ISRAEL JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS **242** (2021), 97–128
DOI: 10.1007/s11856-021-2124-2

THE COFINALITY OF THE SYMMETRIC GROUP AND THE COFINALITY OF ULTRAPOWERS

BY

HEIKE MILDENBERGER*

Abteilung für Mathematische Logik, Mathematisches Institut
Universität Freiburg, Ernst-Zermelo-Str. 1, 79104 Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany
e-mail: heike.mildenberger@math.uni-freiburg.de

AND

SAHARON SHELAH**

Einstein Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Edmond Safra Campus, Givat Ram, Jerusalem 9190401, Israel
e-mail: shelah@math.huji.ac.il

ABSTRACT

We prove that $\mathfrak{mcf} < \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)))$ and $\mathfrak{mcf} > \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) = \mathfrak{b}$ are both consistent relative to ZFC. This answers a question by Banakh, Repovš and Zdomskyy and a question from [MS11].

1. Introduction

We compare the cardinal $\mathfrak{mcf}$, the minimal cofinality of the ultrapower $(\omega, <)$ by a non-principal ultrafilter on ω, and the cofinality of the symmetric group on ω, $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega))$. These two cardinal invariants are closely related: Both are

* The first author's research is supported by an Internal Senior Fellowship of the Freiburg Institute of Advanced Studies.

** The second author's research was partially supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (Grant no. 2002323). This is the second authors publication no. 1021.

Received February 17, 2019 and in revised form December 31, 2019

cofinalities and hence regular. In ZFC, both cardinals have value in the interval $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{d}]$, namely Blass and Mildenberger [BM99] showed $\mathfrak{mcf} \geq \mathfrak{g}$, Brendle and Losada [BL03] showed $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) \geq \mathfrak{g}$, and Simon Thomas [Tho95] showed $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) \leq \mathfrak{d}$. In their relations to $\mathfrak{b}$ the two cardinals behave differently: Obviously $\mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{mcf}$, whereas Sharp and Thomas [ST95, Theorem 1.6] showed that $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) < \mathfrak{b}$ is consistent relative to ZFC. Before our research, in all investigated forcing extensions we have had $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) \leq \mathfrak{mcf}$ and in the forcing extensions in which both $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) \geq \mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{mcf} \geq \mathfrak{b}$, the two cardinal characteristics $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega))$ and $\mathfrak{mcf}$ coincide. The inequality $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) \leq \mathfrak{mcf}$ is partially due to a mathematical reason: Banakh, Repovš and Zdomskyy showed [BRZ11, Theorem 1.3]: If D is not nearly coherent to a Q-point then

$$\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) \leq \mathrm{cf}((\omega, <)^\omega / D).$$

In particular, if there is no Q-point then

$$\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) \leq \mathfrak{mcf}.$$

Here we show that indeed an extra assumption is necessary. Our first forcing shows the relative consistency of $\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{mcf} < \aleph_2 = \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega))$.

In our second forcing we show how to separate the two cardinals in the second direction above $\mathfrak{b}$: $\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{b} = \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) < \mathfrak{mcf}$ is consistent. We use versions of the oracle-c.c. in the $\aleph_1$-$\aleph_2$-scenario.

There are some known forcings establishing the relative consistency of $\mathfrak{b} < \mathfrak{mcf}$: Three interesting forcings for $\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{b} < \mathfrak{mcf}$ are given in [SS93, SS94]. Since $\mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{u}$ [PS87] and since NCF is equivalent to $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{mcf}$ [Mil01] the NCF-models show the relative consistency of $\mathfrak{b} < \mathfrak{mcf}$. In [MS11] we showed that also $\mathfrak{b}^+ < \mathfrak{mcf}$ is possible. In the second forcing extension of that work we arranged $\mathfrak{b}^+ < \mathfrak{mcf} = \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega))$. In the other forcing extensions for $\mathfrak{b} < \mathfrak{mcf}$ the value of $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega))$ has not yet been computed or is possibly not determined by the forcing or by NCF.

We recall the definitions: We denote by ${}^\omega\omega$ the set of functions from ω to ω. For $f, g \in {}^\omega\omega$ we write $f \leq^* g$ and say g **eventually dominates** f if

$$(\exists n)(\forall k \geq n)(f(k) \leq g(k)).$$

A set $B \subseteq {}^\omega\omega$ is called **unbounded** if there is no g that dominates all members of B. The **bounding number** $\mathfrak{b}$ is the minimal cardinality of an unbounded set.

Definition 1.1: Let D be a non-principal ultrafilter over ω. By ultrapower we mean the usual modeltheoretic ultrapower: The structure $(\omega, <)^\omega/D$ is defined on the domain $\{[f]_D : f \in {}^\omega\omega\}$ where

$$[f]_D = \{g \in {}^\omega\omega : \{n : f(n) = g(n)\} \in D\}.$$

The order relation is $[f]_D \leq_D [g]_D$ iff $\{n : f(n) \leq g(n)\} \in D$. We write $\mathrm{cf}((\omega, <)^\omega/D)$ for the minimal size of a set that is cofinal in $\leq_D$. The **minimal cofinality of an ultrapower of ω, $\mathfrak{mcf}$,** is defined as the

$$\mathfrak{mcf} = \min\{\mathrm{cf}((\omega, <)^\omega/D) : D \text{ non-principal ultrafilter over } \omega\}.$$

We define the relation $\leq_D$ also on the space ${}^\omega\omega$ by letting $f \leq_D g$ iff $\{n : f(n) \leq g(n)\} \in D$.

Definition 1.2: The group of permutations of ω is denoted by $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$. If $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega) = \bigcup_{i<\kappa} G_i$, $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \aleph_0$, $\langle G_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ is strictly increasing, and each G_i is a proper subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$, we call $\langle G_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ an **increasing decomposition**. We call the minimal κ such that an increasing decomposition of length κ exists the **cofinality of the symmetric group**, and denote it $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega))$.

Definition 1.3: A subset $\mathcal{G}$ of $[\omega]^\omega$ is called **groupwise dense** if

(1) $(\forall X \in \mathcal{G})(\forall Y \subseteq^* X)(Y \text{ infinite } \to Y \in \mathcal{G})$, and
(2) for every partition of ω into finite intervals $\Pi = \{[\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}) : i \in \omega\}$ there is an infinite set A such that $\bigcup\{[\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}) : i \in A\} \in \mathcal{G}$.

The **groupwise density number,** $\mathfrak{g}$, is the smallest number of groupwise dense families with empty intersection.

An ultrafilter U over ω is called a ***Q*-point**, if given any strictly increasing function $f \colon \omega \to \omega$ there is an $X \in U$ such that $\forall n$, $X \cap [f(n), f(n+1))$ has just one element. The existence of a Q-point is independent of ZFC; see, e.g., [Can90] for existence and [Mil80] for non-existence. An ultrafilter D is **nearly coherent to an ultrafilter** U if there is a finite-to-one function $f \colon \omega \to \omega$ such that $f(D) = f(U)$. Here

$$f(D) = \{E : f^{-1}[E] \in D\}.$$

Throughout we write $g[X]$ for the set $\{g(x) : x \in X\}$ and $g^{-1}[Y] = \{x : g(x) \in Y\}$. The principle NCF says that any two non-principal ultrafilters over ω are nearly coherent. Its consistency is established in [BS87, BS89, Bla89]. **A base** for an ultrafilter is a subset $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathscr{U}$ such that $(\forall Y \in \mathscr{U})(\exists X \in \mathcal{B})(X \subseteq Y)$. The character of an ultrafilter is the smallest size of a base. The **ultrafilter characteristic** $\mathfrak{u}$ is the smallest character of a non-principal ultrafilter.

In forcing the **stronger** condition is the larger one. For a forcing order $\mathbb{P}$ and a formula φ, we say $\mathbb{P}$ forces φ if the weakest condition in $\mathbb{P}$ forces φ.

2. Con($\mathfrak{b} = \mathrm{cf}(\omega^\omega/D) < \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega))$)

In this section we prove

THEOREM 2.1: *The constellation* $\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{mcf} < \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega))$ *is consistent relative to* ZFC.

We essentially use oracle c.c. [She98, Ch. 4], but in addition to the oracle sequence we construct a sequence $\langle \underset{\sim}{D}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ which approximates a name $\underset{\sim}{D}$ for an ultrafilter. We construct a notion of forcing $\mathbb{P}$ such that for a $\mathbb{P}$-generic filter $\mathbf{G}$, $\underset{\sim}{D}[\mathbf{G}]$ will be an ultrafilter witnessing $\mathfrak{mcf} = \aleph_1$. The construction of $\mathbb{P}$ is done via an approximation forcing AP, so that $\mathbb{P} = AP * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$, where $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an AP-name for the AP-generic object.

We recall some oracle technique of [She98, Chapter IV]. Let S be a stationary subset of ω_1. We fix S throughout this section. A set $\mathscr{D} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(S)$ is called a **filter over** S if $\emptyset \notin \mathscr{D}$, $S \in \mathscr{D}$, $\mathscr{D}$ is closed under finite intersections and closed under supersets. A filter $\mathscr{D}$ over S is called **normal** if it contains all sets of the form $[\alpha, \omega_1) \cap S$, $\alpha < \omega_1$, and is closed under diagonal intersections. We recall, given a sequence $\langle D_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$, that its diagonal intersection is the following set

$$\triangle_{\delta \in S} D_\delta = \left\{ \gamma \in S : \gamma \in \bigcap_{\delta \in \gamma \cap S} D_\delta \right\}.$$

For a filter $\mathscr{D}$ over ω_1 and $X, Y \subseteq \omega_1$ we let $X = Y \bmod \mathscr{D}$ if

$$(X \cap Y) \cup ((\omega_1 \setminus X) \cap (\omega_1 \setminus Y)) \in \mathscr{D},$$

and $X \subseteq Y \mod \mathscr{D}$ if $X \setminus Y = \emptyset \mod \mathscr{D}$.

We recall the notion of a $\diamondsuit_S^-$-sequence. A sequence $\bar{P} = \langle P_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is called a $\diamondsuit_S^-$-sequence if $P_\delta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\delta)$ is countable and for any $X \subseteq \aleph_1$

$$\{\delta \in S : X \cap \delta \in P_\delta\} \text{ is a stationary subset of } S.$$

It is well known that $\diamondsuit_S^-$ and $\diamondsuit_S$ are equivalent (see [Kun80, Ch. III]).

We fix a sufficiently large regular cardinal χ, indeed $\chi \geq (2^{\aleph_2})^+$ suffices. We fix a well-order $<_\chi$ on $H(\chi)$.

Definition 2.2: We assume that $S \subseteq \omega_1$ is stationary and $\diamondsuit_S$.

(1) (See [She98, IV, Def. 1.1]) An S**-oracle** is a sequence $\bar{M} = \langle M_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ such that:
   (a) M_δ is countable and transitive and $\delta + 1 \subseteq M_\delta$.
   (b) $i_\delta \colon (M_\delta, \in, (<_\chi)^{M_\delta}) \hookrightarrow_{\text{elem}} (H(\chi), \in, <_\chi)$ is elementary.
   (c) $M_\delta \models \delta$ is countable.
   (d) For $\delta < \varepsilon \in S$, $M_\delta \subseteq M_\varepsilon$.
   (e) For any $A \subseteq \omega_1$ the set $\{\delta \in S : A \cap \delta \in M_\delta\}$ is stationary in ω_1.

(2) Let M be a countable elementary submodel of $H(\chi)$. A real $\eta \in \omega^\omega$ is called a **Cohen real over** M iff for any $D \in M$ that is dense in $\mathbb{C} = \{p : (\exists n)(p \colon n \to \omega)\}$ (ordered by end-extension) there is an n such that $\eta \restriction n \in D$. Equivalently, for any meagre set $F \subseteq \omega^\omega$ that is coded in M, e.g., by a sequence of nowhere dense trees, we have $\eta \notin F$.

(3) We say that $\langle \bar{M}, \bar{N}, \bar{\eta} \rangle$ is an S**-oracle triple** if
   (a) $\bar{M} = \langle M_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is an S-oracle,
   (b) $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$,
   (c) for $\delta \in S$, η_δ is Cohen over M_δ,
   (d) $\bar{N} = \langle N_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$,
   (e) $N_\delta = M_\delta[\eta_\delta]$.

(3) Let $\bar{M}$ be an S-oracle sequence. For $A \subseteq H(\omega_1)$, we let

$$I_{\bar{M}}(A) = \{\alpha \in S : A \cap \alpha \in M_\alpha\}$$

and

$$\mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}} = \{X \subseteq \omega_1 : (\exists A \subseteq \omega_1)(X \supseteq I_{\bar{M}}(A))\}.$$

From now on until the end of the section let $S \subseteq \omega_1$ be stationary and assume $\diamondsuit_S$. For L-structures $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{M}$, we write $\mathcal{A} \prec \mathcal{M}$ if $\mathcal{A}$ is an elementary substructure of $\mathcal{M}$. Since for L-structures $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ also $\mathcal{A} \prec \mathcal{B}$ holds, we have that the structures on any oracle sequence are $\prec$-increasing.

If $f \colon A \to B$ is a function and $C \subseteq A$, then we write $f[C]$ for $\{f(c) : c \in C\}$. We recall the following important properties of $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$.

