数理解析研究所講究録
第 1949 巻 2015 年 73-80

Dominating mad families in Baire space

Robert Ra≈Çowski

ABSTRACT. In this note we consider a Marczewski like nonmeasurable sets (with respect to trees) which forms m.a.d. family in Baire space. Here we show that under assumption that $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{b}$ there is a m.a.d. family in Baire space which is not s-measurable (here we can replace s-nonmeasurable by l-nonmeasurable or m-nonmeasurable). Moreover it is relatively consistent with ZFC theory that $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{d} \leq \mathfrak{c}$ and there is m.a.d. family in Baire space which is not measurable with respect to family of all complete Laver trees in ω^ω.

1. Definitions

We adopt the standard set theoretic notation ω stands for first infinite ordinal, $\mathfrak{c}$ is denoted as size of all reals, for any set X, $|X|$ is size of X, $P(X)$ is power set of X, $[X]^\kappa$ is denoted as set of all subsets of X of the cardinality κ, $X^{<\kappa}$ denotes the set of all sequences in X with lenght less than κ. We say that for $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ the partial order $(T, \subseteq)$ is tree if for any $\tau \in T$ and $n \in dom(\tau)$ we have $\tau \restriction n \in T$. By the set

$$[T] = \{x \in \omega^\omega : (\forall n \in \omega) x \restriction n \in T\}$$

we denote envelope of T.

Now we turn into notion of measurability with respect to a fixed families of trees on the Baire space.

Edward Marczewski [**6**] introduced notion of s measurability and s_0-ideal notion.

DEFINITION 1.1 (Marczewski ideal s_0). *Let X be any fixed uncountable Polish space. Then we say that $A \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ is in s_0 iff*

$$(\forall P \in Perf(X))(\exists Q \in Perf(X))\ Q \subseteq P \wedge Q \cap A = \emptyset.$$

Of course every perfect set is an envelope of some perfect tree and the above definition can be formulated in tree terms.

DEFINITION 1.2 (s measurable set). *Let X be any fixed uncountable Polish space. Then we say that $A \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ is* s-**measurable** *iff*

$$(\forall P \in \mathrm{Perf}(X))(\exists Q \in \mathrm{Perf}(X))\ Q \subseteq P \wedge (Q \subseteq P \vee Q \cap A = \emptyset).$$

Here let us recall the notion of the Laver tree. Then we say that tree $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ is called a **Laver tree** with the stem $s \in T$ if

- for any $t \in T$ we have $t \subset s \vee s \subseteq t$,
- for every node $t \in T$ if $s \subseteq t$ then t is infinitely spliting i.e. $\{n \in \omega : \ t^\frown n \in T\}$ is an infinite.

Miller tree $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ with stem $s \in T$ is defined in the same manner but the second condition is replaced by the following

$$(\forall t \in T)(s \subseteq t) \longrightarrow (\exists r \in T)(t \subseteq r) \wedge (\{n \in \omega : r^\frown n \in T\} \in [\omega]^\omega).$$

The we can recall a similar definition of the ideal l_0 to the previous one. The set of all Laver trees is denoted by the LaverTrees.

Definition 1.3 (ideal l_0). *We say that $A \in \mathcal{P}(\omega^\omega)$ is in l_0 iff*

$$(\forall T \in \text{LaverTrees})(\exists Q \in \text{LaverTrees})\ Q \subseteq T \wedge [Q] \cap A = \emptyset.$$

Definition 1.4 (l measurable set). *We say that $A \in \mathcal{P}(\omega^\omega)$ is l-**measurable** iff for every Laver tree $T \in$ LaverTrees there is a Laver tree $S \in$ LaverTrees such that*

$$(S \subseteq T \wedge [S] \subseteq A) \vee (S \subseteq T \wedge [S] \cap A = \emptyset).$$

We say that tree $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ is called a **complete Laver tree** iff every node $t \in T$ is infinitely spliting.

Then once again we can recall a similar definition of the ideal cl_0 to the previous one. The set of all complete Laver trees is denoted by the cLaver.

