

OPEN FILTERS AND MEASURABLE CARDINALS

SERHII BARDYLA, JAROSLAV ŠUPINA AND LYUBOMYR ZDOMSKYY

ABSTRACT. In this paper we show that the existence of a space X which possesses a free ω_1 -complete open ultrafilter is equivalent to the existence of a measurable cardinal. This result gives an answer to an old question of Liu. Also, we investigate the poset $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ of free open filters on a space X . In particular, we characterize spaces for which $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is a lattice. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we construct a scattered space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is order isomorphic to the n -element chain, which implies the affirmative answer to two questions of Mooney. Assuming CH we constructed a scattered space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is order isomorphic to $(\omega + 1, \geq)$. To prove the latter fact we introduced and investigated a new stratification of ultrafilters which depends on scattered subspaces of $\beta(\omega)$. We show that for each cardinal κ there exists a space X which possesses exactly κ -many free open filters. Assuming the existence of n measurable cardinals, for every $m_0, \dots, m_n \in \mathbb{N}$ we construct a space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is isomorphic to the direct product $\prod_{i=0}^n m_i$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

In this paper all spaces are assumed to be Hausdorff. Each natural number n is identified with the set $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$. All undefined notions can be found in [14] or [20]. Let \mathcal{F} be a filter on a set X and $Y \subset X$. If $Y \cap F \neq \emptyset$ for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, then the filter $\{F \cap Y : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ on Y is called a *trace of the filter \mathcal{F} on Y* . The family \mathcal{A} of subsets of X is said to *generate a filter \mathcal{F}* if the set of all finite intersections of elements of the family \mathcal{A} forms a base of \mathcal{F} . For any element x of a space X by $\mathcal{N}(x)$ we denote the filter on X whose base consists of all open neighborhoods of x .

Let R be any property of subsets of a topological space X and Y be a subspace of X . A filter \mathcal{F} on a space X is called

- an *R filter* if \mathcal{F} possesses a base consisting of the sets with property R ;
- an *R ultrafilter* if for any subset $A \notin \mathcal{F}$ of X with property R there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F \cap A = \emptyset$;
- *R (ultra)filter on Y* if the trace of \mathcal{F} on Y is an R (ultra)filter;
- *free* if $\bigcap \{\bar{F} : F \in \mathcal{F}\} = \emptyset$;
- *κ -complete* if for any $\lambda \in \kappa$ and subfamily $\{F_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ the set $\bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} F_\alpha$ belongs to \mathcal{F} .

In place of R we consider properties of being open, closed, G_δ , F_σ and Borel.

By $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ we denote the poset of all free open filters on a space X partially ordered by the inclusion, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_1 \leq \mathcal{F}_2$ iff $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2$ for any $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathbf{OF}(X)$.

Free open ultrafilters were investigated in [4, 21, 25]. In particular, Carlson and Porter [4] applied open ultrafilters to the study of maximal points and lower topologies in the poset of Hausdorff topologies on a given set. Open ultrafilters naturally appear in Čech-Stone compactifications of Tychonoff spaces. Namely, a known result of van Douwen [6] states that if X is a non-pseudocompact

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54A20, 54D80, 06Bxx, 03E55.

Key words and phrases. lattice of filters, free open filter, open ultrafilter, H-closed extension, κ -complete filter.

The first named author was supported by the Austrian Science Fund FWF (Grant M 2967). The second named author was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the Contract no. APVV-20-0045, and the Slovak Grant Agency VEGA under the contract No. VEGA 1/0657/22. The research was initiated during the research stay of the second author under the scholarship ICM-2020-00442 of the Austrian Agency for International Cooperation in Education and Research (OeAD-GmbH). The third named author was supported by the Austrian Science Fund FWF (Grant I 5930).

Tychonoff space with a countable π -base, then $\beta(X) \setminus X$ contains a remote point, i.e., there exists $y \in \beta(X) \setminus X$ such that y is not in the closure of any nowhere dense subset of X . A point $y \in \beta(X) \setminus X$ is remote if and only if the trace of $\mathcal{N}(y)$ on X is an open ultrafilter [4]. See [2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 39, 42] for more about remote points and their applications to non-homogeneity and butterfly points of Čech-Stone compactifications.

An uncountable cardinal κ which possesses a nonprincipal κ -complete ultrafilter is called *measurable*. The existence of a measurable cardinal cannot be proved within ZFC. The following fact is a folklore (see also [18, Lemma 10.2]).

Theorem. There exists a nonprincipal ω_1 -complete ultrafilter if and only if there exists a measurable cardinal.

Since any nonprincipal ultrafilter on a discrete space X is a free open ultrafilter, the following question of Liu is quite natural.

Question 1 ([21, Remark 3.12]). *Does there exist in ZFC a space X which possesses a free ω_1 -complete open ultrafilter?*

A topological space X is called *H-closed* if $\mathbf{OF}(X) = \emptyset$. Clearly, each compact space is H-closed, but the converse is not true. Free open filters are useful in investigating H-extensions. A space Y is called an *extension* of a space X if Y contains X as a dense subspace. If, moreover, the space Y is H-closed, then it is called an *H-extension* of X . H-extensions is a classical topic in General Topology. It was investigated by many authors in [19, 16, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 40, 43], also see the monograph [35]. By $\mathbf{H}(X)$ we denote the set of all H-extensions of a space X .