LEMMA 2.3 ([She98, IV, Claim 1.4]): *The set* $\{I_{\bar{M}}(A) : A \subseteq \omega_1\}$ *is closed under finite intersections. The filter* $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$ *contains every end segment of* ω_1*, is normal, and contains any club subset of* S*, and for every* $A \subseteq H(\aleph_1)$*,* $I_{\bar{M}}(A) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$*.*

Proof. We prove only the very last statement; the others are proved in [She98, IV, Claim 1.4]. By $\diamondsuit_S$, $|H(\omega_1)| = \omega_1$. Let $f \colon H(\omega_1) \to \omega_1$ be the $<_\chi$-least bijection. Let

$$C = \{\delta \in \omega_1 : \delta \text{ limit and } (\forall \alpha < \delta)(f[M_\alpha] \subseteq \delta)\}.$$

The set $\mathrm{acc}(C)$ of accumulation points of C is club in ω_1. Now we consider $A \subseteq H(\omega_1)$. By definition, $I_{\bar{M}}(f[A]) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$. For any $\delta \in S \cap \mathrm{acc}(C)$ such that $f[A] \cap \delta \in M_\delta$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_\delta \ni (i_\delta^{-1}(f^{-1}))[(f[A \cap \delta])] &= \bigcup_{\alpha<\delta} (f^{-1} \restriction f[M_\alpha])[(f[A] \cap \alpha)] \\ &= \bigcup_{\alpha<\delta} A \cap \alpha = A \cap \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have $I_{\bar{M}}(A) \supseteq I_{\bar{M}}(f[A]) \cap \mathrm{acc}(C)$. By [Jec03, Lemma 14.4], for any club C' in ω_1, any normal filter over S contains the set $S \cap C'$. Since $\mathrm{acc}(C)$ is a club and $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$ is a normal filter, $\mathrm{acc}(C) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$ and thus $I_{\bar{M}}(A) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$. ∎

We recall when a notion of forcing $\mathbb{P}$ has the $\bar{M}$-c.c.

Definition 2.4 ([She98, Ch. IV, Def. 1.5]): Let $\bar{M}$ be an S-oracle sequence and let $\mathbb{P}$ be a notion of forcing. We define when $\mathbb{P}$ satisfies the $\bar{M}$-c.c. by cases:

(a) If $|\mathbb{P}| \leq \aleph_0$, always.
(b) If $|\mathbb{P}| = \aleph_1$ and if for every injective $\pi \colon \mathbb{P} \to \omega_1$ the set

$$\begin{aligned} \{\delta \in S : &(\forall A \in M_\delta \cap \mathcal{P}(\delta)) \\ &(((\pi^{-1})[A] \text{ is predense in } (\pi^{-1})[\delta]) \to ((\pi^{-1})[A] \text{ is predense in } \mathbb{P}))\} \end{aligned}$$

is an element of $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$.
(c) $\mathbb{P}'' \subseteq_{\mathrm{ic}} \mathbb{P}$ means that $\mathbb{P}''$ is an incompatibility preserving suborder of $\mathbb{P}$, i.e., for any $p, q \in \mathbb{P}''$, $p \leq_{\mathbb{P}''} q$ iff $p \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q$ and $p \perp_{\mathbb{P}''} q$ iff $p \perp_{\mathbb{P}} q$.
(d) If $|\mathbb{P}| > \aleph_1$,and for every $\mathbb{P}^\dagger \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ if $|\mathbb{P}^\dagger| \leq \aleph_1$, then there are $\mathbb{P}''$ such that $|\mathbb{P}''| = \aleph_1$ and $\mathbb{P}^\dagger \subseteq \mathbb{P}'' \subseteq_{\mathrm{ic}} \mathbb{P}$ and $\pi \colon \mathbb{P}'' \to \omega_1$ as in (b).

Oracle sequences are not continuous. The requirement $\delta \in M_\delta$ precludes continuity.

Lemma 2.5: *Assume S is stationary and $\diamondsuit_S$.*

(1) *There is an oracle triple.*
(2) *Let $\langle \bar{M}, \bar{N}, \bar{\eta}\rangle$ be an oracle triple. Then*

$$I := \{\delta \in S : \{(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \delta\} \in M_\delta\} \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}.$$

(3) *If $\langle \bar{M}, \bar{N}, \bar{\eta}\rangle$ is an S-oracle triple then $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in I\rangle$ is an I-oracle, with the exception that $(N_\varepsilon, \in)$ is not necessarily an elementary substructure of $H(\chi)$.*[1]

Proof. (1) Let $\langle P_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ be a $\diamondsuit_S^-$-sequence. Again we fix the $<_\chi$-least bijection $f\colon H(\omega_1) \to \omega_1$. We choose M_δ, i_δ by induction on δ. Suppose that M_γ, i_γ, $\gamma < \delta$, have been chosen. Let $M'_\delta \prec (H(\chi), \in, <_\chi)$ be a countable elementary substructure with $\langle M_\gamma, i_\gamma : \gamma < \delta\rangle, \delta, P_\delta \in M'_\delta$. Then $\delta + 1 \subseteq M'_\delta$. We let M_δ be the Mostowski collapse of M'_δ. The Mostowski collapse maps P_δ to itself. Moreover, since P_δ is countable, $P_\delta \subseteq M_\delta$, and hence $X \cap \delta \in P_\delta$ implies $X \cap \delta \in M_\delta$. By now, we have taken care of Definition 2.2.(2) (a). For being definite, we let the Cohen forcing $\mathbb{C}$ be the set of finite partial functions from ω to 2, ordered by extension. By the Rasiowa–Sikorski theorem (e.g., [Jec03, Lemma 14.4]) there is a Cohen-generic filter G_δ over M_δ. Then the function $\eta_\delta = \bigcup\{p : p \in G_\delta\} \in {}^\omega 2$ is a Cohen real over M_δ. We let $M_\delta[G_\delta] = N_\delta$.

(2) The set $A = \{(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon \in S\} \subseteq H(\omega_1)$. We fix a club C such for $\delta \in C$,

$$f[\{(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \delta\}] \subseteq \delta.$$

By Lemma 2.3 we have $I_{\bar{M}}(A) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$. By normality $C \cap I_{\bar{M}}(A) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$. By the choice of C,

$$C \cap I_{\bar{M}}(A) \subseteq \{\delta : \{(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \delta\} \in M_\delta\}$$

and thus the latter is in $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$.

(3) Since $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$ is a normal filter, by [Jec03, Lemma 811], its elements are stationary sets. Hence I is stationary. For $\delta < \varepsilon$, $\delta \in S$, $\varepsilon \in I$, we have $N_\delta \subseteq M_\varepsilon \subseteq N_\varepsilon$. Hence $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in I\rangle$ is increasing. ∎

From now until the end of the section we fix an S-oracle triple $(\bar{M}, \bar{N}, \bar{\eta})$. Note that for $\delta \in I$, $(\forall \alpha < \delta)(M_\alpha[\eta_\alpha] \in M_\delta)$.

[1] In Theorem 2.8 below we will rework the proof of the omitting types theorem for the particular types that shall be omitted and see that the requirement that $(N_\varepsilon, \in)$ fulfil sufficiently much of ZFC and be transitive suffices for our application.

Oracle triples allow for the application of the "Omitting Types Theorem":

LEMMA 2.6 (The Omitting Types Theorem, see [She98, Ch. IV, Lemma 2.1]): *Assume* $\diamondsuit_S$. *Suppose the* $\psi_i(x)$, $i < \omega_1$, *are* Π^1_2 *formulas on reals with a real parameter possibly. Suppose further that there is no solution to* $\bigwedge_{i<\omega_1} \psi_i(x)$ *in* $\mathbf{V}$ *and even if we add a Cohen real to* $\mathbf{V}$ *there will be none. Then there is an* S*-oracle* $\bar{M}'$ *such that for any forcing* $\mathbb{P}$,

$$\text{if } \mathbb{P} \text{ has the } \bar{M}'\text{-c.c, then in } \mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}} \text{ there is no solution to } \bigwedge_i \psi_i(x).$$

We let $\psi(x, \eta_i)$ say the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &x = (y, h) \wedge y \in {}^\omega 2 \text{ and } h \in {}^\omega\omega \text{ is increasing and} \\ &(\forall^\infty n)(\eta_i \restriction [h(n), h(n+1)) \neq y \restriction [h(n), h(n+1))). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

By [BJ95, Theorem Ch. 2], any meagre subset of 2^ω has a superset of the form

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

for some strictly increasing function h and some $y \in {}^\omega 2$. The formula $\psi(x, \eta_i)$ says that η_i is in the meagre set $M_{(h,y)}$. So the type Ψ to be omitted is

$$\bigwedge_{i \in I} \psi(x, \eta_i). \tag{2.2}$$

Actually, we will have a strong form of omission: There is a set Y in a normal filter such that for each $i \in Y$, $x = (y, h) \in M_i[\mathbb{P}]$,

$$(\exists^\infty n) \eta_i \restriction [h(n), h(n+1)) = \eta_i \restriction [h(n), h(n+1)).$$

Since $\mathbb{P} \in M_0$ and $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \bigcup\{M_i : i < \omega\}$, thus $\{\eta_i : i \in Y\}$ is not meagre in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$.

We check that premise of the omitting types theorem is fulfilled in a very local form.

LEMMA 2.7: *Let* M *be a countable transitive model that can be elementarily embedded into* $H(\chi)$, *and let* $\eta \in \mathbf{V}$ *be a Cohen real over* M. *Then there is no* $p \in \mathbb{C}$ *such that* p *forces in Cohen forcing over* $\mathbf{V}$ *that* η *is not Cohen over* $M[\mathbb{C}]$.

Proof. If $\eta \in \mathbf{V}$ is Cohen over M and c is Cohen over $\mathbf{V}$ then c is also Cohen over $M[\eta]$. So $M[\eta][c]$ is an iterated Cohen extension and (η, c) is M-generic for $\mathbb{C} * \mathbb{C}$. Since $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ densely embeds into $\mathbb{C} * \mathbb{C}$, the order of the two Cohen reals does not matter. So c is forced to be Cohen over $M[\eta]$. ∎

By Lemma 2.7, the omitting types theorem shows that there is an oracle $\bar{N}$ for the preservation of η_i' s Coheness over M_i. We review the proof of the omitting types theorem for the preservation of Coheness in order to show that $N_i = M[\eta_i]$ is a strong enough oracle.[2]

Theorem 2.8: *Let $\bar{M}$, $\bar{N}$, S, I be as in Definition 2.2 and Lemma 2.5(2). For each $\mathbb{P}^\dagger$ with the $\bar{N}$-c.c. there is a set $Y \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$ such that for any $i \in Y$, η_i is Cohen over $M_i[\mathbb{P}^\dagger]$.*

Proof. We work with the type given in (2.2). We assume $\mathbb{P}^\dagger = \omega_1$. Then by the oracle-c.c.

$$Y' = \{\delta \in S : (\forall A \in N_\delta \cap \mathcal{P}(\delta))(((A \text{ is predense in } (\delta) \to ((A \text{ is predense in } \mathbb{P}))\}$$

is an element of $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$.

Let τ be a $\mathbb{P}^\dagger$-name for a real. Since $\mathbb{P}^\dagger = \omega_1$ has the c.c.c. we can assume that $\tau \in H(\omega_1)$. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}^\dagger$. Let Y be the set of $\delta \in Y'$ such that

(a) $\tau \in M_\delta$,
(b) $\tau = \tau^{(N_\delta, \delta)}$,
(c) $\mathbb{P}^\dagger \cap \delta \subseteq_{ic} \mathbb{P}^\dagger$.

Then $Y \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$. Let G be $\mathbb{P}^\dagger$-generic over $\mathbf{V}$ and $\delta \in Y$. Then $G \cap \delta$ is $\mathbb{P}^\dagger \cap \delta$-generic over N_δ. Since $\mathbb{P}^\dagger \cap \delta$ is equivalent to Cohen forcing, by Lemma 2.7,

$$N_\delta[G \cap \delta] \models \neg\psi(\underset{\sim}{\tau}[G \cap \delta], \eta_\delta).$$

Since $\mathbb{P}^\dagger \cap \delta \subseteq_{ic} \mathbb{P}^\dagger$, we have $\underset{\sim}{\tau}[G \cap \delta] = \underset{\sim}{\tau}[G]$. By absoluteness,

$$N_\delta[G] \models \neg\psi(\underset{\sim}{\tau}[G], \eta_\delta). \qquad \blacksquare$$

For building up a name for an ultrafilter witnessing $\mathfrak{mcf} = \aleph_1$ we introduce some notions for handling names.

Definition 2.9: Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a c.c.c. forcing of size at most $\aleph_1$.

(1) A **canonical $\mathbb{P}$-name** for a subset of ω is a name of the form

$$\tau = \{\langle \check{n}, p\rangle : p \in A_n\rangle\},$$

where the $A_n \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ are countable maximal antichains.

[2] The sequence of the N_i is not an oracle literally, since its entries are not necessarily elementary subsets of $H(\theta)$. However, they are transitive models of a sufficiently large fragment of ZFC. Theorem 2.8 shows that this is sufficient for our specific types. Henceforth we will also call $\bar{N}$ an oracle sequence.

(2) A **canonical** $\mathbb{P}$**-name** for a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ is a name of the form

$$\underset{\sim}{K} = \{\langle \tau, q \rangle : q \in A_\tau, \tau \in X\},$$

where X is a set of canonical $\mathbb{P}$-names τ for subsets of ω, for maps π as in (3), and for each $\tau \in X$, the set A_τ is a countable antichain in $\mathbb{P}$.

(3) Let $\pi\colon \mathbb{P} \to \omega_1$ be injective. We let $\pi[\mathbb{P}] = \mathbb{P}'$ and define a partial order (or a quasi order) on $\mathbb{P}'$ such that π is an isomorphism from $(\mathbb{P}, <_{\mathbb{P}})$ to $(\mathbb{P}', <_{\mathbb{P}'})$. Then we lift π to a map $\bar{\pi}\colon \mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}} \to \mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}'}$-names by letting

$$\bar{\pi}(\tau) = \{\langle \bar{\pi}(\sigma), \pi(p) \rangle : \langle \sigma, p \rangle \in \tau\}.$$

For canonical names τ, $\underset{\sim}{K}$ as above, $\bar{\pi}(\tau) \in H(\omega_1)$, $\bar{\pi}(\underset{\sim}{K}) \subseteq H(\omega_1)$. Thus according to Lemma 2.3, $I_{\bar{M}}(\bar{\pi}(\underset{\sim}{K})) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$. The names $\bar{\pi}(\underset{\sim}{K})$ and $\bar{\pi}(\tau)$ are canonical.

Definition 2.10: Let $\bar{M}$ be an S-oracle sequence and $\mathbb{P}' \subseteq \omega_1$.

