arXiv:1301.0396v2 [math.LO] 20 Feb 2015

THE FILTER DICHOTOMY PRINCIPLE DOES NOT IMPLY THE SEMIFILTER TRICHOTOMY PRINCIPLE

HEIKE MILDENBERGER

Abstract. We answer Blass' question from 1989 of whether the inequality $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g}$ is strictly stronger than the filter dichotomy principle [5, page 36] affirmatively. We show that there is a forcing extension in which every non-meagre filter on ω is ultra by finite-to-one and the semifilter trichotomy does not hold. This trichotomy says: every semifilter is either meagre or comeagre or ultra by finite-to-one. The trichotomy is equivalent to the inequality $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g}$ by work of Blass and Laflamme. Combinatorics of block sequences is used to establish forcing notions that preserve suitable properties of block sequences.

1. Introduction

We separate two useful combinatorial principles: We show the filter dichotomy principle is strictly weaker than the semifilter trichotomy principle. Consequences of the latter and equivalent statements to the latter in the realm of measure, category, rarefication orders are investigated in [22, 18, 6]. Paul Larson proves in [23] a long-standing question about medial limits: The filter dichotomy implies that there are none. Our result on the combinatorical side thus separates some very powerful principles in analysis.

We first recall the definitions: For $B \subseteq \omega$ and $f\colon \omega \to \omega$, we let $f''B = \{f(b) : b \in B\}$ and $f^{-1}{}''B = \{n : f(n) \in B\}$. By a *filter* we mean a proper filter on ω. We call a filter *non-principal* if it contains all cofinite sets. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a non-principal filter on ω and let $f\colon \omega \to \omega$ be finite-to-one (that means that the preimage of each natural number is finite). Then also $f(\mathcal{F}) = \{X : f^{-1}{}''X \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is a non-principal filter. From now on we consider only non-principal filters. Two filters $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are *nearly coherent*, if there is some finite-to-one $f\colon \omega \to \omega$ such that $f(\mathcal{F}) \cup f(\mathcal{G})$ generates a filter. The set of all infinite subsets of ω is denoted by $[\omega]^\omega$. A *semifilter* $\mathcal{S}$ is a subset of $[\omega]^\omega$ that contains ω as an element and that is closed under almost supersets, i.e., $(\forall X \in \mathcal{S})(\forall Y \in [\omega]^\omega)(X \setminus Y \text{ finite } \to Y \in \mathcal{S})$. In particular, $[\omega]^\omega$ is a semifilter.

Date: Feb. 20, 2015.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E05, 03E17, 03E35, 28A20.

Key words and phrases. Iterated proper forcing, combinatorics with block-sequences, filters, semifilters, preservation theorems for forcing.

The *filter dichotomy principle*, abbreviated FD, says that for every filter there is a finite-to-one function f such that $f(\mathcal{F})$ is either the filter of cofinite sets (also called the *Fréchet filter*) or an ultrafilter. In the latter case we call $\mathcal{F}$ *ultra by finite-to-one* or *nearly ultra*. A semifilter $\mathcal{S}$ is called *meagre/comeagre* if the set of the characteristic functions of the members of $\mathcal{S}$ is a meagre/comeagre subset of the space 2^ω.

We let ${}^\omega\omega$ denote the set of functions from ω to ω. For $f, g \in {}^\omega\omega$ we say g eventually dominates f and write $f \leq^* g$ iff $(\exists n_0 \in \omega)(\forall n \geq n_0)(f(n) \leq g(n))$. Talagrand [36] showed

Lemma 1.1. *For every semifilter $\mathcal{S}$ the following are equivalent*

(1) There is a finite-to-one function such that $\{X : (\exists S \in \mathcal{S})(f''S \subseteq X)\}$ is the Fréchet filter.

(2) $\mathcal{S}$ is meagre.

(3) The set of enumerating functions of members of $\mathcal{S}$ is $\leq^*$-bounded.

The *semifilter trichotomy principle*, abbreviated SFT, says that for every semifilter $\mathcal{S}$ either $\mathcal{S}$ is meagre or $f(\mathcal{S})$ is ultra or $f(\mathcal{S}) = [\omega]^\omega$ for some finite-to-one f. The latter is equivalent to $\mathcal{S}$ being comeagre, for an explicit proof see [23, Th. 4.1].

The semifilter trichotomy can also formulated in terms of two cardinal characteristics: Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on ω. $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ is a *base* for $\mathcal{F}$ if for every $X \in \mathcal{F}$ there is some $Y \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $Y \subseteq X$. The character of $\mathcal{F}$, $\chi(\mathcal{F})$, is the smallest cardinality of a base of $\mathcal{F}$. The cardinal $\mathfrak{u}$ is the smallest character of a non-principal ultrafilter. We denote by $\mathfrak{g}$ be the *groupwise density number*, that is the smallest number of groupwise dense sets whose intersection is empty. A set $\mathcal{G} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is called *groupwise dense* if it is closed under almost subsets and for every strictly increasing function $f\colon \omega \to \omega$ there is an infinite A such that $\bigcup_{n\in A}[f(n), f(n+1)) \in \mathcal{G}$. Laflamme [22, Theorem 8] showed that $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g}$ implies SFT, and Blass [6] showed that SFT implies $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g}$. The purpose of this paper is to show the following:

Main Theorem. *"*FD *and the negation of* SFT*" is consistent relative to* ZFC.

A groupwise dense family that is closed under finite unions is called a groupwise dense ideal. The *groupwise density number for filters*, $\mathfrak{g}_f$, is the smallest number of groupwise dense ideals with empty intersection. From [9] and Blass [6], just read for groupwise dense ideals, it follows that $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g}_f$ is equivalent to FD. Moreover, FD implies $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g}_f = \mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c}$ [6]. Hence FD and and not SFT is equivalent to $\mathfrak{g} \leq \mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g}_f$. Brendle [13] constructed a c.c.c. extension with $\kappa = \mathfrak{g} < \mathfrak{g}_f = \mathfrak{b} = \kappa^+$, and asked whether $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{g} < \mathfrak{g}_f$ is consistent. By Shelah's $\mathfrak{g}_f \leq \mathfrak{b}^+$ in ZFC [35], the only constellation for $\mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{g} < \mathfrak{g}_f$ is $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{g} < \mathfrak{g}_f = \mathfrak{b}^+$. Since in any model of the dichotomy and $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{g}$ we have the cardinal constellation $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{g} < \mathfrak{g}_f = \mathfrak{c}$, the

main theorem also answers a question by Brendle [13, Question 10] about separating $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_f$ above $\mathfrak{b}$.

For $S, X \in [\omega]^\omega$ we say S splits X iff $X \cap S$ and $X \setminus S$ are both infinite. A set $SP \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is called *splitting* or a splitting family iff for every $X \in [\omega]^\omega$ there is some $S \in SP$ splitting X. The smallest cardinal of a splitting family is called the *splitting number* and denoted by $\mathfrak{s}$. Necessarily the splitting number $\mathfrak{s}$ must be bounded by $\mathfrak{u}$ for FD and $\mathfrak{u} \geq \mathfrak{g}$, because by [24, Cor. 4.4], FD together with $\mathfrak{s} > \mathfrak{u}$ implies $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g}$.

The same argument shows:

Proposition 1.2. *$\mathfrak{g}_f \leq \mathfrak{s}$ implies $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_f$.*

Proof. Assume that we have groupwise dense families $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$, $\alpha < \kappa$, for some $\kappa < \mathfrak{g}_f$. Then there is a diagonalisation D of the generated ideals, that is for every $\alpha < \kappa$ there are $A_{\alpha,i} \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha$, $i \leq n_\alpha$, such that $D \subseteq A_{\alpha,0} \cup \dots \cup A_{\alpha,n_\alpha}$. Since $\kappa < \mathfrak{g}_f \leq \mathfrak{s}$ these $A_{\alpha,i} \cap D$ are not a splitting family on $[D]^\omega$. Hence there is some infinite $D' \subseteq D$ and there are i_α, $\alpha < \kappa$, such that $(\forall \alpha < \kappa)(D' \subseteq A_{\alpha,i_\alpha})$. So $D' \in \bigcap_{\alpha<\kappa} \mathcal{G}_\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{g} > \kappa$. □

The only models of FD that have been known so far are also models of $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g}$ (and hence SFT).

A third principle is strictly weaker than FD: The principle of near coherence of filters, short NCF, says that for any two filters (recall: they contain the Fréchet filter) are nearly coherent. The filter dichotomy implies NCF by [9], and the reverse does not hold by [26].

