Miroslav Repický
Perfect sets and collapsing continuum

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 44 (2003), No. 2, 315–327

Perfect sets and collapsing continuum

Miroslav Repický

Abstract. Under Martin's axiom, collapsing of the continuum by Sacks forcing $\mathbb{S}$ is characterized by the additivity of Marczewski's ideal (see [4]). We show that the same characterization holds true if $\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c}$ proving that under this hypothesis there are no small uncountable maximal antichains in $\mathbb{S}$. We also construct a partition of ${}^{\omega}2$ into $\mathfrak{c}$ perfect sets which is a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{S}$ and show that s^0-sets are exactly (subsets of) selectors of maximal antichains of perfect sets.

Keywords: Sacks forcing, Marczewski's ideal, cardinal invariants

Classification: Primary 03E40; Secondary 03E17

1. General remarks

Let $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ be a partial order. We say that elements (conditions) $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ are compatible and write $p \wedge q \neq 0$ if there is $r \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $r \leq p$ and $r \leq q$. Otherwise p and q are incompatible and we write $p \wedge q = 0$. A family of pairwise incompatible elements is called an antichain. For $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p = \{q \in \mathbb{P} : q \leq p\}$. Let us recall some cardinal invariants for $\mathbb{P}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(\mathbb{P}) &= \min\{|X| : X \text{ is a dense subset of } \mathbb{P}\},\\
\operatorname{sat}(\mathbb{P}) &= \min\{\kappa : \text{every antichain has size} < \kappa\},\\
\mathfrak{a}(\kappa, \mathbb{P}) &= \min(\{\pi(\mathbb{P})\} \cup \{|A| : A \subseteq \mathbb{P} \text{ is a maximal antichain with } |A| \geq \kappa\}),\\
\operatorname{cf}_\pi(\mathbb{P}) &= \min\{\kappa : \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \operatorname{cf}(\pi^V(\mathbb{P})) \leq \kappa\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The hereditary version of a cardinal invariant $\kappa(\cdot)$ for partial orders is defined by $\mathrm{h}\kappa(\mathbb{P}) = \min\{\kappa(\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p) : p \in \mathbb{P}\}$. The symbols $\mathrm{h}\pi(\mathbb{P})$, $\operatorname{hsat}(\mathbb{P})$, $\mathrm{h}\mathfrak{a}(\kappa, \mathbb{P})$ denote the hereditary versions of the cardinals $\pi(\mathbb{P})$, $\operatorname{sat}(\mathbb{P})$, $\mathfrak{a}(\kappa, \mathbb{P})$, respectively.

A matrix on $\mathbb{P}$ is a sequence of antichains in $\mathbb{P}$ (the antichains may be maximal). Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a matrix on $\mathbb{P}$. A matrix $\mathcal{A}$ is shattering if for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ there exists an antichain $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $|\{q \in A : p \wedge q \neq 0\}| \geq \pi(\mathbb{P})$. A matrix $\mathcal{A}$ is weakly shattering if $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} |\{q \in A : p \wedge q \neq 0\}| \geq \pi(\mathbb{P})$ for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$. A matrix is a base matrix if $\bigcup \mathcal{A}$ is a dense subset of $\mathbb{P}$. The following two theorems contain some well known basic facts about all these notions.

The work has been supported by grant of Slovak Grant Agency VEGA 2/7555/20.

Theorem 1.1. (1) *A shattering matrix is weakly shattering.*

(2) *There exists a base matrix on* $\mathbb{P}$ *of size* $\pi(\mathbb{P})$.

(3) *If* $\mathrm{h}\pi(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})$, *then every base matrix on* $\mathbb{P}$ *is weakly shattering.*

(4) *There exists a shattering matrix on* $\mathbb{P}$ *if and only if* $\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})^+$.

(5) *If there is a weakly shattering matrix on* $\mathbb{P}$ *of size* $< \pi(\mathbb{P})$, *then* $\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})^+$.

(6) *For every weakly shattering matrix there exists a weakly shattering base matrix of the same size.*

(7) *If* $\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})^+$, *then for every base matrix on* $\mathbb{P}$ *there exists a shattering base matrix on* $\mathbb{P}$ *of the same size.*

(8) *If* $\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})^+$, *then there exists a shattering matrix on* $\mathbb{P}$ *of size* $\mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P}))$.

Proof: The assertions (1)–(5) are easy to see. For the rest of the proof let us fix a dense set $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with $|D| = \pi(\mathbb{P})$.

(6) Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ be a weakly shattering matrix on $\mathbb{P}$. There exists a one-to-one mapping $\varphi : D \to \bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa}\{\alpha\}\times A_\alpha$, $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$, such that $p\wedge\varphi_2(p) \neq 0$ for every $p \in D$. For every $p \in D$ let us fix an element $r(p) \in P$ below p and $\varphi_2(p)$ and let $A'_\alpha = \{r(p) : \varphi_1(p) = \alpha\}$. The matrix $\mathcal{A} = \{A'_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is a weakly shattering base matrix on $\mathbb{P}$.

(7) For $p \in \mathbb{P}$ let B_p be an antichain below p of size $\pi(\mathbb{P})$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a base matrix on $\mathbb{P}$, then the matrix $\mathcal{A}' = \{\bigcup_{p\in A} B_p : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is a shattering base matrix on $\mathbb{P}$.

(8) Let $D = \bigcup\{D_\alpha : \alpha < \mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P}))\}$ with $|D_\alpha| < \pi(\mathbb{P})$. By the Balcar-Vojtáš's Theorem (see [1] or [6]) for each α there is a disjoint refinement A_α of D_α. Therefore $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P}))\}$ is a base matrix on $\mathbb{P}$ and by assertion (7) there exists a shattering matrix on $\mathbb{P}$ of the same size. □

From now on we assume that $\mathrm{h}\pi(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})$ and we define:

$$\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) = \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \text{ is a weakly shattering matrix on } \mathbb{P}\},$$

$$\mathrm{sh}_\lambda(\mathbb{P}) = \min(\{\pi(\mathbb{P})\} \cup \{\kappa : \mathrm{r.o.}(\mathbb{P}) \text{ is } (\kappa, \pi(\mathbb{P}), \lambda)\text{-nowhere distributive}\}).$$

We use the definition of the three-parameter distributivity from [2]. Clearly, $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) = \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \text{ is a base matrix on } \mathbb{P}\} = \min(\{\pi(\mathbb{P})\} \cup \{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \text{ is a shattering matrix on } \mathbb{P}\}) = \mathrm{sh}_{\pi(\mathbb{P})}(\mathbb{P})$. Again, $\mathrm{hsh}(\mathbb{P})$ denotes the hereditary version of the cardinal $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P})$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let us assume that* $\mathrm{h}\pi(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})$.

(1) *If* $\mathrm{r.o.}(\mathbb{P})$ *is* $(\kappa, \lambda, \lambda)$*-nowhere distributive, then* $\mathrm{r.o.}(\mathbb{P})$ *is* $(\kappa, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda)$*-nowhere distributive.*

(2) *If* $\mathrm{r.o.}(\mathbb{P})$ *is* $(\kappa, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda)$*-nowhere distributive, then* $\mathrm{r.o.}(\mathbb{P})$ *is* $(\kappa, \lambda, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda)$*-nowhere distributive.*

(3) *If* $\kappa < \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda$, *then* $\mathrm{r.o.}(\mathbb{P})$ *is* $(\kappa, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda)$*-nowhere distributive if and only if* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda \leq \kappa$.