(1) We let τ be a canonical $\mathbb{P}'$-name of a subset of ω. We let for $\delta \in \omega_1$,

$$\tau^{(M_\delta, \delta)} = \begin{cases} \tau; & \text{if } \tau \text{ is a } \mathbb{P}' \cap \delta\text{-name, and } \tau \in M_\delta, \\ \text{undefined;} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(2) For a canonical $\mathbb{P}'$-name $\underset{\sim}{K} = \{(\tau, q) : q \in A_\tau, \tau \in X\}$ for a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and $\delta < \omega_1$ we define the M_δ-part as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\underset{\sim}{K}^{(M_\delta, \delta)} = \{(\tau, q) :& (\tau, q) \in \underset{\sim}{K}, q \in \mathbb{P}' \cap \delta, \tau \text{ is a } \mathbb{P}' \cap \delta\text{-name},\\ & \tau \in M_\delta, A_\tau \subseteq \mathbb{P}' \cap \delta, A_\tau \in M_\delta\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that for a canonical $\mathbb{P}'$-name we have $\underset{\sim}{K}^{(M_\delta, \delta)} \subseteq M_\delta$, however, in general $\underset{\sim}{K}^{(M_\delta, \delta)}$ is not an element of M_δ. By Lemma 2.3 we have though

$$\{\delta \in S : \langle (\varepsilon, \underset{\sim}{K}^{(M_\varepsilon, \varepsilon)}) : \varepsilon < \delta \rangle \in M_\delta\} \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}.$$

Now we are ready to define the set K^1 of pairs that serve as conditions in the first iterand of our final two-step forcing. The order on K^1 will be defined in Definition 2.18.

Definition 2.11:

(1) For an S-oracle triple $(\bar{M}, \bar{N}, \bar{\eta})$ as above we let K^1 be the set of all $(\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D})$ with the following properties:

(a) $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. forcing with a nonstationary domain $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \omega_1$.

(b) $\underset{\sim}{D}$ is a canonical $\mathbb{P}$-name of a non-principal ultrafilter over ω.

(c) $Y(\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D}) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$, where $Y(\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D})$ is the set of $\delta \in S$ such that items (α) to (ε) hold:
 (α) $\mathbb{P} \cap \delta \in M_\delta$.
 (β) If $E \subseteq \mathbb{P} \cap \delta$ and $E \in N_\delta$ and E is predense in $\mathbb{P} \cap \delta$ then E is predense in $\mathbb{P}$ (so we have that $\mathbb{P}$ has the $\bar{N}$-oracle-c.c.).
 (γ) $\underset{\sim}{D}^{(M_\delta,\delta)} \in M_\delta$ and $M_\delta \models$ "$\underset{\sim}{D}^{(M_\delta,\delta)}$ is a canonical $\mathbb{P} \cap \delta$-name of an ultrafilter over ω".
 (δ) $N_\delta \models (\mathbb{P} \cap \delta \Vdash$ "η_δ is Cohen-generic over $M_\delta[\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{G}}_{\mathbb{P}\cap\delta}]$").
 (ε) $\underset{\sim}{D}^{(N_\delta,\delta)} \in N_\delta$ is a canonical $\mathbb{P}\cap\delta$-name of an ultrafilter over ω such that
$$\mathbb{P} \cap \delta \Vdash (\forall f \in M_\delta[\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{G}}_{\mathbb{P}\cap\delta}] \cap {}^\omega\omega)(f \leq_{\underset{\sim}{D}^{(N_\delta,\delta)}} \eta_\delta).$$

(2) For an oracle triple $(\bar{M}, \bar{N}, \bar{\eta})$ we let K^2 be the set of $(\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D}) \in H(\aleph_2)$ such that there are a non-stationary $\mathbb{P}' \subseteq \omega_1$ and a bijective $\pi \colon \mathbb{P}' \to \mathbb{P}$ and $(\mathbb{P}', \underset{\sim}{D}') \in K^1$, π is an isomorphism from $\mathbb{P}'$ onto $\mathbb{P}$ with $\bar{\pi}(\underset{\sim}{D}') = \underset{\sim}{D}$.

Remark 2.12: Since we do not add new types that have to be omitted in the course of the iteration, one fixed oracle $\bar{N} \in \mathbf{V}$ is sufficient.

We recall the successor step and the direct limit step for oracle-c.c.

Lemma 2.13 (Lemma [She98, IV 3.2]): *If $\mathbb{P}$ has the $\bar{M}$-c.c. and $\mathbb{P}$ forces that $\mathbb{Q}$ has the $\langle M_\delta[\mathbb{P}] : \delta \in S\rangle$-c.c., then $\mathbb{P} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ has the $\bar{M}$-c.c.*

Lemma 2.14 (Lemma [She98, IV 3.10]): *If $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\rangle$ is a finite support iteration such that has the $\bar{M}$-c.c. and for $\alpha < \beta$ the forcing $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ forces that $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ has the $\langle M_\delta[\mathbb{P}_\alpha] : \delta \in S\rangle$-c.c., then $\mathbb{P}_\beta$ has the $\bar{M}$-c.c.*

If $\pi \colon \mathbb{P}' \to \mathbb{P}$ is an isomorphism between forcing orders, we use it also for its natural extension that maps $\mathbb{P}$-names to $\mathbb{P}'$-names.

Lemma 2.15: *Let $(\bar{M}, \bar{N}, \bar{\eta})$ be an S-oracle triple and let K^1 be as in Definition 2.11(1). Assume*

(1) *$(\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D}) \in H(\aleph_2)$, $\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing notion, $\mathbb{P} \in H(\omega_2)$ and $\underset{\sim}{D} \in H(\omega_2)$ is a canonical $\mathbb{P}$-name of an ultrafilter over ω.*
(2) *$\mathbb{P}'_\ell$ is a notion of forcing whose domain is a non-stationary subset of ω_1 for $\ell = 1, 2$.*
(3) *π_ℓ is an isomorphism from $\mathbb{P}'_\ell$ onto $\mathbb{P}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$,*
(4) *$\underset{\sim}{D}'_\ell$ is a $\mathbb{P}'_\ell$-name of a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ such that π_ℓ maps $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\ell$ onto $\underset{\sim}{D}$.*

Then $(\mathbb{P}'_1, \underset{\sim}{D}'_1) \in K^1$ iff $(\mathbb{P}'_2, \underset{\sim}{D}'_2) \in K^1$.

Proof. The map $\pi = \pi_2^{-1} \circ \pi_1$ is an isomorphism from $\mathbb{P}'_1$ onto $\mathbb{P}'_2$, and its lifting $\bar{\pi}$ maps $\underset{\sim}{D}'_1$ to $\underset{\sim}{D}'_2$. According to Lemma 2.3,

$$Z = \{\delta \in S : \pi \restriction \delta \text{ is a one-to-one mapping from } \mathbb{P}'_1 \cap \delta \text{ to } \mathbb{P}'_2 \cap \delta \text{ and } \pi \restriction \delta \in M_\delta\}$$

belongs to $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$. If $\delta \in Z$ then $\delta \in Y(\mathbb{P}'_1, \underset{\sim}{D}'_1)$ iff $\delta \in Y(\mathbb{P}'_2, \underset{\sim}{D}'_2)$, since the defining properties of the sets $Y(\mathbb{P}'_\ell, \underset{\sim}{D}'_\ell)$ are preserved by isomorphisms of forcing orders. ∎

This shows that in Definition 2.11(2) the following is true: If the demand holds for some pair $(\mathbb{P}', \pi)$ then it holds for every such pair. The primed partial orders in Lemma 2.15 shall ensure that the domain is a non-stationary subset of ω_1. Canonical $\mathbb{P}'$-names for reals and for filters over ω are actual subsets of $H(\omega_1)$. According to Lemma 2.15, their properties are invariant under bijections of ω_1. Since any property of the forcing is named modulo $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$ the particular choice of the injections does not matter. For the actual construction of forcing posets it is convenient to use non-stationary domains for the $\mathbb{P}' \in K^1$, since non-stationarity is preserved by countable unions and by diagonal unions.

The property in Definition 2.11(1)(c)(ε) ensures that $\underset{\sim}{D}$ will be forced to be an ultrafilter such that the weakest condition in the two-step forcing forces $\mathrm{cf}(\omega^\omega/\underset{\sim}{D}) = \aleph_1$, as witnessed by $\langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$. Technically it is more convenient to prove property (δ) by induction and then derive property (ε) from property (δ), though property (ε) is more directly related to $\mathrm{cf}(\omega^\omega/\underset{\sim}{D}) = \aleph_1$. In the case of an $\leq^*$-increasing sequence $\langle \eta_\delta : \delta < S\rangle$ unboundedness is preserved in limits of finite support iterations if each initial segment preserves it [BJ95, Ch. 6, §4]. So it might be possible to prove by induction property (ε) and the negation of (δ). We have not investigated this issue.

Concerning the preservation of (δ), we will frequently use [BJ95, Chapter 6 Section 4]:

Lemma 2.16: *Let $\mathbb{P}_n \lessdot \mathbb{P}_{n+1}$ for $n \in \omega$ and let $\mathbb{P}$ be the direct limit of $\langle \mathbb{P}_n : n \in \omega\rangle$. If $\mathbb{P}_n \Vdash$ "η_δ is Cohen generic over $M_\delta[G_{\mathbb{P}_n}]$" for all n, then $\mathbb{P} \Vdash$ "η_δ is Cohen generic over $M_\delta[G_{\mathbb{P}}]$."*

Let $\mathrm{unif}(\mathcal{M})$ denote the smallest cardinality of a non-meagre set. The following proposition gives the additional information that $\mathrm{unif}(\mathcal{M}) = \aleph_1$ in our forcing extensions, as witnessed by $\{\eta_\delta : \delta \in S\}$.

Proposition 2.17: *If* $(\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D}) \in K^2$ *then* $\mathbb{P}$ *forces that* $\{\eta_\delta : \delta \in S\}$ *is a non-meagre subset of* ${}^\omega 2$.

Proof. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$ force that $\{\eta_\delta : \delta \in S\}$ is meagre. Let τ be a name for a meagre F_σ-set. By the c.c.c., there is a $\delta \in Y(\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D})$ such that $\tau, p \in M_\delta$, $p \in \mathbb{P} \cap \delta$, τ is a $\mathbb{P} \cap \delta$-name, and $p \Vdash \{\eta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in S\} \subseteq \tau$. Then $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \eta_\delta \in \tau$. Since $\delta \in Y(\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D})$, clause (β) in the definition of $Y(\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D})$ yields also $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}\cap\delta} \eta_\delta \in \tau$. This is a contradiction to Definition 2.11(1)(c)(δ) of the definition of $Y(\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D})$. ∎

Proposition 2.17 has a sort of an inverse direction for the class of Suslin forcings. A forcing $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ is called Suslin if $\mathbb{Q}$ is an analytic subset of ω^ω and the relations $\leq_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\perp_{\mathbb{Q}}$ are analytic sets in $\omega^\omega \times \omega^\omega$. For Suslin proper forcings, not making the ground model meagre is equivalent to preserving the genericity of a Cohen real over any countable model [Gol93, 6.21, 6.22], and then all non-meagre sets in the ground model stay non-meagre.

Now we introduce the approximation forcing $(AP, <_{AP})$:

Definition 2.18: We let K^2 be as above.

(A) Let $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{p}}, \underset{\sim}{D}_{\mathbf{p}}), \mathbf{q} = (\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{q}}, \underset{\sim}{D}_{\mathbf{q}}) \in K^2$. We define $\mathbf{p} \leq_{AP} \mathbf{q}$, that is, $\mathbf{q}$ is stronger than $\mathbf{p}$, if
  - (a) $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{p}} \lessdot \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{q}}$,
  - (b) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{q}}} \underset{\sim}{D}_{\mathbf{p}} \subseteq \underset{\sim}{D}_{\mathbf{q}}$.

(B) For $i = 1, 2$, we let forcing order of approximations be $AP^i = (K^i, \leq_{AP})$. We let $AP = AP^2$.

The following is the parallel of the basic claim on oracle c.c. forcing, [She98, Ch. IV, Claim 3.2]. The forcing $\mathbb{P}_i$ does not mean iteration up to stage i. The variable i, ranging over $\omega + 1$ or $\omega_1 + 1$ or ω_2, is just an index for $\mathbb{P}_i$ being a component of $(\mathbb{P}_i, \underset{\sim}{D}_i) \in K^2$. $\mathbb{P}_i$ is an $\bar{N}$-oracle c.c. forcing and $|\mathbb{P}_i| \leq \aleph_1$.

Lemma 2.19:

(A) *The structure* $(K^2, \leq_{AP})$ *is a partial order of cardinality* $|H(\aleph_2)|$.

(B) $K^2 \neq \emptyset$.

(C) *If* $\mathbf{p}_n = (\mathbb{P}_n, \underset{\sim}{D}_n) \in K^2$ *for* $n \in \omega$ *and* $\mathbf{p}_n \leq_{AP} \mathbf{p}_{n+1}$, *then the set has an upper bound* $\mathbf{p}_\omega = (\mathbb{P}_\omega, \underset{\sim}{D}_\omega)$ *with* $\mathbb{P}_\omega = \bigcup\{\mathbb{P}_n : n \in \omega\}$.

(D) $(K^2, \leq_{AP})$ *is* (ω_1+1)*-strategically closed, that is, for every* $\mathbf{p} \in AP$ *the protagonist has a winning strategy in the following game* $\eth(\mathbf{p})$*: A play lasts* $\omega_1 + 1$ *moves. During the play the player COM, the protagonist,* *chooses for each* $i \le \omega_1$, $\mathbf{p}_i = (\mathbb{P}_i, \underset{\sim}{D}_i) \in K^2$, *and INC, the antagonist, chooses* $\mathbf{q}_i \in K^2$ *such that*

(a) $\mathbf{p}_i \le_{AP} \mathbf{q}_i$,
(b) $(\forall j < i)(\mathbf{q}_j \le_{AP} \mathbf{p}_i)$,
(c) $\mathbf{p}_0 = \mathbf{p}$.

The protagonist COM wins the game if they can always move. The hard case is the choice of $\mathbf{p}_{\omega_1}$.