An iteration of length ω_2 with countable support of Blass–Shelah forcing over a ground model of CH [10] gives $\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{g} = 2^\omega = \aleph_2$ and an iteration of length ω_2 with countable support of Miller forcing over a ground model of CH [11] gives $\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{s} < \mathfrak{g} = 2^\omega = \aleph_2$. A third type of model of $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g}$ is given by a countable support iteration of Matet forcing [5]. The only technique available for preserving ultrafilters by now is countable support iteration of proper iterands. Combinatorial work in the Baire space and its subsets isolates non-implications, and work in the set of the hereditarily countable sets allows to construct proper forcings in the $\aleph_1$-$\aleph_2$ scenario. Also this paper is of this kind. Only few mathematical reasons for smallness and difference one in cardinals are known, among them the Raisonnier filter [32], which implies NCF $\to$ add$(\mathcal{N}) = \aleph_1$ and the base matrix tree [2], which implies $\mathfrak{g}_f \leq \mathfrak{b}^+$ (Shelah [35]).

The paper is organised as follows: In Section 2 we explain Matet forcing with centred systems and define centred systems that preserve a given countably block-splitting family. In Section 3 we recall Matet forcing with stable ordered-union ultrafilters and Eisworth's work. In Section 4 we define the iterated forcing orders that establish our consistency results. In Section 5 we collect some side results on cardinal characteristics.

Undefined notation on cardinal characteristics can be found in [3, 8]. Undefined notation about forcing can be found in [21, 34]. In the forcing, we follow the Israeli style that the stronger condition is the *larger* one. A good background in proper forcing is assumed.

2. A variant of Matet forcing

We define a variant of Matet forcing. For this purpose, we first introduce some notation about block-sequences. Our nomenclature follows Blass [4] and Eisworth [15].

We let $\mathbb{F}$ be the collection of all finite non-empty subsets of ω. For $a, b \in \mathbb{F}$ we write $a < b$ if $(\forall n \in a)(\forall m \in b)(n < m)$. A filter on $\mathbb{F}$ is a subset of $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{F})$ that is closed under intersections and supersets. A sequence $\bar{a} = \langle a_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ of members of $\mathbb{F}$ is called a block-sequence if for all n, $a_n < a_{n+1}$. The set $(\mathbb{F})^\omega$ denotes the collection of all block-sequences. If X is a subset of $\mathbb{F}$, we write $\mathrm{FU}(X)$ for the set of all finite unions of members of X. We write $\mathrm{FU}(\bar{a})$ instead of $\mathrm{FU}(\{a_n : n \in \omega\})$.

The set of blocks of $\bar{b}$ is $\mathrm{block}(\bar{b}) = \{b_n : n \in \omega\}$, and the union of all blocks is called $\mathrm{set}(\bar{b})$. We say $E \subseteq (\mathbb{F})^\omega$ generates $\mathcal{C}$ iff $\mathcal{C} = \{\bar{a} : (\exists \bar{b} \in E)(\bar{b} \sqsubseteq^* \bar{a})\}$.

Definition 2.1. Given $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ in $(\mathbb{F})^\omega$, we say that $\bar{b}$ *is a condensation of* $\bar{a}$ and we write $\bar{b} \sqsubseteq \bar{a}$ if $\mathrm{block}(\bar{b}) \subseteq \mathrm{FU}(\bar{a})$. We say $\bar{b}$ is *stronger than* $\bar{a}$ and we write $\bar{b} \sqsubseteq^* \bar{a}$ iff there is an n such that $\langle b_t : t \geq n\rangle$ is a condensation of $\bar{a}$.

We also call $\bar{b} \sqsubseteq^* \bar{a}$ a strengthening $\bar{a}$.

Definition 2.2. A set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq (\mathbb{F})^\omega$ is called *centred*, if for any finite $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ there is $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}$ that is stronger than any $\bar{c} \in C$.

Definition 2.3. In the *Matet forcing*, $\mathbb{M}$, the conditions are pairs $(a, \bar{c})$ such that $a \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\bar{c} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$ and $a < c_0$. The forcing order is $(b, \bar{d}) \geq (a, \bar{c})$ (recall the stronger condition is the larger one) iff $a \subseteq b$ and $b \setminus a$ is a union of finitely many of the c_n and $\bar{d}$ is a condensation of $\bar{c}$.

Definition 2.4. Given a centred system $\mathcal{C} \subseteq (\mathbb{F})^\omega$, the notion of forcing $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$ consists of all pairs $(s, \bar{a}')$, such that $s \in \mathbb{F}$ and there is $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\bar{a}'$ is an end-segment of $\bar{a}$, i.e., $\bar{a}' = \langle a_n : n \geq k\rangle$. The forcing order is the same as in the Matet forcing. In the special case that $\mathcal{C}$ is generated by the members of a $\sqsubseteq^*$-descending sequence $\bar{a}_\alpha$, $\alpha < \beta$, we also write $\mathbb{M}(\bar{a}_\alpha : \alpha < \beta)$ for $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$.

We use $\mathbb{M}(\bar{a}_\alpha : \alpha < \beta)$ for $\sqsubseteq^*$-descending sequences of length 1, of length $< \kappa$ and of length κ where $\kappa = (2^\omega)^{\mathbf{V}}$ is assumed to be regular.

Here is more notation for handling block-sequences.

Definition 2.5.

(1) The set of finite-to-finite relations is

$$\mathcal{R}^* = \{R \subseteq \omega \times \omega : (\forall m)\{n : mRn\} \text{ is non-empty and finite} \\ \wedge (\forall n)\{m : mRn\} \text{ is non-empty and finite}\}.$$

We let the letter R range over elements of $\mathcal{R}^*$.

(2) For $a \subseteq \omega$, $R \in \mathcal{R}^*$ we let $R(a) = \{n : mRn, m \in a\}$.

(3) For $\bar{a} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$, $R \in \mathcal{R}^*$ we let $R(\bar{a}) = \langle R(a_n) : n \in \omega\rangle$.

The purpose of $R \in \mathcal{R}^*$ is to increase infinite sets in a gentle manner, as with finite-to-one functions: If $f''x \subseteq f''y$, then $x \subseteq Ry$ for $R = \{(m,n) : f(n) = f(m)\}$. Another use is: For a finite-to-one f, $f(\mathcal{F}) = \{X : f^{-1\prime\prime}X \in \mathcal{F}\} = \{X : R(X) \in \mathcal{F}\}$, where xRy iff $f(y) = x$. Since f is a finite-to-one function, we have $R \in \mathcal{R}$.

Remark 2.6. There are many $R \in \mathcal{R}^*$: For any two sequences $\bar{c}$, $\bar{d}$ in $(\mathbb{F})^\omega$ there is $R_{\bar{c},\bar{d}}$ such that $R_{\bar{c},\bar{d}}(\bar{c}) = \bar{d}$. Indeed, there are many such R, here is one example $R_{\bar{c},\bar{d}} = \bigcup\{c_n \times d_n : n \in \omega\}$. So the quantifier $\forall R \in \mathcal{R}^*$ creates homogeneity among block-sequences.

Definition 2.7. (Kamburelis and Węglorz [19]) A family $\mathcal{X} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is called block-splitting iff for any $\bar{a} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$ there is an $X \in \mathcal{X}$ such that infinitely many blocks of $\bar{a}$ are subsets of X and infinitely many blocks are disjoint from X.

Kamburelis and Węglorz [19] showed that the smallest size of a block-splitting family is $\max(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{s})$. A family $\mathcal{X}$ is block-splitting iff for every $R \in \mathcal{R}^*$, $R[\mathcal{X}] = \{R(X) : X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is splitting.

With an eye on a scheme of iterable properties from [34, Ch. XVIII, Def. 3.4] and [28, Def 4.5] we choose a stronger notion:

Definition 2.8. A family $\mathcal{X} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is called *countably block-splitting* iff for any sequence $(\bar{a}_n)_n$ of block-sequences $\bar{a}_n \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$ there is an $X \in \mathcal{X}$ such that for any n, infinitely many blocks of $\bar{a}_n$ are subsets of X and infinitely many blocks of $\bar{a}_n$ are disjoint from X.

From now on we consider only the simple case that $\mathcal{C}$ is generated by the range of a $\sqsubseteq^*$-descending sequence $\langle \bar{c}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \delta\rangle$ of block-sequences $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$.