Definition 1.5 (ideal cl_0). *We say that $A \in \mathcal{P}(\omega^\omega)$ is in cl_0 iff*

$$(\forall T \in \text{cLaver})(\exists Q \in \text{cLaver})\ Q \subseteq T \wedge [Q] \cap A = \emptyset.$$

Definition 1.6 (cl measurable set). *We say that $A \in \mathcal{P}(\omega^\omega)$ is cl-**measurable** iff for every complete Laver tree $T \in$ cLaver there is a complete Laver tree $S \in$ cLaver such that*

$$(S \subseteq T \wedge [S] \subseteq A) \vee (S \subseteq T \wedge [S] \cap A = \emptyset).$$

As above using notion of Miller tree we can define m-measurability and notion of m_0-ideal.

Next we recall the notion of almost disjoint family in Baire space.

Definition 1.7. *We say that family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ is* **a.d.** *family in Baire space if*

$$(\forall a, b \in \mathcal{A})\ a \neq b \longrightarrow a \cap b \text{ is finite.}$$

If this family is maximal with respect to inclusion in Baire space then $\mathcal{A}$ is called **m.a.d.** *family in ω^ω.*

Now let us reacall cardinal $\mathfrak{d}$ as smallest size of dominating family in ω^ω i.e.

$$\mathfrak{d} = min\{|\mathcal{F}| : \mathcal{F} \subseteq \omega^\omega \wedge (\forall g \in \omega^\omega)(\exists f \in \mathcal{F})(\forall^\infty n)\ g(n) < f(n)\}.$$

2. Dominating MAD families in Baire space and nonmeasurability with respect to ideals defined by trees

It is well known that every **a.d.** family is meager subset of the Baire space. It is natural to ask whether one can prove in ZFC the existence a **m.a.d.** families that are either s-measurable or s-nonmeasurable. One can find a consistency example of **m.a.d.** family $\mathcal{A}$ of cardinality smaller than $\mathfrak{c}$ (see [**5**], for example) by construction of Cohen indestructible m.a.d. family. One can find more about tree-like forcing indestructible m.a.d. familes in [**2**]. It is well known that $\mathrm{non}(s_0) = \mathfrak{c}$ (for other coefficients see [**1, 3, 4, 7**]) where $non(I)$ is smallest size of subset in ω^ω which does not belong to σ-ideal $I \subset P(\omega^\omega)$. It is well known that there exists a perfect **a.d.** family and therefore not all **m.a.d.** families are in s_0.

THEOREM 2.1. *There exists a s-nonmeasurable m.a.d. family in Baire space. Moreover, theorem remains true if we replace s-nonmeasurability by l, m or cl-nonmeasurability.*

PROOF. We show this theorem for s-nonmeasurability, for the other notion mentioned in above theorem the proof runs in analogous way. Let $T \subseteq \omega < \omega$ a perfect tree such that $[T]$ is a.d. in ω^ω. Let us enumerate $Perf(T) = \{T_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ a family of all perfect subsets of T. By transfinite reccursion let us define

$$\{(a_\alpha, d_\alpha, x_\alpha) \in [T]^2 \times \omega^\omega : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$$

such thatfor any $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$ we have:

(1) $\{a_\xi : \xi < \alpha\} \cap \{d_\xi : \xi < \alpha\} = \emptyset$,
(2) $\{a_\xi : \xi < \alpha\} \cup \{x_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$ is a.d.,
(3) $\forall^\infty n\ x_\alpha(n) = d_\alpha(n)$.

Now assume that we are in α-th step construction and we have required sequence

$$\{(a_\xi, d_\xi, x_\xi) \in [T]^2 \times \omega^\omega : \xi < \alpha\}$$

which have size at most $\omega|\alpha| < \mathfrak{c}$ then we can choose in $[T_\alpha]$ (of size $\mathfrak{c}$) $a_\alpha, d_\alpha \in [T_\alpha]$ which fulfills the first condition. Then choose any $x_\alpha \in \omega^\omega$ different than d_α but $(\forall^\infty n) d_\alpha(n) = x_\alpha(n)$ then $x \in \omega^\omega \setminus [T]$ and

$$\{a_\xi : \xi < \alpha\} \cup \{x_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$$

forms an a.d. family in ω^ω. Then α-th step construction is completed. By transfinite induction theorem we have required sequence of the length $\mathfrak{c}$. Now set $A_0 = \{a_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\} \cup \{x_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ and let us extend it to any maximal a.d. family A. It is easy to chect that A is required s-nonmeasurable m.a.d. family in the Baire space ω^ω. $\square$

Here we have obtained a consistency result but the above statement remains true in every model of ZFC theory whenever $\mathfrak{d} = \omega_1$.

