

Theorem \mathcal{U} non-meagre \mathcal{P} -filter \iff I has no winning strategy in the point game

Proof: Not relevant; cf. Shelah, *Combinatorics*

The \mathcal{P} -point game: For \mathcal{P} -filter \mathcal{U} on ω

I $A_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ $A_1 \in \mathcal{U}$... II wins if $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} A_i \in \mathcal{U}$
 II $a_0 \in A_0$ $a_1 \in A_1$... $\bigcap_{i \in \omega} a_i = \emptyset$

Note II cannot have a winning strategy
 I can play two games, alternating, to get $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} a_i \cap \bigcap_{i \in \omega} \tilde{a}_i = \emptyset$

I. Basic properties

If \mathcal{U} is a non-meagre \mathcal{P} -filter both forcings are proper & ω^ω -bounding.

Towards these goals, let's consider our strategy, since it's conceptually easier let's start with ω^ω -bounding.

Given f with $\|f\|_{\mathcal{P}} \in \omega^\omega$, we can, of course, use the usual forcing lemma to get

conditions $\left. \begin{array}{l} p_{n+1} \leq p_n \\ k_n \in \omega \end{array} \right\}$ with $p_n \Vdash f(n) = k_n$.

But our forcing isn't $\bar{\sigma}$ -closed; so we need some kind of fusion.

This is where the game comes in.