(4) *If* $\mathrm{hsh}(\mathbb{P}) = \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P})$, *then* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} |\pi^V(\mathbb{P})| = \mathrm{sh}^V(\mathbb{P})$.
(5) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \pi(\mathbb{P}) = |\pi^V(\mathbb{P})|$.
(6) $\min\{\mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\pi(\mathbb{P})}(\mathbb{P}), \mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P}))\} \le \mathrm{cf}_\pi(\mathbb{P}) \le \min\{\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}), \mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P}))\}$ *and there are two possibilities*: *Either* $\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})^+$ *and* $\mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\pi(\mathbb{P})}(\mathbb{P}) \le \mathrm{cf}_\pi(\mathbb{P}) \le \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) \le \mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P}))$, *or* $\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) \le \pi(\mathbb{P})$ *and* $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})$.
(7) *If* $\mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\pi(\mathbb{P})}(\mathbb{P}) = \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P})$ (*e.g., if* $\pi(\mathbb{P})$ *is regular, or if* $\mathfrak{a}(\mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P})), \mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})$), *then* $\mathrm{cf}_\pi(\mathbb{P}) = \min\{\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}), \mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P}))\}$.
(8) *If* $\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) \ge \lambda^+$, *then* $\mathrm{sh}_\lambda(\mathbb{P}) \le (\mathrm{cf}\,\lambda) \cdot \sup_{\kappa<\lambda} \mathrm{sh}_\kappa(\mathbb{P})$ *and* $\mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\lambda}(\mathbb{P}) \le \mathrm{cf}\,\mathrm{sh}_\lambda(\mathbb{P})$.

Proof: The assertions (1) and (2) are easy.

(3) Let $\{\lambda_\xi : \xi < \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda\}$ be an increasing cofinal sequence in λ and let $\kappa < \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda$. Let $\dot f$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name of an unbounded function from κ to λ. For $\alpha < \kappa$ let $A_\alpha = \{\|\dot f(\alpha) \in [\lambda_\xi, \lambda_{\xi+1})\| : \xi < \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda\} \setminus \{0\}$. The matrix $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ witnesses the $(\kappa, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda)$-nowhere distributivity of r.o.$(\mathbb{P})$. Conversely, if $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is a matrix on r.o.$(\mathbb{P})$ with $A_\alpha = \{a_{\alpha,\xi} : \xi < \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda\}$ witnessing the $(\kappa, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda, \mathrm{cf}\,\lambda)$-nowhere distributivity of r.o.$(\mathbb{P})$, then the formula $\|\dot f(\alpha) = \lambda_\xi\| = a_{\alpha,\xi}$ defines a $\mathbb{P}$-name of an unbounded function from κ to λ.

(4) Let us assume that p and μ are such that $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} |\pi^V(\mathbb{P})| = \mu$. Let $\dot f$ be a $\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p$-name of a function from μ onto $\pi(\mathbb{P})$ and for $\alpha < \mu$ let A_α be a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p$ consisting of $q \in \mathbb{P}{\restriction}p$ deciding $\dot f(\alpha)$. Since every $q \in \mathbb{P}{\restriction}p$ forces that $\dot f$ is onto $\pi(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p)$, easily, it can be verified that $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\}$ is a weakly shattering matrix on $\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p$. Therefore $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) = \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p) \le \mu$ and $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \mathrm{sh}^V(\mathbb{P}) \le |\pi^V(\mathbb{P})|$.

Let $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) = \kappa$. If $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})$, then clearly, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} |\pi^V(\mathbb{P})| \le \mathrm{sh}^V(\mathbb{P})$. Let us assume that $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) < \pi(\mathbb{P})$. Then by Theorem 1.1(5), $\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})^+$. For every $q \in \mathbb{P}$ let us fix a maximal antichain $\{(q)_\xi : \xi < \pi(\mathbb{P})\}$ below q. As $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) = \kappa$, there is a base matrix $\mathcal{A} = \{A_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ (with all antichains maximal). We define a $\mathbb{P}$-name $\dot f$ of a function from κ onto $\pi^V(\mathbb{P})$ by $\|\dot f(\alpha) = \xi\| = \bigvee\{(q)_\xi : q \in A_\alpha\}$. Therefore $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} |\pi^V(\mathbb{P})| \le \mathrm{sh}^V(\mathbb{P})$.

(5) Clearly, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \pi(\mathbb{P}) \le |\pi^V(\mathbb{P})|$. Let p and κ be such that $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \pi(\mathbb{P}) = \kappa$ and $\mathrm{hsh}(\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p) = \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p)$. Let $\dot f$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name of a function from κ into $\mathbb{P}$ such that $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} (\forall q \in \mathbb{P})(\exists \alpha < \kappa)\, \dot f(\alpha) \le q$. Let A_α, $\alpha < \kappa$, be a maximal antichain of conditions below p deciding $\dot f(\alpha)$. For $q \le p$ let $B_{\alpha,q} = \{r \in A_\alpha : q \wedge r \ne 0\}$ and $B'_{\alpha,q} = \{s \in \mathbb{P} : (\exists r \in B_{\alpha,q})\, r \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot f(\alpha) = s\}$. The set $\bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa} B'_{\alpha,q}$ is a dense subset of $\mathbb{P}$ for every $q \le p$ and $|B_{\alpha,q}| \ge |B'_{\alpha,q}|$. Therefore $\sum_{\alpha<\kappa} |B_{\alpha,q}| \ge \pi(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p)$ and hence the matrix $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is weakly shattering on $\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p$. Hence $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}{\restriction}p) \le \kappa$ and by (4) we have $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} |\pi^V(\mathbb{P})| \le \pi(\mathbb{P})$. A density argument proves that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} |\pi^V(\mathbb{P})| \le \pi(\mathbb{P})$.

(6) By (1)–(3) we easily obtain the inequalities $\min\{\mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\pi(\mathbb{P})}(\mathbb{P}), \mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P}))\} \le \mathrm{cf}_\pi(\mathbb{P}) \le \min\{\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}), \mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P}))\}$. If $\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})^+$, then, by Theorem 1.1(8), $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) \le \mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P}))$. Since $\mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\pi(\mathbb{P})}(\mathbb{P}) \le \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P})$, by (5), $\mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\pi(\mathbb{P})}(\mathbb{P}) \le \mathrm{cf}_\pi(\mathbb{P})$. If

$\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) \leq \pi(\mathbb{P})$, then $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})$ by Theorem T1.1(5)

(7) immediately follows by (6), and (8) can be obtained by an easy computation. □

In the case $\mathrm{hsat}(\mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})^+$, in some special cases (e.g., if $\pi(\mathbb{P})$ is regular, or $\mathfrak{a}(\mathrm{cf}(\pi(\mathbb{P})), \mathbb{P}) = \pi(\mathbb{P})$, etc., see Theorem 1.2(7) or (8)), $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P})$ is regular (even in $V^{\mathrm{r.o.}(\mathbb{P})}$). But in general it is not clear whether $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{P})$ is a regular cardinal.

