COMBINATORIAL AND MODEL-THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES RELATED TO REGULARITY OF ULTRAFILTERS AND COMPACTNESS OF TOPOLOGICAL SPACES. III.

PAOLO LIPPARINI

Abstract. We generalize the results from [L2]; in particular the present results apply to singular cardinals, too.

See [L4, KV, HNV] for definitions and notation. We shall need the following theorem from [L5].

**Theorem 1.** If $\lambda$ is a singular cardinal, then an ultrafilter is $(\lambda, \lambda)$-regular if and only if it is either $(\text{cf } \lambda, \text{cf } \lambda)$-regular or $(\lambda^+, \lambda^+)$-regular.

**Corollary 2.** Suppose that $\lambda$ is a singular cardinal, and consider the topological space $X$ obtained by forming the disjoint union of the topological spaces $\lambda^+$ and $\text{cf } \lambda$, both endowed with the order topology.

Then, for every ultrafilter $D$, the space $X$ is $D$-compact if and only if $D$ is not $(\lambda, \lambda)$-regular.

Thus, $X$ is productively $[\lambda', \mu']$-compact if and only if there exists a $(\lambda', \mu')$-regular not $(\lambda, \lambda)$-regular ultrafilter. In particular, $X$ is not productively $[\lambda, \lambda]$-compact.

**Proof.** By Theorem [L2], $D$ is not $(\lambda, \lambda)$-regular if and only if it is neither $(\text{cf } \lambda, \text{cf } \lambda)$-regular nor $(\lambda^+, \lambda^+)$-regular.

Hence, by [L2] Proposition 1, and since both $\lambda^+$ and $\text{cf } \lambda$ are regular cardinals, $D$ is not $(\lambda, \lambda)$-regular if and only if both $\lambda^+$ and $\text{cf } \lambda$ are $D$-compact. This is clearly equivalent to $X$ being $D$-compact.

The last statement is immediate from [C2] Theorem 1.7, also stated in [L2] Theorem 2. $\square$
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Let $\mathcal{2} = \{0, 1\}$ denote the two-elements topological space with the discrete topology. If $\lambda \leq \mu$ are cardinals, let $\mathcal{2}^\mu$ be the Tychonoff product of $\mu$-many copies of $\mathcal{2}$, and let $\mathcal{2}_\lambda^\mu$ denote the subset of $\mathcal{2}^\mu$ consisting of all those functions $h : \mu \to \mathcal{2}$ such that $|\{\alpha \in \mu | h(\alpha) = 1\}| < \lambda$.

In passing, let us mention that, when $\mu = \aleph_\omega$, the space $\mathcal{2}_\lambda^\mu$ provides an example of a linearly Lindelöf not Lindelöf space. See [AB, Example 4.1]. Compare also [S, Example 4.2].

Notice that $\mathcal{2}_\lambda^\mu$ is a Tychonoff topological group with a base of clopen sets.

Set theoretically, $\mathcal{2}_\lambda^\mu$ is in a one to one correspondence (via characteristic functions) with $S_\lambda(\mu)$, the set of all subsets of $\mu$ of cardinality $< \lambda$. Since many properties of ultrafilters are defined in terms of $S_\lambda(\mu)$, for sake of convenience, in what follows we shall deal with $S_\lambda(\mu)$, rather than $\mathcal{2}_\lambda^\mu$. Henceforth, we shall deal with the topology induced on $S_\lambda(\mu)$ by the above correspondence.

In detail, $S_\lambda(\mu)$ is endowed with the smallest topology containing, as open sets, all sets of the form $X_\alpha = \{x \in S_\lambda(\mu) | \alpha \in x\}$ ($\alpha$ varying in $\mu$), as well as their complements. Thus, a base for the topology consists of all finite intersections of the above sets; that is, the elements of the base are the sets $\{x \in S_\lambda(\mu) | \alpha_1 \in x, \alpha_2 \in x, \ldots, \alpha_n \in x, \beta_1 \notin x, \beta_2 \notin x, \ldots, \beta_m \notin x\}$, with $n, m$ varying in $\omega$ and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m$ varying $\mu$.

