, always a singular cardinal of cofinality ω.

Additional principles

τ in rest of talk, always a singular cardinal of cofinality ω.

A square sequence at τ^+ is a sequence $\langle C_\xi \mid \xi < \tau^+ \rangle$ so that C_ξ is club in ξ, of order type $\leq \tau$, and the clubs cohere.

Additional principles

τ in rest of talk, always a singular cardinal of cofinality ω.

A square sequence at τ^+ is a sequence $\langle C_\xi \mid \xi < \tau^+ \rangle$ so that C_ξ is club in ξ, of order type $\leq \tau$, and the clubs cohere.

Let δ_i ($i < \omega$) be cofinal and increasing in τ.

Additional principles

τ in rest of talk, always a singular cardinal of cofinality ω.

A square sequence at τ^+ is a sequence $\langle C_\xi \mid \xi < \tau^+ \rangle$ so that C_ξ is club in ξ, of order type $\leq \tau$, and the clubs cohere.

Let δ_i ($i < \omega$) be cofinal and increasing in τ.

$\prod \delta_i = \{$functions f so that $\mathrm{Dom}(f) = \omega$ and $f(i) \in \delta_i\}$.

Additional principles

τ in rest of talk, always a singular cardinal of cofinality ω.

A square sequence at τ^+ is a sequence $\langle C_\xi \mid \xi < \tau^+ \rangle$ so that C_ξ is club in ξ, of order type $\leq \tau$, and the clubs cohere.

Let δ_i ($i < \omega$) be cofinal and increasing in τ.

$\prod \delta_i = \{$functions f so that $\mathrm{Dom}(f) = \omega$ and $f(i) \in \delta_i\}$.

$f <^* g$ iff $f(i) < g(i)$ for all but finitely many i.

Additional principles

τ in rest of talk, always a singular cardinal of cofinality ω.

A square sequence at τ^+ is a sequence $\langle C_\xi \mid \xi < \tau^+ \rangle$ so that C_ξ is club in ξ, of order type $\leq \tau$, and the clubs cohere.

Let δ_i ($i < \omega$) be cofinal and increasing in τ.

$\prod \delta_i = \{$functions f so that $\mathrm{Dom}(f) = \omega$ and $f(i) \in \delta_i\}$.

$f <^* g$ iff $f(i) < g(i)$ for all but finitely many i.

A scale of length τ^+ in $\prod_{i<\omega} \delta_i$ is a sequence $\langle f_\xi \mid \xi < \tau^+ \rangle$ which is $<^*$-increasing and cofinal.

Other principles

Scales are central tools in Shalah’s PCF theory. Eg:

Other principles

Scales are central tools in Shalah's PCF theory. Eg:

Theorem (Shelah)

$\exists A \subseteq \omega$ so that $\prod_{n\in A} \aleph_n$ carries a scale of length $\aleph_{\omega+1}$.

Other principles

Scales are central tools in Shalah's PCF theory. Eg:

Theorem (Shelah)

$\exists A \subseteq \omega$ so that $\prod_{n \in A} \aleph_n$ carries a scale of length $\aleph_{\omega+1}$.

Proof sketch.

Easy to construct $<^*$-increasing $\vec{f} = \langle f_\xi \mid \xi < \aleph_{\omega+1} \rangle$ in $\prod_{n<\omega} \aleph_n$. Work goes into making sure $\vec{f}$ has an exact upper bound (eub), that is a bound g so that $\vec{f}$ is cofinal in g. One can then turn $\vec{f}$ into a scale on $\prod_{i<\omega} \mathrm{Cof}(g(i))$. $\square$

Other principles

Scales are central tools in Shalah's PCF theory. Eg:

Theorem (Shelah)

$\exists A \subseteq \omega$ so that $\prod_{n \in A} \aleph_n$ carries a scale of length $\aleph_{\omega+1}$.

Proof sketch.

Easy to construct $<^*$-increasing $\vec{f} = \langle f_\xi \mid \xi < \aleph_{\omega+1} \rangle$ in $\prod_{n<\omega} \aleph_n$. Work goes into making sure $\vec{f}$ has an exact upper bound (eub), that is a bound g so that $\vec{f}$ is cofinal in g. One can then turn $\vec{f}$ into a scale on $\prod_{i<\omega} \mathrm{Cof}(g(i))$. $\square$

Definition

$\alpha \leq \mathrm{Length}(\vec{f})$ with $\mathrm{Cof}(\alpha) > \omega$ is good for $\vec{f}$ if $\vec{f} \restriction \alpha$ has an eub of cofinality $\mathrm{Cof}(\alpha)$. Otherwise α is bad.

Other principles

Scales are central tools in Shalah's PCF theory. Eg:

Theorem (Shelah)

$\exists A \subseteq \omega$ so that $\prod_{n \in A} \aleph_n$ carries a scale of length $\aleph_{\omega+1}$.

Proof sketch.

Easy to construct $<^*$-increasing $\vec{f} = \langle f_\xi \mid \xi < \aleph_{\omega+1} \rangle$ in $\prod_{n<\omega} \aleph_n$. Work goes into making sure $\vec{f}$ has an exact upper bound (eub), that is a bound g so that $\vec{f}$ is cofinal in g. One can then turn $\vec{f}$ into a scale on $\prod_{i<\omega} \mathrm{Cof}(g(i))$. $\square$

Definition

$\alpha \leq \mathrm{Length}(\vec{f})$ with $\mathrm{Cof}(\alpha) > \omega$ is good for $\vec{f}$ if $\vec{f} \restriction \alpha$ has an eub of cofinality $\mathrm{Cof}(\alpha)$. Otherwise α is bad.

A scale of length τ^+ is good if it has a club of good points. Otherwise the scale is bad.

Other principles

Other principles

Theorem (Shelah)

If there is a supercompact cardinal below τ, then every scale of length τ^+ is bad.

Other principles

Theorem (Shelah)

If there is a supercompact cardinal below τ, then every scale of length τ^+ is bad.

Theorem (Shelah)

If there is a square sequence at τ^+, then every scale of length τ^+ is good.

Forcing basics

Basic goal: Adjoin an object G to a model M of ZFC.
Resulting extension $M[G]$ is a model of ZFC.