We use the standard terminology. By $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ we denote the ideal of meager sets and the ideal of null sets, respectively, $\mathfrak{b}$ is the least cardinality of an unbounded family and $\mathfrak{d}$ is the least cardinality of a dominating family of functions in the ordering $\leq^*$ on ${}^\omega\omega$ defined for $f, g \in {}^\omega\omega$ by $f \leq^* g$ if and only if $f(n) \leq g(n)$ for all but finitely many $n \in \omega$. $\mathrm{add}(I)$ is the additivity of an ideal I, $\mathrm{cov}(I)$ is the least size of a set $I_0 \subset I$ such that $\bigcup I_0 = \bigcup I$, $\mathrm{non}(I)$ is the least size of a subset of $\bigcup I$ not belonging to I, and $\mathrm{cof}(I)$ is the least size of a set $I_0 \subset I$ which is cofinal in $(I, \subseteq)$. Sacks forcing $\mathbb{S}$ is the set of perfect trees $p \subseteq {}^{<\omega}2$ where p is stronger than q, $p \leq q$, if $p \subseteq q$. For $p \in \mathbb{S}$ and $s \in {}^{<\omega}2$ we denote $p_s = \{t \in p : s \subseteq t \text{ or } t \subseteq s\}$, $[p] = \{x \in {}^\omega 2 : \forall n\ x{\restriction}n \in p\}$, $[s] = \{x \in {}^\omega 2 : s \subseteq x\}$. Every perfect set in ${}^\omega 2$ is of the form $[p]$ for some $p \in \mathbb{S}$.

2. Maximal antichains in $\mathbb{S}$

Important is the question what the possible sizes of small maximal antichains in Sacks forcing are. By the next well-known theorem, $\mathfrak{a}(\omega_1, \mathbb{S}) \geq \mathrm{cov}(\mathcal{M})$ and we prove in Theorem 2.5 below that $\mathfrak{a}(\omega_1, \mathbb{S}) \geq \mathfrak{d}$.

Theorem 2.1. *For a cardinal κ the following conditions are equivalent*:

(1) $\kappa < \mathrm{cov}(\mathcal{M})$;
(2) *for every family B of perfect sets such that $|B| \leq \kappa$ and ${}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup C$ is uncountable for every $C \in [B]^{\leq\omega}$, ${}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup B \neq \emptyset$*;
(3) *for every family B of perfect sets such that $|B| \leq \kappa$ and ${}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup C$ is uncountable for every $C \in [B]^{\leq\omega}$, ${}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup B$ contains a perfect set.*

Proof: The implications (3) → (2) → (1) are obvious. We prove (1) → (3).

Let $\kappa < \mathrm{cov}(\mathcal{M})$ and let B be a family of perfect sets such that $|B| \leq \kappa$ and ${}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup C$ is uncountable for every $C \in [B]^{\leq\omega}$. Let q be the set of all $s \in {}^{<\omega}2$ such that $[s] \setminus \bigcup C$ is uncountable for every $C \in [B]^{\leq\omega}$. By the assumption, $\emptyset \in q$ and it follows that q is a perfect tree and for every perfect set $[p] \in B$, $[p] \cap [q]$ is nowhere dense in $[q]$. As $\kappa < \mathrm{cov}(\mathcal{M})$, MA_κ(countable) implies the existence of a perfect tree $r \leq q$ such that $[r] \cap [p] = \emptyset$ for all $[p] \in B$ (using a countable forcing for adding a perfect set of Cohen reals). □

We need the following special case of Exercise 7.13 in [5]:

Lemma 2.2. *If G is a dense G_δ subset of ${}^\omega 2$ such that ${}^\omega 2 \setminus G$ is dense in ${}^\omega 2$, then there exists a homeomorphism f from G onto ${}^\omega\omega$.*

PROOF: By the assumptions no relatively clopen subset of G is compact. Let U_n, $n \in \omega$, be open sets in ${}^\omega 2$ such that $G = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} U_n$ and $U_{n+1} \subseteq U_n$ for all n. For $s \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ let us define $t_s \in {}^{<\omega}2$ by induction on $|s|$ so that $s \subseteq s'$ if and only if $t_s \subseteq t_{s'}$, $t_\emptyset = \emptyset$, and $[t_s] \cap U_{n+1} = \bigcup_{i\in\omega}[t_{s^\frown\langle i\rangle}]$ for $|s| = n$. Then for $x \in G$ we let $f(x)$ be the unique element $y \in {}^\omega\omega$ such that $t_{y\restriction n} \subseteq x$ for all $n \in \omega$. □

Theorem 2.3. *If B is a family of perfect sets in ${}^\omega 2$ and $|B| < \mathfrak{d}$, then the set ${}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup B$ is either at most countable or contains a perfect set.*

PROOF: Let us assume that $|B| < \mathfrak{d}$ and the set $X = {}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup B$ is uncountable. Let Y be a countable subset of X without isolated points. Let $q \in \mathbb{S}$ be such that $[q] = \overline{Y}$. By Lemma 2.2 there is a homeomorphism f from $G = [q] \setminus Y$ onto ${}^\omega\omega$. For $F \in B$, $F \cap Y = \emptyset$ and hence $F \cap G = F \cap [q]$. It follows that $f``(F \cap G)$ is compact and hence bounded in ${}^\omega\omega$. As $|B| < \mathfrak{d}$, there is an $y \in {}^\omega\omega$ not dominated by any member of the set $\bigcup_{F\in B} f``(F \cap G)$. Then the set $E = f^{-1}(\{x \in {}^\omega\omega : \forall n\ x(n) \geq y(n)\})$ is an uncountable relatively closed subset of G disjoint from $\bigcup B$. □

If $\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c}$, then using Theorem 2.3 one can construct a partition of ${}^\omega 2$ into $\mathfrak{c}$ perfect sets. In the next theorem we prove that partitions of ${}^\omega 2$ into $\mathfrak{c}$ perfect sets exist in ZFC. We shall use the following notation:

Let $p \in \mathbb{S}$ and $x \in [p]$. Let $\{k_n : n \in \omega\}$ be the increasing enumeration of the set $\{k \in \omega : (x\restriction k)^\frown\langle 0\rangle \in p$ and $(x\restriction k)^\frown\langle 1\rangle \in p\}$ and let $\bar{x} \in {}^\omega 2$ be such that $\bar{x}(n) \neq x(n)$ for all $n \in \omega$. Let us define $\tau(p,x,n) = p_{(x\restriction k_n)^\frown\langle\bar{x}(k_n)\rangle} = \{s \in p : s \subseteq (x\restriction k_n)^\frown\langle\bar{x}(k_n)\rangle$ or $(x\restriction k_n)^\frown\langle\bar{x}(k_n)\rangle \subseteq s\}$. Then the system $[\tau(p,x,n)]$, $n \in \omega$, is a partition of $[p] \setminus \{x\}$. In particular, $[\tau({}^{<\omega}2,x,n)]$, $n \in \omega$, is a partition of ${}^\omega 2 \setminus \{x\}$ into clopen sets.

