

MyTitle

MyName

October 29, 2024

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Set-Theoretic Preliminaries	4
2.1	ZF Set Theory and the Axiom of Choice	4
2.2	Forcing	5
2.3	Symmetric Extensions	6
3	Outline of the Formalized Proof	7
4	Isabelle/ZF and Formalization in Prior Work	9
4.1	Isabelle/ZF	9
4.2	Internalized First-Order Formulas	9
4.3	Forcing	9
5	Formalization of the Proof	10
5.1	Introduction to the Formalization	10
5.2	Defining Symmetric Extensions	11
5.2.1	\mathbb{P} -names	11
5.2.2	Automorphisms	11
5.2.3	Hereditarily Symmetric Names	11
5.2.4	Symmetric Extensions	11
5.3	Proving that Symmetric Extensions are Models of ZF	11
5.3.1	Relativized Forcing Relation \Vdash_{HS}	11
5.3.2	The Symmetric Lemma	11
5.3.3	Separation	11
5.3.4	Replacement	11
5.3.5	Other Axioms	11
5.4	Defining the Basic Cohen Model	11
5.4.1	The Notion of Forcing	11
5.4.2	The Group of Automorphisms	11
5.4.3	The Normal Filter	11
5.5	Proving that the Basic Cohen Model satisfies $\neg AC$	11
6	Conclusion and Future Work	12

Chapter 1

Introduction

The formalization of mathematics using proof assistants such as Isabelle, Coq, and Lean, has been actively conducted, leading to numerous achievements. For instance, the proofs of the four color theorem, Kepler’s conjecture, and the Feit-Thompson theorem have been formalized using proof assistants, enhancing the reliability of these proofs. Additionally, various fields of mathematics, such as number theory, algebra, and topology, are also being formalized.

The independence of the axiom of choice(AC) from Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory(ZF) is a well-known result in the early history of axiomatic set theory, as well as the independence of the continuum hypothesis(CH) from ZF with AC(ZFC). Cohen invented the forcing method and proved them in 1963. Forcing is a powerful tool for exploring models of set theory and was subsequently further sophisticated by other researchers.

Independence proofs of CH from ZFC has been formalized in Isabelle/ZF by Gunther et al. [2] and in Lean 3 by Han and van Doorn [3]. In these studies, forcing methods were formalized, and the independence of CH was proven by showing the relative consistency of CH and \neg CH with ZFC.

For AC, the relative consistency of AC with ZF has been formalized in Isabelle/ZF by Paulson [8]. However, the relative consistency of \neg AC with ZF has not been formalized. It can be proven by forcing, but the proof involves complexities that cannot be achieved by simply modifying the proof for CH.

In this work, we formalized the relative consistency proof of \neg AC with ZF in Isabelle/ZF. This work contributes to the formalization of axiomatic set theory and serves as a new example of the formalization using forcing, which is a crucial tool in set theory. It also may provide insights into how the formalization of axiomatic set theory could be advanced.

Related works

Paulson et al. formalized an extensive part of ZF set theory [6, 7, 8, 9, 10], including cardinal arithmetic, relativization, the reflection theorem, features for handling inductive definitions, and the relative consistency of AC with ZF. The proof of the relative consistency was achieved by constructing Gödel’s constructible universe.

Building on these results, Gunther et al. formalized forcing and a proof of the independence of CH [1, 2] in Isabelle/ZF. In these formalizations, the countable transitive model (c.t.m.) approach was used, following Kunen’s book [5].

In Lean, Han and van Doorn also formalized forcing and the independence of CH [3] in Lean 3. using the Boolean-valued model approach, which is another approach to forcing. Additionally, in Lean 4, Holmes and Wilshaw formalized the complex parts of the consistency proof of Quine’s New Foundations [4], ensuring the correctness of the proof.