Forcing basics

Basic goal: Adjoin an object G to a model M of ZFC. Resulting extension $M[G]$ is a model of ZFC.

G is a “new” subset of a set $\mathbb{P} \in M$. $M[G]$ consists of all sets that can be constructed from elements of M using the new set G.

Forcing basics

Basic goal: Adjoin an object G to a model M of ZFC. Resulting extension $M[G]$ is a model of ZFC.

G is a "new" subset of a set $\mathbb{P} \in M$. $M[G]$ consists of all sets that can be constructed from elements of M using the new set G.

One way to describe elements of $M[G]$:

Forcing basics

Basic goal: Adjoin an object G to a model M of ZFC. Resulting extension $M[G]$ is a model of ZFC.

G is a "new" subset of a set $\mathbb{P} \in M$. $M[G]$ consists of all sets that can be constructed from elements of M using the new set G.

One way to describe elements of $M[G]$:

For each $\tau \in M$ define
$\tau[G] = \{\sigma[G] \mid (\exists p \in G)\langle \sigma, p\rangle \in \tau\}$.

Forcing basics

Basic goal: Adjoin an object G to a model M of ZFC. Resulting extension $M[G]$ is a model of ZFC.

G is a "new" subset of a set $\mathbb{P} \in M$. $M[G]$ consists of all sets that can be constructed from elements of M using the new set G.

One way to describe elements of $M[G]$:

For each $\tau \in M$ define
$\tau[G] = \{\sigma[G] \mid (\exists p \in G)\langle\sigma, p\rangle \in \tau\}$.

Then $M[G] = \{\tau[G] \mid \tau \in M\}$.

Forcing basics

The fundamental theorem of forcing (Cohen) allows reasoning about $M[G]$ from inside M. There is a relation $\Vdash$, definable in M, so that:

Forcing basics

The fundamental theorem of forcing (Cohen) allows reasoning about $M[G]$ from inside M. There is a relation $\Vdash$, definable in M, so that:

1. If $M[G] \models \varphi(\tau_1[G], \ldots, \tau_n[G])$ then there is $p \in G$ so that $p \Vdash \varphi(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)$.
2. If $p \Vdash \varphi(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)$ then $M[G] \models \varphi(\tau_1[G], \ldots, \tau_n[G])$ for all G so that $p \in G$.

Forcing basics

The fundamental theorem of forcing (Cohen) allows reasoning about $M[G]$ from inside M. There is a relation $\Vdash$, definable in M, so that:

1. If $M[G] \models \varphi(\tau_1[G], \ldots, \tau_n[G])$ then there is $p \in G$ so that $p \Vdash \varphi(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)$.
2. If $p \Vdash \varphi(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)$ then $M[G] \models \varphi(\tau_1[G], \ldots, \tau_n[G])$ for all G so that $p \in G$.

Requires some assumptions on $\mathbb{P}$ and G:

Forcing basics

The fundamental theorem of forcing (Cohen) allows reasoning about $M[G]$ from inside M. There is a relation $\Vdash$, definable in M, so that:

1. If $M[G] \models \varphi(\tau_1[G], \ldots, \tau_n[G])$ then there is $p \in G$ so that $p \Vdash \varphi(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)$.
2. If $p \Vdash \varphi(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)$ then $M[G] \models \varphi(\tau_1[G], \ldots, \tau_n[G])$ for all G so that $p \in G$.

Requires some assumptions on $\mathbb{P}$ and G: $\mathbb{P}$ is a partially ordered set, G is a filter, and G meets every dense open subset of $\mathbb{P}$ in M. (Such G are called generic over M.)

Changing the continuum

Work in M. Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$, ordered by extension: $r <_{\mathbb{P}} s$ iff r extends s.

Changing the continuum

Work in M. Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$, ordered by extension: $r <_{\mathbb{P}} s$ iff r extends s. Let G be generic over M.

Changing the continuum

Work in M. Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$, ordered by extension: $r <_{\mathbb{P}} s$ iff r extends s. Let G be generic over M.

Since G is a filter, all partial functions $r \in G$ agree.

Changing the continuum

Work in M. Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$, ordered by extension: $r <_{\mathbb{P}} s$ iff r extends s. Let G be generic over M.

Since G is a filter, all partial functions $r \in G$ agree. $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$.

Changing the continuum

Work in M. Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$, ordered by extension: $r <_{\mathbb{P}} s$ iff r extends s. Let G be generic over M.

Since G is a filter, all partial functions $r \in G$ agree. $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$.

For $\xi < \aleph_2$ define $\theta_\xi(n) = \theta(\xi, n)$.

Changing the continuum

Work in M. Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$, ordered by extension: $r <_{\mathbb{P}} s$ iff r extends s. Let G be generic over M.

Since G is a filter, all partial functions $r \in G$ agree. $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$.

For $\xi < \aleph_2$ define $\theta_\xi(n) = \theta(\xi, n)$. Then $\theta_\xi \in {}^\omega 2$.

Changing the continuum

Work in M. Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$, ordered by extension: $r <_{\mathbb{P}} s$ iff r extends s. Let G be generic over M.

Since G is a filter, all partial functions $r \in G$ agree. $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$.

For $\xi < \aleph_2$ define $\theta_\xi(n) = \theta(\xi, n)$. Then $\theta_\xi \in {}^\omega 2$.

Using genericity, θ is total, and $\xi \neq \zeta \to \theta_\xi \neq \theta_\zeta$.

Changing the continuum

Work in M. Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$, ordered by extension: $r <_{\mathbb{P}} s$ iff r extends s. Let G be generic over M.

Since G is a filter, all partial functions $r \in G$ agree. $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$.

For $\xi < \aleph_2$ define $\theta_\xi(n) = \theta(\xi, n)$. Then $\theta_\xi \in {}^\omega 2$.

Using genericity, θ is total, and $\xi \neq \zeta \rightarrow \theta_\xi \neq \theta_\zeta$.

Conclusion: $M[G] \models 2^\omega \geq (\aleph_2)^M$.

Changing the continuum

Work in M. Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$, ordered by extension: $r <_{\mathbb{P}} s$ iff r extends s. Let G be generic over M.

Since G is a filter, all partial functions $r \in G$ agree. $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$.

For $\xi < \aleph_2$ define $\theta_\xi(n) = \theta(\xi, n)$. Then $\theta_\xi \in {}^\omega 2$.