THEOREM 2.2. *It $\mathfrak{d} = \omega_1$ then there exists a m.a.d. family of functions $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ is not s-measurable and there is an dominating subfamily $\mathcal{A}' \in [\mathcal{A}]^{\leq \mathfrak{d}}$ in Baire space ω^ω. Moreover, the words not s-measurable can be replaced by not l, m and cl-measurable.*

PROOF. Now by assumption there is a dominating family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ of size ω_1. Then we can show that we can find an a.d. dominating family of size ω_1. To do let us enumerate $\mathcal{A} = \{f_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\}$ and assume that we are in α-setp of construction with a.d. family $\mathcal{D}_\alpha = \{g_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$ such that for any $\xi < \alpha$ we have $f_\xi \leq g_\xi$. Now let $\{h_n : n \in \omega\}$ be enumeration of $\mathcal{D}_\alpha$ then for any $n \in \omega$ let

$$g_\alpha(n) = \max\{f_\alpha(n), \max\{h_k(n) : k \leq n\}\} + 1.$$

Then the family $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{\alpha<\omega_1} \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ is as was required almost disjoint and dominating family of size equal to ω_1. Moreover, one can assume tha each member of $\mathcal{D}$ has even values only. Now let us fix a perfect tree S with the porperty that each member of S has odd values only.

Then we are ready to find a m.a.d. family $\mathcal{B}$ which is not s-measurable (in the perfect set $[S]$) and $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$.

Let us enumerate $Perf(S) = \{T_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ a family of all perfect subsets of S. By transfinite reccursion let us define

$$\{(a_\alpha, d_\alpha, x_\alpha) \in [S]^2 \times \omega^\omega : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$$

such that for any $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$ we have:

(1) $a_\alpha, d_\alpha \in T_\alpha$,
(2) $\{a_\xi : \xi < \alpha\} \cap \{d_\xi : \xi < \alpha\} = \emptyset$,
(3) $\{a_\xi : \xi < \alpha\} \cup \{x_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$ is a.d.,
(4) $\forall^\infty n \; x_\alpha(n) = d_\alpha(n)$ but $x_\alpha \neq d_\alpha$.

Now assume that we are in α-th step construction and we have required sequence

$$\{(a_\xi, d_\xi, x_\xi) \in [S]^2 \times \omega^\omega : \xi < \alpha\}$$

which have size at most $\omega|\alpha| < \mathfrak{c}$ then we can choose in $[T_\alpha]$ (of size $\mathfrak{c}$) $a_\alpha, d_\alpha \in [T_\alpha]$ which fulfills the first condition. Then choose any $x_\alpha \in \omega^\omega$ different than d_α but $(\forall^\infty n) d_\alpha(n) = x_\alpha(n)$ then $x_\alpha \in \omega^\omega \setminus [S]$ and

$$\{a_\xi : \xi \leq \alpha\} \cup \{x_\xi : \xi \leq \alpha\}$$

forms an a.d. family in ω^ω. Then α-th step construction is completed. By transfinite induction theorem we have required sequence of the length $\mathfrak{c}$. Now set $A_0 = \mathcal{D} \cup \{a_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\} \cup \{x_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ and let us extend it to any maximal a.d. family A. It is easy to check that A is required s-nonmeasurable m.a.d. family in the Baire space ω^ω. □

In contrast of the previously proven result, we show the consistency for $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{d}$ and existing a dominating cl-nonmeasurable **m.a.d.** –family of size $\mathfrak{d}$.

THEOREM 2.3. *It is relatively consistent with ZFC theory that* $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{c}$ *and there exists a* **m.a.d.** *family of functions* $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ *such that* $\mathcal{A}$ *is not cl-measurable. Moreover, there is a dominating subfamily* $\mathcal{A}' \in [\mathcal{A}]^{\mathfrak{d}}$ *and* $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{d} \leq \mathfrak{c}$.