Our Approach

Repository

Our source code is available at: https://github.com/tarakojo/ZF_notAC

Chapter 2

Set-Theoretic Preliminaries

In this chapter, we introduce the concepts of set theory used in the formalization of this study. We use first-order logic with the language of set theory, which consists only of only two relation symbols \in and $=$. Formulas involving other mathematical operators that may appear are considered abbreviations for formulas in this language. Parentheses in formulas are omitted where no confusion arises. Unless otherwise stated, "a statement holds" means "the statement holds in ZF".

2.1 ZF Set Theory and the Axiom of Choice

Definition 2.1. *The axioms of ZF are the following statements:*

- *Extensionality:* $\forall x \forall y (\forall z (z \in x \leftrightarrow z \in y) \rightarrow x = y)$
- *Pairing:* $\forall x \forall y \exists z \forall w (w \in z \leftrightarrow w = x \vee w = y)$
- *Union:* $\forall x \exists y \forall z (z \in y \leftrightarrow \exists w (z \in w \wedge w \in x))$
- *Power set:* $\forall x \exists y \forall z (z \in y \leftrightarrow z \subseteq x)$
- *Infinity:* $\exists x (\emptyset \in x \wedge \forall y (y \in x \rightarrow y \cup \{y\} \in x))$
- *Regularity:* $\forall x (x \neq \emptyset \rightarrow \exists y (y \in x \wedge y \cap x = \emptyset))$
- *Infinity:* $\forall x (x \neq \emptyset \rightarrow \exists y (y \in x \wedge \forall z (z \in x \rightarrow z \notin y)))$
- *Separation:* $\forall p \forall x \exists y \forall z (z \in y \leftrightarrow z \in x \wedge \phi(z, p))$
- *Replacement:* $\forall p (\forall x \forall y \forall z (\phi(x, y, p) \wedge \phi(x, z, p) \rightarrow y = z) \rightarrow \forall X \exists Y \forall y (y \in Y \leftrightarrow \exists x (x \in X \wedge \phi(x, y, p))))$

Where separation and replacement are axiom schemas, representing infinitely many axioms for each formula ϕ with an appropriate arity.

Definition 2.2. *The axiom of choice (AC) is the following statement:*
 $\forall x \exists f ("f \text{ is a function on } x" \wedge \forall y (y \in x \rightarrow f(y) \in y))$

Where the phrase "f is a function on x" is also considered an abbreviation in the language of set theory. Theory ZF + AC is denoted by ZFC. Next, we introduce the well-ordering theorem, as we treat AC in this form.

Definition 2.3. We say that a linear ordering $<$ on a set P is a well-ordering if, every non-empty subset of P , it has a least element.

Lemma 2.4. The axiom of choice is equivalent to the well-ordering theorem, which states that every set can be well-ordered.

2.2 Forcing

Forcing is a technique used in proving relative consistency and Independence. We introduce basic concepts of forcing in the context of the transitive countable model (c.t.m.) approach. In this approach, the relative consistency proof is achieved by using forcing to construct an extended model by adding new sets to an assumed c.t.m. Let M be a c.t.m. of ZF and $(\mathbb{P}, \leq_{\mathbb{P}})$ be a notion of forcing, which is a pre-ordered set in M with a maximum element $1_{\mathbb{P}}$.

Definition 2.5. We define $M^{\mathbb{P}}$, the set of \mathbb{P} -names, by transfinite recursion on ordinals:

1. $M_0^{\mathbb{P}} = \emptyset$
2. $M_{\alpha+1}^{\mathbb{P}} = \mathcal{P}^M(M_{\alpha}^{\mathbb{P}} \times \mathbb{P})$
3. $M_{\alpha}^{\mathbb{P}} = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} M_{\beta}^{\mathbb{P}}$ for a limit ordinal α
4. $M^{\mathbb{P}} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ord}} M_{\alpha}^{\mathbb{P}}$

Where \mathcal{P}^M denotes the power set operation in M . We often write a \mathbb{P} -name with a dot, e.g., \dot{x} .

Definition 2.6.