Recall $\mathsf{MA}_{<\kappa}(\sigma\text{-centred})$ is Martin's axiom for σ-centred posets and $< \kappa$ dense sets. A poset $\mathbb{P}$ is called centred if for any finite $F \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ there is q stronger than any of the $p \in F$. $\mathbb{P}$ is σ-centred if it is the union of countably many centred sub-posets. Let Γ be a class of forcings. $\mathsf{MA}_{<\kappa}(\Gamma)$ says: For any $\mathbb{P} \in \Gamma$ for any collection $\mathcal{D}$ of size strictly less than κ of dense sets there is a filter $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ such that $(\forall D \in \mathcal{D})(D \cap G \neq \emptyset)$.

Here is a bit more notation:
We let $\bar{c}\,;\mathrm{past}\, n = \langle c_m : m \in [k,\omega)\rangle$ with the minimal k such that $n < \min(c_k)$.

Now the cornerstone of the iteration.

Lemma 2.9. *Assume* CH *or* $\mathsf{MA}_{<2^\omega}(\sigma\text{-centred})$. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *be a countably block-splitting family. There is a sequence* $\mathcal{C} = \langle \bar{c}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\rangle$ *such that for any* $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$*-name* $(\bar{d}_n)_n$ *for countably many block-sequences, there are cofinally many stages* ε *in which "some* $X \in \mathcal{X}$ *simultaneously block-splits* $(\bar{d}_n)_n$*" is sealed.*

For any $\mathcal{C}$ *with these properties,* $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$ *forces* $\mathcal{X}$ *is countably block-splitting.*

The proof of the lemma we use a technique called "sealing antichains" or "processing names". This method has been used in the set theory of the reals [1, 12, 14, 16, 25] and possibly elsewhere and also in constructing forcings under the assumption of large cardinals.

Let $g\colon \omega \to H(\omega)$, $H(\omega)$ is the set of hereditarily finite sets. Suppose that $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c forcing order. A standardised name for g is

$$g = \{\langle (n, k_{n,m}), p_{n,m}\rangle : n, m \in \omega\},$$

such that $\{p_{n,m} : m \in \omega\}$ is predense in $\mathbb{P}$ and $p_{n,m} \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} g \restriction n = k_{n,m}$, $k_{n,m} \in H(\omega)$, and such that $k_{n',m'} \restriction n = k_{n,m}$ if $p_{n',m'}$ and $p_{n,m}$ are compatible and $n' \geq n$.

In our case g is a name of a countable sequence of block sequences.

We write $\mathbb{P} \subseteq_{ic} \mathbb{P}'$ iff $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}'$ and for any $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$, if p and q are incompatible in $\mathbb{P}$ then they are also incompatible in $\mathbb{P}'$. If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq_{ic} \mathbb{P}'$ then not every standardised $\mathbb{P}$-name for a real is also $\mathbb{P}'$-name for a real. This happens, however, if any maximal antichain $\{p_{n,m} : m \in \omega\}$ in $\mathbb{P}$ stays maximal in $\mathbb{P}'$. In the end we evaluate only names in the final order, and each name that made it to the final stage appears at some stage of countable cofinality (see Lemma 2.10) and then can be construed also as a name of a forcing order of any later stage.

If $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ are centred systems, then $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq_{ic} \mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C}')$. If g is a $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$-name and an $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C}')$-name, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ and $p \in \mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$ and $k \in H(\omega)$, then $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})} g(n) = k$ is equivalent to $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C}')} g(n) = k$.

In general $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$ is not a complete suborder of $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C}')$. For example, there are $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$ that preserve an ultrafilter from the ground model [15, Theorem 2.5].

Lemma 2.10. *Let* $\langle \bar{c}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \delta\rangle$, *be a* $\sqsubseteq^*$*- decreasing sequence. Assume* $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{M}(\bar{c}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \delta)$ *and* $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) > \omega_0$ *and* g *is a* $\mathbb{Q}$*-name for a member of* ${}^\omega H(\omega)$. *Then we can find an* $\varepsilon_0 < \delta$ *such that for every* $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_0, \delta)$ *there are* $p_{n,m} \in \mathbb{M}(\bar{c}_\varepsilon)$ *and* $k_{n,m} \in {}^\omega H(\omega)$ *such that* $\{p_{n,m} : m < \omega\}$ *is predense in* $\mathbb{Q}$ *and* $p_{n,m} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} g(n) = k_{n,m}$.

Proof. We assume that $g = \{\langle (n, h_{n,m}), q_{n,m}\rangle : m, n < \omega\}$. Since $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) > \omega$, there is some $\varepsilon_0 < \delta$ such that all $q_{n,m}$ are in $\mathbb{M}(\bar{c}_\beta : \beta \leq \varepsilon_0)$. Now, given $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_0, \delta)$, we take

$$I_n = \{q \in \mathbb{M}(\bar{c}_\varepsilon) : (\exists m)(q \geq_{\mathbb{Q}} q_{n,m})\}.$$

Then I_n is predense in $\mathbb{Q}$. Now let $p_{n,m}$, $m < \omega$, list I_n and choose $k_{n,m}$ such that $p_{n,m} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} g(n) = k_{n,m}$. Then $k_{n,m}$, $p_{n,m}$, $n, m \in \omega$, describe g as desired.

□

The purpose of the lemma is to allow to work just in $\mathbb{M}(\bar{c}_\varepsilon)$ for a single $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$. Here is a convention about double indices: If $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$ is a block-sequence, then we let $\bar{c}_\varepsilon = \langle c_{\varepsilon,n} : n \in \omega\rangle$.

Proof of Lemma 2.9: Let $\langle \bar{b}_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\rangle$ list the pairs $(\bar{b}, g)$ such that $\bar{b} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$ and $g = \{\langle (n, k_{n,m}), p_{n,m}\rangle : m, n \in \omega\}$ is an $\mathbb{M}(\bar{b})$-name for a sequence of countably many block-sequences. We assume that each pair $(\bar{b}, g)$ appears in the list κ many times.

We choose by induction on $\varepsilon < \kappa$ a sequence $\bar{c}_\varepsilon \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$ with the following properties:

(a) If $\delta < \varepsilon$ then $\bar{c}_\varepsilon \sqsubseteq^* \bar{c}_\delta$.

(b) If $\varepsilon = \delta + 1$ and for some $\gamma \leq \delta$, $\bar{b}_\delta = \bar{c}_\gamma$ and g_δ is a $\mathbb{M}(\bar{b}_\delta)$-name of a condensation of $\bar{a}$ set that can be construed as an $\mathbb{M}(\bar{c}_\delta)$-name, then $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$ guarantees that for some $X \in \mathcal{X}$ that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} (\forall n)(\exists^\infty k)((g_\delta)_{n,k} \subseteq X) \wedge (\exists^\infty k)(g_\delta)_{n,k} \cap X = \emptyset)$.

For $\varepsilon = 0$ we let $\bar{c}_0 = \langle \{n\} : n < \omega\rangle$.

Let $\varepsilon < \kappa$ be a limit ordinal. We apply $\mathsf{MA}_{<\kappa}(\sigma\text{-centred})$ to the σ-centred forcing notion $\{(\bar{c}, n, F) : \bar{c}$ is a finite block sequence of subsets of n and F is a finite subset of $\varepsilon\}$, ordered by $(\bar{b}, n', F') \geq (\bar{c}, n, F)$ iff $n' \geq n$, $F' \supseteq F$, $\bar{b} =\sqsubseteq \bar{c}$, $b_i = c_i$ for $i < n$ and $(\forall \gamma \in F)(\forall k)(b_k \subseteq [n, n') \to b_k \in FU(\bar{c}_\gamma))$, and the dense sets $\mathscr{I}_{\delta,n} = \{(\bar{c}, m, F) : \mathrm{set}(\bar{c}) \setminus n \neq \emptyset \wedge \delta \in F \wedge m \geq n\}$, $\delta < \varepsilon$, $n < \omega$, and thus we get a filter G intersecting all the $\mathscr{I}_{\delta,n}$. The set $\bar{c}_\varepsilon = \bigcup\{\bar{c} : (\exists n, F)((\bar{c}, n, F) \in G)\}$ is as desired. If $\mathrm{cf}(\varepsilon) = \omega$ then we simply take a $\sqsubseteq^*$ lower bound in ZFC.

Step $\varepsilon = \delta + 1$, and $\bar{c}_\delta$ is chosen. We assume that for some $\gamma \leq \delta$, $\bar{b}_\delta = \bar{c}_\gamma$ and $g_\delta = (\mathbf{g}_j)_j$ is a $\mathbb{M}(\bar{b}_\delta)$-name of a countable sequence of block-sequences that has an equivalent $\mathbb{M}(\bar{c}_\delta)$-name. Otherwise we can take $\bar{c}_{\delta+1} = \bar{c}_\delta$.