PROOF. Let us consider the ground model V of GCH. We first choose any complete Laver tree $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ in V such that $[T]$ forms an **a.d.** family. Now, let us define a forcing notion $(Q_T, \leq)$ as follows: $p = (x_p, s_p^g, s_p^b, \mathcal{F}_p) \in Q_T$ iff

- $x_p \in \omega^{<\omega}$ and
- $s_p^g, s_p^b \in [T]^{<\omega}$ are finite trees and
- $\mathcal{F}_p \in [\omega^\omega]^{<\omega}$,

The order is defined as follows: for every $p = (x_p, s_p^g, s_p^b, \mathcal{F}_p) \in Q_T$ and $q = (x_q, s_q^g, s_q^b, \mathcal{F}_q) \in Q_T$ we have $p \leq q$ iff

(1) $x_q \subset x_p \wedge s_q^g \subseteq s_p^g \wedge s_q^b \subseteq s_p^b \wedge \mathcal{F}_q \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p$,
(2) $(\forall t \in s_p^g)(\forall k) x_p(k) = t(k) \longrightarrow t\restriction_{k+1} \in s_q^g \wedge x_p\restriction_{k+1} \subseteq x_q$,
(3) $(\forall h \in \mathcal{F}_q)(\forall k) h(k) \geq x_p(k) \longrightarrow x_p\restriction_{k+1} \subseteq x_q$,
(4) $(\forall h \in \mathcal{F}_q)(\forall t \in s_p^b)(\forall k)\ h(k) = t(k) \longrightarrow t\restriction_{k+1} \in s_q^b$,
(5) $(\forall h \in \mathcal{F}_q)(\forall t \in s_p^g)(\forall k)\ h(k) = t(k) \longrightarrow t\restriction_{k+1} \in s_q^g$.

CLAIM 2.4. Q_T *is* σ*-centered (and so is c.c.c.) forcing notion.*

PROOF. Let $I = \{(x, s^g, s^b) :\ x \in \omega^{<\omega} \wedge s^g, s^b \in [T]^{<\omega}\}$. For every $v = (x, s^g, s^b) \in I$ the set $Q_v = \{p \in Q_T :\ (x_p, s_p^g, s_p^b) = (x, s^g, s^b)\}$ is a centered subset of Q_T, because for any $p, q \in Q_v$ the condition $r = (x, s^g, s^b, \mathcal{F}_p \cup \mathcal{F}_q)$ from Q_v is a common extension of p and q. Since I is countable Q_T is σ-centered and hence it satisfies *c.c.c.* . □

Let $G \subseteq Q_T$ be a generic filter over V and in $V[G]$ let

$$x_G = \bigcup\{x_p :\ p \in G\},$$

$$S_G^g = \{t \in T :\ (\exists p \in G)(\exists s \in s_p^g)\ t \subseteq s\},$$

$$S_G^b = \{t \in T :\ (\exists p \in G)(\exists s \in s_p^b)\ t \subseteq s\}.$$

It follows that $x_G \in \omega^\omega$ because the sets $D_n = \{p \in Q_T :\ |x_p| \geq n\}$ for $n \in \omega$ are dense.

CLAIM 2.5. $\emptyset \neq [S_G^g] \subseteq [T]$ *and* $\emptyset \neq [S_G^b] \subseteq [T]$,

PROOF. Fix $n \in \omega$, condition $p \in G$ $s \in s_p^g$ then the set $D_{s,n} = \{r \in Q_T :\ (\exists t \in s_r^g) n \leq |t| \wedge s \subseteq t\}$ is dense in the poset Q_T under p. To see it, let $q \leq p$ be any forcing condition. Then $s_p^g \subseteq s_q^g$ of course. Then because tree T is a complete Laver tree then one can find a sequence $t \in T$ such that $s \subseteq t$, $n \leq |t|$, $t \cap x_q = s \cap x_q$ and for every $h \in \mathcal{F}_q$ $h \cap t = h \cap s$. Then the condition $r = (x_q, s_q^g \cup \{t\}, s_q^b, \mathcal{F}_q)$ is stronger than q and $r \in D_{n,s}$ what shows that $D_{n,s}$ is dense under p.