1. We say that $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is dense if, for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$, there exists $q \in D$ such that $q \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$.
2. We say that $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a filter if following conditions hold:
 - If $p \in G$, $q \in \mathbb{P}$, and $p \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q$, then $q \in G$
 - If $p, q \in G$, there exists $r \in G$ such that $r \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ and $r \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q$
3. We say that $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is generic filter on \mathbb{P} if G is a filter and for any dense $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, $D \cap G \neq \emptyset$.

The following lemma shows that a generic filter actually exists.

Lemma 2.7. For any $p \in \mathbb{P}$, there exists a generic filter G on \mathbb{P} such that $p \in G$.

Definition 2.8. Let G be a generic filter on \mathbb{P} and $\dot{x} \in M^{\mathbb{P}}$. We define the interpretation of \dot{x} denoted by \dot{x}_G recursively, $\dot{x}_G = \{\dot{y}_G \mid \exists p \in G (\langle \dot{y}, p \rangle \in \dot{x})\}$.

We call a *Pbb*-name whose interpretation is a set x a name of x and denote it by \dot{x} . Note that a single set may have multiple names.

Definition 2.9. Let G be a generic filter on \mathbb{P} . We define a generic extension $M[G]$ as $\{x_G \mid \dot{x} \in M^{\mathbb{P}}\}$.

Theorem 2.10. Let G be a generic filter on \mathbb{P} . Then, $M[G]$ is the smallest c.t.m. of ZF extending M and containing G .

By choosing \mathbb{P} appropriately, we can construct $M[G]$ with various properties. What holds or does not hold in $M[G]$ can be identified using the forcing relation.

Definition 2.11 (Forcing relation). *ATODE*

Theorem 2.12 (Forcing relation and generic extensions). *ATODE*

2.3 Symmetric Extensions

Symmetric extensions are substructures of generic extensions of a given c.t.m. of ZF and are formed by interpreting only the hereditarily symmetric names. Let M be a c.t.m. of ZF, $(\mathbb{P}, \leq_{\mathbb{P}})$ be a pre-ordered set in M with the maximum element $1_{\mathbb{P}}$.

Definition 2.13. We say that $\pi : \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ is an automorphism if for all $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$, $p \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q \Leftrightarrow \pi p \leq_{\mathbb{P}} \pi q$. π induces a bijection on \mathbb{P} -names defined recursively as follows:

$$\pi \dot{x} = \{\langle \pi \dot{y}, \pi p \rangle \mid \langle \dot{y}, p \rangle \in \dot{x}\}$$

Definition 2.14. Let \mathcal{G} be a group of automorphisms of \mathbb{P} . We say that \mathcal{F} is a normal filter on \mathcal{G} if the following conditions hold:

1. \mathcal{F} is non-empty family of subgroups of \mathcal{G} .
2. \mathcal{F} is closed under finite intersections and supergroups.
3. For every $H \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{G}$, $\pi H \pi^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}$.

We fix a group of automorphisms \mathcal{G} of \mathbb{P} and a normal filter \mathcal{F} on \mathcal{G} .

Definition 2.15. For every \mathbb{P} -name \dot{x} , let $\text{sym}_{\mathcal{G}}(\dot{x}) = \{\pi \in \mathcal{G} \mid \pi \dot{x} = \dot{x}\}$. We say that \mathbb{P} -name \dot{x} is hereditarily \mathcal{F} -symmetric if $\text{sym}_{\mathcal{G}}(\dot{x}) \in \mathcal{F}$. $HS_{\mathcal{F}}$ denotes the set of all hereditarily \mathcal{F} -symmetric \mathbb{P} -names.

Definition 2.16. Let G be a generic filter on \mathbb{P} . The set $HS_{\mathcal{F}}^G = \{\dot{x}_G \mid \dot{x} \in HS_{\mathcal{F}}\}$ is called a symmetric extension of M .

Theorem 2.17. Let G be a generic filter on \mathbb{P} . Then, the symmetric extension $HS_{\mathcal{F}}^G$ is a c.t.m. of ZF and a substructure of $M[G]$.