By our coding, $g_\delta = \{\langle\langle n, k_{n,m}\rangle, p_{n,m}\rangle : n, m \in \omega\}$, $k_{n,m}$ is an initial segment of a countable sequence of block-sequences and all blocks of $k_{n,m}$ are subsets of $[0, n)$.

By induction on $r \in \omega$ we first choose $c^+_{\delta,r} \in \mathbb{F}$ and $b(r) \in \omega$, $u_r \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $c^+_{\delta,r} = \bigcup\{c_{\delta,n} : n \in u_r\}$. We let $c^+_{\delta,0} = c_{\delta,0}$, $b(1) = \max(c^+_{\delta,0}) + 1$.

Suppose that $c^+_{\delta,r-1}$, $b(r)$ are chosen. Let $\{w_{r,i} : i < 2^{b(r)}\}$ enumerate all subsets of $b(r)$. We write $p = (c(p), \bar{c}(p))$ to indicate the components.

Now by subinduction on $i < 2^{b(r)}$ we choose $n(r, i) = n(i)$, $m(r, i) = n(i)$ such that

(1) $n(-1) \geq r$ and $p_{n(0),m(0)} \geq (w_{r,0}, \bar{c}_\delta \,;\mathrm{past}\ \max(u_r) + 1)$.

(2) $p_{n(i),m(i)} = (w_{r,i} \cup c(p_{n(i),m(i)}), \bar{c}(p_{n(i),m^(i)}))$.

(3) $\bar{c}(p_{n(i),m(i)})$ is an end segment of $\bar{c}_\delta$.

(4) $p_{n(i),m(i)} \leq p_{n(i+1),m(i+1)}$.

(5) $p_{n(i),m(i)}$ determines $(\mathbf{g}_j)_{j\leq r} \restriction n(i)$ and forces that for any $j \leq r$, there is a full $\mathbf{g}_j$-block between $n(i-1)$ and $n(i)$ and all these blocks are pairwise disjoint. We call the union of these blocks $g(p_{n(i),m(i)})\,\mathrm{in}[n(i-1), n(i))$.

Once the subinduction is performed, we do not drop the counter r anymore. We take the union

$$\bigcup\{g(p_{n(r,i),m(r,i)})\,\mathrm{in}[n(r,i-1), n(r,i)) \,:\, i < 2^{b(r)}\}$$

and call this $\mathbf{g}_r$. The parts of $\mathbf{g}_r$ come from possibly incompatible conditions, because of the different $w_{r,i}$, and they evaluate the first r blocksequences of $(g_n)_n$. We let $c^+_{\delta,r} = \bigcup\{c(p_{n(r,i),m(r,i)}) \,:\, i < 2^{b(r)}\}$. This also determines u_r. Thus the step r is finished. We let $b(r+1) = \max(c^+_{\delta,r+1}) + 1$, and start the next step with $\bar{c}(p_{n(r,2^{b(r)}-1),m(r,2^{b(r)}-1)}) = \bar{c}_\delta \,;\mathrm{past}\,(\max(u_{r+1}) + 1)$.

Since $\mathcal{X}$ is a countably block-splitting family there is $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and there is an infinite set $\{r_k \,:\, k \in \omega\}$ of stages r such that

$$(\oplus) \qquad (\forall k \in \omega)(X \supseteq \mathbf{g}_{r_k} \wedge X \cap \mathbf{g}_{r_{k+1}} = \emptyset).$$

We let $\bar{c}_\varepsilon = \langle c^+_{\delta,r_k} \cup c^+_{\delta,r_{k+1}} \,:\, k < \omega\rangle$. This union of the r_k-block and the r_{k+1}-block is the core of the difference between $\mathfrak{g}_f$ and $\mathfrak{g}$. We call $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$ a sealing for g_δ at $\bar{c}_\delta$. Of course, any sequence stronger than $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$ would seal as well.

We show that in the generic extension by $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$, $\mathcal{X}$ is countably block-splitting.

Assume towards a contradiction that there is a $\mathbb{Q}$-name g for a countable sequence of block-sequences and there is $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{X} \text{ does not countably block-split } g.$$

Since $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \omega$, by Lemma 2.10 there is some $\gamma < \kappa$ such that g is an $\mathbb{M}(\bar{c}_\gamma)$-name. Since in the enumeration every name appears cofinally often, for some $\delta \geq \gamma$ we have $(\bar{b}_\delta, g_\delta) = (\bar{c}_\gamma, g)$. So at stage $\varepsilon = \delta + 1$ in our construction we took care of g's equivalent $\mathbb{M}(\bar{c}_\delta)$-name. Let X, $\{r_k \,:\, k \in \omega\}$ and $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$ be as in $\oplus$ of this step.

By our assumption there are $q_0 \geq p$ and some $n(*)$ such that

$$q_0 \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} (\text{no block of } g_{n(*)} \,;\mathrm{past}\, n(*) \text{ is a subset of } X) \text{ or}$$
$$(\text{no block of } g_{n(*)} \,;\mathrm{past}\, n(*) \text{ is a subset of } X^c).$$

(We already restricted to the diagonal, this is enough.) We take yet a stronger condition, say q that forces the first the alternatives. By the form of $\mathbb{Q}$, $q = (s, \bar{c}_{\varepsilon(1)})$ for some $\varepsilon(1) \geq \varepsilon$ and some s, such that $\bar{c}_{\varepsilon(1)}$ is a condensation of $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$. So there are k, j, ℓ_j, ℓ_{j+1} and $r_k \geq n(*)$ with r_k as in $(\oplus)$ for the construction step of $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$. By the definition of $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$, we have that $c_{\varepsilon(1),j} \subseteq \ell_{j+1}$ and $c_{\varepsilon(1),j} \cap [\ell_j, \ell_{j+1}) = c_{\varepsilon,k}$. However, $c_{\varepsilon,k} = c^+_{\delta,r_k} \cup c^+_{\delta,r_{k+1}}$. We let $s' = s \cup (\bigcup \bar{c}_{\varepsilon(1)} \cap [0, \ell_j))$, and we let $q' = (s' \cup c_{\varepsilon,k}, c_{\varepsilon(1),j+1}, \dots)$.

There is $i < 2^{b(r_k)}$ such that $s' = w_{r_k,i}$. Then q' witnesses that q and $p_{n(r_k,i),m(r_k,i)}$ are compatible, because $q \leq q'$ and $p_{n(r_k,i),m(r_k,i)} \leq q'$. Property $(\oplus)$ in the choice of Y together with the definition of $\mathbf{g}_{r_k}$, $\bar{c}^+_\delta$ and of

$\bar{c}_\varepsilon$ yield $q' \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} g_{r_k} \subseteq X$. Since $n(r_k, 0) \geq r_k \geq n(*)$, this is a contradiction. □

We remark: The answer X in $\oplus$ corresponds to the coverers $\mathbf{g}$ from the iteration theory in [34, Chapter XVIII, §3]: An answer in the ground model to countably many challenging names.

We state a corollary of the proof:

Lemma 2.11. *Assume* CH *or* $\mathsf{MA}_{<2^\omega}(\sigma\text{-centred})$. *Then there is a descending sequence* $\mathcal{C}$ *such that* $\{\mathrm{set}(\bar{c}) : \bar{c} \in \mathcal{C}\}$ *is a countably block-splitting family. Moreover, any descending sequence that contains for each* $(\bar{a}_n)_n$ *at least one sealing step is a countably block-splitting family.*

3. Preserving a P-point from the ground model

In this section we specialise the partial orders $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$ further. The results we collect in this section are Hindman's and Eisworth's (see [15]).

We write $A \subseteq^* B$ iff $A \setminus B$ is finite. An ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ is called a *P-point* if for every for every sequence A_n, $n \in \omega$ of elements of $\mathcal{U}$, there is some $A \in \mathcal{U}$ such that for all n, $A \subseteq^* A_n$; such an A is called a *pseudo-intersection* of the A_n. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a notion of forcing. We say that $\mathbb{P}$ preserves an ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ if $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$(\forall X \in [\omega]^\omega)(\exists Y \in \mathcal{U})(Y \subseteq X \vee Y \subseteq \omega \setminus X)$)" and in the contrary case we say "$\mathbb{P}$ destroys $\mathcal{U}$". If $\mathbb{P}$ is proper and preserves $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ is a P-point, then $\mathcal{U}$ stays a P-point [10, Lemma 3.2].

