

**REVIEW OF “RATHJEN, MICHAEL: INDEFINITENESS IN
SEMI-INTUITIONISTIC SET THEORIES: ON A CONJECTURE
OF FEFERMAN”**

DANKO ILIK

Classification: 03E50 03F50 03E35 03F25 03C70 03E60.

Keywords: continuum hypothesis; realizability; semi-intuitionistic set theory; forcing.

In semi-intuitionistic set theories, where the law of excluded middle $\phi \vee \neg\phi$ does not hold for all ϕ , one can wonder whether it does hold for ϕ the Continuum Hypothesis (CH). Feferman had conjectured that $\text{CH} \vee \neg\text{CH}$ does not hold (is not provable) for the set theory $\mathbf{T} := \mathbf{SCS} + \text{“}\mathbb{R} \text{ is a set”}$, where $\mathbf{SCS} := \mathbf{IKP} + (\Delta_0\text{-LEM}) + (\text{MP}) + (\text{BOS}) + (\text{AC}_{\text{Set}})$, where \mathbf{IKP} is intuitionistic Kripke-Platek set theory, $\Delta_0\text{-LEM}$ is the law of excluded middle for Δ_0 -formulas, MP is Markov’s Principle, BOS is the Bounded Omniscience Schema, and AC_{Set} is the Axiom of Choice.

Rathjen first proves that $\Delta_0\text{-LEM}$ and BOS are redundant in \mathbf{SCS} , by using Diaconescu well-known argument with AC_{Set} . He then develops a proof of Feferman’s conjecture,

$$\mathbf{T} \not\vdash \text{CH} \vee \neg\text{CH},$$

by:

- choosing an appropriate version of relativized constructible hierarchies, $L[A]$;
- defining computability over $L[A]$;
- defining realizability over $L[A]$, with a realizability theorem (Theorem 5.2) showing that from any proof in \mathbf{T} one can effectively construct a hereditarily finite set as a realizer;
- finally, a set C is constructed that provides a contradiction with $L[C]$ -realizability of $\text{CH} \vee \neg\text{CH}$.

The paper ends by remarks on extensions of \mathbf{T} that still do not prove $\text{CH} \vee \neg\text{CH}$, as well as showing an analogous result of Projective Determinacy (PD): a proof that $\mathbf{T} \not\vdash \text{PD} \vee \neg\text{PD}$.