Definition 2.18 (HS forcing relation). *ATODE*

Lemma 2.19 (strengthening). *ATODE*

Theorem 2.20 (relation between HS forcing relations and symmetric extensions). *ATODE*

Lemma 2.21 (Symmetric Lemma). *ATODE*

Chapter 3

Outline of the Formalized Proof

We outline the formalized relative consistency proof of $\text{ZF} + \neg\text{AC}$. In this proof, the relative consistency is proved by assuming the existence of a c.t.m. of ZF and constructing a model of $\text{ZF} + \neg\text{AC}$ by forcing. This model is a symmetric extension called the basic Cohen model.

Let M be a c.t.m. of ZF, \mathbb{P} be the set of all finite partial functions from $\omega \times \omega$ to $\{0, 1\}$, and $\leq_{\mathbb{P}}$ be \supseteq . Note that the maximum element $1_{\mathbb{P}}$ is the empty set. Let π be a bijection on ω . π induces an automorphism on \mathbb{P} defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(\pi p) &= \{(\pi n, m) \mid (n, m) \in \text{dom}(p)\} \\ (\pi p)(\pi n, m) &= p(n, m) \end{aligned}$$

This automorphism further induces an automorphism on \mathbb{P} -names. Let \mathcal{G} be the group of all such automorphisms. For every finite $e \subseteq \omega$, let

$$\text{fix}(e) = \{\pi \in \mathcal{G} \mid \forall n \in e (\pi n = n)\}$$

Let \mathcal{F} be the set of all subgroups H of \mathcal{G} such that there exists a finite $e \subseteq \omega$ with $\text{fix}(e) \subseteq H$. Note that \mathcal{F} is a normal filter on \mathcal{G} . Let $\mathcal{N} = \text{HS}_{\mathcal{F}}^G$. Since \mathcal{N} is a symmetric extension of M , it is a c.t.m. of ZF.

Theorem 3.1. *\mathcal{N} does not satisfy the well-ordering theorem.*

Proof. We outline the proof of this theorem as follows. For every $n \in \omega$, let a_n be the following real number:

$$a_n = \{m \in \omega \mid \exists p \in G (p(n, m) = 1)\}$$

Since a_n are pairwise distinct, $A = \{a_n \mid n \in \omega\}$ is an infinity set. A and every a_n are elements of \mathcal{N} . A serves as a counterexample to the well-ordering theorem in \mathcal{N} . Suppose for contradiction that A is well-ordered in \mathcal{N} , there exists an injection f from ω to A in \mathcal{N} . Let $\varphi(g, x, y)$ be a formula that represents the relation $g(x) = y$. For

every $n \in \omega$, There exists $i \in \omega$ such that $N \models \varphi(f, i, a_n)$. Thus there exists $p \in G$ and hereditarily \mathcal{F} -symmetric names \dot{f}, \dot{i} and \dot{a}_n for each of f, i, a_n such that

$$p \Vdash_{\text{HS}} \varphi(\dot{f}, \dot{i}, \dot{a}_n)$$

By choosing n and the names appropriately, we can find $\pi \in \mathcal{G}$ such that the following conditions are additionally satisfied:

1. $\pi \dot{f} = \dot{f}$
2. $\pi \dot{i} = \dot{i}$
3. $\pi n \neq n$
4. There exists a hereditarily \mathcal{F} -symmetric name $\dot{a}_{\pi n}$ of $a_{\pi n}$ such that $\pi \dot{a}_n = \dot{a}_{\pi n}$
5. There exists $q \in G$ such that $q \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ and $q \leq_{\mathbb{P}} \pi p$

By Lemma ??

$$\pi p \Vdash_{\text{HS}} \varphi(\pi \dot{f}, \pi \dot{i}, \pi \dot{a}_n)$$

Thus

$$\pi p \Vdash_{\text{HS}} \varphi(\dot{f}, \dot{i}, \dot{a}_{\pi n})$$

Therefore, by Lemma ??

$$q \Vdash_{\text{HS}} \varphi(\dot{f}, \dot{i}, \dot{a}_n) \text{ and } q \Vdash_{\text{HS}} \varphi(\dot{f}, \dot{i}, \dot{a}_{\pi n})$$

This means that $N \models \varphi(f, i, a_n)$ and $N \models \varphi(f, i, a_{\pi n})$, which implies that $f(i) = a_n$ and $f(i) = a_{\pi n}$. Since a_n and $a_{\pi n}$ are distinct, this is a contradiction. \square

Chapter 4

Isabelle/ZF and Formalization in Prior Work

In this chapter, we introduce Isabelle/ZF, a proof assistant for ZF set theory, and the results from prior work used in the formalization of this study.