Now by the above paragraph we can define recursively the following two sequences $\{s_n : n \in \omega\}$ and $\{p_n : n \in \omega\}$ such that for every $n \in \omega$ we have

- $p_0 = p$ and $p_{n+1} \leq p_n$ and $p_n \in G$,
- $s_0 = s$, $s_n \in s^g_{p_n}$, $n \leq |s_n|$ and $s_n \subseteq s_{n+1}$.

Then $z = \bigcup\{s_n : n \in \omega\}$ is an element of $[S^g_G]$. Then $[S^g_G]$ is nonempty. It is easy to see that every element of $[S^g_G]$ belongs to $[T]$ by the definition of the set $[S^g_G]$. The proof for $\emptyset \neq [S^b_G] \subseteq [T]$ is the same. □

Let us denote by cLaver(T) the collection of all complete Laver subtrees of the tree T.

CLAIM 2.6. *For every $T_1 \in$ cLaver$(T) \cap V$ there is $z \in [S^b_G] \cap [T_1]$ such that $z \cap x_G$ and $\{m \in \omega : z(m) \neq x_G(m)\}$ are infinite sets,*

PROOF. Let us choose $p \in G$ and any ground model complete Laver subtree $T_1 \subseteq T$. Then we will find three sequences $\{p_n : n \in \omega\}$, $\{y_n : n \in \omega\}$ and $\{s_n : n \in \omega\}$ such that for every $n \in \omega$ we have:

- $p_0 = p$, $p_{n+1} \leq p_n$ and $p_{n+1} \in G$,
- $s_n \in s^b_{p_n}$ and $s_n \subseteq s_{n+1} \in T_1$,
- $y_n = x_{p_n}$,
- there is $m > n$ such that $y_{n+1}(m) = s_{n+1}(m)$,
- there is $m' > n$ such that $y_{n+1}(m') \neq s_{n+1}(m')$.

Assume that we have three finite sequences $\{p_k : k \leq n\}$, $\{y_k : k \leq n\}$ and $\{s_n : k \leq n\}$ such that for every $k < n$ we have:

- $p_{k+1} \leq p_k$ and $p_{k+1} \in G$,
- $s_k \in s^b_{p_k}$ and $s_k \subseteq s_{k+1} \in T_1$,
- $y_k = x_{p_k}$,
- there is $m > k$ such that $y_{k+1}(m) = s_{k+1}(m)$,
- there is $m' > k$ such that $y_{k+1}(m') \neq s_{k+1}(m')$.

Then in particular we have $p_n \in G$, $y_n = x_{p_n}$ and $s_n \in s^b_{p_n} \cap T_1$. Now let us denote by the symbols D and E the following sets:

$$\{r \in Q_T : n{+}1 < |x_r| \wedge (\exists s \in s^b_r \cap T_1)(\exists m > n{+}1) s_n \subseteq s \wedge s(m) = x_r(m)\},$$

and

$$\{r \in Q_T : n{+}1 < |x_r| \wedge (\exists s \in s^b_r \cap T_1)(\exists m > n{+}1) s_n \subseteq s \wedge s(m) \neq x_r(m)\}$$

respectively.

We show that D is dense set in Q_T under the condition p_n. To do, fix any forcing condition $q \in Q_T$ such that $q \leq p_n$. We know that $s_n \in s^b_q$ because $q \leq p_n$ and $s_n \in T_1$. Moreover T_1 is a complete Laver tree then $\{n \in \omega : s^\frown n \in T_1\}$ is infinite and the sets s^g_q and $\mathcal{F}_q$ are finite. Then there is $x \in T$ and $s \in T_1$ such that $x_q \subseteq x$, $s_n \subseteq s$, $x(m) = s(m)$ for a some $m > n+1$ and for every $h \in \mathcal{F}_q$ $x \cap h = x_q \cap h$, for every $t \in s^g_q$ $x \cap t = x_q \cap t$. Then $r = (x, s^g_q, s^b_q \cup \{s\}, \mathcal{F}_q)$ is a stronger forcing condition than q and belongs to the set D and then