Using genericity, θ is total, and $\xi \neq \zeta \rightarrow \theta_\xi \neq \theta_\zeta$.

Conclusion: $M[G] \models 2^\omega \geq (\aleph_2)^M$.

Prove $(\aleph_2)^{M[G]} = (\aleph_2)^M$.

Changing the continuum

Work in M. Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$, ordered by extension: $r <_{\mathbb{P}} s$ iff r extends s. Let G be generic over M.

Since G is a filter, all partial functions $r \in G$ agree. $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function from $\aleph_2 \times \omega$ into $\{0, 1\}$.

For $\xi < \aleph_2$ define $\theta_\xi(n) = \theta(\xi, n)$. Then $\theta_\xi \in {}^\omega 2$.

Using genericity, θ is total, and $\xi \neq \zeta \rightarrow \theta_\xi \neq \theta_\zeta$.

Conclusion: $M[G] \models 2^\omega \geq (\aleph_2)^M$.

Prove $(\aleph_2)^{M[G]} = (\aleph_2)^M$. Here fundamental theorem of forcing is crucial. Allows reasoning in M about $f\colon (\aleph_1)^M \rightarrow (\aleph_2)^M$ that belong to $M[G]$. Using properties of $\mathbb{P}$ in M show such f are not onto.

Changing 2^κ

Changing 2^κ

A cardinal κ is regular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Changing 2^κ

A cardinal κ is regular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Method for changing the continuum (${}^\omega 2$) works for any regular κ.

Changing 2^κ

A cardinal κ is regular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Method for changing the continuum (${}^{\omega}2$) works for any regular κ.

Force with $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of partial functions of size $< \kappa$ from $\kappa^{++} \times \kappa$ into $\{0, 1\}$.

Changing 2^κ

A cardinal κ is regular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Method for changing the continuum (${}^\omega 2$) works for any regular κ.

Force with $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of partial functions of size $< \kappa$ from $\kappa^{++} \times \kappa$ into $\{0, 1\}$. (Called $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \kappa^{++})$.)

Changing 2^κ

A cardinal κ is regular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Method for changing the continuum (${}^\omega 2$) works for any regular κ.

Force with $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of partial functions of size $< \kappa$ from $\kappa^{++} \times \kappa$ into $\{0, 1\}$. (Called $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \kappa^{++})$.)

As before, get $(\kappa^{++})^M$ elements of ${}^\kappa 2$ out of G.

Changing 2^κ

A cardinal κ is regular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Method for changing the continuum (${}^\omega 2$) works for any regular κ.

Force with $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of partial functions of size $< \kappa$ from $\kappa^{++} \times \kappa$ into $\{0, 1\}$. (Called $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \kappa^{++})$.)

As before, get $(\kappa^{++})^M$ elements of ${}^\kappa 2$ out of G.

Further, M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals.

Changing 2^κ

A cardinal κ is regular if $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \kappa$.

Method for changing the continuum (${}^{\omega}2$) works for any regular κ.

Force with $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of partial functions of size $< \kappa$ from $\kappa^{++} \times \kappa$ into $\{0, 1\}$. (Called $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \kappa^{++})$.)

As before, get $(\kappa^{++})^M$ elements of ${}^{\kappa}2$ out of G.

Further, M and $M[G]$ have the same cardinals. Argument again uses fundamental theorem of forcing. Relies on the closure of $\mathbb{P}$ to show cardinals $\leq \kappa$ are preserved.

Without closure

Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from ω to κ, ordered by extension.

Without closure

Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from ω to κ, ordered by extension.

Let G be generic over M.

Without closure

Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from ω to κ, ordered by extension.

Let G be generic over M.

Again, $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function, this time from ω into κ.

Without closure

Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from ω to κ, ordered by extension.

Let *G* be generic over *M*.

Again, $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function, this time from ω into κ.

By genericity *G* is total (again), and onto.

Without closure

Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from ω to κ, ordered by extension.

Let G be generic over M.

Again, $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function, this time from ω into κ.

By genericity G is total (again), and onto.

Conclusion: $M[G] \models \mathrm{Card}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Without closure

Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from ω to κ, ordered by extension.

Let G be generic over M.

Again, $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function, this time from ω into κ.

By genericity G is total (again), and onto.

Conclusion: $M[G] \models \mathrm{Card}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Note

For κ of cofinality ω, $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \kappa^{++})$ is not closed.

Without closure

Consider $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of all finite partial functions from ω to κ, ordered by extension.

Let G be generic over M.

Again, $\theta = \bigcup G$ is a function, this time from ω into κ.

By genericity G is total (again), and onto.

Conclusion: $M[G] \models \mathrm{Card}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Note

For κ of cofinality ω, $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \kappa^{++})$ is not closed. will act like poset above, and collapse κ.

Singular cardinals

Singular cardinals

Increasing the powerset of a singular cardinal will typically collapse it.

Singular cardinals

Increasing the powerset of a singular cardinal will typically collapse it.

There are ZFC theorems showing that certain changes involving singular cardinals are in fact impossible:

Singular cardinals

Increasing the powerset of a singular cardinal will typically collapse it.

There are ZFC theorems showing that certain changes involving singular cardinals are in fact impossible:

Theorem (Silver)

SCH *cannot fail for the first time at a cardinal of uncountable cofinality.*

Singular cardinals

Increasing the powerset of a singular cardinal will typically collapse it.

There are ZFC theorems showing that certain changes involving singular cardinals are in fact impossible:

Theorem (Silver)

SCH *cannot fail for the first time at a cardinal of uncountable cofinality.*

Theorem (Solovay)

SCH *holds above supercompacts.*

Singular cardinals

Increasing the powerset of a singular cardinal will typically collapse it.

There are ZFC theorems showing that certain changes involving singular cardinals are in fact impossible:

Theorem (Silver)

SCH *cannot fail for the first time at a cardinal of uncountable cofinality.*

Theorem (Solovay)

SCH *holds above supercompacts.*

Theorem (Shelah)

Failures of SCH *at* $\aleph_\omega$ *are limited: if* $2^{\aleph_n} < \aleph_\omega$ *for each n, then* $2^{\aleph_\omega} < \aleph_{\omega_4}$.

Ultrafilters

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{U}$.