For $A \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ let $B_A = \{[p] : p \in A\}$ and let $\bigvee A$ denote the Boolean sum of A in r.o.($\mathbb{S}$). In the Boolean sums we will consider only those $A \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ for which $\bigvee A \in \mathbb{S}$. Notice that $\bigvee_n \tau(p,x,n) = \bigcup_n \tau(p,x,n) = p$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let D be a dense subset of $\mathbb{S}$.*

(1) *There exists a maximal antichain $A \subseteq D$ such that the family B_A is disjoint and for every $p \in \mathbb{S}$ with $[p] \subseteq \bigcup B_A$ there exists $C \in [B_A]^{<\mathfrak{c}}$ such that $[p] \subseteq \bigcup C$.*

(2) *There exist maximal antichains $A \subseteq D$ and $\bar{A} \subseteq \mathbb{S}$, both of size $\mathfrak{c}$, such that B_A is a disjoint family, $B_{\bar{A}}$ is a partition of ${}^\omega 2$, and the following conditions are satisfied:*

   (a) *for every $q \in \bar{A} \setminus A$ the set $A_q = \{p \in A : p \leq q\}$ is countable, $q = \bigvee A_q$, and $|[q] \setminus \bigcup B_{A_q}| = 1$;*

(b) *For every* $q \in \mathbb{S}$, *if* $|[q] \setminus \bigcup B_A| < \mathfrak{c}$, *then* $|\{p \in A : [q] \cap [p] \neq \emptyset\}| < \mathfrak{c}$;

(c) *for every* $q \in \mathbb{S}$, $|\{p \in A : q \wedge p \neq 0\}| < \mathfrak{c}$ *if and only if* $|\{p \in A : [q] \cap [p] \neq \emptyset\}| < \mathfrak{c}$.

In particular, by (b), $|^{\omega}2 \setminus \bigcup B_A| = \mathfrak{c}$.

Proof: The assertion (1) is Lemma 1.1 in [4] and it clearly follows from (2). The following proof of (2) is a modification of the proof in [4].

Let $\{q_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ be an enumeration of $\mathbb{S}$ such that for each $q \in \mathbb{S}$, $q = q_\alpha$ for $\mathfrak{c}$ many α's, and let $\{y_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ be an enumeration of $^{\omega}2$ without repetitions.

Let A' be a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{S}$ such that the set $\{[p] \cap [s] : p \in A'\}$ has size $\mathfrak{c}$ for every $s \in {}^{<\omega}2$ (for example, find pairwise disjoint perfect sets $[p_s] \subseteq [s]$, $s \in {}^{<\omega}2$ and split each $[p_s]$ into $\mathfrak{c}$ many disjoint perfect sets). Without loss of generality we can assume that $D \subseteq \{p : \exists q \in A' \ p \leq q\}$. By induction on $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$ we construct $p_\alpha \in D$, countable $A'_\alpha \subseteq D$, and $x_\alpha \in {}^{\omega}2$. Let us assume that p_β, A'_β, x_β for $\beta < \alpha$ have been constructed and that the set $A''_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} A'_\beta \cup \{p_\beta\}$ is an antichain.

If the set $[q_\alpha] \setminus (\{x_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup \bigcup B_{A''_\alpha})$ is nonempty, then let x_α be its element; otherwise let $x_\alpha = x_0$.

If q_α is compatible with some $p \in A''_\alpha$, then we set $p_\alpha = p_0$. Otherwise the set

$$X_\alpha = \{x_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\} \cup \{y_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup ([q_\alpha] \cap \bigcup B_{A''_\alpha}) \cup \bigcup \{[q_\beta] \cap [q_\alpha] : \beta < \alpha \text{ and } q_\beta \wedge q_\alpha = 0\}$$

has size $< \mathfrak{c}$ and let $p_\alpha \in D$, $p_\alpha \leq q_\alpha$, be such that $[p_\alpha] \cap X_\alpha = \emptyset$. Notice that if $p_\alpha \neq p_0$, then $x_\alpha \neq x_\beta$ for all $\beta < \alpha$.

If $y_\alpha \in \bigcup B_{A''_\alpha \cup \{p_\alpha\}}$, then we set $A'_\alpha = \{p_0\}$. Assume that $y_\alpha \notin \bigcup B_{A''_\alpha \cup \{p_\alpha\}}$. By the assumption put on D the antichain $A''_\alpha \cup \{p_\alpha\}$ is nowhere locally maximal and for every $n \in \omega$ there is $r'_{\alpha,n}$ such that $p \wedge r'_{\alpha,n} = 0$ for $p \in A''_\alpha \cup \{p_\alpha\}$. The set

$$X_{\alpha,n} = \{x_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\} \cup \{y_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\} \cup ([r'_{\alpha,n}] \cap \bigcup B_{A''_\alpha \cup \{p_\alpha\}}) \cup \bigcup \{[q_\beta] \cap [r'_{\alpha,n}] : \beta < \alpha \text{ and } q_\beta \wedge r'_{\alpha,n} = 0\}$$

has size $< \mathfrak{c}$. Let $r_{\alpha,n} \in D$, $r_{\alpha,n} \leq r'_{\alpha,n}$ be such that $[r_{\alpha,n}] \cap X_{\alpha,n} = \emptyset$ and let $A'_\alpha = \{r_{\alpha,n} : n \in \omega\}$. Then $r_{\alpha,n} = \tau(\bigvee A'_\alpha, y_\alpha, n)$ and $[\bigvee A'_\alpha] = \{y_\alpha\} \cup \bigcup_{n\in\omega} [r_{\alpha,n}]$.

By the construction it is clear that $A = \bigcup \mathcal{A}$ is a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{S}$ refining the antichain A'. It follows that its size is $\mathfrak{c}$. Let $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ be an enumeration of the family $\mathcal{A}$ without repetitions and let $\bar{A} = \{\bigvee A_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$. Then $\bar{A}$ is a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{S}$. B_A is a disjoint family and as $A'_\alpha \neq \{p_0\}$ if and only if $y_\alpha \notin \bigcup B_A$, $[\bigvee A'_\alpha] = \{y_\alpha\} \cup \bigcup B_{A'_\alpha}$ whenever $A'_\alpha \neq \{p_0\}$. Therefore $B_{\bar{A}}$ is a partition of $^{\omega}2$ and condition (a) is satisfied. We prove conditions (b) and (c). Let $q \in \mathbb{S}$ be arbitrary.

(b) If the set $\{p \in A : [p] \cap [q] \neq \emptyset\}$ has size $\mathfrak{c}$, then, for every α such that $q_\alpha = q$, the set $[q_\alpha] \setminus \bigcup B_{A''_\alpha}$ has size $\mathfrak{c}$ and hence $x_\alpha \neq x_\beta$ for all $\beta < \alpha$. Therefore the set $\{x_\alpha : q_\alpha = q\}$ has size $\mathfrak{c}$ and is a subset of $[q] \setminus \bigcup B_A$.

(c) There is $\beta < \mathfrak{c}$ such that $q = q_\beta$. Let us assume that the set $B = \{p \in A : q \wedge p \neq 0\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{c}$. Let $\gamma > \beta$ be such that $B \subseteq A''_\gamma$. We prove that the set $\{p \in A : [q] \cap [p] \neq \emptyset\}$ is a subset of A''_γ and hence it has size $< \mathfrak{c}$.

For every $\alpha \geq \gamma$, if $p_\alpha \notin A''_\gamma$, then $p_\alpha \neq p_0$ and $q_\beta \wedge q_\alpha = 0$. Therefore $p_\alpha \leq q_\alpha$ is such that $[q_\beta] \cap [p_\alpha] = \emptyset$.