D is dense under p_n. The subtree T_1 is from ground model then D belongs to ground model V. The similar argument shows that the set E is a dense in Q_T by replacing $x(m) = s(m)$ for a some $m > n+1$ by the $x(m) \neq s(m)$ for a some $m > n+1$ in the above paragraph and E is in the ground model V of course. Then $r \in D \cap E \cap G \neq \emptyset$ for a some r and one can find a condition $p_{n+1} \in G$ which is a stronger than p_n and r. Then there exists $s \in s^b_{p_{n+1}}$ such that $s_n \subseteq s \in T_1$ such that $x_{p_{n+1}}(m) = s(m)$ for a some $m > n+1$. Then let $s_{n+1} = s$ and $y_n = x_{p_{n+1}}$. Then by induction hypothesis the sequences $\{p_n : n \in \omega\}$, $\{s_n : n \in \omega\}$, $\{y_n : n \in \omega\}$ with the above conditions exists.

It is easy to see that $z = \bigcup\{s_n : n \in \omega\} \in S^b_G \cap [T_1]$ and $z \cap x_G$ is infinite and we have $x_G = \bigcup\{y_n : n \in \omega\} = \bigcup\{x_{p_n} : n \in \omega\}$. □

CLAIM 2.7. *For every* $T_1 \in \mathrm{cLaver}(T) \cap V$ *we have* $[S^g_G] \cap [T_1] \neq \emptyset$.

PROOF. Proof is similar to the previous one. □

CLAIM 2.8. *The following familes* $\{x_G\} \cup [S^g_G] \cup (\omega^\omega \cap V)$ *and* $[S^b_G] \cup (\omega^\omega \cap V)$ *are almost disjoint.*

PROOF. By standard argument, the order conditions (3) and (5) guaranties that $x_G \cap h$ and $z \cap h$ for any $z \in [S^g_G]$ are finite, where $h \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ is an any old real. To see that for any $z \in [S^g_G]$ the intersection $x_G \cap z$ is finite, let $\{s_n : n \in \omega\}$ and $\{p_n : n \in \omega\}$ are sequences witnessing that $z \in S^g_G$. If for any $n \in \omega$ the intersection $s_n \cap x_{p_n}$ is empty then $z \cap x_G = \emptyset$ also. Then let assume that $n_0 \in \omega$ be a first positive integer such that intersection $x_{p_{n_0}} \cap s_{n_0}$ is nonempty. Let us choose an any integer n greater than n_0 such that there are no $s \in s^g_{p_{n_0}}$ such that $s_n \subset s$. Then by the point (2) of the definition of order between p_n and p_{n_0} we have $x_{p_n} \cap s_n \subseteq x_{p_{n_0}} \cap s_{n_0}$, (here $s_{n_0} \in s^g_{p_{n_0}}$ and $s_n \in s^g_{p_n}$). Then $x_G \cap z \subseteq x_{p_{n_0}} \cap s_{n_0}$ but $x_{p_{n_0}} \cap s_{n_0}$ is finite.

By the second condition we have $[S^g_G] \subseteq [T]$ but our complete Laver tree $T \in V$ is almost disjoint i.e. collection of all branches in T are almost disjoint in the ground model but

$$(\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall n \in \omega)(x \neq y \wedge x \restriction n \in T \wedge y \restriction n \in T) \longrightarrow (\exists m \in \omega)(|x \cap y| < m)$$

is $\prod^1_1$ formula and then is absolute between transitive ZF models of the set theory. Then our tree T consists almost disjoint branches in the generic extension $V[G]$ and then $[S^g_G]$ forms almost disjoint family also. Then $\{x_G\} \cup [S^g_G] \cup (\omega^\omega \cap V)$ forms almost disjoint family.

The similar argument shows that $[S^b_G] \cup (\omega^\omega \cap V)$ forms almost disjoint family. □

CLAIM 2.9. x_G *is dominating in* $\omega^\omega \cap V$.