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
2. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under intersections. $X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \rightarrow X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U}$.

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
2. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under intersections. $X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \rightarrow X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
3. For every $X \subseteq S$, either X or $S - X$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \to Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
2. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under intersections. $X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \to X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
3. For every $X \subseteq S$, either X or $S - X$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

The ultrafilter is κ-complete if it is closed under all intersections of fewer than κ sets.

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \to Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
2. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under intersections. $X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \to X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
3. For every $X \subseteq S$, either X or $S - X$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

The ultrafilter is κ-complete if it is closed under all intersections of fewer than κ sets.

Example

Suppose κ is a measurable cardinals. Let $\pi : V \to M$ have critical point κ.

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \to Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
2. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under intersections. $X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \to X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
3. For every $X \subseteq S$, either X or $S - X$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

The ultrafilter is κ-complete if it is closed under all intersections of fewer than κ sets.

Example

Suppose κ is a measurable cardinals. Let $\pi : V \to M$ have critical point κ. Define $\mathcal{U}$ over κ by $X \in \mathcal{U} \leftrightarrow \kappa \in \pi(X)$.

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
2. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under intersections. $X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \rightarrow X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
3. For every $X \subseteq S$, either X or $S - X$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

The ultrafilter is κ-complete if it is closed under all intersections of fewer than κ sets.

Example

Suppose κ is a measurable cardinals. Let $\pi : V \rightarrow M$ have critical point κ. Define $\mathcal{U}$ over κ by $X \in \mathcal{U} \leftrightarrow \kappa \in \pi(X)$. Then $\mathcal{U}$ is a κ-complete ultrafilter.

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \to Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
2. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under intersections. $X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \to X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
3. For every $X \subseteq S$, either X or $S - X$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

The ultrafilter is κ-complete if it is closed under all intersections of fewer than κ sets.

Example

Suppose κ is a measurable cardinals. Let $\pi : V \to M$ have critical point κ. Define $\mathcal{U}$ over κ by $X \in \mathcal{U} \leftrightarrow \kappa \in \pi(X)$. Then $\mathcal{U}$ is a κ-complete ultrafilter.

Example

Suppose κ is λ-supercompact. Let $\pi : V \to M$ with $\mathrm{Crit}(\pi) = \kappa$ and $a = \pi''\lambda \in M$.

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
2. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under intersections. $X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \rightarrow X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
3. For every $X \subseteq S$, either X or $S - X$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

The ultrafilter is κ-complete if it is closed under all intersections of fewer than κ sets.

Example

Suppose κ is a measurable cardinals. Let $\pi : V \rightarrow M$ have critical point κ. Define $\mathcal{U}$ over κ by $X \in \mathcal{U} \leftrightarrow \kappa \in \pi(X)$. Then $\mathcal{U}$ is a κ-complete ultrafilter.

Example

Suppose κ is λ-supercompact. Let $\pi : V \rightarrow M$ with $\mathrm{Crit}(\pi) = \kappa$ and $a = \pi''\lambda \in M$. Define $\mathcal{U}$ over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
2. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under intersections. $X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \rightarrow X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
3. For every $X \subseteq S$, either X or $S - X$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

The ultrafilter is κ-complete if it is closed under all intersections of fewer than κ sets.

Example

Suppose κ is a measurable cardinals. Let $\pi : V \rightarrow M$ have critical point κ. Define $\mathcal{U}$ over κ by $X \in \mathcal{U} \leftrightarrow \kappa \in \pi(X)$. Then $\mathcal{U}$ is a κ-complete ultrafilter.

Example

Suppose κ is λ-supercompact. Let $\pi : V \rightarrow M$ with $\mathrm{Crit}(\pi) = \kappa$ and $a = \pi''\lambda \in M$. Define $\mathcal{U}$ over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$ by $X \in \mathcal{U} \leftrightarrow a \in \pi(X)$.

Ultrafilters

An ultrafilter over a set S is a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty subsets of S so that:

1. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed upward. $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X \subseteq Y \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
2. $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under intersections. $X, Y \in \mathcal{U} \rightarrow X \cap Y \in \mathcal{U}$.
3. For every $X \subseteq S$, either X or $S - X$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

The ultrafilter is κ-complete if it is closed under all intersections of fewer than κ sets.

Example

Suppose κ is a measurable cardinals. Let $\pi : V \rightarrow M$ have critical point κ. Define $\mathcal{U}$ over κ by $X \in \mathcal{U} \leftrightarrow \kappa \in \pi(X)$. Then $\mathcal{U}$ is a κ-complete ultrafilter.

Example

Suppose κ is λ-supercompact. Let $\pi : V \rightarrow M$ with $\mathrm{Crit}(\pi) = \kappa$ and $a = \pi''\lambda \in M$. Define $\mathcal{U}$ over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$ by $X \in \mathcal{U} \leftrightarrow a \in \pi(X)$. Then $\mathcal{U}$ is a κ-complete ultrafilter.

Prikry forcing

Many uses of ultrafilters in forcing.

Prikry forcing

Many uses of ultrafilters in forcing. We concentrate on those that help change cofinalities.

Prikry forcing

Many uses of ultrafilters in forcing. We concentrate on those that help change cofinalities.

Let κ be measurable, and let $\mathcal{U}$ be κ-complete ultrafilter over κ.

Prikry forcing

Many uses of ultrafilters in forcing. We concentrate on those that help change cofinalities.

Let κ be measurable, and let $\mathcal{U}$ be κ-complete ultrafilter over κ.

Prikry forcing is the poset $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of pairs $\langle s, X \rangle$ where s is a finite subset of κ and $X \subseteq \kappa$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

Prikry forcing

Many uses of ultrafilters in forcing. We concentrate on those that help change cofinalities.

Let κ be measurable, and let $\mathcal{U}$ be κ-complete ultrafilter over κ.

Prikry forcing is the poset $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of pairs $\langle s, X \rangle$ where s is a finite subset of κ and $X \subseteq \kappa$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$. The order on $\mathbb{P}$ is defined by:
$\langle t, Y \rangle < \langle s, X \rangle \leftrightarrow t$ extends s, $Y \subseteq X$, and $t - s \subseteq X$.

Prikry forcing

Many uses of ultrafilters in forcing. We concentrate on those that help change cofinalities.

