

Forcing and combinatorics of Van Douwen families

Lukas Schembecker

University of Hamburg

27.01.2025

Some combinatorial families of reals

Definition

A family \mathcal{A} of infinite subsets of ω is called almost disjoint (ad) iff $A \cap B$ is finite for all $A \neq B \in \mathcal{A}$. \mathcal{A} is called maximal almost disjoint (mad) iff its maximal with respect to inclusion.

In combinatorial set theory we want to understand the possible sizes of such maximal families of reals and their relation to the existence of maximal objects of other types.

Definition

We define the spectrum and cardinal characteristic of mad families:

$$\text{spec}(\mathfrak{a}) := \{|\mathcal{A}| \mid \mathcal{A} \text{ is an infinite mad family}\}$$
$$\mathfrak{a} := \min(\text{spec}(\mathfrak{a}))$$

Proposition

$\mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{a}$, where \mathfrak{b} is the bounding number.

Theorem (Shelah 2004, [9])

$\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{a} < \mathfrak{d}$ in the Cohen model, where \mathfrak{d} is the dominating number.

$\aleph_1 < \mathfrak{d} < \mathfrak{a}$ is consistent in a template model.

Theorem (Hechler 1997, [5])

$\text{spec}(\mathfrak{a})$ is closed under singular limits.

Definition

Two functions $f, g : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ are called eventually different iff

$$\{n \in \omega \mid f(n) = g(n)\}$$

is finite. A family \mathcal{F} of such functions is called eventually different (e.d.) iff all its members are pairwise eventually different. \mathcal{F} is called maximal (m.e.d.) iff its maximal with respect to inclusion. Finally,

$$\text{spec}(\mathfrak{a}_e) := \{|\mathcal{F}| \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is a m.e.d. family}\}$$

$$\mathfrak{a}_e := \min(\text{spec}(\mathfrak{a}_e))$$

On eventually different families

Proposition (Bartoszynski, Judah 1995, [1])

$$\text{non}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \mathfrak{a}_e.$$

Theorem (Shelah 2004, [9]; Blass 2010, [2])

$\aleph_1 < \text{non}(\mathcal{M}) < \mathfrak{a}_e$ is consistent in a template model.

$\aleph_1 = \mathfrak{a} < \text{non}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{a}_e$ holds in the random model.

Questions for eventually different families

Question

Does ZFC prove $\mathfrak{a} \leq \mathfrak{a}_e$ or is $\mathfrak{a}_e < \mathfrak{a}$ consistent?

Question

Is $\text{spec}(\mathfrak{a}_e)$ closed under singular limits?

Theorem (Brian 2021, [3])

$\text{spec}(\mathfrak{a}_T)$ is closed under singular limits.

On Van Douwen families

Definition

Let \mathcal{F} be an e.d. family. We say that \mathcal{F} is a Van Douwen family iff for all infinite subsets $A \subseteq \omega$ also

$$\mathcal{F} \upharpoonright A := \{f \upharpoonright A \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

is a maximal eventually different family. In other words: For every partial function $g : A \rightarrow \omega$ there is a $f \in \mathcal{F}$ agreeing with g infinitely often.

Theorem (Zhang 1999, [10])

Under MA there is a Van Douwen family of size continuum.

Theorem (Raghavan 2010, [7])

There always is a Van Douwen family of size continuum.

Definition

Hence, we may define the spectrum and cardinal characteristic:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{spec}(\mathfrak{a}_v) &:= \{|\mathcal{F}| \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is a Van Douwen family}\} \\ \mathfrak{a}_v &:= \min(\text{spec}(\mathfrak{a}_v))\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, we have $\text{spec}(\mathfrak{a}_v) \subseteq \text{spec}(\mathfrak{a}_e)$, so that $\mathfrak{a}_e \leq \mathfrak{a}_v$. However, we may answer the two previous questions for Van Douwen families!

Proposition (Folklore)

ZFC *proves that* $\mathfrak{a} \leq \mathfrak{a}_v$.

Theorem (S. 2024, [8])

spec(\mathfrak{a}_v) *is closed under singular limits.*

Question

Does $\alpha_e = \alpha_v$ hold? Maybe even $\text{spec}(\alpha_e) = \text{spec}(\alpha_v)$?

A positive answer would give us a positive answer for the two previous old questions for α_e , respectively:

Question

Does $\alpha \leq \alpha_e$ hold? Is $\text{spec}(\alpha_e)$ closed under singular limits?