Proof. (A) and (B) are obvious.

(C) Let $\mathbf{p}_n = (\mathbb{P}_n, \underset{\sim}{D}_n)$ and let $\langle \mathbf{p}_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ be $\le_{AP}$-increasing. We choose $(\mathbb{P}_n, \pi_n, \mathbb{P}'_n, \underset{\sim}{D}'_n)$ by induction on n with the following properties:

(1) $\mathbb{P}'_n \subseteq \omega_1$ is not stationary,
(2) $\pi_n \colon \mathbb{P}'_n \to \mathbb{P}_n$ is an isomorphism of partial orders,
(3) $(\bar{\pi})^{-1}(\underset{\sim}{D}_n) = \underset{\sim}{D}'_n$,
(4) $\pi_n \subseteq \pi_{n+1}$,
(5) $(\mathbb{P}'_n, \underset{\sim}{D}'_n) \in K^1$.

Then we let $\mathbb{P}'_\omega = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} \mathbb{P}'_n$, and the latter is not stationary. Moreover, we let $\pi_\omega = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} \pi_n$.

We fix for $n \in \omega$ a reduction $r_{\mathbb{P}'_\omega, \mathbb{P}'_n} : \mathbb{P}'_\omega \to \mathbb{P}'_n$ and we set

$$C = \{\delta \in S : \delta \text{ limit of } S \text{ and } (\forall n) r_{\mathbb{P}'_\omega, \mathbb{P}'_n}[\mathbb{P}'_\omega \cap \delta] \subseteq \delta\}.$$

Of course C is club in ω_1. We let

$$Y = \bigcap_{k\in\omega} Y(\mathbb{P}'_k, \underset{\sim}{D}'_k) \cap C. \tag{2.3}$$

By [She98, Ch. IV, Claim 3.2], the poset $\mathbb{P}'_\omega$ has the $\bar{N}$-oracle c.c., i.e., $\mathbb{P}'_\omega$ satisfies clause (c)(β) of Definition 2.11. By Lemma 2.16 the set Y is also a witness to clause (c)(δ) for $\mathbb{P}'_\omega \in K^1$.

We show that there is $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega$ such that $(\mathbb{P}'_\omega, \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega)$ is an upper bound of $\langle \mathbf{p}'_n : n < \omega\rangle$ in $\le_{AP}$. To this end we define an $\mathbb{P}'_\omega$-name $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega$ for an ultrafilter such that $\mathbf{p}_\omega = (\mathbb{P}'_\omega, \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega) \in K^1$ and $Y \subseteq Y(\mathbb{P}'_\omega, \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega)$. We let

$$\mathbb{P}'_\omega \Vdash \underset{\sim}{E}' = \bigcup_{k\in\omega} \underset{\sim}{D}'_k.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}'_k$ is a complete suborder of $\mathbb{P}'_\omega$ the $\underset{\sim}{D}'_k$ are names for filters and $0_{\mathbb{P}'_{k+1}} \Vdash \underset{\sim}{D}'_k \subseteq \underset{\sim}{D}'_{k+1}$ the weakest element of $\mathbb{P}'_\omega$ forces that $\underset{\sim}{E}'$ is a $\mathbb{P}'_\omega$-name for a filter.

We write $\text{next}(Y,\varepsilon)$ for the next element in Y after ε, i.e.,

$$\text{next}(Y,\varepsilon) = \min\{\delta > \varepsilon : \delta \in Y\}.$$

By induction on $\delta \in Y$, we will define a canonical $\mathbb{P}'_\omega \cap \delta$-name $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta) \in M_\delta$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}'_\omega \cap \delta \Vdash \text{“}\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta) \supseteq \bigcup\{\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma) : \gamma \in Y \cap \delta\} \text{ and } \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta) \text{ is an ultrafilter in } M_\delta,\text{”}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}'_\omega \cap \text{next}(Y,\delta) \Vdash \text{“}(\forall f \in M_\delta[\mathbb{P}'_\omega])(\eta_\delta \geq_{\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\text{next}(Y,\delta))} f) \text{ and } \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\text{next}(Y,\delta)) \cap \mathcal{P}(\omega)^{N_\varepsilon} \text{ is an ultrafilter in } N_\varepsilon.\text{”}$$

The restriction of names, mapping each name X to a name $X^{(M_\delta,\delta)}$, was defined in Definition 2.10(2). We will often write X^{M_δ} instead of $X^{(M_\delta,\delta)}$. For $k \in \omega$ we let

$$Y_k = \{\delta \in Y : \underset{\sim}{D}'_k(\delta) = \underset{\sim}{D}'^{\,M_\delta}_k\}.$$

Then $Y_k \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$ and thus also their intersection $Y' = \bigcap_{k\in\omega} Y_k$ is in $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$. For simplicity, we write just Y for Y'.

Assume that $\langle \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma) : \gamma \in Y \cap \delta\rangle$ has been defined. By the induction hypothesis on $(\mathbf{p}'_k, \pi_k)$, the $\mathbb{P}'_k$-names for ultrafilters $\underset{\sim}{D}'_k$ are defined and increasing in k.

We first consider the limit steps in the induction. Let $\delta \in Y$ be a limit of Y. First case: $\langle \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma) : \gamma < Y \cap \delta\rangle \notin M_\delta$. Then we let

$$1_{\mathbb{P}\cap\delta} \Vdash \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta) = \bigcup\{\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma) : \gamma \in Y \cap \delta\}.$$

Second case: $\langle \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma) : \gamma \in Y \cap \delta\rangle \in M_\delta$. We first show

$$1 \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}'_\omega\cap\delta} \underset{\sim}{F}'(\delta) := \underset{\sim}{E}'^{M_\delta} \cup \bigcup\{\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma) : \gamma \in Y \cap \delta\} \text{ is a filter base.”}$$

We assume, for a contradiction, that there are a condition $p \in \mathbb{P}'_\omega$, $k \in \omega$, and a $\gamma \in Y \cap \delta$ and there are names X, X', such that p forces that $X \in \underset{\sim}{D}'^{\,M_\delta}_k$ and $X' \in \underset{\sim}{E}'^{M_\delta}$, $\gamma \in Y \cap \delta$ such that $X \cap X'$ is empty. Then $p \restriction \mathbb{P}'_k \Vdash X \in \underset{\sim}{\tilde{D}}'_k \restriction \delta$. Let $\mathbf{G}_k$ be $\mathbb{P}'_k$-generic over N_δ with $p \restriction \mathbb{P}'_k \in \mathbf{G}_k$. We let

$$Z[\mathbf{G}_k] = \{n : (\exists \tilde{q} \in \mathbb{P}'_\omega \cap \delta/\mathbf{G}_k)(\tilde{q} \geq p[\mathbf{G}_k] \wedge \tilde{q} \Vdash n \in X'[\mathbf{G}_k] \cap X)\}.$$

Since $\mathbf{p}_k$ is a condition the name $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma){\restriction}\delta$ is an ultrafilter compatible with $\underset{\sim}{D}'_k(\gamma)$. Therefore we have that $p \restriction \mathbb{P}'_k \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}'_k}$ “$Z[\mathbf{G}_k]$ is infinite.” Now we take $n \in \omega$, $\tilde{q}$ as in the definition of $Z[\mathbf{G}_k]$, so that $\tilde{q} \Vdash n \in X \cap X'$. So we have a contradiction. Hence for any $\gamma \in Y \cap \delta$, the weakest condition forces that $\underset{\sim}{E}' \restriction \delta \cup \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma)$ is a filter basis. Since the names $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma)$ are forced to be increasing with $\gamma \in Y \cap \delta$, also their union, $\underset{\sim}{F}'(\delta)$, is forced to be a filter basis. Now we choose a name $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta) \in M_\delta$ for an ultrafilter that extends $\underset{\sim}{F}'(\delta)$.

Now we consider the beginning and the successor steps of the induction. For the beginning, let $\gamma = -1$, $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(-1) = \underset{\sim}{E}'$ and let $\delta = \min(Y)$, and for the successor let δ be the successor of $\gamma \in Y$, i.e., $\delta = \mathrm{next}(Y, \gamma)$. Then $N_\gamma \in M_\delta$. We extend $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma)$ to $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta) \in M_\delta$ so that $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta)$ is a $\mathbb{P}' \cap \delta$-name for an ultrafilter such that

$$\begin{aligned} &1_{\mathbb{P} \cap \delta} \Vdash \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta) \supseteq \underset{\sim}{F}(\delta) := (\underset{\sim}{E}' \restriction \delta) \cup \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\gamma) \\ &\cup \{\{n \in \omega : \eta_\gamma(n) \geq \underset{\sim}{f}(n)\} : \underset{\sim}{f} \in M_\gamma \text{ a } \mathbb{P}'_\omega \cap \delta\text{-name for a function}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma \in Y$, we can restrict the considerations to $\mathbb{P}'_\omega \cap \gamma$ names $\underset{\sim}{f}$. Again we show that the weakest condition forces that $\underset{\sim}{F}(\delta)$ has the finite intersection property. Let $q_0 \in \mathbb{P}'_\omega \cap \delta$ be given. Let q_0 force that $\underset{\sim}{A}_1$ be a name of a member of $\underset{\sim}{D}'_k \restriction \delta$ and $q_0 \Vdash \underset{\sim}{A}_2 \in \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta)$ and $A_3 = \{n : \eta_\gamma(n) > \underset{\sim}{f}(n)\}$. Now in M_δ we define a $(\mathbb{P}'_k \cap \delta)$-name $\underset{\sim}{A}_{23}$ as follows: if $\mathbf{G}_k \subseteq \mathbb{P}'_{\mathbf{p}_k}$, $q_0 \restriction \mathbb{P}'_k \in G_k$ is $\mathbb{P}'_k$-generic over M_δ we let

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\sim}{A}_{23}[\mathbf{G}_k] = \{n : (\exists \hat{q} \in (\mathbb{P}'_\omega \cap \delta)/\mathbf{G}_k) \\ (\hat{q} \geq q_0[\mathbf{G}_k] \wedge \hat{q} \Vdash (n \in \underset{\sim}{A}_2[\mathbf{G}_k] \wedge \eta_\gamma(n) \geq \underset{\sim}{f}[\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{p}_k}](n)))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $q_0 \restriction \mathbb{P}'_k \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}'_k} \underset{\sim}{A}_1 \cap \underset{\sim}{A}_{23}[\mathbf{G}_k]$ is infinite, since $\mathbb{P}'_k$ is already an approximation and η_γ is Cohen generic also over $M_\gamma[\mathbb{P}'_k]$, and hence $M_\gamma[\mathbb{P}'_k] \models \eta_\gamma \not\leq_{\underset{\sim}{D}'_k} f$. We take $\hat{q} \in (\mathbb{P}'_\omega \cap \delta)/\mathbf{G}_k$ and n as in the definition of $\underset{\sim}{A}_{23}[\mathbf{G}_k]$. Since $q_0 \restriction \mathbb{P}'_k$ is $\mathbb{P}'_k$-generic over M_δ, we may assume that $\hat{q} \restriction \mathbb{P}'_k \geq q_0$ and $\hat{q} \Vdash$ "$n \in \underset{\sim}{A}_1 \cap \underset{\sim}{A}_{23}$." Hence in M_δ there is a name for an ultrafilter $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta)$ containing $\underset{\sim}{F}(\delta)$, and we choose and fix the $<_\chi$-least one and call it $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta)$. Since $N_\gamma \subseteq M_\delta$ and $N_\gamma \in M_\delta$, $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta) \cap \mathcal{P}(\omega)^{N_\gamma}$ is an ultrafilter in N_γ.

Now the induction on $\delta \in Y$ is carried out. We choose a name $\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}'_\omega \Vdash \underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega = \bigcup \{\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega(\delta) : \delta \in Y\}.$$

We mirror the construction back to the class K^2: by letting $\underset{\sim}{D}_\omega = \bar{\pi}(\underset{\sim}{D}'_\omega)$.

(D) Let $\mathbf{p} \in K^2$ be given. We write $\mathbf{p}_i = (\mathbb{P}_i, \underset{\sim}{D}_i)$, $i < \omega_1$. The strategy of the protagonist is to choose in addition to $\mathbf{p}_i \geq_{AP} \mathbf{q}_j$ for $j < i$, on the side also $\mathbf{p}'_i = (\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i) \in K^1$ and $\pi_i \colon \mathbb{P}'_i \to \mathbb{P}_i$ and $\xi_i \in \omega_1$ with the following properties:

(a) $\langle \xi_i : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ is continuously increasing.
(b) $(\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i) \in K^1$, $\mathbb{P}'_i \setminus \bigcup\{\mathbb{P}'_j : j < i\} \subseteq [\xi_i + 1, \omega_1)$.
(c) π_i is a isomorphism from $\mathbb{P}'_i$ onto $\mathbb{P}_i$ mapping $\underset{\sim}{D}'_i$ onto $\underset{\sim}{D}_i$.
(d) For $j < i$, $\pi_j \subseteq \pi_i$ (so the $\mathbb{P}'_i$ are $\subseteq$-increasing in ω_1).
(e) For $j < i$, $(\mathbb{P}'_j, \underset{\sim}{D}'_j) \leq_{AP^1} (\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i)$ and $(\mathbb{P}_j, \underset{\sim}{D}_j) \leq_{AP} (\mathbb{P}_i, \underset{\sim}{D}_i)$.
(f) If $k < j \leq i$, $p \in \mathbb{P}'_k$ and $q \in \mathbb{P}'_j \cap \xi_i$ and p and q are compatible in $\mathbb{P}'_i$, then they are compatible with a witness in $\mathbb{P}'_i \cap \xi_i$. (Then the proof of [She98, Claim 3.2] for showing that also $\mathbb{P}_i$ has the $\bar{N}$-c.c. works.)
(g) If $i = j + 1 < \omega_1$ is a successor ordinal, then COM chooses $\mathbf{p}_i = \mathbf{q}_j$.
(h) If $i < \omega_1$ is a limit ordinal and if there is $j(*) < i$ such that

$$H = \bigcap\{Y(\mathbb{P}'_j, \underset{\sim}{D}'_j) : j \in [j(*), i)\} \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}},$$

then player COM takes for $\mathbf{p}_i$ the limit of a countable cofinal sequence of $\mathbf{q}_j$'s in the manner described in (C). Thus

$$H \subseteq Y(\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i). \tag{2.4}$$

If there is no such $j(*)$, then COM can play just any lower bound of the countable sequence $\mathbf{q}_j$, $j < i$. For a set of $i \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$ there is such a $j(*) < i$ with Equation (2.4).