Let κ be measurable, and let $\mathcal{U}$ be κ-complete ultrafilter over κ.

Prikry forcing is the poset $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of pairs $\langle s, X\rangle$ where s is a finite subset of κ and $X \subseteq \kappa$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$. The order on $\mathbb{P}$ is defined by:
$\langle t, Y\rangle < \langle s, X\rangle \leftrightarrow t$ extends s, $Y \subseteq X$, and $t - s \subseteq X$.

Given a generic G, set $g = \bigcup\{s \mid (\exists X)\langle s, X\rangle \in G\}$.

Prikry forcing

Many uses of ultrafilters in forcing. We concentrate on those that help change cofinalities.

Let κ be measurable, and let $\mathcal{U}$ be κ-complete ultrafilter over κ.

Prikry forcing is the poset $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of pairs $\langle s, X \rangle$ where s is a finite subset of κ and $X \subseteq \kappa$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$. The order on $\mathbb{P}$ is defined by:
$\langle t, Y \rangle < \langle s, X \rangle \leftrightarrow t$ extends s, $Y \subseteq X$, and $t - s \subseteq X$.

Given a generic G, set $g = \bigcup\{s \mid (\exists X)\langle s, X \rangle \in G\}$.

By genericity, g is cofinal in κ. It has order type ω.

Prikry forcing

Many uses of ultrafilters in forcing. We concentrate on those that help change cofinalities.

Let κ be measurable, and let $\mathcal{U}$ be κ-complete ultrafilter over κ.

Prikry forcing is the poset $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of pairs $\langle s, X\rangle$ where s is a finite subset of κ and $X \subseteq \kappa$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$. The order on $\mathbb{P}$ is defined by:
$\langle t, Y\rangle < \langle s, X\rangle \leftrightarrow t$ extends s, $Y \subseteq X$, and $t - s \subseteq X$.

Given a generic G, set $g = \bigcup\{s \mid (\exists X)\langle s, X\rangle \in G\}$.

By genericity, g is cofinal in κ. It has order type ω.

The clause $t - s \subseteq X$ above restricts g, and prevents it from coding any patterns of ordinals.

Prikry forcing

Many uses of ultrafilters in forcing. We concentrate on those that help change cofinalities.

Let κ be measurable, and let $\mathcal{U}$ be κ-complete ultrafilter over κ.

Prikry forcing is the poset $\mathbb{P}$ consisting of pairs $\langle s, X\rangle$ where s is a finite subset of κ and $X \subseteq \kappa$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$. The order on $\mathbb{P}$ is defined by:
$\langle t, Y\rangle < \langle s, X\rangle \leftrightarrow t$ extends s, $Y \subseteq X$, and $t - s \subseteq X$.

Given a generic G, set $g = \bigcup\{s \mid (\exists X)\langle s, X\rangle \in G\}$.

By genericity, g is cofinal in κ. It has order type ω.

The clause $t - s \subseteq X$ above restricts g, and prevents it from coding any patterns of ordinals. g turns the cofinality of κ to ω, and does nothing else.

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Requires a measurable cardinal κ with many measurable cardinals below it.

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Requires a measurable cardinal κ with many measurable cardinals below it. Will add, for example, $g = \{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\}$ increasing and cofinal.

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Requires a measurable cardinal κ with many measurable cardinals below it. Will add, for example, $g = \{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\}$ increasing and cofinal.

Uses many local instances of Prikry forcing.

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Requires a measurable cardinal κ with many measurable cardinals below it. Will add, for example, $g = \{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\}$ increasing and cofinal.

Uses many local instances of Prikry forcing. In example above, $\sup\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ is measurable, and $\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ Prikry generic for it.

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Requires a measurable cardinal κ with many measurable cardinals below it. Will add, for example, $g = \{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\}$ increasing and cofinal.

Uses many local instances of Prikry forcing. In example above, $\sup\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ is measurable, and $\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ Prikry generic for it. Similarly above ω.

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Requires a measurable cardinal κ with many measurable cardinals below it. Will add, for example, $g = \{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\}$ increasing and cofinal.

Uses many local instances of Prikry forcing. In example above, $\sup\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ is measurable, and $\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ Prikry generic for it. Similarly above ω.

Another forcing due to Magidor is diagonal Prikry forcing.

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Requires a measurable cardinal κ with many measurable cardinals below it. Will add, for example, $g = \{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\}$ increasing and cofinal.

Uses many local instances of Prikry forcing. In example above, $\sup\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ is measurable, and $\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ Prikry generic for it. Similarly above ω.

Another forcing due to Magidor is diagonal Prikry forcing.

Fix ω measurable cardinals κ_n, with ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$.

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Requires a measurable cardinal κ with many measurable cardinals below it. Will add, for example, $g = \{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\}$ increasing and cofinal.

Uses many local instances of Prikry forcing. In example above, $\sup\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ is measurable, and $\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ Prikry generic for it. Similarly above ω.

Another forcing due to Magidor is diagonal Prikry forcing.

Fix ω measurable cardinals κ_n, with ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$.

Use conditions $\langle \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}, X_n, \ldots \rangle$, $\alpha_i \in \kappa_i$, $X_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$.

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Requires a measurable cardinal κ with many measurable cardinals below it. Will add, for example, $g = \{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\}$ increasing and cofinal.

Uses many local instances of Prikry forcing. In example above, $\sup\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ is measurable, and $\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ Prikry generic for it. Similarly above ω.

Another forcing due to Magidor is diagonal Prikry forcing.

Fix ω measurable cardinals κ_n, with ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$.

Use conditions $\langle \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, X_n, \dots \rangle$, $\alpha_i \in \kappa_i$, $X_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$.

Adds a cofinal subset $\{\alpha_i \mid i < \omega\}$ of $\sup\{\kappa_n \mid n < \omega\}$,

Magidor forcing

Magidor forcing is a generalization of Prikry forcing, designed to change cofinalities to $\lambda > \omega$.

Requires a measurable cardinal κ with many measurable cardinals below it. Will add, for example, $g = \{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega_1\}$ increasing and cofinal.

Uses many local instances of Prikry forcing. In example above, $\sup\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ is measurable, and $\{\alpha_\xi \mid \xi < \omega\}$ Prikry generic for it. Similarly above ω.