For every $\alpha \geq \gamma$, if $A'_\alpha \setminus A''_\gamma \neq \emptyset$, then $A'_\alpha \neq \{p_0\}$ and $A'_\alpha = \{r_{\alpha,n} : n \in \omega\}$ where $r_{\alpha,n} \leq r'_{\alpha,n}$ and $p \wedge r'_{\alpha,n} = 0$ for all $p \in A''_\alpha \supseteq A''_\gamma$, $n \in \omega$. It follows that $q_\beta \wedge r'_{\alpha,n} = 0$ and hence $r_{\alpha,n} \leq r'_{\alpha,n}$ is such that $[r_{\alpha,n}]$ is disjoint from $[q_\beta]$. So, if $A'_\alpha \neq \{p_0\}$, then $[q_\beta] \cap [p] = \emptyset$ for all $p \in A'_\alpha$. □

Let us consider the following families:

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \{A : A \text{ is a maximal antichain in } \mathbb{S} \text{ and } B_A \text{ is a disjoint family}\},$$
$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \{B : B \text{ is a partition of } {}^\omega 2 \text{ into closed sets}\},$$
$$\mathcal{A}_3 = \{A : A \text{ is a maximal antichain in } \mathbb{S},\ B_A \text{ is a disjoint family, and the set } {}^\omega 2 \setminus \textstyle\bigcup B_A \text{ has size } \mathfrak{c}\},$$
$$\mathcal{A}_4 = \{A : A \text{ is a maximal antichain in } \mathbb{S},\ B_A \text{ is a disjoint family, and the set } {}^\omega 2 \setminus \textstyle\bigcup B_A \text{ is uncountable}\}.$$

By Theorem 2.4 all these families are nonempty and by Theorem 2.3 the families $\mathcal{A}_3$ and $\mathcal{A}_4$ do not contain countable antichains. Let us define the cardinals:

$$\mathfrak{a}_i = \min\{|A| : X \in \mathcal{A}_i \text{ and } |A| \geq \omega_1\}, \qquad i = 1, 2, 3, 4,$$
$$\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_i = \sup\{|A|^+ : A \in \mathcal{A}_i \text{ and } |A| < \mathfrak{c}\} \cup \{\omega_1\}, \qquad i = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$
$$\mathrm{cov}_1 = \min\{|B| : B \text{ is a family of perfect sets such that the set } {}^\omega 2 \setminus \textstyle\bigcup B \text{ is uncountable and does not contain a perfect set}\},$$
$$\mathrm{cov}_2 = \min\{|B| : B \text{ is a family of perfect sets such that the set } {}^\omega 2 \setminus \textstyle\bigcup B \text{ has size } \mathfrak{c} \text{ and does not contain a perfect set}\}.$$

Theorem 2.5. (1) $\mathfrak{d} = \mathrm{cov}_1 \leq \mathfrak{a}(\omega_1, \mathbb{S}) \leq \mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathfrak{a}_4 \leq \min\{\mathfrak{a}_2, \mathfrak{a}_3\}$; $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1 = \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_4$.

(2) $\mathrm{cov}_1 \leq \mathrm{cov}_2 \leq \mathfrak{a}_3$.

(3) *For every* i, $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_i \leq \mathfrak{a}_i$ *if and only if* $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_i = \omega_1$ *if and only if* $\mathfrak{a}_i = \mathfrak{c}$.

(4) *For every* i, $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1 \leq \mathfrak{a}_i$ *if and only if* $\mathfrak{a}_i = \mathfrak{c}$.

(5) *If* $\mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathfrak{c}$, *then, for all* i, $\mathfrak{a}_i = \mathfrak{c}$ *and* $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_i = \omega_1$.

(6) *If* $\mathfrak{a}_2 = \mathfrak{c}$, *then* $\mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathfrak{a}_3$ *and* $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1 = \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3$.

(7) *If* $\mathfrak{a}_3 = \mathfrak{c}$, *then* $\mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathfrak{c}$ *if and only if* $\mathfrak{a}_2 = \mathfrak{c}$.

(8) $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1 = \max\{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2, \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3\}$.

Proof: (1) The inequality $\mathfrak{d} \leq \mathrm{cov}_1$ is Theorem 2.3. To prove $\mathrm{cov}_1 \leq \mathfrak{d}$, without loss of generality let us assume that $\mathfrak{c} > \mathfrak{d}$. Let $X = \{x_\alpha, y_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \subseteq {}^\omega 2$ be a Hausdorff gap (see [3]), i.e., $x_\alpha \leq^* x_\beta \leq^* y_\beta \leq^* y_\alpha$ for $\alpha \leq \beta < \omega_1$, and for every $x \in {}^\omega 2$ there is $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that $x_\alpha \not\leq^* x$ or $x \not\leq^* y_\alpha$. Let $K_\alpha = \{x \in {}^\omega 2 : x_\alpha \not\leq^* x \text{ or } x \not\leq^* y_\alpha\}$ for $\alpha < \omega_1$. Then $K_\alpha \subseteq K_\beta$ for $\alpha \leq \beta$, $K_\alpha \cap X$ is countable, and consequently, the sets $K_\alpha \setminus X$, $\alpha < \omega_1$, are G_δ sets covering ${}^\omega 2 \setminus X$. The Baire space ${}^\omega\omega$ is a union of $\mathfrak{d}$ many compact sets and as every Polish space is a continuous image of ${}^\omega\omega$, every Polish space is a union of $\leq \mathfrak{d}$ compact sets. It follows that every set $K_\alpha \setminus X$ a union of $\leq \mathfrak{d}$ compact sets and hence ${}^\omega 2 \setminus X$ is a union of $\leq \mathfrak{d}$ compact sets. Considering the perfect kernels of these compacts (obtained by removing countable sets) we obtain a family of $\leq \mathfrak{d}$ perfect subsets of ${}^\omega 2$ whose union has uncountable complement of size $< \mathfrak{c}$ and hence $\mathrm{cov}_1 \leq \mathfrak{d}$.

Let us assume that $\mathfrak{a}(\omega_1, \mathbb{S}) < \mathrm{cov}_1$ and we prove a contradiction. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ be a maximal antichain of size $\mathfrak{a}(\omega_1, \mathbb{S})$. The set $X = \bigcup\{[p] \cap [q] : p, q \in A, p \neq q\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{c}$. For every $p \in A$ let $x_p \in [p] \setminus X$ be arbitrary. The family $A' = \{\tau(p, x_p, n) : p \in A \text{ and } n \in \omega\}$ is a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{S}$ because if $[p] \cap [q]$ is uncountable for some $p \in A$, then $[\tau(p, x_p, n)] \cap [q]$ is uncountable for some n. The set $Y = {}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup B_{A'}$ is uncountable as it contains the set $\{x_p : p \in A\}$ and as $\mathfrak{a}(\omega_1, \mathbb{S}) < \mathrm{cov}_1$, there is a perfect set $[q] \subseteq Y$. But $[p] \cap [q] \subseteq \{x_p\}$ for all $p \in A$ which contradicts the assumption that A is maximal. Therefore $\mathrm{cov}_1 \leq \mathfrak{a}(\omega_1, \mathbb{S})$.

The inequality $\mathfrak{a}_4 \leq \mathfrak{a}_1$ can be easily proved by the same argument. Therefore $\mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathfrak{a}_4$ and by the same proof we obtain $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1 = \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_4$. The other inequalities are trivial.

(2) is an easy consequence of definitions.

(3–4) The implications from the right to the left are obvious. Let us assume that $\mathfrak{a}_i < \mathfrak{c}$ for some i. Then $\mathfrak{a}_i < \mathfrak{a}_i^+ \leq \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_i$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_i \leq \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1$.

(5) By (1), for all i, $\mathfrak{a}_i = \mathfrak{c}$ and by (3), $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_i = \omega_1$.

(6) If there is a maximal antichain $A \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ of size $< \mathfrak{c}$ such that the family B_A is disjoint and the set $X = {}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup B_A$ has size $< \mathfrak{c}$, then the partition $B = B_A \cup \{\{x\} : x \in X\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{c}$.