Measuring Van Douwen'ness

Towards the possible consistency of $\alpha_e < \alpha_v$ we may want to study maximal non Van Douwen families and their forcing indestructibility.

Definition (Raghavan)

Let \mathcal{F} be a m.e.d. family. We define its associated ideal $\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})$ as

$$\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F}) := \{A \in [\omega]^\omega \mid \mathcal{F} \upharpoonright A \text{ is not a m.e.d. family}\} \cup \text{Fin}.$$

Observation

\mathcal{F} is a Van Douwen family iff $\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Fin}$.

Theorem (Raghavan 2010, [7])

If \mathcal{F} is analytic, then $\text{Fin} \subsetneq \mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})$.

Corollary

Van Douwen families cannot be analytic.

Theorem (Horowitz, Shelah 2016, [6])

There is a Borel maximal eventually different family.

Many non Van Douwen families

Can we realize every ideal as the associated ideal of some m.e.d. family? If $\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})$ is a maximal ideal we have for every $A \in [\omega]^\omega \setminus \text{cofin}(\omega)$

- 1 either there is $g : A \rightarrow \omega$ such that $\mathcal{F} \upharpoonright A \cup \{g\}$ is e.d.,
- 2 or there is $g : A^c \rightarrow \omega$ such that $\mathcal{F} \upharpoonright A^c \cup \{g\}$ is e.d.,

so in some sense \mathcal{F} would be as far as possible away from being Van Douwen.

Theorem (S. 2024, [8])

Assume CH. Then for every ideal \mathcal{I} containing Fin there is a m.e.d. such that $\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{I}$.

Forcing indestructibility of the associated ideal

What about $\neg\text{CH}$? May the associated ideal exhibit some forcing indestructibility?

Definition

Let \mathcal{F} be a m.e.d. family and \mathbb{P} be a forcing. We say that $\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})$ is \mathbb{P} -indestructible iff for every \mathbb{P} -generic G in $V[G]$ we have that

$$\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})^{V[G]} = \langle \mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})^V \rangle,$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is the generated ideal.

Note that the indestructibility of $\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})$ implies that the maximality of \mathcal{F} is preserved.

Realizing Sacks-indestructible associated ideals

Theorem (S. 2024, [8])

Assume CH. Then for every ideal \mathcal{I} containing Fin there is a m.e.d. \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})$ is \mathbb{S}^{\aleph_0} -indestructible.

Theorem (Fischer, S. 2023, [4])

If $\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})$ is \mathbb{S}^{\aleph_0} -indestructible, then $\mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})$ is indestructible by any countably supported iteration or product of Sacks-forcing.

Corollary (S. 2024, [8])

In the iterated Sacks-model for every \aleph_1 -generated ideal \mathcal{I} there is a m.e.d. family \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{F})$.

References I

- [1] Tomek Bartoszyński and Haim Judah.
Set Theory: On the Structure of the Real Line.
A.K. Peters, Wellsley, MA, 1995.
- [2] Andreas Blass.
Combinatorial cardinal characteristics of the continuum.
In Matthew Foreman and Akihiro Kanamori, editors, *Handbook of Set Theory*, pages 395–489. Springer Dordrecht, 2010.
- [3] Will Brian.
Partitioning the real line into Borel sets.
To appear in *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*.
- [4] Vera Fischer and Lukas Schembecker.
Universally Sacks-indestructible combinatorial sets of reals.
preprint, submitted, 2023.
- [5] Stephen H. Hechler.
Short complete nested sequences in $\beta\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{N}$ and small maximal almost-disjoint families.
General Topology and its Applications, 2(3):139–149, 1972.
- [6] Haim Horowitz and Saharon Shelah.
A Borel maximal eventually different family.
Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 175(1, Part B):103334, 2024.
Kenneth Kunen (1943-2020).
- [7] Dilip Raghavan.
There is a Van Douwen family.
Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 362(11):5879–5891, 2010.
- [8] Lukas Schembecker.
Van Douwen and many non Van Douwen families.
preprint, 2023.
- [9] Saharon Shelah.
Two cardinal invariants of the continuum ($\mathfrak{d} < \mathfrak{a}$) and FS linearly ordered iterated forcing.
Acta Mathematica, 192(2):187–223, 2004.
- [10] Yi Zhang.
Towards a Problem of E. van Douwen and A. Miller.
Mathematical Logic Quarterly, 45(2):183–188, 1999.

Thank you for your attention!