Now if $\mathbf{p}'_i$, $i < \omega_1$, are defined, in the ω_1-limit COM chooses $\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}$ as the direct limit. Then Equation (2.4) implies that

$$Y(\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1}) \supseteq \triangle_{i \in \omega_1} Y(\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i) \cap \{i : \xi_i = i\},$$

and hence $Y(\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1}) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$. Hence

$$1_{\mathbb{P}'} \Vdash \underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1} = \bigcup_{i<\omega_1} \underset{\sim}{D}'_i \text{ is an ultrafilter extending } \underset{\sim}{D}'_i, i < \omega_1.$$

We mirror the primed objects via $\bigcup_{j<\omega_1} \pi_j$ back to K^2 and thus we get a forcing $\mathbb{P}_{\omega_1} = \bigcup\{\mathbb{P}_i : i < \omega\}$ and a $\mathbb{P}_{\omega_1}$-name $\underset{\sim}{D}_{\omega_1}$ for an ultrafilter over ω. The protagonist COM hence has won the play of the completeness game. ∎

Definition 2.20: Let $\mathbf{G}_{AP}$ be an AP-generic filter. In $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}_{AP}]$ we let

$$\mathbb{Q} = \bigcup\{\mathbb{P} : (\exists \underset{\sim}{D})\ (\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D}) \in \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{G}}_{AP}\}$$

and let $\underset{\sim}{E}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-name such that

$$\mathbb{Q} \Vdash \underset{\sim}{E} = \bigcup\{\underset{\sim}{D} : (\exists \mathbb{P})\ (\mathbb{P}, \underset{\sim}{D}) \in \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{G}}_{AP}\}.$$

We let $\underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}$ be an AP-name for $\mathbb{Q}$ and we use the symbol $\underaccent{\tilde}{E}$ also for an AP-name for $\underaccent{\tilde}{E}$.

LEMMA 2.21:

(a) $\Vdash_{AP} \underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}$ *is a c.c.c. forcing of cardinality* $\aleph_2$,
(b) $\Vdash_{AP} \underaccent{\tilde}{E}$ *is a* $\underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}$*-name of a non-principal ultrafilter and* $\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$,
(c) *if* $(\mathbb{P}, \underaccent{\tilde}{D}) \in AP$, *then* $(\mathbb{P}, \underaccent{\tilde}{D}) \Vdash_{AP} (\underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}} \Vdash \langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ *is a* $\leq_{\underaccent{\tilde}{E}}$*-increasing sequence and cofinal in* $\omega^\omega/\underaccent{\tilde}{E})$.

Proof. For (a), see [She98, Ch. IV, Claim 1.6]. Now we prove (b). By the c.c.c. and the construction with direct limits, for every $AP * \underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}$-name τ for a real there are a pair $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbb{P}, \underaccent{\tilde}{D}) \in AP$ and a condition $p \in \mathbb{P}$, and a $\mathbb{P}$-name real τ' for such that $(\mathbf{p}, p) \Vdash_{AP*\underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}} \tau' = \tau$.

(c) We work with the approximation forcing AP^1. Suppose for a contradiction that $((\mathbb{P}, \underaccent{\tilde}{D}), p) \Vdash_{AP^1 * \underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}} (\exists f \in {}^\omega\omega)(f \geq_{\underaccent{\tilde}{E}} \langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle)$. Then there is $((\mathbb{P}', \underaccent{\tilde}{D}'), p') \geq_{AP^1} ((\mathbb{P}, \underaccent{\tilde}{D}), p)$ and there is a canonical $\mathbb{P}'$-name $\underaccent{\tilde}{h}$ such that

$$((\mathbb{P}', \underaccent{\tilde}{D}'), p') \Vdash_{AP^1 * \underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}} \underaccent{\tilde}{h} \geq_{\underaccent{\tilde}{E}} \langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle. \tag{2.5}$$

Since $\underaccent{\tilde}{h}$ is a name of a real in the c.c.c. forcing $\mathbb{P}'$, there are some $\delta_0 < \omega_1$, $\underaccent{\tilde}{h}' \in M_{\delta_0}$ such that $\underaccent{\tilde}{h}'$ is a $\mathbb{P}' \cap \delta_0$-name such that $((\mathbb{P}', \underaccent{\tilde}{D}'), p') \Vdash_{AP^1 * \underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}} \underaccent{\tilde}{h} = \underaccent{\tilde}{h}'$. We fix such a δ_0, $\underaccent{\tilde}{h}'$. Since $(\mathbb{P}', \underaccent{\tilde}{D}') \in K^1$, by Lemma 2.8 there is $\delta \geq \delta_0$ such that

$$N_\delta \models (\forall h \in M_\delta[G_{\mathbb{P}' \cap \delta}])(h \not\geq_{\underaccent{\tilde}{D}'[G_{\mathbb{P}' \cap \delta}]} \eta_\delta).$$

We take a condition $q \in \mathbb{P}' \cap \delta$, $q \geq_{\mathbb{P}'} p'$, forcing $\forall h \in M_\delta[G_{\mathbb{P}'}] h \not\geq_{\underaccent{\tilde}{D}'} \eta_\delta$. Thus $((\mathbb{P}', \underaccent{\tilde}{D}'), q') \geq ((\mathbb{P}', \underaccent{\tilde}{D}'), p')$ and this is a contradiction to Equation (2.5). ∎

Now we show that the union of the generic filter of the approximation forcing, i.e., the $\underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}$ as given in Lemma 2.21, fulfils $\Vdash_{AP*\underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}} \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) = \aleph_2$. The conditions of the form $((\mathbb{P}_*, \underaccent{\tilde}{D}_*), p)$ with $p \in \mathbb{P}_*$ are dense in $AP * \underaccent{\tilde}{\mathbb{Q}}$.

A forcing destroying a given increasing cofinal chain of subgroups $\langle G_i : i < \omega_1\rangle$ of $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ is written down in [MS11]. Such a forcing adds one particular real, a new permutation g that for cofinally many $i < \omega_1$ there is $f_i \in G_{i+1} \setminus G_i$ such that $g \circ f_i \circ g^{-1} \in G_i$. Thus in the extension we have $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(\omega) \setminus \bigcup\{G_i : i < \omega_1\}$ and the sequence $\langle G_i : i < \omega_1\rangle$ is not cofinal any more.

In the rest of this section we construct a variant of such a forcing that adds such a conjugator and at the same time has the $\bar{N}$-oracle c.c. We first show that we can work with convenient supports of permutations.

Lemma 2.22: *Suppose that a chain of subgroups $\langle G_i : i < \omega_1\rangle$ is an increasing chain of subgroups of* $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ *such that all permutations that move only finitely many elements are elements of G_0. Suppose that $U \subseteq \omega_1$ is uncountable and there are*

$$\langle \zeta_i^1, \zeta_i^2, f_i^1, f_i^2 : i \in U\rangle \text{ and } g$$

with the following properties:

1. *for $i < j \in U$, $i \le \zeta_i^1 < \zeta_i^2 < j$,*
2. *for $i \in U$, $f_i^1 \in G_{\zeta_i^1}$ and $f_i^2 \in G_{\zeta_i^2} \setminus G_{\zeta_i^1}$, and*
3. *for $i \in U$, $(\forall^\infty n)((g \circ f_i^1)(n) = (f_i^2 \circ g)(n))$.*

Then $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(\omega) \setminus \bigcup\{G_i : i \in \omega_1\}$.

Proof. If $g \in G_{\zeta_i^1}$ for some $i \in U$, then by (3) also $f_i^2 \in G_{\zeta_i^1}$, contradiction. ∎

For carrying this out we use some notions describing permutation groups.

Definition 2.23: Let $f\colon \omega \to \omega$. $\mathrm{supp}(f) = \{n : f(n) \neq n\}$.

Observation 2.24: If $f \in \mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$, then $f[\mathrm{supp}(f)] = \mathrm{supp}(f)$.

For $f \in \mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$, we say f has order 2 if $f \circ f$ is the identity.

For arguing with given supports, we use

Lemma 2.25 ([MS11, Lemma 3.3]): *If $\langle G_i : i < \omega_1\rangle$ is an increasing sequence of proper subgroups of* $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ *with union* $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$, *and G_0 contains all permutations with finite support, then for any $W \in [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$ the sequence*

$$\langle G_i \cap \{f \in \mathrm{Sym}(\omega) : \mathrm{supp}(f) \subseteq W \wedge f \text{ is of order } 2\} : i < \omega_1\rangle$$

is not eventually constant.

Now we return to forcing.

Lemma 2.26: $\Vdash_{AP * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}}$ "$\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) = \aleph_2$".

Proof. Assume towards a contradiction:

- $\oplus_1$ $((\mathbb{P}_*, \underset{\sim}{D}_*), p_*) \Vdash_{AP*\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}}$ "$\langle \underset{\sim}{G}_i : i < \omega_1\rangle$ is an increasing sequence of proper subgroups of $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ with union $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$, and $\underset{\sim}{G}_0$ contains all permutations with finite support".
- $\oplus_2$ By Lemma 2.25, $\oplus_1$ implies: $((\mathbb{P}_*, \underset{\sim}{D}_*), p_*) \Vdash_{AP*\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}}$ "if $W \in [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$ then $\langle \underset{\sim}{G}_i \cap \{f \in \mathrm{Sym}(\omega) : \mathrm{supp}(f) \subseteq W \wedge f$ is of order $2\} : i < \omega_1\rangle$ is not eventually constant".

$\oplus_3$ We let $\langle m_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}\omega\rangle$ be a sequence of natural numbers without repetitions. For $\eta \in {}^\omega\omega$ we let $W(\eta) = \{m_{\eta\restriction n} : n \in \omega\}$. Then for $\eta \neq \eta'$ and $k = \min\{n : \eta(n) \neq \eta'(n)\}$ we have

$$W(\eta) \cap W(\eta') = \{m_{\eta\restriction n} : n < k\}.$$

By induction on $i < \omega_1$ we choose $\mathbf{p}_i = (\mathbb{P}_i, \underset{\sim}{D}_i) \in AP$, π_i, $\mathbf{p}'_i \in AP^1$, $\xi_i \in \omega_1$, and $(\mathbf{p}_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{p}'_i, \xi_i, \underset{\sim}{\zeta}^1_i, \underset{\sim}{\zeta}^2_i, \underset{\sim}{f}^1_i, \underset{\sim}{f}^2_i, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{R}}'_i, Y(\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i))$ such that:

(a) $\mathbf{p}_0 = \mathbf{p}_*$, $Y(\mathbb{P}'_0, \underset{\sim}{D}'_0) = Y(\mathbb{P}_*, \underset{\sim}{D}_*)$.

(b) $\mathbf{p}_i = ((\mathbb{P}_i, \underset{\sim}{D}_i), p_*) \in AP * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $j < i \to \mathbf{p}_j \leq_{AP} \mathbf{p}_i$.

(c) $\mathbf{p}'_i = ((\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i), p_*) \in AP^1 * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ satisfies

(α) $\mathbb{P}'_0 \cap \{\xi_i : i < \omega_1\} = \emptyset$, the set of members of

$$\mathbb{P}'_i \setminus \bigcup\{\mathbb{P}'_j : j < i\} \subseteq [\xi_i + 1, \omega_1),$$

hence $\mathbb{P}'_i \cap \xi_i = \mathbb{P}'_j \cap \xi_i$ for any $j \geq i$,

(β) $\pi_i \colon \mathbb{P}'_i \to \omega_1$ is a one-to-one function mapping $\mathbb{P}'_i$ onto $\mathbb{P}_i$ and mapping $\underset{\sim}{D}'_i$ onto $\underset{\sim}{D}_i$,

(γ) if $j < i$, then $\pi_j \subseteq \pi_i$,

(δ) $\langle \xi_i : i < \omega_1\rangle$ has the properties (a) to (d) of the proof of Lemma 2.19 (D) with respect to the sequence $\langle \mathbf{p}'_i, \pi_i : i < \omega_1\rangle$,

(ε) the set $Y(\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i)$ witnesses that $(\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_1) \in K^1$ as in Definition 2.11(1)(c).

(d) At double successor steps of limit ordinals we add a new Cohen real: If $i = \omega j + 1$ then $\mathbb{P}'_{i+1} = \mathbb{P}'_i * ({}^{\omega>}\omega, \lhd)$, we let $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_i$ be a name for a $({}^{\omega>}\omega, \lhd)$-generic real. So $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_i$ is a Cohen real over $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}'_{\omega\cdot j}}$. Since $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}'_i}$ is unbounded in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}'_{i+1}}$ by Lemma 2.7, there is a $\mathbb{P}_{i+1}$-name for an ultrafilter $\underset{\sim}{D}_{i+1}$. The set

$$Y(\mathbb{P}_{i+1}, \underset{\sim}{D}_{i+1}) = Y(\mathbb{P}_i, \underset{\sim}{D}_i) \cap [i+1, \omega) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$$

witnesses that $(\mathbb{P}'_{i+1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{i+1}) \in K^1$.

(e) Also, if $i = \omega j + 1$ then we choose $\underset{\sim}{D}'_{i+1}$ such that

$$(\mathbb{P}'_{i+1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{i+1}) \geq_{AP} (\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \underset{\sim}{G}_\ell \cap \mathcal{P}(\omega)^{\mathbb{P}'_j} : \ell < \omega_1\rangle$$

and even $\langle \underset{\sim}{G}_\ell \cap \mathcal{P}(\omega)^{\mathbb{P}'_i} : \ell < \omega_1\rangle$ is a $\mathbb{P}'_i$-name.