(7) Let $\mathfrak{a}_3 = \mathfrak{c}$. If $\mathfrak{a}_2 = \mathfrak{c}$, then, by (6), $\mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathfrak{a}_3 = \mathfrak{c}$.

(8) $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1 \geq \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1 \geq \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3$. Let us assume that $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3 < \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1$. For any κ with $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3 \leq \kappa < \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1$ there is an antichain $A \in \mathcal{A}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_3$ of size $< \mathfrak{c}$ and $\geq \kappa$. Then the partition $B_A \cup \{\{x\} : x \in {}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup B_A\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{c}$ and $\geq \kappa$. Therefore $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2 > \kappa$ and so $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2 = \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1$. □

Clearly, $\mathfrak{a}(\omega, \mathbb{S}) = \omega$. There are known several constructions of small uncountable antichains in $\mathbb{S}$. J. Stern and independently K. Kunen (for the proof see [8]) under CH constructed a partition of ${}^\omega 2$ into ω_1 compact sets. L. Newelski [9] pointed out that under MA the same construction produces a partition into $\mathfrak{c}$ compact sets which is preserved by forcing with measure algebras and he proved that after adding ω_1 dominating reals, the Baire space ${}^\omega\omega$ (and hence, by Lemma 2.2, also the Cantor space ${}^{\omega}2$) can be partitioned into ω_1 disjoint compact perfect sets. A. Rosłanowski and S. Shelah [10], by a finite support iteration of c.c.c. forcing notions of length ω_1, constructed a maximal antichain A such that the family B_A is disjoint and every tree $p \in A$ has on each level at most one branching node. Moreover, the set $\bigcup B_A$ does not contain any ground model reals and therefore $\mathfrak{a}_3 = \omega_1$ holds in the extension.

We say that a set $a \subseteq {}^{<\omega}2$ is saturated if for every $s, t \in {}^{<\omega}2$ whenever $s \subseteq t$ and $t \in a$, then $s \in a$. Easily, it can be observed that $\mathfrak{a}_2$ is the minimal size of a family A, maximal with respect to the inclusion, such that A is an uncountable almost disjoint family of infinite saturated sets. Notice that such a family A cannot be a maximal almost disjoint family of infinite subsets of ${}^{<\omega}2$. To see this, let $a \in A$ be such that the set of all infinite branches in a is nowhere dense in ${}^{\omega}2$ and let $x \in a$ be arbitrary. For every n choose $s_n \in {}^{<\omega}2$ such that $x{\restriction}n \subseteq s_n$ and $s_n \notin a$. Then the set $\{s_n : n \in \omega\}$ has a finite intersection with every $b \in A$. The similarity of this characterization of $\mathfrak{a}_2$ with maximal almost disjoint families suggests the question whether there is some relation between $\mathfrak{a}_2$ and $\mathfrak{a}$ (the minimal size of a maximal almost disjoint family of subsets of ω).

3. Marczewski's ideal and the collapse by Sacks forcing

A subset X of ${}^{\omega}2$ is an s^0-set if for every $p \in \mathbb{S}$ there is $q \leq p$ such that $[q] \cap X = \emptyset$. This notion is due to E. Marczewski [7]. It is known that $\omega_1 \leq \mathrm{add}(s^0) \leq \mathrm{cov}(s^0) \leq \mathrm{cf}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq \mathrm{non}(s^0) = \mathfrak{c} < \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{cof}(s^0))$ (see [4]) and $\mathrm{add}(s^0) \leq \mathfrak{b}$ (in fact $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathfrak{b}$ see [11]; this is not true for $\mathrm{cov}(s^0)$ because in the iterated Sacks forcing model $\mathrm{cov}(s^0) = \omega_2$ see [4] but $\mathfrak{b} = \mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{N}) = \omega_1$). Notice that $\mathrm{add}(I) \leq \mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{non}(I))$ for each ideal I. If $y \in {}^{\omega}2$ is a new real, then the perfect set $A_y = \{x \in {}^{\omega}2 : (\forall n)\, x(2n) = y(n)\}$ does not contain old reals. This explains why in iterations of length ω_1 the set of old reals is an s^0-set and $\mathrm{cov}(s^0) = \omega_1$. To see that there are s^0-sets of size $\mathfrak{c}$ (see also [4]), take any maximal antichain $\{p_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ of size $\mathfrak{c}$ in $\mathbb{S}$ so that the system of perfect sets $B_A = \{[p_\alpha] : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ is disjoint and clearly, every selector of this system is an s^0-set. By Theorem 2.4(2) every s^0-set has this form. If B_A is not disjoint, then its selectors need not be s^0-sets (observe that the system $\{A_y : y \in {}^{\omega}2\}$ has a perfect selector).

The next theorem refines Theorem 1.1 in [4].

Theorem 3.1. (1) $\mathrm{sh}_{\mathfrak{a}_3}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathrm{add}(s^0) \leq \mathrm{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \min\{\mathrm{cf}\,\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{b}\}$.

(2) $\mathrm{sh}_{\omega_1}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathrm{sh}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}(\mathbb{S}) = \min\{\mathrm{sh}_{\mathfrak{a}_2}(\mathbb{S}), \mathrm{add}(s^0)\} \leq \mathrm{sh}_{\mathfrak{a}_3}(\mathbb{S})$.

(3) $\mathrm{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \max\{\mathrm{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3}(\mathbb{S}), \mathrm{add}(s^0)\} = \mathrm{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S})$.

(4) $\mathrm{sh}_{\omega_1}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\mathfrak{c}}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathrm{cf}_\pi(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S})$.

(5) $\mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\mathfrak{c}}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathrm{cf}\,\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S})$, *and if* $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S})$ *is singular*, *then* $\mathrm{sh}_\kappa(\mathbb{S}) < \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S})$ *for* $\kappa < \mathfrak{c}$, $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1 = \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3 = \mathfrak{c}$, *and* $\mathfrak{c}$ *is singular.*

(6) *If* $\max\{\mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2, \mathfrak{a}_3\} = \mathfrak{c}$, *then* $\mathrm{add}(s^0) = \mathrm{sh}_{\mathfrak{a}_3}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathrm{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2}(\mathbb{S})$.

(7) *If* $\mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathfrak{c}$, *then*, *for every* κ *with* $\omega_1 \leq \kappa \leq \mathfrak{c}$, $\mathrm{add}(s^0) = \mathrm{sh}_\kappa(\mathbb{S}) = \mathrm{cf}_\pi(\mathbb{S})$.

(8) *If* $\mathfrak{a}_2 = \mathfrak{c}$, *then* $\mathrm{add}(s^0) = \mathrm{sh}_{\omega_1}(\mathbb{S})$.
(9) *If* $\mathfrak{a}_3 = \mathfrak{c}$, *then* $\mathrm{add}(s^0) = \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S})$.
(10) *If* $\mathfrak{a}(\mathrm{cf}\,\mathfrak{c}, \mathbb{S}) = \mathfrak{c}$, *then* $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathrm{cf}_\pi(\mathbb{S}) = \mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\mathfrak{c}}(\mathbb{S})$.

In particular, if $\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c}$, *then the assumptions of* (6)–(10) *are satisfied, and if* $\mathfrak{c}$ *is regular, then the assumption of* (10) *is satisfied.*

Here is the picture of the inequalities between the cardinals:



Proof: (1) $\mathrm{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2}(\mathbb{S}) \le \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S})$ because $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2 \le \mathfrak{c}$, $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S}) \le \mathrm{cf}\,\mathfrak{c}$ by Theorem 1.1(8). We shall sketch a proof of the inequality $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S}) \le \mathfrak{b}$ which a little simplifies the proof presented in [11]. Let us recall some notation.