Notice that this topology is finer than the topology on $S_\lambda(\mu)$ used in [L2].

With the above topology, $S_\lambda(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{2}_\lambda^\mu$ are homeomorphic, thus $S_\lambda(\mu)$ can be given the structure of a Tychonoff topological group. Notice that if $\lambda \leq \mu$ then $S_\lambda(\mu)$ is not $[\lambda, \lambda]$-compact. Indeed, for $\alpha \in \mu$, let $Y_\alpha = \{x \in S_\lambda(\mu) | \alpha \notin x\}$. If $Z \subseteq \mu$ and $|Z| = \lambda$ then $(Y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in Z}$ is an open cover of $S_\lambda(\mu)$ by $\lambda$-many sets, $< \lambda$ of which never cover $S_\lambda(\mu)$.

**Proposition 3.** For every ultrafilter $D$ and every cardinal $\lambda$, the topological space $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ is $D$-compact if and only if $D$ is not $(\lambda, \lambda)$-regular.

**Proof.** Suppose that $D$ is an ultrafilter over $I$ and that $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ is $D$-compact. For every $f : I \to S_\lambda(\lambda)$ there exists $x \in S_\lambda(\lambda)$ such that $f(i)_{i \in I} D$-converges to $x$. If $\alpha \in \lambda$ and $\{i \in I | \alpha \in f(i)\} \in D$ then $\alpha \in x$, since otherwise $Y = \{z \in S_\lambda(\lambda) | \alpha \notin z\}$ is an open set containing $x$, and $\{i \in I | f(i) \in Y\} = \{i \in I | \alpha \notin f(i)\} \notin D$, contradicting $D$-convergence.

Whence, $\{\alpha \in \lambda | \{i \in I | \alpha \in f(i)\} \in D\} \subseteq x \in S_\lambda(\lambda)$, and thus $x$ has cardinality $< \lambda$; that is, $f$ does not witness $(\lambda, \lambda)$-regularity of $D$. Since $f$ has been chosen arbitrarily, $D$ is not $(\lambda, \lambda)$-regular.
Conversely, suppose that $D$ over $I$ is not $(\lambda, \lambda)$-regular, and let $f : I \to S(\lambda)$. Then $x = \{ \alpha \in \lambda \{ i \in I | \alpha \in f(i) \} \in D \}$ has cardinality $< \lambda$ and hence is in $S(\lambda)$. We show that $f D$-converges to $x$. Indeed, let $Y$ be a neighborhood of $x$: we have to show that $\{ i \in I | f(i) \in Y \} \in D$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $Y$ is an element of the base of $S(\lambda)$, that is, $Y$ has the form $\{ z \in S(\lambda) | \alpha_1 \in z, \alpha_2 \in z, \ldots, \alpha_n \in z, \beta_1 \notin z, \beta_2 \notin z, \ldots, \beta_m \notin z \}$. Since $D$ is closed under finite intersections, then $\{ i \in I | f(i) \in Y \} \in D$ if and only if $\{ i \in I | \alpha_1 \in f(i) \} \in D$ and $\{ i \in I | \alpha_2 \in f(i) \} \in D$ and ... and $\{ i \in I | \alpha_n \in f(i) \} \in D$ and $\{ i \in I | \beta_1 \notin f(i) \} \in D$ and ... and $\{ i \in I | \beta_m \notin f(i) \} \in D$. But all the above sets are actually in $D$, by the definition of $x$ and since $x \in Y$ and $D$ is an ultrafilter; thus $f D$-converges to $x$.

Since $f$ was arbitrary, every $f : I \to S(\lambda)$ $D$-converges, and thus $S(\lambda)$ is $D$-compact.

**Corollary 4.** The space $S(\lambda)$ is productively $[\lambda', \mu']$-compact if and only if there exists a $(\lambda', \mu')$-regular not-$(\lambda, \lambda)$-regular ultrafilter.