Another forcing due to Magidor is diagonal Prikry forcing.

Fix ω measurable cardinals κ_n, with ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$.

Use conditions $\langle \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, X_n, \dots \rangle$, $\alpha_i \in \kappa_i$, $X_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$.

Adds a cofinal subset $\{\alpha_i \mid i < \omega\}$ of $\sup\{\kappa_n \mid n < \omega\}$, and does nothing else.

Violating SCH

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ. κ is regular. Force to get a model $M[G]$ satisfying $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ. κ is regular. Force to get a model $M[G]$ satisfying $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$. With some luck, κ still measurable in $M[G]$.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ. κ is regular. Force to get a model $M[G]$ satisfying $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$. With some luck, κ still measurable in $M[G]$. Then use Prikry forcing over $M[G]$. Get $M[G][H]$ where:

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ. κ is regular. Force to get a model $M[G]$ satisfying $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$. With some luck, κ still measurable in $M[G]$. Then use Prikry forcing over $M[G]$. Get $M[G][H]$ where:

1. $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$.
2. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ. κ is regular. Force to get a model $M[G]$ satisfying $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$. With some luck, κ still measurable in $M[G]$. Then use Prikry forcing over $M[G]$. Get $M[G][H]$ where:

1. $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.
2. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Need to make sure κ remains measurable in $M[G]$.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ. κ is regular. Force to get a model $M[G]$ satisfying $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$. With some luck, κ still measurable in $M[G]$. Then use Prikry forcing over $M[G]$. Get $M[G][H]$ where:

1. $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$.
2. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Need to make sure κ remains measurable in $M[G]$. Must start with stronger assumption on κ in M.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ. κ is regular. Force to get a model $M[G]$ satisfying $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$. With some luck, κ still measurable in $M[G]$. Then use Prikry forcing over $M[G]$. Get $M[G][H]$ where:

1. $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$.
2. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Need to make sure κ remains measurable in $M[G]$. Must start with stronger assumption on κ in M. Supercompact certainly enough.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ. κ is regular. Force to get a model $M[G]$ satisfying $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$. With some luck, κ still measurable in $M[G]$. Then use Prikry forcing over $M[G]$. Get $M[G][H]$ where:

1. $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$.
2. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Need to make sure κ remains measurable in $M[G]$. Must start with stronger assumption on κ in M. Supercompact certainly enough. Reduced by Woodin.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ. κ is regular. Force to get a model $M[G]$ satisfying $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$. With some luck, κ still measurable in $M[G]$. Then use Prikry forcing over $M[G]$. Get $M[G][H]$ where:

1. $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$.
2. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Need to make sure κ remains measurable in $M[G]$. Must start with stronger assumption on κ in M. Supercompact certainly enough. Reduced by Woodin. Final optimal result obtained by Gitik.

Violating SCH

Recall: Easy to change ${}^{\kappa}2$ for regular κ, without collapsing cardinals. Difficult for singular κ.

Ultrafilters provide a way to singularize a cardinal, without collapsing any cardinals.

Can be used to violate SCH.

Start with measurable κ. κ is regular. Force to get a model $M[G]$ satisfying $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$. With some luck, κ still measurable in $M[G]$. Then use Prikry forcing over $M[G]$. Get $M[G][H]$ where:

1. $2^{\kappa} = \kappa^{++}$.
2. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Need to make sure κ remains measurable in $M[G]$. Must start with stronger assumption on κ in M. Supercompact certainly enough. Reduced by Woodin. Final optimal result obtained by Gitik. Gives an equiconsistency.

Violating SCH

Violating SCH

Method:

Violating SCH

Method: Using Prikry forcing to singularize a measurable cardinal κ with $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.

Violating SCH

Method: Using Prikry forcing to singularize a measurable cardinal κ with $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.

Is this the only way?

Violating SCH

Method: Using Prikry forcing to singularize a measurable cardinal κ with $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.

Is this the only way?

Recall, tree property fails at κ^+ if ${}^{<\kappa}\kappa = \kappa$.

Violating SCH

Method: Using Prikry forcing to singularize a measurable cardinal κ with $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.

Is this the only way?

Recall, tree property fails at κ^+ if ${}^{<\kappa}\kappa = \kappa$. In particular, fails at successors of measurable cardinals.

Violating SCH

Method: Using Prikry forcing to singularize a measurable cardinal κ with $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.

Is this the only way?

Recall, tree property fails at κ^+ if ${}^{<\kappa}\kappa = \kappa$. In particular, fails at successors of measurable cardinals.

Singularizing preserves this.

Violating SCH

Method: Using Prikry forcing to singularize a measurable cardinal κ with $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.

Is this the only way?

Recall, tree property fails at κ^+ if ${}^{<\kappa}\kappa = \kappa$. In particular, fails at successors of measurable cardinals.

Singularizing preserves this.

If method above is only way to violate SCH, then failure of SCH can only be obtained with failure of the tree property.

Violating SCH

Method: Using Prikry forcing to singularize a measurable cardinal κ with $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.

Is this the only way?

Recall, tree property fails at κ^+ if ${}^{<\kappa}\kappa = \kappa$. In particular, fails at successors of measurable cardinals.

Singularizing preserves this.

If method above is only way to violate SCH, then failure of SCH can only be obtained with failure of the tree property.

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH *at* κ *imply failure of the tree property at* κ^+*?*

Violating SCH

Method: Using Prikry forcing to singularize a measurable cardinal κ with $2^\kappa = \kappa^{++}$.

Is this the only way?

Recall, tree property fails at κ^+ if ${}^{<\kappa}\kappa = \kappa$. In particular, fails at successors of measurable cardinals.

Singularizing preserves this.

If method above is only way to violate SCH, then failure of SCH can only be obtained with failure of the tree property.

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH *at κ imply failure of the tree property at κ^+?*

Intended to test whether the only way to violate SCH is by singularizing a measurable cardinal κ where ${}^\kappa 2 > \kappa^+$.

Violating SCH

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH at κ imply failure of the tree property at κ^+?

Intended to test whether the only way to violate SCH is by singularizing a measurable cardinal κ where ${}^{\kappa}2 > \kappa^+$.

Violating SCH

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH at κ imply failure of the tree property at κ^+?