For $p \in \mathbb{S}$ let $f_p \in {}^\omega\omega$ be such that for every n and every $s \in {}^{f_p(n)}2$ there is a splitting node $t \in {}^{<f_p(n+1)}2$ above s in p. For $p \in \mathbb{S}$ and $a \subseteq \omega$, $p[a]$ is a subtree of p defined by induction: (i) $\emptyset \in p[a]$; (ii) Let $s \in p[a]$ and $\mathrm{dom}\, s = n$. If $n \in a$, then, for $i = 0,\ 1$, $s^\frown i \in p[a]$ if and only if $s^\frown i \in p$. If $n \notin a$, then, for $i = 0,\ 1$, $s^\frown i \in p[a]$ if and only if $i = 0$ and $s^\frown 0 \in p$ or $i = 1$ and $s^\frown 0 \notin p$.

If $p, q \in \mathbb{S}$ and $a, b \subseteq \omega$, then $p[a] \cap q[b] = (p \cap q)[a \cap b]$, and if $[f_p(n), f_p(n+1)) \subseteq a$ for infinitely many n, then $p[a] \in \mathbb{S}$.

We shall construct a base matrix on $\mathbb{S}$ of size $\mathfrak{b}$ using the fact that $\mathfrak{h} \le \mathfrak{b}$ where $\mathfrak{h}$ is the minimal size of a base matrix on $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$ (see [2]). Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\omega\omega$ be an unbounded family of increasing functions and let $\{B_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{h}\}$ be a base matrix on $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$. If $p \in \mathbb{S}$, then there is an $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that the set $x_p = \{n : |[f(n), f(n+1)) \cap \mathrm{rng}\, f_p| \ge 2\}$ is infinite and so there is $\alpha < \mathfrak{h}$ and $a \in B_\alpha$ such that $a \subseteq^* x_p$. Now for $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $a \in \bigcup_{\alpha<\mathfrak{h}} B_\alpha$ let $\mathbb{S}_{f,a}$ be the set of all $p \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $|[f(n), f(n+1)) \cap \mathrm{rng}\, f_p| \ge 2$ for all but finitely many $n \in a$. As $\mathbb{S}_{f,a}$ has size $\le \mathfrak{c}$, we can assign, in a one-to-one way, for each $p \in \mathbb{S}_{f,a}$ an infinite set $b_{f,a,p} \subseteq a$ so that the system $\{g_{f,a,p} : p \in \mathbb{S}_{f,a}\}$ is almost disjoint. Let $c_{f,a,p} = \bigcup\{[f(n), f(n+1)) : n \in b_{f,a,p}\}$. Then $\{c_{f,a,p} : a \in B_\alpha$ and $p \in \mathbb{S}_{f,a}\}$ is an almost disjoint family and hence the system $A_{f,\alpha} = \{p[c_{f,a,p}] : a \in B_\alpha$ and $p \in \mathbb{S}_{f,a}\}$ is an antichain in $\mathbb{S}$ refining $\bigcup_{a \in B_\alpha} \mathbb{S}_{f,a}$. Therefore $\{A_{f,\alpha} : f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\alpha < \mathfrak{h}\}$ is a base matrix on $\mathbb{S}$.

$\mathrm{sh}_{\mathfrak{a}_3}(\mathbb{S}) \le \mathrm{add}(s^0)$: Let $\kappa < \mathrm{sh}_{\mathfrak{a}_3}(\mathbb{S})$ and let X_α, $\alpha < \kappa$, be s^0-sets. We prove that the set $X = \bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa} X_\alpha$ is an s^0-set and hence $\kappa < \mathrm{add}(s^0)$. Let A_α, $\alpha < \kappa$, be maximal antichains in $\mathbb{S}$ such that $X_\alpha \cap B_{A_\alpha} = \emptyset$. By Theorem 2.4(1) we can assume that for every $\alpha < \kappa$, B_{A_α} is a disjoint family. Let $q \in \mathbb{S}$ be arbitrary. By $(\kappa, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{a}_3)$-distributivity of r.o.$(\mathbb{S})$ there is $q' \le q$ such that for every α the set $A'_\alpha = \{p \in A_\alpha : q' \wedge p \neq 0\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{a}_3$. By the definition of $\mathfrak{a}_3$ it follows that every set $Y_\alpha = [q'] \setminus \bigcup B_{A'_\alpha}$ has size $< \mathfrak{c}$ and as $\kappa < \operatorname{cf} \mathfrak{c}$, the set $X \cap [q'] \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa} Y_\alpha$ has size $< \mathfrak{c}$. Therefore there is $r \le q'$ such that $X \cap [r] = \emptyset$.

$\operatorname{add}(s^0) \le \operatorname{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2}(\mathbb{S})$: Let $\kappa < \operatorname{add}(s^0)$ and let $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ be a system of maximal antichains in $\mathbb{S}$. We prove that for every $q \in \mathbb{S}$ there is $r \le q$ such that for every $\alpha < \kappa$ the set $\{p \in A_\alpha : r \wedge p \neq 0\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{a}_2$ and hence $\kappa < \operatorname{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2}(\mathbb{S})$. By refining the antichains, if necessary, we can assume without loss of generality that they all satisfy the conditions in Theorem 2.4(1). By the additivity assumption, the set $X = \bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa}({}^\omega 2 \setminus \bigcup B_{A_\alpha})$ is an s^0-set. Let $q \in S$. There is $r \le q$ such that $X \cap [r] = \emptyset$ and hence for every α, $[r] \subseteq \bigcup B_{A_\alpha}$. By Theorem 2.4(1) then, for every α, $C_\alpha = \{p \in A_\alpha : [r] \cap [p] \neq \emptyset\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{c}$ and by the definition of $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2$ we have $|C_\alpha| < \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2$.

(2) We prove only $\min\{\operatorname{sh}_{\mathfrak{a}_2}(\mathbb{S}), \operatorname{add}(s^0)\} \le \operatorname{sh}_{\omega_1}(\mathbb{S})$; all the remaining inequalities of this part of the theorem hold due to the monotonicity of the invariants $\operatorname{sh}_\kappa(\mathbb{S})$ and part (1).

Let $\kappa < \min\{\operatorname{sh}_{\mathfrak{a}_2}(\mathbb{S}), \operatorname{add}(s^0)\}$ and let A_α, $\alpha < \kappa$, be maximal antichains in $\mathbb{S}$. We show that for every $q \in \mathbb{S}$ there is $r \le q$ such that for every $\alpha < \kappa$ the set $\{p \in A_\alpha : r \wedge p \neq 0\}$ is countable. Without loss of generality we can assume that all the antichains A_α satisfy conditions in Theorem 2.4(2). Given $q \in \mathbb{S}$ by the κ-additivity of s^0 and $(\kappa, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{a}_2)$-distributivity of r.o.$(\mathbb{S})$ there is $q' \le q$ such that for each $\alpha < \kappa$, $[q'] \subseteq \bigcup B_{A_\alpha}$ and the set $\{p \in A_\alpha : q' \wedge p \neq 0\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{a}_2$. By condition (c) in Theorem 2.4(2), as $\kappa < \operatorname{cf} \mathfrak{c}$, the set $X = \bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa} \bigcup\{[q'] \cap [p] : p \in A_\alpha$ and $q' \wedge p = 0\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{c}$. Let $r \le q'$ be such that $X \cap [r] = \emptyset$. Then for each $\alpha < \kappa$ the set $\{p \in A_\alpha : [r] \cap [p] \neq \emptyset\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{a}_2$ and therefore it is countable.