(f) Also at double successors to limit ordinals we fix witnessing functions with the new Cohen ν_i as information in their support, i.e., if $i = \omega \cdot j + 1$ then

(α) for $\ell = 1, 2$, $\mathbf{p}'_{i+1}$ forces that $i < \underset{\sim}{\zeta}^1_i < \underset{\sim}{\zeta}^2_i$,

(β) and for $\ell = 1, 2$, $\mathbf{p}'_{i+1}$ forces that $\underset{\sim}{f}^2_i \in G_{\underset{\sim}{\zeta}^2_i} \setminus G_{\underset{\sim}{\zeta}^1_i}$, $\underset{\sim}{f}^1_i \in G_{\underset{\sim}{\zeta}^1_i}$ is a $\mathbb{P}'_{i+1}$-name of a member of $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ of order 2 such that

$$\mathbb{P}'_{i+1} \Vdash \mathrm{supp}(f^\ell_i) \subseteq \underset{\sim}{w}^\ell_i = W(\langle \ell \rangle ^\frown \underset{\sim}{\nu}_i).$$

Here $\langle \ell \rangle ^\frown \nu$ is the concatenation of the singleton $\langle \ell \rangle$ and ν, i.e., $(\langle \ell \rangle ^\frown \nu)(k) = \ell$ if $k = 0$, and $= \nu(k-1)$ else. Recall that for $\eta \in {}^\omega\omega$, $W(\eta)$ has been defined in $\oplus_3$.

By Lemma 2.25, the desired names for countable ordinals $\underset{\sim}{\zeta}^1_i$, $\underset{\sim}{\zeta}^2_i$ and names $\underset{\sim}{f}^1_i$, $\underset{\sim}{f}^2_i$ exist. The triple $\mathbf{p}'_i \in AP * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ stays unchanged.

(g) At limit steps $i < \omega_1$, we let $(\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i)$ be a lower bound of $(\mathbb{P}_j, \underset{\sim}{D}_j)$, $j < i$, as in Lemma 2.19(C). We let $Y(\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$ be a witness to $(\mathbb{P}'_i \underset{\sim}{D}'_i) \in K^1$.

(h) Now finally we explain the order $\mathbb{P}_{i+1}$ for countable limit ordinals i. We let

$$H = \bigcap \{Y(\mathbb{P}'_\varepsilon, \underset{\sim}{D}'_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < i\}.$$

Then $H \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$. We let Y_i, ξ_i be as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i =& \{\delta \in H : (\forall j < i)(\xi_j < \delta) \wedge (\forall j_1 \in i) \\ & \quad ((\underset{\sim}{\zeta}^1_{j_1}, \underset{\sim}{\zeta}^2_{j_1}, \underset{\sim}{f}^1_{j_1}, \underset{\sim}{f}^2_{j_1}) \in M_\delta \wedge N_{j_1} \in M_\delta \\ & \quad \wedge \underset{\sim}{\zeta}^1_{j_1}, \underset{\sim}{\zeta}^2_{j_1}, \underset{\sim}{f}^1_{j_1}, \underset{\sim}{f}^2_{j_1} \text{ are } \mathbb{P}'_i \cap \delta\text{-names})\}, \\ \xi_i =& \min(Y_i). \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Then $Y_i \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$. Since any element of $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$ is unbounded in ω_1, the ordinal ξ_i is well-defined. We define $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{R}}'_i \in M_{\xi_i}$: $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{R}}'_i$ is a $\mathbb{P}'_i \cap \xi_i$-name of a c.c.c. forcing notion. Recall that w^1_ε, w^2_ε, $\varepsilon < \xi_i$, ε successor ordinal, are defined in $\oplus_3$(f)(β). The key fact to the $\bar{N}$-c.c. is that these names are so faintly related to the Cohen reals $\langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$. The following is forced by $\mathbb{P}'_i \cap \xi_i$: A member of $\mathbb{R}'_i$ has the form (u, g) such that:

(α) $u \subseteq \{\omega \cdot j + 1 : \omega \cdot j + 1 \in \xi_i\}$ is finite, g a finite partial permutation of order two, $\mathrm{dom}(g) \subseteq \bigcup_{\varepsilon \in u} w^2_\varepsilon$, such that $\varepsilon \in u$ implies $\mathrm{range}(g) \subseteq w^1_\varepsilon$.

(β) Recall that for $\eta \in {}^{\omega >}\omega$, m_η has been defined in $\oplus_3$. The sets $\mathrm{dom}(g)$ and $\mathrm{range}(g)$ are sufficiently large in the following sense:

- if $\delta \neq \varepsilon \in u$ then we fix n, such that $\nu_\delta \restriction n \neq \nu_\varepsilon \restriction n$ and then require that for $k = 1, 2$ the set

$$\{m_{\langle k\rangle ^\frown \nu_\delta \restriction \ell} : \ell < n\} \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(g) \cap \mathrm{range}(g),$$

- $\forall \varepsilon \in \mathrm{dom}(p)$, if ε is Cohen coordinate (as in $\oplus_3$(d)) and $p(\varepsilon) \in 2^n$, $\ell \leq n$, $k = 1, 2$, then

$$m_{\langle k\rangle ^\frown p(\varepsilon)\restriction \ell} \in \mathrm{dom}(g) \cap \mathrm{range}(g).$$

(γ) If $\varepsilon \in u$ then $\mathrm{dom}(g) \cap w^2_\varepsilon$ is closed under f^1_ε and $\mathrm{range}(g) \cap w^1_\varepsilon$ is closed under f^2_ε.

(δ) For $(u_1, g_1), (u_2, g_2) \in \mathbb{R}'_i$ we let $(u_1, g_1) \leq (u_2, g_2)$ iff
 (i) $u_1 \subseteq u_2$,
 (ii) $g_1 \subseteq g_2$,
 (iii) $(\forall \varepsilon \in u_1)(\forall n \in w^2_\varepsilon \cap (\mathrm{dom}(g_2) \setminus \mathrm{dom}(g_1))(g_2(n) \in w^1_\varepsilon \wedge f^2_\varepsilon(g_2(n)) = g_2(f^1_\varepsilon(n)))$.

We let $\mathbb{P}'_{i+1} = \mathbb{P}'_i * \mathbb{R}'_i$.
Since $\mathbb{R}'_i$ is countable, $\mathbb{P}'_{i+1}$ has the $\bar{N}$-c.c., and again by Lemma 2.7 we find $\underset{\sim}{D}'_{i+1}$ such that $(\mathbb{P}'_{i+1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{i+1}) \in K^1$ with witness

$$Y(\mathbb{P}_{i+1}, \underset{\sim}{D}_{i+1}) = Y_i \cap [\xi_i, \omega_1).$$

$\oplus_4$ Once the induction is performed, we define $\mathbf{p}_{\omega_1} = (\mathbb{P}_{\omega_1}, \underset{\sim}{D}_{\omega_1})$ and $\mathbf{p}'_{\omega_1} \in K^1$ and $\pi = \bigcup_{i<\omega_1} \pi_i$ which maps $\mathbf{p}'_{\omega_1}$ onto $\mathbf{p}_{\omega_1}$ as follows:
 (a) $\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1} = \bigcup\{(\mathbb{P}'_i \cap \xi_i) * \mathbb{R}'_i : i < \omega_1, i \text{ limit}\}$.
 (b) $\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1} \Vdash \underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1} = \bigcup\{\underset{\sim}{D}'_i : i < \omega_1, i \text{ limit}\}$.
 (c) $\pi = \bigcup_{i<\omega_1} \pi_i$ is an isomorphism from $\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}$ onto $\mathbb{P}_{\omega_1}$ mapping $\underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1}$ to $\underset{\sim}{D}_{\omega_1}$.
 (d) $\bigwedge_{i<\omega_1} \mathbf{p}_i \leq \mathbf{p}_{\omega_1} \in K^2$, $\bigwedge_{i<\omega_1} \mathbf{p}'_i \leq \mathbf{p}'_{\omega_1} \in K^1$.

We show that $\mathbf{p}'_{\omega_1} \in K^1$. We let $Y(\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1})$ be the diagonal intersection of the $Y(\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i)$ intersected with the set of i such that for any $j < i$, $\xi_j < i$. Since $\mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$ is a normal filter, $Y(\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1}) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$. We show that this set witnesses Definition 2.11(1)(c). To this end, we prove the following claim.

Claim: *Suppose that $i \in Y(\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1})$. The forcing $\mathbb{P}'_i \cap \xi_i$ forces the following: If $i_1 < i$, $i_1 \in Y(\mathbb{P}'_i, \underset{\sim}{D}'_i)$, then $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{R}}'_{i_1} \subseteq_{ic} \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{R}}'_i$ and if $D_0 \in N_{i_1}$ is a predense subset of $\mathbb{P}'_{i_1} \cap \xi_{i_1} * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{R}}'_{i_1}$ then D_0 is predense in $\mathbb{P}'_i \cap \xi_i * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{R}}'_i$.*

We prove this claim: $\mathbb{P}'_i \cap \xi_i \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{R}}'_{i_1} \subseteq_{ic} \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{R}}'_i$ follows from the definition of the orders $\mathbb{R}'_j$.

Assume that $D_0 \in N_{i_1}$ is an open dense subset of $\mathbb{P}'_{i_1} \cap \xi_{i_1} * \mathbb{R}_{i_1}$, and $p = (p \restriction \xi_{i_1}, p(\xi_{i_1})) \in (\mathbb{P}'_i \cap i * \mathbb{R}'_i)$. We have to find a condition in $q \in D_0$ that is compatible with p. Assume that $p \cap \xi_{i_1} \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}'_{\xi_{i_1}}} p(i_1) = (u, g)$ and u, g are pinned down in $\mathbf{V}$, not names. After possibly strengthening p and g we can assume that g is so strong that it fulfils:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{dom}(g) \supseteq &\{m_{p(\beta)\restriction k} : \beta \in \mathrm{supp}(p), \beta \text{ successor ordinal}, \\ &\qquad \beta \in u, k \leq |p(\beta)| \wedge \mathbb{P}'_\beta = \mathbb{P}'_{\beta-1} * ({}^{\omega>}\omega, \lhd)\}; \\ \mathrm{range}(g) \supseteq &\{(f^1_\beta)(m_{p(\beta)}) : \beta \in \mathrm{supp}(p), \beta \text{ successor ordinal}, \\ &\qquad \beta \in u,\, k \leq |p(\beta)| \wedge \mathbb{P}'_\beta = \mathbb{P}'_{\beta-1} * ({}^{\omega>}\omega, \lhd)\}.\end{aligned}$$

After possibly further strengthening p we can assume that $p \restriction \xi_{i_1}$ determines ζ^j_β for $j = 1, 2$ and determines $\underset{\sim}{f}^2_\beta$ restricted to the set on the right-hand side of the first eqution, and determines $\underset{\sim}{f}^1_\beta$ on the right-hand side of the second equation for any $\beta \in u$. We assume the analogous strength of p' for all triples $(p', (u', g'))$ appearing later in the proof. We assume that $\mathrm{dom}(g) \in \omega$ and that $\mathrm{dom}(g)$ is larger than any $W^2_\varepsilon \cap W^2_\zeta$ for $\varepsilon \neq \zeta \in u$ and that $\mathrm{range}(g)$ is a superset of $W^1_\varepsilon \cap W^1_\zeta$ for $\varepsilon \neq \zeta \in u$.

Now we choose $p_0 = (p \restriction \xi_{i_1}, (u \cap \xi_{i_1}, g)) \in M_{\xi_{i_1}}$. We choose $q_0 = (q_0 \restriction \xi_{i_1}, (u_{q_0}, g_{q_0})) \geq p_0$, $q_0 \in D \cap \xi_{i_1} \cap M_{\xi_{i_1}}$. Then q_0 does not determine more of the Cohen real ν_ε for $\varepsilon \in u_{q_0}$ than p_0 does. Then we take $q_1 \geq q_0$ such that

$$q_1 = (q_0 \restriction \xi_{i_1} \cup \{(\varepsilon, q_1(\varepsilon)) : \varepsilon \in u_{q_0} \setminus \xi_{i_1}\}, (u_{q_0}, g_{q_0}))$$

where for each $\varepsilon \in u \setminus \xi_{i_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}q_1(\varepsilon) \Vdash &W(0^\frown \underset{\sim}{\nu}_\varepsilon) \cap (\mathrm{dom}(g_{q_0}) \setminus \mathrm{dom}(g)) = \emptyset \\ &\qquad \wedge W(1^\frown \underset{\sim}{\nu}_\varepsilon) \cap (\mathrm{range}(g_{q_0}) \setminus \mathrm{range}(g)) = \emptyset.\end{aligned}$$

This special point (not in [She98, Ch. IV], [She06]) is that the $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_i$, i sucessor of a countable limit ordinal, η_δ, $\delta \in S$, are just Cohen reals: Defining relevant generic objects that have a Cohen real as domain allows us to carry on the oracle-c.c. and thus to preserve the Cohenness of the η_δ. This main trick is also used in the next section. Now q_1 is compatible with p.

Thus $Y(\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1}) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{N}}$ is a witness for the oracle-c.c. of $\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}$, as required in Definition 2.11(1)(c)(β). The other properties in Definition 2.11(1)(c) follow now for $i \in Y(\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1})$ by the inductive definition of the $\mathbb{P}'_i$.

This finishes the construction of a stronger member in AP-forcing.