Definition 3.1. A non-principal filter $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathbb{F}$ is said to be an *ordered-union* filter if it has a basis of sets of the form $\mathrm{FU}(\bar{d})$ for $\bar{d} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$. Let μ be an uncountable cardinal. An ordered-union filter is said to be $< \mu$*-stable* if, whenever it contains $\mathrm{FU}(\bar{d}_\alpha)$ for $\bar{d}_\alpha \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$, $\alpha < \kappa$, for some $\kappa < \mu$, then it also contains some $\mathrm{FU}(\bar{e})$ for some $\bar{e}$ that is almost a condensation of $\bar{d}_\alpha$ for $\alpha < \kappa$. For "$< \omega_1$-stable" we say "stable". Stable ordered-union ultrafilters are also called Milliken–Taylor ultrafilters.

Ordered-union ultrafilters need not exist, as their existence implies the existence of Q-points [4] and there are models without Q-points [30]. With the help of Hindman's theorem one shows that under $\mathsf{MA}(\sigma\text{-centred})$ stable (even $< 2^\omega$-stable) ordered-union ultrafilters exist [4]. We recall Hindman's theorem:

Theorem 3.2. *(Hindman,* [17, Corollary 3.3]*) If the set* $\mathbb{F}$ *is partitioned into finitely many pieces then there is a set* $\bar{d} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$ *such that* $\mathrm{FU}(\bar{d})$ *is included in one piece.*

The theorem also holds if instead of $\mathbb{F}$ we partition only $\mathrm{FU}(\bar{c})$ for some $\bar{c} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$, the homogeneous sequence $\bar{d}$ given by the theorem is then a condensation of $\bar{c}$.

Corollary 3.3. *Under* CH *for every* $\bar{a} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega$ *there is a stable ordered-union ultrafilter* $\mathcal{U}$ *such that* $\mathrm{FU}(\bar{a}) \in \mathcal{U}$.

In order to state a preservation property of $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{U}) := \mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$ for $\mathcal{C} = \{\bar{a} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega : \mathrm{block}(\bar{a}) \in \mathcal{U}\}$, we need the following definition.

Definition 3.4. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a filter on $\mathbb{F}$. The *core of* $\mathcal{U}$ is the filter $\Phi(\mathcal{U})$ such that

$$X \in \Phi(\mathcal{U}) \text{ iff } (\exists FU(\bar{c}) \in \mathcal{U})(\mathrm{set}(\bar{c}) \subseteq X).$$

If $\mathcal{U}$ is ultra on $\mathbb{F}$, then $\Phi(\mathcal{U})$ does not have a pseudointersection (see [15, Prop. 2.3]) and also all finite-to-one images of $\Phi(\mathcal{U})$ do not (same proof). So $\Phi(\mathcal{U})$ is not meagre. Therefore $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{U})$ adds an unbounded real. The filter $\Phi(\mathcal{U})$, though, is not ultra by finite-to-one. This is proved in [7]. The reason is: There are two ultrafilters $\min(\mathcal{U}) = \{\{\min(d) : d \in D\} : D \in \mathcal{U}\}$, $\max(\mathcal{U}) \supset \Phi(\mathcal{U})$ that are not nearly coherent.

The *Rudin-Blass ordering* on semifilters is defined as follows: Let $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RB} \mathcal{G}$ iff there is a finite-to-one f such that $f(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq f(\mathcal{G})$. Usually only filters are considered. We use this order also for semifilters.

The following property of stable ordered-union ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}$ will be used in the iteration.

Theorem 3.5. *(Eisworth* [15, "$\to$" Theorem 4, "$\leftarrow$" Cor. 2.5, this direction works also with non-P ultrafilters*) Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a stable ordered-union ultrafilter on $\mathbb{F}$ and let $\mathcal{V}$ be a P-point. Iff $\mathcal{V} \not\geq_{RB} \Phi(\mathcal{U})$, then $\mathcal{V}$ continues to generate an ultrafilter after we force with $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{U})$.*

4. Iterated forcing

We let $S^2_1 = \{\alpha \in \omega_2 : \mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1\}$. We start with a ground model $\mathbf{V}$ that fulfils CH and $\diamondsuit(S^2_1)$ (and hence $2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_2$). We fix a $\diamondsuit(S^2_1)$-sequence $\langle D_\alpha : \alpha \in S^2_1\rangle$.

We work with countable support iterations $\mathbb{P}_{\omega_2} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\beta, \mathbb{Q}_\gamma : \beta \leq \alpha, \gamma < \alpha\rangle$. We denote $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$ by $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$. If the iterands are proper each real appears in a $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$ for some α with countable cofinality [33, Ch. III]. A reflection property ensures that each non-meagre filter $\mathcal{F}$ in the final model has ω_1-club many $\alpha \in \omega_2$ such that $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbf{V}_\alpha$ has a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name and is a non-meagre filter in $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$ (see [10, Item 5.6 and Lemma 5.10]). A subset of ω_2 is called ω_1-club if it is unbounded in ω_2 and closed under suprema of strictly ascending sequences of lengths ω_1. A subset of ω_2 is called ω_1-stationary if is has non-empty intersection with every ω_1-club. By well-known techniques based on coding $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-names for filters as subsets of ω_2 (e.g., such a coding is carried out in [29, Claim 2.8]) and based on the maximal principle (see, e.g., [21, Theorem 8.2]) the $\diamondsuit(S^2_1)$-sequence $\langle D_\alpha : \alpha \in S^2_1\rangle$ gives ω_1-club often a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name D_α for a non-meagre filter in $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$ such that for any non-meagre filter $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbf{V}_{\omega_2}$ there are ω_1-stationarily many $\alpha \in S^2_1$ with $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbf{V}_\alpha = S_\alpha$.

We introduce a particular name:

Definition 4.1. Suppose that G is an $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{C})$-generic filter over $\mathbf{V}$. The generic real is $s(\mathcal{C}) := \bigcup\{s : \exists \bar{c} \in \mathcal{C}(s, \bar{c}) \in G\}$.

In $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$, we will have $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha = \mathbb{M}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)$ and a name $s_\alpha := s(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)$. We also fix a P-point $\mathcal{E} \in \mathbf{V}$ that will be preserved throughout our iteration. We fix an enumeration $\langle E_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\rangle$ of a basis of $\mathcal{E}$ such that each elements appears cofinally often. For $\mathcal{X} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$, we let $\mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{X}) = \{Y : (\exists X \in \mathcal{X})(Y \supseteq X)\}$.

We use R for elements of $\mathcal{R}^*$, and $R \in \mathbf{V}_\alpha$ means $R \in \mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathbf{V}_\alpha$. We use $\bar{a}$, $\bar{b}$, $\bar{c}$, $\bar{d}$ for elements of $(\mathbb{F})^\omega$, and $\bar{a} \in \mathbf{V}_\alpha$ means $\bar{a} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega \cap \mathbf{V}_\alpha$. The letter B stands for subsets of $\mathbb{F}$.

We construct by induction on $\alpha \leq \omega_2$ a countable support iteration $\mathbb{P} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\beta : \beta < \omega_2, \alpha \leq \omega_2\rangle$ such that for any $\alpha \leq \omega_2$, the initial segment $\langle \mathbb{P}_\gamma, \mathbb{Q}_\beta : \beta < \alpha, \gamma \leq \alpha\rangle$ fulfils:

(I1) For all $\beta < \alpha$, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ "$\mathbb{Q}_\beta$ is proper and $|\mathbb{Q}_\beta| \leq \aleph_1$".

(I2) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$ "$\mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{E})$ is ultra".

(I3) If $\beta \in S^2_1 \cap \alpha$ and if D_β is a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name $\mathcal{F}$ for a non-meagre filter in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$, then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\beta+1}}$ "$g_\beta(\mathcal{F}) = g_\beta(\mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{E}))$". Here $g_\beta(n) = |s_\beta \cap n|$.

(I4) For all $\beta < \alpha$: s_β is $\leq^*$-unbounded over $\mathbf{V}_\beta$ and

$$(\forall \gamma < \beta)(\forall R \in \mathcal{R}^* \cap \mathbf{V}_\gamma)\big(\mathbb{P}_{\beta+1} \Vdash (s_\beta \not\subseteq^* R(s_\gamma))\big).$$

(I5) For any $\beta < \alpha$: $\mathbb{Q}_\beta = \mathbb{M}(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ and

$$\mathbb{P}_\alpha \Vdash \Phi(\mathcal{U}_\beta) \text{ is countably block-splitting.}$$

Property (I5) is used to obtain $\mathcal{U}_\beta$, so that $\mathbb{Q}_\beta$ forces the statements in (I4). For deriving SFT and not FD in $\mathbf{V}_{\omega_2}$ only properties (I1), (I2), (I3), and (I4) play a role.