Intended to test whether the only way to violate SCH is by singularizing a measurable cardinal κ where ${}^{\kappa}2 > \kappa^+$.

Turns our there are other ways (Gitik–Magidor, starting with strong measurable where ${}^{\kappa}2 = \kappa^+$).

Violating SCH

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH at κ imply failure of the tree property at κ^+?

Intended to test whether the only way to violate SCH is by singularizing a measurable cardinal κ where ${}^{\kappa}2 > \kappa^+$.

Turns our there are other ways (Gitik–Magidor, starting with strong measurable where ${}^{\kappa}2 = \kappa^+$). Did not settle test question.

Violating SCH

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH at κ imply failure of the tree property at κ^+?

Intended to test whether the only way to violate SCH is by singularizing a measurable cardinal κ where ${}^{\kappa}2 > \kappa^+$.

Turns our there are other ways (Gitik–Magidor, starting with strong measurable where ${}^{\kappa}2 = \kappa^+$). Did not settle test question.

Over time, question gained a life of its own.

Violating SCH

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH at κ imply failure of the tree property at κ^+?

Intended to test whether the only way to violate SCH is by singularizing a measurable cardinal κ where ${}^{\kappa}2 > \kappa^+$.

Turns our there are other ways (Gitik–Magidor, starting with strong measurable where ${}^{\kappa}2 = \kappa^+$). Did not settle test question.

Over time, question gained a life of its own.

Equivalent to: does tree property at κ^+ imply SCH at κ?

Violating SCH

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH at κ imply failure of the tree property at κ^+?

Intended to test whether the only way to violate SCH is by singularizing a measurable cardinal κ where ${}^{\kappa}2 > \kappa^+$.

Turns our there are other ways (Gitik–Magidor, starting with strong measurable where ${}^{\kappa}2 = \kappa^+$). Did not settle test question.

Over time, question gained a life of its own.

Equivalent to: does tree property at κ^+ imply SCH at κ?

Similar to other questions,

Violating SCH

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH at κ imply failure of the tree property at κ^+?

Intended to test whether the only way to violate SCH is by singularizing a measurable cardinal κ where ${}^{\kappa}2 > \kappa^+$.

Turns our there are other ways (Gitik–Magidor, starting with strong measurable where ${}^{\kappa}2 = \kappa^+$). Did not settle test question.

Over time, question gained a life of its own.

Equivalent to: does tree property at κ^+ imply SCH at κ?

Similar to other questions, eg, does PFA imply SCH?

Violating SCH

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH at κ imply failure of the tree property at κ^+?

Intended to test whether the only way to violate SCH is by singularizing a measurable cardinal κ where ${}^{\kappa}2 > \kappa^+$.

Turns our there are other ways (Gitik–Magidor, starting with strong measurable where ${}^{\kappa}2 = \kappa^+$). Did not settle test question.

Over time, question gained a life of its own.

Equivalent to: does tree property at κ^+ imply SCH at κ?

Similar to other questions, eg, does PFA imply SCH?

(Both PFA and tree property at successors of singulars are remnants of supercompacts, which imply SCH.)

Violating SCH

Question (Woodin, late 1980s)

Does failure of SCH at κ imply failure of the tree property at κ^+?

Intended to test whether the only way to violate SCH is by singularizing a measurable cardinal κ where ${}^{\kappa}2 > \kappa^+$.

Turns our there are other ways (Gitik–Magidor, starting with strong measurable where ${}^{\kappa}2 = \kappa^+$). Did not settle test question.

Over time, question gained a life of its own.

Equivalent to: does tree property at κ^+ imply SCH at κ?

Similar to other questions, eg, does PFA imply SCH?

(Both PFA and tree property at successors of singulars are remnants of supercompacts, which imply SCH.)

Question on PFA answered in the positive.

First cracks

First cracks

Gitik–Sharon, investigating combinatorial properties compatible with failure of the SCH, recently proved:

Theorem (Gitik–Sharon 2008)

(Assuming the existence of a supercompact cardinal.) There is a model with a cardinal κ so that:

1. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.
2. SCH *fails at* κ.
3. *Weak square fails at* κ^+.

First cracks

Gitik–Sharon, investigating combinatorial properties compatible with failure of the SCH, recently proved:

Theorem (Gitik–Sharon 2008)

(Assuming the existence of a supercompact cardinal.) There is a model with a cardinal κ so that:

1. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.
2. SCH *fails at* κ.
3. *Weak square fails at* κ^+.

Weak square was considered a candidate for a principle that would (a) follow from failure of SCH at κ, and (b) imply failure of tree property at κ^+.

First cracks

Gitik–Sharon, investigating combinatorial properties compatible with failure of the SCH, recently proved:

Theorem (Gitik–Sharon 2008)

(Assuming the existence of a supercompact cardinal.) There is a model with a cardinal κ so that:

1. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.
2. SCH *fails at κ.*
3. *Weak square fails at κ^+.*

Weak square was considered a candidate for a principle that would (a) follow from failure of SCH at κ, and (b) imply failure of tree property at κ^+.

Gitik–Sharon showed it does not follow from failure of SCH.

Related results

(Gitik–Sharon 2008, assuming the existence of a supercompact cardinal.)
There is a model with a cardinal κ so that:

1. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.
2. SCH fails at κ.
3. Weak square fails at κ^+.

Related results

(Gitik–Sharon 2008, assuming the existence of a supercompact cardinal.)
There is a model with a cardinal κ so that:

1. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.
2. SCH fails at κ.
3. Weak square fails at κ^+.

Theorem (Cummings–Foreman)

In the Gitik–Sharon model, in fact have

(3′) *There is both a good scale and a bad scale on κ^+.*

Related results

(Gitik–Sharon 2008, assuming the existence of a supercompact cardinal.)
There is a model with a cardinal κ so that:

1. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.
2. SCH fails at κ.
3. Weak square fails at κ^+.

Theorem (Cummings–Foreman)

In the Gitik–Sharon model, in fact have

(3′) *There is both a good scale and a bad scale on* κ^+.

(3)′ implies (3).

Related results

(Gitik–Sharon 2008, assuming the existence of a supercompact cardinal.)
There is a model with a cardinal κ so that:

1. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.
2. SCH fails at κ.
3. Weak square fails at κ^+.