(3) It is clear that $\operatorname{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_2}(\mathbb{S}) \le \operatorname{sh}(\mathbb{S}) = \operatorname{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1}(\mathbb{S})$. Let $\kappa_1 = \operatorname{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3}(\mathbb{S})$ and $\kappa_2 = \operatorname{add}(s^0)$. We prove that $\max\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\} = \operatorname{sh}(\mathbb{S})$. We know that the inequality $\le$ holds true. Let us assume that $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 < \operatorname{sh}(\mathbb{S})$ and we prove a contradiction. Let $\{A'_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa_1\}$ be a system of maximal antichains in $\mathbb{S}$ witnessing the $(\kappa, \mathfrak{c}, \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3)$-nowhere distributivity of r.o.$(\mathbb{S})$ and let $\{X_\beta : \beta < \kappa_2\}$ be a system of s^0-sets such that for every $q \in \mathbb{S}$, $[q] \cap \bigcup_{\beta<\kappa} X_\beta$ has size $\mathfrak{c}$. For each pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in \kappa_1 \times \kappa_2$ let $A_{\alpha,\beta}$ be a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{S}$ such that $A_{\alpha,\beta}$ refines A'_α and $X_\beta \cap \bigcup B_{A_{\alpha,\beta}} = \emptyset$. We can find $A_{\alpha,\beta}$'s so that the conditions in Theorem 2.4(2) are satisfied. We claim that the system $\{A_{\alpha,\beta} : (\alpha, \beta) \in \kappa_1 \times \kappa_2\}$ is a witness for the $(\kappa_1 \cdot \kappa_2, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{c})$-nowhere distributivity of r.o.$(\mathbb{S})$ which contradicts the inequality $\kappa_1 \cdot \kappa_2 < \operatorname{sh}(\mathbb{S})$. To see this let $q \in \mathbb{S}$ be arbitrary. As $\kappa_1 \cdot \kappa_2 < \operatorname{sh}(\mathbb{S})$ there is $r \le q$ such that for every $(\alpha, \beta) \in \kappa_1 \times \kappa_2$ the set $A'_{\alpha,\beta} = \{p \in A_{\alpha,\beta} : r \wedge p = 0\}$ has size $< \mathfrak{c}$. As $[r] \cap \bigcup_{\beta<\kappa_2} X_\beta$ has size $\mathfrak{c}$ and $\kappa_2 < \operatorname{cf} \mathfrak{c}$ there is $\beta < \kappa_2$ such that $[r] \cap X_\beta$ has size $\mathfrak{c}$. As for every α the antichain $A_{\alpha,\beta}$ refines the antichain A'_α, there is $\alpha < \kappa_1$

such that $|A'_{\alpha,\beta}| \geq \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3$. Now $[r] \cap X_\beta$ is disjoint from $\bigcup B_{A'_{\alpha,\beta}}$ and $|A'_{\alpha,\beta}| < \mathfrak{c}$. It follows that $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3 \geq |A'_{\alpha,\beta}|^+$ while $|A'_{\alpha,\beta}| \geq \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3$. A contradiction.

(4) The inequalities hold true by Theorem 1.2(6) because $\mathrm{sh}_{\omega_1}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\mathfrak{c}}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathrm{cf}\,\mathfrak{c}$.

(5) The inequalities hold true by Theorem 1.2(8) by which $\mathrm{sh}_\kappa(\mathbb{S})$ is regular for κ regular. Hence if $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S})$ is singular, then $\mathfrak{c}$ is singular, and as $\mathrm{add}(s^0)$ is regular, by (3), $\mathrm{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathrm{sh}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S})$. Therefore, $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_1 = \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_3 = \mathfrak{c}$.

(6)–(9) are easy consequences of the above proved inequalities using the fact that $\mathfrak{a}_i = \mathfrak{c}$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_i = \omega_1$.

(10) follows by (4) since under the assumption $\mathrm{sh}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathrm{sh}_{\mathrm{cf}\,\mathfrak{c}}(\mathbb{S})$. □

By Theorem 3.1(10), if the continuum is regular, then it is collapsed to a regular cardinal of the extension. MA(countable) does not imply the continuum is regular. Anyway, by Theorem 3.1(7), under MA(countable) (even under $\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c}$) Sacks forcing collapses the continuum to a regular cardinal in $V^{\mathrm{r.o.}(\mathbb{S})}$. We think that it is an open question whether Sacks forcing can collapse the continuum to a singular cardinal.

Under some hypotheses (see Theorem 3.1), there is $\kappa \leq \mathfrak{c}$ such that $\mathrm{add}(s^0) = \mathrm{sh}_\kappa(\mathbb{S})$. We do not know whether the same is true in ZFC.

References

[1] Balcar B., Vojtáš P., *Refining systems on Boolean algebras*, in: Set Theory and Hierarchy Theory, V (Proc. Third Conf., Bierutowice, 1976), Lecture Notes in Math. **619**, Springer, Berlin, 1977, pp. 45–58; MR 58 #16445.

[2] Balcar B., Simon P., *Disjoint refinement*, in: Handbook of Boolean Algebras, Vol. 2 (J.D. Monk and R. Bonnet, Eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989, pp. 333–388.

[3] Hausdorff F., *Summen von* $\aleph_1$ *Mengen*, Fund. Math. **26** (1936), 241–255; Zbl. 014.05402.

[4] Judah H., Miller A.W., Shelah S., *Sacks forcing, Laver forcing, and Martin's axiom*, Arch. Math. Logic **31** (1992), no. 3, 145–161; MR 93e:03074.

[5] Kechris A.S., *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **156**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995; MR 96e:03057.

[6] Koppelberg S., *Handbook of Boolean Algebras*, Vol. 1 (J.D. Monk and R. Bonnet, Eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989; MR 90k:06003.

[7] Marczewski (Szpilrajn) E., *Sur une classe de fonctions de W. Sierpiński et la classe correspondante d'ensembles*, Fund. Math. **24** (1935), 17–34; Zbl. 0010.19901.

[8] Miller A.W., *Covering* 2^ω *with* ω_1 *disjoint closed sets*, The Kleene Symposium (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., 1978), Stud. Logic Foundations Math. **101** (J. Barwise, H.J. Keisler, and K. Kunen, Eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980, pp. 415–421; MR 82k:03083.

[9] Newelski L., *On partitions of the real line into compact sets*, J. Symbolic Logic **52** (1997), no. 2, 353–359; MR 88k:03107.

[10] Rosłanowski A., Shelah S., *More forcing notions imply diamond*, Arch. Math. Logic **35** (1996), no. 5–6, 299–313; MR 97j:03098.

[11] Simon P., *Sacks forcing collapses* $\mathfrak{c}$ *to* $\mathfrak{b}$, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **34** (1993), no. 4, 707–710; MR 94m:03084.
[12] Vaughan J.E., *Small uncountable cardinals and topology*, in: Open Problems of Topology (J. van Mill and G.M. Reed, Eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990, pp. 195–218.

Mathematical Institute of Slovak Academy of Sciences, Jesenná 5, 041 54 Košice, Slovakia

E-mail: repicky@kosice.upjs.sk

(*Received* September 14, 2002, *revised* December 3, 2002)