We first show that the existence of such an iteration implies the main theorem:

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that $\mathbb{P}$ has the properties listed above. Then in $\mathbf{V}_{\omega_2}$ the filter dichotomy holds and the semifilter*

$$\mathcal{S} = \{x \in [\omega]^\omega : (\exists \alpha \in \omega_2)(x \supseteq^* s_\alpha)\}$$

is not-meagre, not comeagre, and not ultra by finite-to-one.

Proof. By properness our iteration preserves $\aleph_1$. It preserves $\aleph_2$, because any collapse would appear at some intermediate step $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$, but $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ has size $\aleph_1$ and the $\aleph_2$-c.c. So $\aleph_1^{\mathbf{V}} = \aleph_1^{\mathbf{V}_{\omega_2}}$ and $\aleph_2^{\mathbf{V}} = \aleph_2^{\mathbf{V}_{\omega_2}}$ and we write just $\aleph_1$, $\aleph_2$. The filter dichotomy holds because of (I2) and (I3).

By Talagrand's lemma 1.1 and since the enumerating functions of the s_α, $\alpha \in \omega_2$ form an $\leq^*$-unbounded family, the semifilter is not meagre.

Since FD implies NCF, the statement "$\mathcal{S}$ is not ultra by finite-to-one" is equivalent to "$\mathcal{S}$ is not nearly coherent with $\mathcal{E}$". Assume for a contradiction that $\mathcal{S}$ is nearly coherent with $\mathcal{E}$. Then a finite-to-one function f with $f(\mathcal{E}) = f(\mathcal{S})$ would appear in some $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$, $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$ and $\alpha < \omega_2$. We take $\beta > \alpha$. By the properties of $\mathbb{Q}_\beta$, the increasing enumeration of $f'' s_\beta$ is $\leq^*$-unbounded over $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$. Hence $f'' s_\beta \not\supseteq^* f'' E$ for any $E \in \mathcal{E}$. So $f(\mathcal{S}) \neq f(\mathcal{E})$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{S}$ is comeagre. Then there is a finite-to-one f such that $f(\mathcal{S})$ is dense in $([\omega]^\omega, \subseteq^*)$. There is $\alpha \in \omega_2$ such that such an $f \in \mathbf{V}_\alpha$. Then by (I4) for $\alpha < \beta < \omega_2$, $f''s_\beta \not\subseteq^* s_\alpha$. However, $([s_\alpha]^\omega, \subseteq^*)$ has $2^\omega = \aleph_2$ pairwise almost disjoint subsets, and hence $\{f''s_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\}$, being of size at most $\aleph_1$, is not dense in $([s_\alpha]^\omega, \subseteq^*)$. So the whole set $f(\mathcal{S}) = \{f''s_\beta : \beta \in \omega_2\}$ is not $\subseteq^*$-dense below s_α. □

We let $\bar{\mathrm{id}} = \langle \{i\} : i \in \omega \rangle$. We note that (I1) to (I5) are true for $\alpha = 0$.

Lemma 4.3. *Induction Lemma. Assume that $\alpha \in \omega_2$ and that $\langle \mathbb{P}_\gamma, \mathbb{Q}_\delta : \gamma < \alpha, \delta < \gamma \rangle$ is defined with properties (I1) to (I5). Then there is a continuation $\langle \mathbb{P}_\gamma, \mathbb{Q}_\delta : \gamma \leq \alpha, \delta < \alpha \rangle$ with properties (I1) to (I5).*

The proof of the induction lemma has four cases:

(a) α is a limit ordinal of uncountable cofinality

(b) α is a limit ordinal of countable cofinality

(c) α is a successor ordinal of a successor ordinal or of a limit ordinal of countable cofinality

(d) α is a successor ordinal of a limit ordinal of uncountable cofinality

We begin with the easiest case: In case (a) all statements are true, since names for reals in proper forcings are hereditarily countable objects.

In case (b) we invoke preservation theorems: Preservation of properness [33], preservation of P-points [10, Theorem 4.4], preservation of unbounded families in countable support interations is proved in [3, Theorem 6.1.18].

Given countably many block sequences there is $X \in \mathcal{X}$ that block-splits all of them simultaneously, and each iterand preserves this by construction. Hence Shelah's iterability condition [34, Ch. XVIII, Def. 3.4] (or in not misprinted form, with one additional index running, see [28, Def. 4.5]) is fulfilled and we can apply the preservation theorem [34, Ch. XVIII, Theorem 3.6].

In the successor cases $\alpha = \beta + 1$ we construct $\mathbb{Q}_\beta = \mathbb{M}(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ in $\mathbf{V}_\beta$. We introduce two aids. We also write $\underline{\bar{d}}$ for $(\bar{d}_n)_n$, especially when it comes with an index.

Definition 4.4. We call a sequence $\langle R_\varepsilon, B_\varepsilon, E_\varepsilon, \zeta_\varepsilon, \underline{\bar{d}}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_\beta$ a book-keeping in $\mathbf{V}_\beta$ if any $(R, B, E, \zeta, \underline{\bar{d}})$ is named cofinally often, where $R \in \mathcal{R}^*$, $B \subseteq \mathbb{F}$, $E \in \mathcal{E}$, $\zeta \in \varepsilon$, and finally, for some $\bar{c}$, the sequence $\underline{\bar{d}}$ is a standardised $\mathbb{M}(\bar{c})$-name for a countable sequence of block-sequences (see Lemma 2.9).

Since $\mathbf{V}_\beta \models \mathsf{CH}$, there is a book-keeping. We use small names, like standardised ones.

Definition 4.5. A descending sequence $\langle \bar{c}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_\beta$ is called good if there is a book-keeping $\langle R_\varepsilon, B_\varepsilon, E_\varepsilon, \zeta_\varepsilon, \underline{\bar{d}}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_\beta$ such for each $\varepsilon < \omega_1$ the following holds:

(1) (The Hindman tasks) $\mathrm{FU}(\bar{c}^1_\varepsilon)$ is included in B_ε or disjoint from B_ε and $\bar{c}^1_\varepsilon \sqsubseteq^* \bar{c}_\varepsilon$.

(2) (The Eisworth tasks) $\omega \setminus R_\varepsilon(\mathrm{set}(\bar{c}^2_\varepsilon)) \in R_\varepsilon(\mathrm{cl}^{\mathbf{V}_\beta}(\mathcal{E}))$ and $\bar{c}^2_\varepsilon \sqsubseteq^* \bar{c}^1_\varepsilon$.

(3) (The Blass–Laflamme tasks) If possible we take $\bar{c}^3_\varepsilon \sqsubseteq^* \bar{c}^2_\varepsilon$ such that $\bar{c}^3_\varepsilon \Vdash g_\beta{}'' E_\varepsilon \in g_\beta(\mathcal{F})$, for the finite-to-one function $g_\beta(n) = |s_\beta \cap n|$. If there is no such $\bar{c}^3_\varepsilon$, we let $\bar{c}^3_\varepsilon = \bar{c}^2_\varepsilon$. Here $\mathcal{F}$ is a non-meagre filter handed down by the diamond. (This item is only relevant in the case of a successor of an ordinal of uncountable cofinality)

(4) (Sealing for preservation of countable block-splitting and for getting new countable block-splitting) The successor $\bar{c}_{\varepsilon+1} \sqsubseteq^* \bar{c}^3_\varepsilon$ seals the $\mathbb{M}(\bar{c}^3_\varepsilon)$ name $\underline{\bar{d}}_\varepsilon$ such that it is not a $\mathbb{M}(\bar{c}^3_\varepsilon)$-name for a sequence that is not block-split by $\Phi(\mathcal{U}_{\zeta_\varepsilon})$ and such that $\Phi(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ will block-split the preliminary evaluation of $\underline{\bar{d}}_\varepsilon$ that is given by $\bar{c}^3_\varepsilon$.

Continuation the proof of the induction lemma:
Case (c): Let $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\beta) \leq \omega$. We let $\bar{c}_0 = \mathrm{i\bar{d}}$ and we construct a good sequence $\langle \bar{c}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$. This sequence generates $\mathcal{U}_\beta$

We show that all properties (Ix) follow from goodness and the induction hypotheses: Since decreasing countable sequences in $\mathcal{U}_\beta$ have lower bounds and since there are the Hindman tasks, the centred system $\mathcal{U}_\beta$ generated by the good sequence is a stable ordered-union ultrafilter.