**Proof.** Immediate from Proposition 3 and [C2, Theorem 1.7].

In the statements of the next theorems the word “productively”, when included within parentheses, can be equivalently inserted or omitted.

**Theorem 5.** For all infinite cardinals $\lambda$, $\mu$, $\kappa$, the following are equivalent:

(i) Every productively $[\lambda, \mu]$-compact topological space is (productively) $[\kappa, \kappa]$-compact.

(ii) Every productively $[\lambda, \mu]$-compact family of topological spaces is productively $[\kappa, \kappa]$-compact.

(iii) Every $(\lambda, \mu)$-regular ultrafilter is $(\kappa, \kappa)$-regular.

(iv) Every productively $[\lambda, \mu]$-compact Hausdorff normal topological space with a base of clopen sets is productively $[\kappa, \kappa]$-compact.

(v) Every productively $[\lambda, \mu]$-compact Tychonoff topological group with a base of clopen sets is (productively) $[\kappa, \kappa]$-compact.

If $\kappa$ is regular, then the preceding conditions are also equivalent to:

(vi) Every productively $[\lambda, \mu]$-compact Hausdorff normal topological space with a base of clopen sets is $[\kappa, \kappa]$-compact.

**Proof.** Let us denote by (i)$_p$ Condition (i) when the second occurrence of the word “productively” is included, and simply by (i) when it is omitted. Similarly, for condition (v).

The equivalence of (i)-(iii) has been proved in [L2, Theorem 1], where it has also been proved that, for $\kappa$ regular, they are equivalent to (vi).
Since (ii) ⇒ (i) are trivial, we get that (i), (ii), (iii), (i) are all equivalent, and equivalent to (vi) for \( \kappa \) regular.

(ii) ⇒ (iv) and (ii) ⇒ (v) are trivial.

If (iii) fails, then there is a \( \lambda, \mu \)-regular ultrafilter which is not \((\kappa, \kappa)\)-regular, thus, for \( \kappa \) singular, the space \( X \) of Corollary 2 is productively \([\lambda, \mu]\)-compact. For \( \kappa \) regular, take \( X = \kappa \) with the order topology (see [L2]). \( X \) is Hausdorff, normal, with a base of clopen sets, but not productively \([\kappa, \kappa]\)-compact, again by Corollary 2, thus (iv) fails. We have proved (iv) ⇒ (iii).

(v) ⇒ (iii) is similar, using Corollary 4, since \( S_\kappa(\kappa) \) is not \([\kappa, \kappa]\)-compact.

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 6.** For all infinite cardinals \( \lambda, \mu \), and for any family \( (\kappa_i)_{i \in I} \) of infinite cardinals, the following are equivalent:

(i) Every productively \([\lambda, \mu]\)-compact topological space is (productively) \([\kappa_i, \kappa_i]\)-compact for some \( i \in I \).

(ii) Every productively \([\lambda, \mu]\)-compact family of topological spaces is productively \([\kappa_i, \kappa_i]\)-compact for some \( i \in I \).

(iii) Every \((\lambda, \mu)\)-regular ultrafilter is \((\kappa_i, \kappa_i)\)-regular for some \( i \in I \).

(iv) Every productively \([\lambda, \mu]\)-compact Hausdorff normal topological space with a base of clopen sets is productively \([\kappa_i, \kappa_i]\)-compact for some \( i \in I \).

(v) Every productively \([\lambda, \mu]\)-compact Tychonoff topological group with a base of clopen sets is (productively) \([\kappa_i, \kappa_i]\)-compact for some \( i \in I \).

If every \( \kappa_i \) is regular, then the preceding conditions are also equivalent to:

(vi) Every productively \([\lambda, \mu]\)-compact Hausdorff normal topological space with a base of clopen sets is \([\kappa_i, \kappa_i]\)-compact for some \( i \in I \).