$\oplus_5$ Let

$$\underset{\sim}{g} = \bigcup\{g : \exists p \exists u (p, (u, g)) \in \mathbf{G}_{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}}}\},$$

$$\underset{\sim}{U} = \bigcup\{u : \exists p \exists g (p, (u, g)) \in \mathbf{G}_{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}}}\}.$$

We show

$$((\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}, \underset{\sim}{D}'_{\omega_1}), p_*) \Vdash_{AP*\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}} |\underset{\sim}{U} = \aleph_1| \wedge \text{“}\underset{\sim}{g} \notin \bigcup\{\underset{\sim}{G}_i : i < \omega_1\}\text{”}.$$

Proof. We fix a generic filter $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}}$. By the construction of $\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}$ we have

$$(\forall i < j \in S \cap C)(\underset{\sim}{f}^\ell_i \in M_j \wedge \underset{\sim}{f}^\ell_i \text{ is a } \mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1} \cap j\text{-name}).$$

The forcing $\mathbb{P}'_{\omega_1}$ adds a $g \colon \bigcup_{\varepsilon \in U} w^2_\varepsilon \to \bigcup_{\varepsilon \in U} w^1_\varepsilon$ that conjugates for $i \in U$, $f^1_i \in G_{\zeta^1_i}$ and $f^2_i \in G_{\zeta^2_i} \setminus G_{\zeta^1_i}$. If $i \in U$ then

$$\mathrm{dom}(f^\ell_i) = w^\ell_i = W_{\langle \ell \rangle ^\frown \nu_i}$$

and g conjugates f^1_i and f^2_i up to a finite mistake, by $\oplus_3$ item (i)(δ)(iii). So, for each $i \in U$, $g \circ f^1_i \circ g^{-1} = f^2_i$ up to finitely many arguments. But g is in some subgroup G_j. So for $\zeta^1_i > i > j$, $i \in X$, $f^2_i \in G_{\zeta^1_i}$, contradiction. ∎

End of proof of Theorem 2.1. We assume that $S \subseteq \omega_1$ is stationary and $\mathbf{V} \models \diamondsuit^-_S$. We extend $\mathbf{V}$ with the forcing poset $AP * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$. By Lemma 2.21, $\mathfrak{mcf} = \aleph_1$ in the extension, and by Lemma 2.26, $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) = \aleph_2$. ∎

3. On Con($\mathfrak{b} = \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) < \mathfrak{mcf}$)

Now we show that $\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{b} = \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) < \aleph_2 = \mathfrak{mcf}$ is consistent relative to ZFC. In [MST06] we established that it is consistent relative to ZFC that $\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{g} < \aleph_2 = \mathfrak{mcf}$. Brendle and Losada showed that $\mathfrak{g} \leq \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega))$ in ZFC; see [BL03]. So the following theorem gives another consistency proof for $\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{g} < \aleph_2 = \mathfrak{mcf}$.

THEOREM 3.1: *It is consistent relative to* ZFC *that* $\mathfrak{b} = \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) < \aleph_2 = \mathfrak{mcf}$.

For the proof we will again work with oracle c.c.-forcing. Let $D \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ be a filter over ω. Then we write D^+ for the D-positive sets, i.e., $X \in D^+$ iff $X \cap Y$ is infinite for any $Y \in D$.

Lemma 3.2: *Let $\kappa \geq \aleph_2$ be a cardinal in $\mathbf{V}$. The $(\mathrm{A})_\kappa$ implies $(\mathrm{B})_\kappa$.*

$(\mathrm{A})_\kappa$ *For every filter $D \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ over ω such that $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/D$ has the c.c.c. (that is: for every A_i, $i < \omega_1$, such that $A_i \in D^+$ there are $i \neq j$ such that $A_i \cap A_j \in D^+$), for every regular $\kappa_* < \kappa$, for every sequence $\langle f_i : i < \kappa_* \rangle$ of functions $f_i \in {}^\omega\omega$ there is $g \in {}^\omega\omega$ such that for unboundedly many $i < \kappa_*$, $\neg g \leq_D f_i$.*

$(\mathrm{B})_\kappa$ *After forcing with a c.c.c. ${}^\omega\omega$-bounding forcing $\mathbb{Q}$, in the extension $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ for every non-principal ultrafilter D on ω, $\mathrm{cf}({}^\omega\omega/D) \geq \kappa$, and $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{V}} = \mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}}$.*

Proof. Assume $(A)_\kappa$ and that $q_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ forces "$\underset{\sim}{D}$ is an ultrafilter over ω and $\langle \underset{\sim}{f}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa_* \rangle$ is increasing modulo $\underset{\sim}{D}$ and $\kappa_* < \kappa$". So κ_* is regular and uncountable in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ and hence regular and uncountable in $\mathbf{V}$. We shall show that there is $q_* \geq q_0$,

$$(\boxdot) \qquad q_* \Vdash \exists f \in ({}^\omega\omega) \bigwedge_{\alpha < \kappa_*} \underset{\sim}{f}_\alpha <_{\underset{\sim}{D}} f,$$

and thus we will have established $(B)_\kappa$.

Since $\mathbb{Q}$ is ${}^\omega\omega$-bounding and c.c.c., we can take $g_\alpha \in \mathbf{V}$ for $\alpha \in \kappa_*$ such that $q_0 \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{f}_\alpha \leq^* g_\alpha$".

We let

$$E = \{A \in \mathcal{P}(\omega)^{\mathbf{V}} : (\exists q \in \mathbb{Q})(q \geq q_0 \wedge q \Vdash \check{A} \in \underset{\sim}{D})\}$$

and we let

$$D' = \{A \in \mathcal{P}(\omega)^{\mathbf{V}} : q_0 \Vdash \check{A} \in \underset{\sim}{D}\}.$$

Then we have $E, D' \in \mathbf{V}$ and the following holds:

(1) D' is a filter over ω.

(2) $E \subseteq (D')^+$. Let $A \in E$, say $q \Vdash A \in \underset{\sim}{D}$, $q \geq q_0$ and let $B \in D'$. Then $q \Vdash A \in \underset{\sim}{D} \wedge B \in \underset{\sim}{D}$, so $q \Vdash$ "$A \cap B$ is infinite." Since $A, B \in \mathbf{V}$, $A \cap B$ is infinite. Since this holds for every $B \in D'$, item (2) is proved.

(3) $(D')^+ \subseteq E$. Suppose that $X \notin E$. Then $\forall q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $q \geq q_0$ implies that $q \nVdash X \in \underset{\sim}{D}$, so $q_0 \Vdash X \notin \underset{\sim}{D}$. Since $\underset{\sim}{D}$ is a name of an ultrafilter $q_0 \Vdash X^c \in \underset{\sim}{D}$. So $X^c \in D'$ and $X \notin (D')^+$.

(4) So together: $(D')^+ = E$.

(5) q_0 forces that D' is a c.c.c. filter. Proof: Let $q_0 \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} A_\alpha \in (D')^+ = E$ for $\alpha \in \omega_1$, via $q_\alpha \geq q_0$. Since $\mathbb{Q}$ is c.c.c. there are $\alpha \neq \beta$ such that $q_\alpha \not\perp q_\beta$. Then there is $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r \Vdash A_\alpha \in \underset{\sim}{D}, A_\beta \in \underset{\sim}{D}$, and hence $r \Vdash A_\alpha \cap A_\beta \in \underset{\sim}{D}$ since $\underset{\sim}{D}$ is forced to be a filter. So $A_\alpha \cap A_\beta \in D'^+$.

Let g be as in the condition $(A)_\kappa$, applied to D' and $\langle g_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$, so for some cofinal set $u \subseteq \kappa_*$ we have for $\alpha \in u \subseteq \kappa_*$, $\neg g \leq_{D'} g_\alpha$. Hence for $\alpha \in u$, $q_0 \nVdash \{n : g(n) \leq g_\alpha(n)\} \in \underset{\sim}{D}$ and there is

$$\tilde{q}_\alpha \geq q_0, \quad \tilde{q}_\alpha \Vdash \{n : g(n) \leq g_\alpha(n)\} \notin \underset{\sim}{D}.$$

Thus $\tilde{q}_\alpha \Vdash \{n : g(n) > g_\alpha(n)\} \in \underset{\sim}{D}$ and the choice of g_α implies

$$\tilde{q}_\alpha \Vdash \{n : g(n) > \underset{\sim}{f}_\alpha(n)\} \in \underset{\sim}{D}.$$

Since $\mathbb{Q}$ has the c.c.c., we have $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa_*) > \omega$. Therefore κ_*-many of the $\tilde{q}_\alpha$ are in the generic filter. So for any $\mathbb{Q}$-generic filter G with $q_0 \in G$ we have $\underset{\sim}{f}_\alpha[G] \leq_{\underset{\sim}{D}[G]} g$ for cofinally many $\alpha \in u$. Hence a condition $q_* \geq q_0$ forces this. Since the sequence $\langle \underset{\sim}{f}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa_* \rangle$ is $\leq_{\underset{\sim}{D}}$-increasing, we get $q_* \Vdash$ "$(\forall \alpha < \kappa_*)(\underset{\sim}{f}_\alpha \leq_{\underset{\sim}{D}} g)$." Thus Equation ($\boxdot$) and the first statement of $(\mathrm{B})_\kappa$ are proved.

Since the forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ is ${}^\omega\omega$-bounding, we have $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{V}} = \mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}}$. ∎

An example for such a $\mathbb{Q}$ is the forcing adding $\aleph_1$ random reals, in a countable support iteration or with the measure algebra over 2^{ω_1}. From now on, we let $\mathbb{Q}$ be one of these forcing for adding $\aleph_1$ random reals. In the extension $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ of Lemma 3.2 we have $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) = \aleph_1$ by [ST95, Theorem 1.6]. So if we succeed to establish the condition $(\mathrm{A})_\kappa$ of the lemma together with $\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$ for some $\kappa \geq \aleph_2$, Theorem 3.1 will be proved. We fix a stationary $S \subseteq \omega_1$ and take $\kappa = \aleph_2$ and we work again with oracle-c.c. forcings in order to establish the consistency of $(A)_{\aleph_2}$ and $\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$.

Lemma 3.3: *We assume that in $\mathbf{V}$, the set S is stationary in ω_1 and the two diamond principles $\diamondsuit_S$ and $\diamondsuit_{\{\delta < \aleph_2 : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_1\}}$ hold. Then there is an oracle c.c. forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ such that in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ we have $(A)_{\aleph_2}$ of the previous lemma, and $\mathfrak{b} = \omega_1$.*

Proof. We fix in $\mathbf{V}$ a $\leq^*$-increasing sequence $\langle g_\delta : \delta < \omega_1 \rangle$ that is $\leq^*$-unbounded. We fix an oracle $\bar{M} = \langle M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in S \rangle$ such that the $\bar{M}$-c.c. ensures that the type $\bigwedge_{\delta < \omega_1} x \geq^* g_\delta$ is omitted. Indeed, $\langle g_\delta : \delta \in \omega_1 \rangle \in M_0' \prec H(\chi)$ and M_0 being the Mostowski collapse of M_0' suffices for this. In addition we fix a $\diamondsuit_{\{\alpha < \aleph_2 : \mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \aleph_1\}}$-sequence $\langle T_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_2, \mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \aleph_1 \rangle \in M_0'$.

In the following α, α' will range over ω_2, $i, j, \varepsilon, \zeta, \xi$ over ω_1, and the letters β, γ, δ will denote particular functions with values in ω_2, ω_1, ω_1. We fix a bijection $b\colon 2^{<\omega} \to \omega$, a bijection $c\colon 2^\omega \cap \mathbf{V} \to \omega_1$ and another bijection $b_2\colon \aleph_2 \to (\mathcal{P}(H(\omega_1)))^2$. By $\diamondsuit_S$ and $\diamondsuit_{\{\alpha<\aleph_2 : \mathrm{cf}(\alpha)=\aleph_1\}}$ such bijections exist.

A finite support iteration $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta : \beta < \omega_2, \alpha \leq \omega_2 \rangle$ is constructed by induction on $\alpha \leq \omega_2$ with the following properties:

(1) $|\mathbb{P}_\alpha| \leq \aleph_1$ for $\alpha < \omega_2$,
(2) $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ has the $\bar{M}$-c.c.

For an odd stage $\alpha \in \omega_2$ we force via $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha = \mathbb{C}$, and we conceive Cohen forcing $\mathbb{C}$ in the form

$$\{p : p \text{ is a partial function from } 2^{<\omega} \text{ to } 2, |p| < \omega\}$$

and fix for $\eta \in 2^\omega \cap \mathbf{V}$ sets

$$A_{\alpha,\eta} = \{b((p(\eta \restriction 0), \dots, p(\eta \restriction n-1))) : n \in \omega, p \in G\} \subseteq \omega$$

in the extension by $\mathbb{C}$, where b is the bijection from above. Note that for $\eta \neq \eta'$, $A_{\alpha,\eta} \cap A_{\alpha,\eta'}$ is finite. We write $A'_{\alpha,\varepsilon} = A_{\alpha,c^{-1}(\varepsilon)}$. Then $|\mathbb{P}_{\alpha+1}| \leq \aleph_1$.

For even $\alpha < \omega_2$ we define $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ as follows: If $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) < \omega_1$, we let $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ be the trivial forcing, i.e., $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha = \{0\}$. Now let $\alpha > 0$. We assume that $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \subseteq \omega_1$. Then every canonical $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name $(\underset{\sim}{D}, \langle \underset{\sim}{f}_i : i < \omega_1 \rangle)$ for a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and an ω_1-sequence of reals is a subset of $H(\omega_1)$. We say that $T \subseteq \alpha$ codes the canonical name $(\underset{\sim}{D}, \langle \underset{\sim}{f}_i : i < \omega_1 \rangle)$ if $b_2[T] = (\underset{\sim}{D}, \langle \underset{\sim}{f}_i : i < \omega_1 \rangle)$.

If $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$ and T_α is a canonical $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name of a pair $(\underset{\sim}{D}, \langle \underset{\sim}{f}_{\alpha,i} : i < \omega_1 \rangle)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_\alpha \Vdash \text{“}\underset{\sim}{D} \text{ contains the cofinite sets and } \mathcal{P}(\omega)/\underset{\sim}{D} \text{ is c.c.c.”}$$

then we first fix in the ground model an increasing sequence $\langle \beta(\alpha, i) : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ that converges to α such that each $\beta(\alpha, i)$ is an odd member of ω_2.