4.1 Isabelle/ZF

4.2 Internalized First-Order Formulas

4.3 Forcing

Chapter 5

Formalization of the Proof

5.1 Introduction to the Formalization

In this chapter, we

5.2 Defining Symmetric Extensions

5.2.1 \mathbb{P} -names

5.2.2 Automorphisms

5.2.3 Hereditarily Symmetric Names

5.2.4 Symmetric Extensions

5.3 Proving that Symmetric Extensions are Models of ZF

5.3.1 Relativized Forcing Relation \Vdash_{HS}

5.3.2 The Symmetric Lemma

5.3.3 Separation

5.3.4 Replacement

5.3.5 Other Axioms

5.4 Defining the Basic Cohen Model

5.4.1 The Notion of Forcing

5.4.2 The Group of Automorphisms

5.4.3 The Normal Filter

5.5 Proving that the Basic Cohen Model satisfies $\neg AC$

Chapter 6

Conclusion and Future Work

Bibliography

- [1] Emmanuel Gunther, Miguel Pagano, and Pedro Sánchez Terraf. “Formalization of Forcing in Isabelle/ZF”. In: *Archive of Formal Proofs* (May 2020). <https://isa-afp.org/entries/Forcing.html>, Formal proof development. ISSN: 2150-914x.
- [2] Emmanuel Gunther et al. “The Independence of the Continuum Hypothesis in Isabelle/ZF”. In: *Archive of Formal Proofs* (Mar. 2022). https://isa-afp.org/entries/Independence_CH.html, Formal proof development. ISSN: 2150-914x.
- [3] Jesse Michael Han and Floris van Doorn. “A formal proof of the independence of the continuum hypothesis”. In: *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs, CPP 2020, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 20-21, 2020*. 2020.
- [4] M. Randall Holmes and Sky Wilshaw. *NF is Consistent*. 2024. eprint: arXiv:1503.01406.
- [5] Kenneth Kunen. *Set Theory*. London, England: College Publications, Nov. 2011.
- [6] Lawrence C. Paulson. “A fixedpoint approach to implementing (Co)inductive definitions”. In: *Automated Deduction — CADE-12*. Ed. by Alan Bundy. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1994, pp. 148–161. ISBN: 978-3-540-48467-7.
- [7] Lawrence C. Paulson. “The Reflection Theorem: A Study in Meta-theoretic Reasoning”. In: *Automated Deduction—CADE-18*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2002, pp. 377–391. ISBN: 9783540456209. DOI: 10.1007/3-540-45620-1_31. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45620-1_31.
- [8] Lawrence C. Paulson. “The Relative Consistency of the Axiom of Choice — Mechanized Using Isabelle/ZF”. In: *Logic and Theory of Algorithms*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 486–490. ISBN: 9783540694076. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-69407-6_52. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-69407-6_52.
- [9] Lawrence C. Paulson and Krzysztof Grabczewski. “Mechanizing set theory: Cardinal arithmetic and the Axiom of Choice”. In: *Journal of Automated Reasoning* 17.3 (Dec. 1996). ISSN: 1573-0670. DOI: 10.1007/bf00283132. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00283132>.

- [10] Gordon Plotkin, Colin P. Stirling, and Mads Tofte. “A Fixedpoint Approach to (Co)Inductive and (Co)Datatype Definitions”. In: *Proof, Language, and Interaction: Essays in Honour of Robin Milner*. 2000, pp. 187–211.