**Proof.** The equivalence of (i)-(iii) has been proved in [L2, Theorem 3], thus, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5, we get that (i), (ii), (iii), (i) are all equivalent.

(ii) ⇒ (iv) ⇒ (vi) and (ii) ⇒ (v) ⇒ (v) are trivial.

If (iii) fails, then there is a \((\lambda, \mu)\)-regular ultrafilter \( D \) which for no \( i \in I \) is \((\kappa_i, \kappa_i)\)-regular. By Proposition 3 for every \( i \in I \) the topological space \( S_{\kappa_i}(\kappa_i) \) is \( D \)-compact. By Corollary 3, for every \( i \in I \) the topological space \( S_{\kappa_i}(\kappa_i) \) is \( D \)-compact, hence \( X = \prod_{i \in I} S_{\kappa_i}(\kappa_i) \) is \( D \)-compact, thus productively \([\lambda, \mu]\)-compact, by [C2, Theorem 1.7]. However, \( X \) is a Tychonoff topological group with a base of clopen sets which for no \( i \in I \) is \([\kappa_i, \kappa_i]\)-compact, thus (v) fails. We have proved (v) ⇒ (iii).

The proofs of (iv) ⇒ (iii) and (vi) ⇒ (iii) are similar, using the next proposition. If (iii) fails, then there is a \((\lambda, \mu)\)-regular ultrafilter \( D \) which for no \( i \in I \) is \((\kappa_i, \kappa_i)\)-regular. By the proof of Theorem 5, for
every $i \in I$ we have a $D$-compact topological space $X_i$ which falsify (iv), resp., (vi). Then the space $X = \{x\} \bigcup \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ we shall construct in the next definition is $D$-compact, thus productively $[\lambda, \mu]$-compact, by [C2, Theorem 1.7], and makes (iv), resp., (vi), fail.

**Definition 7.** Given a family $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ of topological spaces, construct their Frechet disjoint union $X = \{x\} \bigcup \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ as follows.

Set theoretically, $X$ is the union of (disjoint copies) of the $X_i$’s, plus a new element $x$ which belongs to no $X_i$. The topology on $X$ is the smallest topology which contains each open set of each $X_i$, and which contains $\{x\} \bigcup \bigcup_{i \in E} X_i$, for every $E \subseteq I$ such that $I \setminus E$ is finite.

**Proposition 8.** If $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ is a family of topological spaces, then their Frechet disjoint union $X = \{x\} \bigcup \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ is $T_0$, $T_1$, Hausdorff, regular, normal, $D$-compact (for a given ultrafilter $D$), $[\lambda, \mu]$-compact (for given infinite cardinals $\lambda$ and $\mu$), has a base of clopen sets if and only if so is (has) each $X_i$.

**Proof.** Straightforward. We shall comment only on regularity, normality and $D$-compactness.

For regularity and normality, just observe that if $C$ is closed in $X$ and $C$ has nonempty intersection with infinitely many $X_i$’s, then $x \in C$.

As for $D$-compactness, suppose $D$ is over $J$ and that each $X_i$ is $D$-compact. Let $(y_j)_{j \in J}$ be a sequence of elements of $X$. If $\{j \in J \mid y_j \in \bigcup_{i \in F} X_i\} \notin D$ holds for every $F \subseteq I$, then $(y_j)_{j \in J}$ $D$-converges to $x$. Otherwise, since $D$ is an ultrafilter, hence $\omega$-complete, there exists some $i \in I$ such that $\{j \in J \mid y_j \in X_i\} \in D$. But then $(y_j)_{j \in J}$ $D$-converges to some point of $X_i$, since $X_i$ is supposed to be $D$-compact.

When $\kappa$ is singular of cofinality $\omega$, Condition (vi) in Theorem 5 is equivalent to the other conditions. When each $\kappa_i$ is either a regular cardinal, or a singular cardinal of cofinality $\omega$, then Condition (vi) in Theorem 6 is equivalent to the other conditions. Proofs shall be given elsewhere.
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