Theorem (Cummings–Foreman)

In the Gitik–Sharon model, in fact have

(3′) *There is both a good scale and a bad scale on κ^+.*

(3)′ implies (3).

Extended by Sinapova to other cofinalities:

Related results

(Gitik–Sharon 2008, assuming the existence of a supercompact cardinal.)
There is a model with a cardinal κ so that:

1. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.
2. SCH fails at κ.
3. Weak square fails at κ^+.

Theorem (Cummings–Foreman)

In the Gitik–Sharon model, in fact have

(3′) *There is both a good scale and a bad scale on κ^+.*

(3)′ implies (3).

Extended by Sinapova to other cofinalities:

Theorem (Sinapova)

Can obtain the same, but with $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \lambda$ (arbitrary λ).

More on Gitik–Sharon

More on Gitik–Sharon

Gitik–Sharon model constructed by Diagonal Prikry forcing,

More on Gitik–Sharon

Gitik–Sharon model constructed by Diagonal Prikry forcing, using supercompactness ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$ on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^{(+n)})$.

More on Gitik–Sharon

Gitik–Sharon model constructed by Diagonal Prikry forcing, using supercompactness ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$ on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^{(+n)})$.

Resulting G singularizes κ *and* collapses $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ to κ.

More on Gitik–Sharon

Gitik–Sharon model constructed by Diagonal Prikry forcing, using supercompactness ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$ on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^{(+n)})$.

Resulting G singularizes κ *and* collapses $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ to κ. $(\kappa^+)^{M[G]} = (\lambda^+)^M$.

More on Gitik–Sharon

Gitik–Sharon model constructed by Diagonal Prikry forcing, using supercompactness ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$ on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^{(+n)})$.

Resulting G singularizes κ *and* collapses $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ to κ. $(\kappa^+)^{M[G]} = (\lambda^+)^M$.

In starting model, ${}^\kappa 2 = \kappa^{(+\omega+2)} = \lambda^{++}$.

More on Gitik–Sharon

Gitik–Sharon model constructed by Diagonal Prikry forcing, using supercompactness ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$ on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^{(+n)})$.

Resulting G singularizes κ *and* collapses $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ to κ. $(\kappa^+)^{M[G]} = (\lambda^+)^M$.

In starting model, ${}^\kappa 2 = \kappa^{(+\omega+2)} = \lambda^{++}$.

In end model: ${}^\kappa 2 = (\lambda^{++})^M = (\kappa^{++})^{M[G]}$.

More on Gitik–Sharon

Gitik–Sharon model constructed by Diagonal Prikry forcing, using supercompactness ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$ on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^{(+n)})$.

Resulting G singularizes κ *and* collapses $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ to κ. $(\kappa^+)^{M[G]} = (\lambda^+)^M$.

In starting model, ${}^\kappa 2 = \kappa^{(+\omega+2)} = \lambda^{++}$.

In end model: ${}^\kappa 2 = (\lambda^{++})^M = (\kappa^{++})^{M[G]}$.

Suppose $\tau > \kappa$ is a limit of supercompacts of cofinality ω. Recall (Magidor–Shelah) tree property holds at τ^+ if τ is a limit of supercompacts.

More on Gitik–Sharon

Gitik–Sharon model constructed by Diagonal Prikry forcing, using supercompactness ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$ on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^{(+n)})$.

Resulting G singularizes κ *and* collapses $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ to κ. $(\kappa^+)^{M[G]} = (\lambda^+)^M$.

In starting model, ${}^\kappa 2 = \kappa^{(+\omega+2)} = \lambda^{++}$.

In end model: ${}^\kappa 2 = (\lambda^{++})^M = (\kappa^{++})^{M[G]}$.

Suppose $\tau > \kappa$ is a limit of supercompacts of cofinality ω. Recall (Magidor–Shelah) tree property holds at τ^+ if τ is a limit of supercompacts.

Adapt Gitik–Sharon construction, replace $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ by τ.

More on Gitik–Sharon

Gitik–Sharon model constructed by Diagonal Prikry forcing, using supercompactness ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$ on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^{(+n)})$.

Resulting G singularizes κ *and* collapses $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ to κ. $(\kappa^+)^{M[G]} = (\lambda^+)^M$.

In starting model, ${}^\kappa 2 = \kappa^{(+\omega+2)} = \lambda^{++}$.

In end model: ${}^\kappa 2 = (\lambda^{++})^M = (\kappa^{++})^{M[G]}$.

Suppose $\tau > \kappa$ is a limit of supercompacts of cofinality ω. Recall (Magidor–Shelah) tree property holds at τ^+ if τ is a limit of supercompacts.

Adapt Gitik–Sharon construction, replace $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ by τ.

Try to preserve Magidor–Shelah result.

More on Gitik–Sharon

Gitik–Sharon model constructed by Diagonal Prikry forcing, using supercompactness ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}_n$ on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^{(+n)})$.

Resulting G singularizes κ *and* collapses $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ to κ. $(\kappa^+)^{M[G]} = (\lambda^+)^M$.

In starting model, ${}^\kappa 2 = \kappa^{(+\omega+2)} = \lambda^{++}$.

In end model: ${}^\kappa 2 = (\lambda^{++})^M = (\kappa^{++})^{M[G]}$.

Suppose $\tau > \kappa$ is a limit of supercompacts of cofinality ω. Recall (Magidor–Shelah) tree property holds at τ^+ if τ is a limit of supercompacts.

Adapt Gitik–Sharon construction, replace $\lambda = \kappa^{(+\omega)}$ by τ.

Try to preserve Magidor–Shelah result. (Two levels of preservation. First, ${}^\kappa 2 = \tau^{++}$, second G. Both pose difficulties.)

Answer

Answer

Theorem (N.)

(Assuming the existence of ω supercompact cardinals.) There is a model with a cardinal κ so that:

1. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.
2. SCH *fails at* κ.
3. *The tree property holds at* κ^+.

Answer

Theorem (N.)

(Assuming the existence of ω supercompact cardinals.) There is a model with a cardinal κ so that:

1. $\mathrm{Cof}(\kappa) = \omega$.
2. SCH *fails at* κ.
3. *The tree property holds at* κ^+.

Question

Can this be done with additional collapsing, so that κ becomes $\aleph_\omega$? Or even $\aleph_{\omega^2}$?