

Now we're ready for some fusion!

Recall: \mathcal{P} is ω^{ω} -bounding if $\forall G \text{ generic } \forall f \in \mathbb{R}^{\omega} \exists g \in \omega^{\omega} \cap V: f \leq g$.

Lemma If u is a non-negative \mathcal{P} -filter, then \mathcal{P} is ω^{ω} -bounding.

Proof: • Let $p_0 \Vdash f \in \omega^{\omega}$.

• We describe a strategy for I in the \mathcal{P} -point game.

I split p_0 ... $\text{split}(p_{(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})})$...
 II $a_0 \leq \text{split } p_0$... $a_n \leq \text{split}(p_{(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})})$...

doing the following

1) $p_{(a_0, \dots, a_{i+1})} \leq p_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)} \quad \forall i < n-1$

2) $\bigcup_{j < i} a_j \leq \text{split}(p_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)}) \quad \forall i < n$

(We also keep track of) \rightarrow 3) $H_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)} \leq \omega$ such that $p_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)} \Vdash f(i) \in H_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)}$

[This is easy with the preceding 'crucial fact' lemma]

• Now II can beat this strategy (since u is a non-negative \mathcal{P} -filter), i.e.

there are $(a_i)_{i \in \omega}, (p_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)})_{i \in \omega}, (H_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)})_{i \in \omega}$ such that

1) $p_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)} \Vdash f(i) \in H_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)}$

2) $\text{split}(p_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)}) \geq \bigcup_{j < i} a_j$

3) $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} a_i \in u$

• But then $p := \bigwedge_{i \in \omega} p_i \in \mathcal{P}$ [$\text{split } p \geq \bigcup_{i \in \omega} a_i \in u$]

$\exists p \Vdash f(i) \in H_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)}$ for all i [$p \leq p_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)}$]

• In particular, $p \Vdash f(i) \leq \max H_{(a_0, \dots, a_i)}$

$\omega \rightarrow \omega \rightarrow \omega$, $n \mapsto \max H_{(a_0, \dots, a_n)}$ is as desired.

□

The proof for properness is similar, but we need the definition first...