Next we define by induction on $i < \omega$ countable ordinals as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(\alpha, 0) &= \min\{\varepsilon < \omega_1 : \underset{\sim}{f}_{\alpha,0} \in \mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_{\beta(\alpha,\varepsilon)}}\}, \\ \gamma(\alpha, i) &= \min\{\varepsilon < \omega_1 : \underset{\sim}{f}_{\alpha,i} \in \mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_{\beta(\alpha,\varepsilon)}} \wedge (\forall j < i)(\varepsilon > \gamma(\alpha, j))\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Later it will be important that the $\gamma(\alpha, i)$, $i < \omega_1$, are pairwise different.

Then for each $i < \omega_1$ we choose with the maximum principle a name $\delta(\alpha, i) \in \omega_1$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_\alpha \Vdash (\omega \setminus A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,i)),\delta(\alpha,i)}) \in \underset{\sim}{D}. \tag{3.2}$$

We do not write the tildes under the names of the δ. For the existence of such $\delta(\alpha, i)$ we use the following claim.

CLAIM: *For any $i < \omega_1$ there are coboundedly many ε such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_\alpha \Vdash (\omega \setminus A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,i)),\varepsilon}) \in \underset{\sim}{D}.$$

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that $i < \omega_1$ is a counterexample to the claim. Then there are unboundedly many $\varepsilon \in \omega_1$ such that there is $p_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ such that $p_\varepsilon \Vdash A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,i)),\varepsilon)} \in \underset{\sim}{D}^+$. Since $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ has the c.c.c. there is a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-generic G that contains $\aleph_1$ many p_ε as above. Call this uncountable set of ε's X. However, for $\varepsilon \neq \varepsilon' \in X$,

$$\mathbb{P}_\alpha \Vdash A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,i)),\varepsilon} \cap A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,i)),\varepsilon'}$$

is finite. This contradicts the fact that $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \Vdash \mathcal{P}(\omega)/\underset{\sim}{D}$ is c.c.c., and thus the claim is proved. ∎

We use only one $\delta(\alpha, i)$ and its value in ω_1 is not important. However, for the $\gamma(\alpha, i)$, the pairwise inequality $\beta(\alpha, \gamma(\alpha, i)) \neq \beta(\alpha, \gamma(\alpha, j))$ for $i \neq j$ is important, so that there are no conflicts between the various instances of condition (6) below.

Once the sequence $\langle \gamma(\alpha, i), \delta(\alpha, i) : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ is chosen, we define in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$ the forcing $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ as follows: $p \in \mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ iff

(1) $p = (u_p, h_p)$,
(2) $u_p \subseteq \omega_1$ is finite,
(3) $h_p \in {}^{\omega>}\omega$.

$\mathbb{Q}_\alpha \models p \leq q$ if

(4) $u_p \subseteq u_q$ and
(5) $h_p \trianglelefteq h_q$ and
(6) if $\xi \in u_p$ and

$$m \in (\omega \setminus A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)),\delta(\alpha,\xi)}) \cap (\mathrm{dom}(h_q) \setminus \mathrm{dom}(h_p))$$

then $f_{\alpha,\xi}(m) < h_q(m)$.

We show by induction on $\alpha \leq \omega_2$ that $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ has the $\bar{M}$-c.c. and $|\mathbb{P}_\alpha| \leq \aleph_1$ for $\alpha < \omega_1$. Since we take direct limits, the limit steps are covered by [She98, Ch. IV, 3.2]. The start of the induction is trivial. Now we look at the successor steps $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha+1} = \mathbb{P}_\alpha * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha$.

Odd α: $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ is the Cohen forcing. Any countable forcing has the $\bar{M}[\mathbb{P}_\alpha]$-c.c. Putting this together with the induction hypothesis, $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha+1}$ has the $\bar{M}$-c.c.

Even α: Since $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ has the c.c.c., there is a set of representatives of $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-names of members of $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ of size at most $\aleph_1$. Hence we can assume that $|\mathbb{P}_{\alpha+1}| \leq \aleph_1$. To simplify notation, we assume that $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \subseteq \omega_1$ and we assume

$$\mathbb{P}_\alpha \Vdash \mathbb{Q}_\alpha \cap \varepsilon = \{(u,p) \in \mathbb{Q}_\alpha : u \subseteq \varepsilon\}.$$

We fix a witness $Y(\mathbb{P}_\alpha) \in \mathscr{D}_{\bar{M}}$ for the $\bar{M}$-c.c. of $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$, i.e., for every $\varepsilon \in Y(\mathbb{P}_\alpha)$ for every $I \in M_\varepsilon$ that is a dense subset of $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap \varepsilon$, I is dense in $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$.

We intersect $Y(\mathbb{P}_\alpha)$ with the club $C \subseteq \omega_1$ of countable limit ordinals that are closed under the functions $\gamma(\alpha,\cdot)$ and $\delta(\alpha,\cdot)$ that are defined as in Equations (3.1), (3.2). Since $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ is c.c.c., such a club can be found in the ground model although $\delta(\alpha,\cdot)$ is a name.

Next we prove that $Y(\mathbb{P}_\alpha) \cap C$ witnesses that $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha+1}$ has the $\bar{M}$-c.c. Let $\varepsilon \in Y(\mathbb{P}_\alpha) \cap C$, $D \in M_\varepsilon$ be an open and dense subset of $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap \varepsilon) * (\mathbb{Q} \cap \varepsilon)$. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}_{\alpha+1}$. We have to show that there is $q \in D$ that is compatible with p.

We write $p = (p \restriction \alpha, (u_{p(\alpha)}, h_{p(\alpha)}))$ and we assume that $p \restriction \alpha$ determines the finite sets $u_{p(\alpha)}$ and $h_{p(\alpha)}$ so that they are elements of $[\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ and ${}^{\omega>}\omega$ and that it also determines $\gamma(\alpha,\xi)$ and $\delta(\alpha,\xi)$ for any $\xi \in u_{p(\alpha)}$.

The search for q proceeds in four steps:

First step: We apply the induction hypothesis. We let $D' = D \cap \mathbb{P}_\alpha$; $D' \in M_\varepsilon$ is dense and open in $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap \varepsilon$. Since $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ has the $\bar{M}$-c.c. and $\varepsilon \in Y(\mathbb{P}_\alpha)$ there is $q' \in D' \cap M_\varepsilon$ that is compatible with $p \restriction \alpha$. We fix a witness $r' \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ for compatibility.

Second step: We choose $(h', u_{p(\alpha)}) \geq p(\alpha)$ to take a record of r' on its finitely many Cohen coordinates by taking $n \in \omega$ so large such that

$$\begin{aligned}(3.3)\qquad &(\forall m)(\forall \xi \in u_{p(\alpha)})(\forall \beta = \beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)) \in \operatorname{supp}(r'))\\ &\qquad\qquad ((r' \Vdash (m \notin A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)),\delta(\alpha,\xi)})) \to m < n).\end{aligned}$$

Such an n exists since r' pins down only a finite part of the name $A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\beta,\xi)),\delta(\alpha,\xi)}$ for any $\xi \in u_{p(\alpha)}$ with $\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)) \in \operatorname{dom}(r')$. Now we let $\operatorname{dom}(h') = n$ and on $n \setminus \operatorname{dom}(h_{p(\alpha)})$ we fix some $h'(k) \geq f_{\alpha,\xi}(k)$ for all $\xi \in u_{p(\alpha)}$. We let $q' = (h', u_{p(\alpha)})$.

Third step: We go again into $D \cap M_\varepsilon$. With the maximum principle we choose $q(\alpha) \in M_\varepsilon$ such that $q' \Vdash \underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha) \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha} (u_{p(\alpha)} \cap \varepsilon, h') \wedge \underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha) \in D_\alpha[\mathbb{P}_\alpha]$ and let $q = (q', \underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha))$. Then $q = (q', \underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha)) \in M_\varepsilon \cap D$.

Fourth step: We show that p and q are compatible. For any $\xi \in u_{p(\alpha)} \setminus \varepsilon$ we choose $q_1(\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi))) \geq q'(\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)))$ such that

$$(3.4) \qquad q_1(\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi))) \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi))}} (\forall n \in \operatorname{dom}(h_{\underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha)} \setminus \operatorname{dom}(h')))(n \in A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)),\delta(\alpha,\xi)}).$$

We let

$$r = (q' \cup \{(\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)), q_1(\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)))) : \xi \in u_{\underset{\sim}{p}(\alpha)} \setminus \varepsilon\}, (u_{\underset{\sim}{p}(\alpha)} \cup u_{\underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha)}, h_{\underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha)})).$$

The condition r is well defined, since for any $\xi \in u_{p(\alpha} \setminus \varepsilon$, the condition $q_1(\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)) \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ can be chosen to be compatible with $q'(\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi))$, by the choice of n as in Equation (3.3).

We show that $r \geq p, q$. First $r \restriction \alpha \geq p \restriction \alpha, q'$ and $q' = q \restriction \alpha$. We show that

$$r \restriction \alpha \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha} (u_{\underset{\sim}{p}(\alpha)} \cup u_{\underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha)}, h_{\underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha)}) \geq_{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha} (u_{\underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha)}, h_{\underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha)}), (u_{\underset{\sim}{p}(\alpha)}, h').$$

The first is trivial. For the latter, let $\xi \in u_{\underset{\sim}{p}(\alpha)}$. First case: $\xi \in M_\delta$. We chose (after Equation (3.3)) the function $h_{q(\alpha)}(k)$ such that it dominates $f_{\alpha,\xi}(k)$ on any coordinate k not in $\operatorname{dom}(h_{p(\alpha)})$ such that $r' \Vdash k \notin A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)),\delta(\alpha,\xi)}$. Thus $r \restriction \alpha$ forces the relevant instances of clause (6) of $r(\alpha) \geq p(\alpha)$.

Second case: $\xi \in u_{p(\alpha)} \setminus \varepsilon$. Since clause (6) speaks only about $m \in \omega \setminus A_{\beta(\alpha,\gamma(\alpha,\xi)),\delta(\alpha,\xi)}$, Equation (3.4) implies $r \restriction \alpha \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha} \underset{\sim}{r}(\alpha) \geq \underset{\sim}{q}(\alpha)$. ■

Remark: We work with the assumption $\diamondsuit_{\{\delta<\aleph_2 : \mathrm{cf}(\delta)=\aleph_1\}}$. Alternatively, we could force as in the previous section by approximations of size $\aleph_1$ in a first step and thereafter force with the generic filter of the first forcing. The diamond $\diamondsuit_{\{\delta<\aleph_2 : \mathrm{cf}(\delta)=\aleph_1\}}$ hands down at stage α a possible $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name for objects D, $\langle g_i : i < \aleph_1 \rangle$ as in property $(\mathrm{A})_{\aleph_2}$ of Lemma 3.2 and thus allows to construct a finite support iteration up to stage ω_2 instead of using an approximation forcing in a first forcing step. So the partial order $\mathbb{P}$ of the sketched alternative construction corresponds in the actually performed forcing $AP * \mathbb{Q}$ to the generic $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ of the approximation forcing AP.

Acknowledgement. We thank the referee for numerous valuable hints.

References

[BJ95] T. Bartoszyński and H. Judah, *Set Theory*, A K Peters, Wellesley, MA, 1995.

[BL03] J. Brendle and M. Losada, *The cofinality of the inifinite symmetric group and groupwise density*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **68** (2003), 1354–1361.

[Bla89] A. Blass, *Applications of superperfect forcing and its relatives*, in*Set Theory and its Applications*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 1401, Springer, Berlin, 1989, pp. 18–40.

[BM99] A. Blass and H. Mildenberger, *On the cofinality of ultrapowers*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **64** (1999), 727–736.

[BRZ11] T. Banakh, D. Repovš and L. Zdomskyy, *On the length of chain of proper subgroups covering a topological group*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **50** (2011), 411–421.

[BS87] A. Blass and S. Shelah, *There may be simple $P_{\aleph_1}$- and $P_{\aleph_2}$-points and the Rudin–Keisler ordering may be downward directed*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **33** (1987), 213–243.

[BS89] A. Blass and S. Shelah, *Near coherence of filters. III. A simplified consistency proof*, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic **30** (1989), 530–538.

[Can90] R. M. Canjar, *On the generic existence of special ultrafilters*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **110** (1990), 233–241.

[Gol93] M. Goldstern, *Tools for your forcing construction*, in *Set Theory of the Reals (Ramat Gan, 1991)*, Israel Mathematical Conference Proceedings, Vol. 6, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, 1993, pp. 305–360.

[Jec03] T. Jech, *Set Theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[Kun80] K. Kunen, *Set Theory*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Vol. 102, North-Holland, Amsterdam–New York, 1980.

[Mil80] A. Miller, *There are no Q-points in Laver's model for the Borel conjecture*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **78** (1980), 103–106.

[Mil01] H. Mildenberger, *Groupwise dense families*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **40** (2001), 93–112.

[MS11] H. Mildenberger and S. Shelah, *The minimal cofinality of an ultrafilter of ω and the cofinality of the symmetric group can be larger than $\mathfrak{b}^+$*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **76** (2011), 1322–1340.

[MST06] H. Mildenberger, S. Shelah and B. Tsaban, *Covering the Baire space with meager sets*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **140** (2006), 60–71.

[PS87] Z. Piotrowski and A. Szymański, *Some remarks on category in topological spaces*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **101** (1987), 156–160.

[She98] S. Shelah, *Proper and Improper Forcing*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer, Berlin, 1998.

[She06] S. Shelah, *Non-Cohen oracle C.C.C,*, Journal of Applied Analysis **12** (2006), 1–17.

[SS93] S. Shelah and J. Steprāns, *Maximal chains in ${}^\omega\omega$ and ultrapowers of the integers*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **32** (1993), 305–319.

[SS94] S. Shelah and J. Steprāns, *Erratum: "Maximal chains in ${}^\omega\omega$ and ultrapowers of the integers" [Arch. Math. Logic* **32** *(1993), no. 5, 305–319; MR1223393 (94g:03094)]*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **33** (1994), 167–168.

[ST95] J. D. Sharp and S. Thomas, *Unbounded families and the cofinality of the infinite symmetric group*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **34** (1995), 33–45.

[Tho95] S. Thomas, *Unbounded families and the cofinality of the infinite symmetric group*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **34** (1995), 33–45.