The forcing $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ is σ-centred, hence proper. It has size $\aleph_1$. Forcing with $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ preserves $\mathcal{E}$ by the Eisworth tasks and Eisworth's Theorem 3.5. The forcing $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ preserves the countably block-splitting families $\Phi(\mathcal{U}_\gamma)$, $\gamma < \beta$, by Lemma 2.9 and creates a new countably block-splitting family $\Phi(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ by Lemma 2.11. So (I1), (I2), (I3) (vacuously) are carried on.

Now about the forcing tasks (I4): For any $\gamma < \beta$ for any $R \in \mathbf{V}_\gamma$, the filter $R[\mathcal{U}_\gamma] = \{R(\mathrm{set}(\bar{c}_{\gamma,\varepsilon})) : \varepsilon < \omega_1\}$ is a block-splitting family in $\mathbf{V}_\gamma$. The latter is preserved in $\mathbf{V}_\beta$ by (I5). Since countably block-splitting families are in particular splitting, there is $\bar{c}_{\gamma,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma$ such that s_β is split by $R(\mathrm{set}(\bar{c}_{\gamma,\varepsilon}))$. So $s_\beta \not\subseteq^* R(\mathrm{set}(\bar{c}_{\gamma,\varepsilon}))$ and since $s_\gamma \subseteq^* \mathrm{set}(\bar{c}_{\gamma,\varepsilon})$, we have $s_\beta \not\subseteq^* R(s_\gamma)$. This finishes the proof of case (c).

Finally property (I5) is carried on by [34, Ch. XVIII, Claim 3.5].

Case (d): $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$. Tasks can be fulfilled only in stages where all the inputs are evaluated. Let $\langle R_\varepsilon, B_\varepsilon, E_\varepsilon, \zeta_\varepsilon, \underline{\bar{d}}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_\beta$ be a book-keeping. Let $\langle \beta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$ be a continuously increasing sequence with supremum β. Since β_ε is continuous, there is a continuous subsequence α_ε, $\varepsilon < \omega_1$, such that for any $\gamma \in \alpha_\varepsilon$, we have $R_\gamma, B_\gamma, E_\gamma, \zeta_\gamma, \underline{\bar{d}}_\gamma \in \mathbf{V}_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$. We assume that $\alpha_0 = 0$. Now we construct a good sequence:

We start with $\bar{c}_0 = \mathrm{i\bar{d}}$.

At limit steps ε we take the $\bar{c}_\varepsilon \sqsubseteq^* \bar{c}_\zeta$ for all $\zeta < \varepsilon$.

We carry out the successor step, $\varepsilon = \delta + 1$. Suppose $\bar{c}_\delta \in \mathbf{V}_{\alpha_\delta}$ is given. We work until further notice in $\mathbf{V}_{\alpha_\delta}$. We strengthen $\bar{c}_\delta$ four times in order to

fulfil the current instance of the Hindman task, the Eisworth task, the Blass–Laflamme task, the sealing task and we call the outcome $\bar{c}^+_\delta \sqsubseteq \bar{c}_\delta$. The names R_δ, B_δ, E_δ (in $\mathbf{V}_0$), ζ_δ, $\underline{\bar{d}}_\delta$ and the handed down names for members of $\mathcal{F}$ are elements of $\mathbf{V}_{\alpha_\delta}$ and all the strengthening is done in $\mathbf{V}_{\alpha_\delta}$. Now we leave $\mathbf{V}_{\alpha_\delta}$ and go to $\mathbf{V}_{\alpha_{\delta+1}}$. Thus we have a good sequence. We showed in case (c) that goodness implies that (I1), (I2), (I5) are carried on and that (I4) follows from (I5). We show now that (I3) follows from goodness: Recall, $g_\beta(n) = |s_\beta \cap n|$. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is not meagre, the set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1(E_\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) = \big\{ Z \in [\omega]^\omega \cap \mathbf{V}_\beta \,:\, (\exists Y \in \mathcal{F})\big(\forall a, b \in Z\big) \\ \big((a < b \to \wedge[a,b) \cap Y \neq \emptyset) \to [a,b) \cap E_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset\big)\big\}\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

is groupwise dense. For details see [8, Section 9]. So $(\forall \bar{c} \in (\mathbb{F})^\omega \cap \mathbf{V}_\beta)(\exists \bar{b} \sqsubseteq^* \bar{c})(\mathrm{set}(\bar{b}) \in \mathcal{G}_1(E_\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}))$. If already in $\mathbf{V}_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$ there is such a $\bar{b} \sqsubseteq \bar{c}^2_\varepsilon$ then we let $\bar{c}^3_\varepsilon \sqsubseteq^* \bar{b}$ in the relevant intermediate step. Blass and Laflamme [9] showed that $\bar{c}^3_\varepsilon$ ensures that $\mathbb{P}_{\beta+1} \Vdash$ "$g''_\beta E_\varepsilon = g''_\beta Y \in g_\beta(\mathcal{F})$", for a witness $Y \in \mathcal{F}$ that is as in Equation (4.1). Since $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbf{V}_\beta$ and every task $E \in \mathcal{E}$ appears at cofinally many stages, fulfilling the task will be possible at some stage when a suitable member $Y \in \mathcal{F}$ is seen and then be taken care of. □

So we have proved the main theorem.

Remark 4.6. There is an alternative presentation of the independence proof: Renounce the diamond and work with approximations of length strictly less than ω_2 to the final iteration, see, e.g., [27].

5. Side results on cardinal characteristics

Any non-meagre family is block-splitting. There is a relative of non-meagreness that implies being countably block-slpitting. We take standardised meagre sets:

$$M_{(g,x)} = \{y \in {}^\omega 2 \,:\, (\forall^\infty n)(y \restriction [g(n), g(n+1)) \neq x \restriction [g(n), g(n+1)))\}.$$

By [3, 2.2.4] any meagre set is a subset of a meagre set of this form.

Definition 5.1. We call $\mathcal{X}$ countably non-meagre iff for any $(g_n, x_n)_n$ there is $X \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \bigcup\{M_{g_n,x_n} \,:\, n \in \omega\}$.

The following is a relative of Lemma 2.9.

Lemma 5.2. *Assume that κ is a regular uncountable cardinal, $2^\omega = \kappa$, $\mathrm{MA}_{<\kappa}(\sigma\text{-centred})$, and that $\mathcal{X}$ is countably non-meagre. Then there is a $\sqsubseteq^*$-descending sequence $\langle \bar{c}_\varepsilon \,:\, \varepsilon < \kappa\rangle$ such that $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{M}(\bar{c}_\varepsilon \,:\, \varepsilon < \kappa)$ forces "$\mathcal{X}$ is countably non-meagre".*

Preserving non-meagreness is in general not preserved: Kellner and Shelah give a non-meagre set and a countable support iteration such that each initial segment preserves the non-meagreness, but the countable support limit does not [20, Example 4.1]. The author thanks Dilip Raghavan for pointing this

out to her. Raghavan showed that non-meagerness of the ground model is preserved in iterations with countable supports ([31, Theorem 61]).

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\mathbb{M}$ be the full Matet forcing and let $\mathcal{X}$ be countably non-meagre. Then in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{M}}$, $\mathcal{X}$ is countably non-meagre.*

Proof. This is, after the proof of Lemma 5.2, a density argument in the $\sqsubseteq^*$-order.

Of course, the traditional $\mathrm{unif}(\mathcal{M})$ is larger than or equal to the smallest size of a countably non-meagre set. Let us call the latter $\mathrm{unif}_\sigma(\mathcal{M})$

Corollary 5.4. *(a) In the countable support iteration of $\mathbb{M}$ of length ω_2, $\mathrm{unif}(\mathcal{M}) = \aleph_1$.*

(b) In the modification via sealing the countable non-meagreness of $\mathbf{V}$ at any step, the forcing extensions from the main theorem fulfil $\mathrm{unif}_\sigma(\mathcal{M}) = \aleph_1$.