PROOF. Let us consider any $y \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ then we can find a generic condition $p \in G$ such that $y \in \mathcal{F}_p$. Let $m = dom x_p$ (here $x_p \subseteq x_G$) and for any $n \in \omega$ with $m < n$ then by 3) condition of order the set

$$D_{y,n} = \{p \in Q_T : y(n) < x_p(n)\} \in V$$

is dense in under p because each node of T is ω-splitting one. $\square$

Now let us consider any cardinal κ greater than ω_1 with a uncountable cofinality and finite support iteration $((P_\alpha : \alpha \leq \kappa), (\dot{Q}_\beta : \beta < \kappa))$ such that for every $\beta < \kappa$ we have $\Vdash_{P_\beta} \dot{Q}_\beta = \hat{Q}_T$. Assume that $G_\beta = \{p \in P_\beta : i_{\beta\kappa}(p) \in G\}$ where $G \supset P_\kappa$ generic filter over V and $\beta < \kappa$. Then there exists $H \subseteq \dot{Q}_{\beta G_\beta}$ generic over universe $V[G_\beta]$ such that $G_{\beta+1} = G_\beta * H$. Now let us define the following family $\mathcal{A}_\beta = \{x_{G_{\beta+1}}\} \cup [S^g_{G_{\beta+1}}]$ and then $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup\{\mathcal{A}_\beta : \beta < \kappa\}$. In $V[G]$ we show that $\mathcal{A}$ forms **a.d.** and for every $\mathcal{B}$ **m.a.d.** family containing $\mathcal{A}$. Let us consider any two different reals $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$. Then there are $\alpha, \beta < \kappa$ such that $x \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ and $y \in \mathcal{A}_\beta$. We can assume that $\alpha \leq \beta$ (for the other case the proof is the same). First assume that $\alpha < \beta$ then $x \in \omega^\omega \cap V[G_\alpha]$ and if $y = y_{G_{\beta+1}}$ or $y \in [S^g_{G_{\beta+1}}]$ then by the Claim 2.8 we have that $x \cap y$ is finite. If $\alpha = \beta$ then we can assume that $x = x_{G_{\beta+1}}$ and $y \in [S^g_{G_{\beta+1}}]$ and once again by the Claim 2.8 the intersection $x \cap y$ is finite too.

Now let us choose in $V[G]$ any complete Laver tree $T_1 \subseteq T$ which is a subtree of the tree T. Then by choosing a nice name for T_1 there is a some $\beta < \kappa$ such that $T_1 \in V[G_\beta]$. Then by the Claim 2.6 there is a some real $z \in [S^b_{G_{\beta+1}}] \subseteq T$ such that $z \in T_1$ and $z \cap x_{G_{\beta+1}}$ is infinite. Moreover, let observe that $z \notin \mathcal{B}$ because in other case $x_{G_{\beta+1}}, z \in \mathcal{B}$ what witness that $\mathcal{B}$ is not an a.d. family, contradiction. By the Claim 2.7 we have $[S^g_{G_{\beta+1}}] \cap [T_1] \neq \emptyset$. Then we have showed that $\mathcal{B}$ is a cl-nonmeasurable set in the generic extension $V[G]$. $\square$

References

[1] Bartoszyński T., Judah H., Set Theory, On the Structure of the Real Line, A K Peters Wellesley, Massachusetts, (1995).

[2] Brendle J., Yatabe S., Forcing indestructibility of MAD families, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 132 (2005) 271-312.

[3] Goldstern M., Repický M., Shelah S., Spinas O., On Tree Ideals, Proc. of the Amer. Math. Soc. vol. 123 no. 5, (1995). pp. 1573-1581. Springer-Verlag, (2003).

[4] Judah H., Miller A., Shelah S., Sacks forcing, Laver forcing and Martin's Axiom, Archive for Math Logic 31 (1992) 145-161.

[5] Kunen, K., Set Theory. An Introduction to Independence Proofs, North Holland, Amsterdamm, New York, Oxford 1980.

[6] Marczewski (Szpilrajn) E., Sur une classe de fonctions de W. Sierpiński et la classe correspondante d'ensembles, Fund. Math. 24 (1935), 17–34.

[7] Yorioka T., Forcings with the countable chain condition and the covering number of the Marczewski ideal, Arch. Math. Logic 42 (2003), 695–710.

Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Fundamental Problems of Technology, Wrocław University of Technology, Wybrzeże Wyspiańskiego 27, 50-370 Wrocław, Poland.

E-mail address, Robert Rałowski: `robert.ralowski@pwr.edu.pl`