Observation 5.5. *From the short proof of Laflamme's* [22] *theorem $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{g} \to \mathsf{SFT}$ in* [8, Lemma 9.15, Theorem 9.22] *we read off groupwise dense families that witness $\mathfrak{g} \leq \mathfrak{u}$ in our forcing extensions. In the ground model, we fix a basis $\{E_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\}$ for the P-point $\mathcal{E}$. Then we let*

$$\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon = \{Z \in [\omega]^\omega : (\exists S \in \mathcal{S})(\forall m, n \in Z)([m,n) \cap S \neq \emptyset \to [m,n) \cap E_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset) \wedge (\exists T \in [\omega]^\omega)(T^c \notin \mathcal{S} \wedge (\forall m, n \in Z)([m,n) \cap T \neq \emptyset \to [m,n) \cap E_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset))\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{S}$ is not meagre and not comeagre, the sets $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon$ are groupwise dense, The intersection $\bigcap_{\varepsilon<\omega_1} \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon = \emptyset$ because $\mathcal{S}$ is not equal to $\mathcal{E}$ by finite-to-one.

Now we renounce the P-point and the symmetry between $\mathcal{S}$ and its dual $\{X^c : X \in [\omega]^\omega \setminus \mathcal{S}\}$ that comes with the ultrafilter $\mathcal{E}$ and go for a finite support construction. We can work with the traditional block-splitting. In finite support iterations, both properties are preserved.

Theorem 5.6. *Let κ be a regular cardinal and assume $\diamondsuit(\{\alpha \in \kappa^+ : \mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \kappa\})$. Then there is a finite support iteration of c.c.c. forcings that forces $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{s} = \kappa$ and $\mathfrak{g}_f = 2^\omega = \kappa^+$.*

Proof. We start with a ground model in which $2^\omega = \kappa$ and $\mathsf{MA}_{<\kappa}(\sigma\text{-centred})$ hold. Ther is a finite support iteration of length κ^+ of a variant of the iterands that are constructed in the proof of the main theorem. The first centred system $\mathcal{C}_0 = \langle \bar{c}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$ stays block-splitting, and hence the bounding number and the splitting number stay κ. We iterate with finite support, and in intermediate steps we re-establish $\mathsf{MA}_{<\kappa}(\sigma\text{-centred})$. This finite support iteration preserves block-splitting families by [3, Theorem 6.4.13]. The diamond hands down groupwise dense ideals and thus $\mathfrak{g}_f = \kappa^+$ in the extension. We let

$$\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon = \{Z \in [\omega]^\omega : (\exists S \in \mathcal{S})(\forall m, n \in Z)([m,n) \cap S \neq \emptyset \to [m,n) \cap \Phi(\mathcal{C}_0) \neq \emptyset)\}$$

Now we have $\bigcap_{\varepsilon<\kappa} \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon = \emptyset$, because the first system $\mathcal{C}_0$ stays block-splitting in the final model and hence for any $R \in \mathcal{R}^*$, $\mathcal{S} \not\subseteq \{X : (\exists \varepsilon < \kappa)(X \subseteq^*$

$R(\mathrm{set}(\bar{c}_\varepsilon))\}$. □

Acknowledgement. Part of the research was carried out in the fall of 2007 at the Gödel Center of the University of Vienna, and in the winter of 2009/2010 at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and at the Mittag Leffler Institute, supported by an assistant's position at the University of Vienna and by Marie Curie grant PIEF-2008-219292 of the European Union. I thank Stevo Todorčević for his remarks about block-sequences and Péter Komjáth for encouragement to return to old problems. Biggest thanks go to the referee for reading, pointing out a gap and a detailed report.

References

[1] Uri Abraham. Proper forcing. In Matthew Foreman and Akihiro Kanamori, editors, *Handbook of Set Theory*. Springer, 2010.

[2] Bohuslav Balcar and Petr Simon. Disjoint refinement. In J. Donald Monk and R. Bonnet, editors, *Handbook of Boolean Algebras, vol. II*, pages 35–67. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989.

[3] Tomek Bartoszyński and Haim Judah. *Set Theory, On the Structure of the Real Line*. A K Peters, 1995.

[4] Andreas Blass. Ultrafilters related to Hindman's finite unions theorem and its extensions. In Stephen Simpson, editor, *Logic and Combinatorics, Arcata, California, 1985*, volume 65 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 89–124. Amer. Math. Soc., 1987.

[5] Andreas Blass. Applications of superperfect forcing and its relatives. In Juris Steprāns and Steve Watson, editors, *Set Theory and its Applications*, volume 1401 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 18–40, 1989.

[6] Andreas Blass. Groupwise density and related cardinals. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 30:1–11, 1990.

[7] Andreas Blass. Homogeneous sets from several ultrafilters. *Topology Appl.*, 156:2581–2594, 2009.

[8] Andreas Blass. Combinatorial cardinal characteristics of the continuum. In Matthew Foreman and Akihiro Kanamori, editors, *Handbook of set theory. Vols. 1, 2, 3*, pages 395–489, Dordrecht, 2010. Springer.

[9] Andreas Blass and Claude Laflamme. Consistency results about filters and the number of inequivalent growth types. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 54:50–56, 1989.

[10] Andreas Blass and Saharon Shelah. There may be simple $P_{\aleph_1}$- and $P_{\aleph_2}$-points and the Rudin-Keisler ordering may be downward directed. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 33:213–243, 1987.

[11] Andreas Blass and Saharon Shelah. Near coherence of filters III: A simplified consistency proof. *Notre Dame J. Formal Logic*, 30:530–538, 1989.

[12] Jörg Brendle. Mob families and mad families. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 37(3):183–197, 1997.

[13] Jörg Brendle. Distinguishing groupwise density numbers. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 152(3):207–215, 2007.

[14] R. Michael Canjar. Mathias forcing which does not add dominating reals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 104:1239–1248, 1988.

[15] Todd Eisworth. Forcing and stable ordered-union ultrafilters. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 67:449–464, 2002.

[16] Vera Fischer and Juris Steprāns. The consistency of $\mathfrak{b} = \kappa < \mathfrak{s} = \kappa^+$. *Fund. Math.*, 2001(3):283–293, 2008.

[17] Neil Hindman. Finite sums from sequences within cells of a partition of N. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 17:1–11, 1974.

[18] Winfried Just and Claude Laflamme. Classifying sets of measure zero with respect to their open covers. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 321(2):621–645, 1990.
[19] Anastasios Kamburelis and Bogdan Węglorz. Splittings. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 35:263–277, 1996.
[20] Jakob Kellner and Saharon Shelah. Preserving preservation. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 70(3):914–945, 2005.
[21] Kenneth Kunen. *Set Theory, An Introduction to Independence Proofs*. North-Holland, 1980.
[22] Claude Laflamme. Equivalence of families of functions on natural numbers. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 330:307–319, 1992.
[23] Paul B. Larson. The filter dichotomy and medial limits. *J. Math. Log.*, 9(2):159–165, 2009.
[24] Heike Mildenberger. Groupwise dense families. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 40:93 –112, 2001.
[25] Heike Mildenberger and Saharon Shelah. Increasing the groupwise density number by c.c.c. forcing. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 149(1-3):7–13, 2007.
[26] Heike Mildenberger and Saharon Shelah. The principle of near coherence of filters does not imply the filter dichotomy principle. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361:2305–2317, 2009.
[27] Heike Mildenberger and Saharon Shelah. The minimal cofinality of an ultrafilter of ω and the cofinality of the symmetric group can be larger than $\mathfrak{b}^+$. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 76:1322–1340, 2011.
[28] Heike Mildenberger and Saharon Shelah. Many countable support iterations of proper forcings preserve Souslin trees. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 165(2):573–608, 2014.
[29] Heike Mildenberger, Saharon Shelah, and Boaz Tsaban. Covering the Baire space with meager sets. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 140:60–71, 2006.
[30] Arnold Miller. There are no Q-points in Laver's model for the Borel conjecture. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 78:103–106, 1980.
[31] Dilip Raghavan. Maximal almost disjoint families of functions. *Fund. Math.*, 204(3):241–282, 2009.
[32] Jacques Raisonnier. A Mathematical Proof of S. Shelah's Theorem on the Measure Problem and Related Results. *Israel J. Math.*, 49:48–56, 1984.
[33] Saharon Shelah. *Proper forcing*, volume 940 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, xxix+496 pp, 1982.
[34] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and Improper Forcing, 2nd Edition*. Springer, 1998.
[35] Saharon Shelah. Groupwise density cannot be much bigger than the unbounded number. *Math. Logic Quart.*, 54:340–344, 2008.
[36] Michel Talagrand. Compacts de fonctions mesurables et filtres non mesurables. *Studia Mathematicae*, 67:13 – 43, 1980.

Heike Mildenberger, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Mathematisches Institut, Abteilung für math. Logik, Eckerstr. 1, 79104 Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany

E-mail address: heike.mildenberger@math.uni-freiburg.de