Free closed filters on topological spaces were investigated by Pelant, Simon and Vaughan [29]. In particular, they showed that every Hausdorff (Tychonoff, resp.) non-compact space admits at least ω_1 (ω_2 , resp.) free closed filters. Also, they constructed a normal space possessing a unique free closed ultrafilter. This motivated them to ask about the smallest possible non-zero number of free open filters on a given Hausdorff space.

In [24] Mooney constructed a space X admitting a unique free open filter and this way answered the question of Pelant, Simon and Vaughan. Note that the Mooney space X admits a unique extension Y . Moreover, Y is H-closed and $Y \setminus X$ is singleton. Also, he showed that for each Bell number¹ $B(n)$ there exists a space X such that $|\mathbf{H}(X)| = B(n)$. This motivated Mooney to ask the following questions:

Question 2 ([24, Question 6.8]). *Is there a space with exactly three H-extensions? Four? Other non-Bell numbers?*

Question 3 ([24, Question 6.9]). *Is there a space with two one-point H-extensions and no other H-extensions?*

In this paper we answer Question 1 by showing that the existence of a space X which possesses a free ω_1 -complete open ultrafilter is equivalent to the existence of a measurable cardinal. Also, we investigate the poset $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ of free open filters on a space X . In particular, we characterize spaces for which $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is a lattice and show that not every finite lattice can be represented as $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ for some space X . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we construct a scattered space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is order isomorphic to the n -element chain. This result implies the affirmative answer to Questions 2 and 3. Assuming CH we constructed a scattered space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is order isomorphic to $(\omega + 1, \geq)$. To prove the latter fact we introduced and investigated a new stratification of ultrafilters which depends on scattered subspaces of $\beta(\omega)$. Assuming the existence of n measurable cardinals, for every $m_0, \dots, m_n \in \mathbb{N}$ we construct a space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is isomorphic to the direct product $\prod_{i=0}^n m_i$.

¹For a positive integer n the Bell number $B(n)$ is equal to the number of equivalence relations on an n -element set.

2. COMPLETENESS OF DIFFERENT SORTS OF ULTRAFILTERS

We start with a simple but useful lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *An open filter \mathcal{F} on a space X is an open ultrafilter if and only if for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and open subset $U \subset F$ either $U \in \mathcal{F}$ or $F \setminus \overline{U} \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Assuming that \mathcal{F} is an open ultrafilter fix any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and an open subset $U \subset F$. Either $U \in \mathcal{F}$ or there exists an open set $H \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $H \cap U = \emptyset$. Then $H \cap \overline{U} = \emptyset$, implying that $\mathcal{F} \ni H \cap F \subset F \setminus \overline{U}$. Hence $F \setminus \overline{U} \in \mathcal{F}$.

(\Leftarrow) Assume that \mathcal{F} is an open filter on X such that for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and open subset $U \subset F$ either $U \in \mathcal{F}$ or $F \setminus \overline{U} \in \mathcal{F}$. Since $X \in \mathcal{F}$ for any open subset $U \subset X$ either $U \in \mathcal{F}$ or $X \setminus \overline{U} \in \mathcal{F}$. Then for any open set $U \notin \mathcal{F}$, the set $X \setminus \overline{U}$ is an element of \mathcal{F} disjoint with U . Hence \mathcal{F} is an open ultrafilter. \square

Lemma 2.1 implies that any open ultrafilter on a space X contains all dense open subsets of X .

The proof of the following theorem does not require that X satisfies any separation axioms.

Theorem 2.2. *There exists a space X possessing a free ω_1 -complete open ultrafilter if and only if there exists a measurable cardinal.*

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Let λ be a measurable cardinal. Since any nonprincipal ultrafilter on a discrete space is a free open ultrafilter, the cardinal λ endowed with the discrete topology possesses a free λ -complete open ultrafilter.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that a space X possesses a free ω_1 -complete open ultrafilter \mathcal{F} . Let

$$\lambda = \min\{\kappa : \exists \mathcal{F}' \in [\mathcal{F}]^\kappa : \text{Int}(\bigcap_{G \in \mathcal{F}'} \overline{G}) \notin \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Since the filter \mathcal{F} is free and ω_1 -complete we get that $\omega_1 \leq \lambda \leq |X|$. Let

$$\lambda' = \min\{\kappa : \exists \mathcal{F}' \in [\mathcal{F}]^\kappa : \text{Int}(\bigcap_{G \in \mathcal{F}'} \overline{G}) = \emptyset\}.$$

Claim 1. $\lambda = \lambda'$.

Proof. Since $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$ we get that $\lambda \leq \lambda'$. By the definition of λ , there exists a family $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ of cardinality λ such that $A = \text{Int}(\bigcap_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \overline{G}) \notin \mathcal{F}$. Since \mathcal{F} is an open ultrafilter, there exists an open set $B \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A \cap B = A \cap \overline{B} = \emptyset$. Then the family $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G} \cup \{B\}$ has cardinality λ and $\text{Int}(\bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \overline{H}) = \emptyset$. Thus, $\lambda = \lambda'$. \square

Next we shall inductively construct a subset $\{F_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ which satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) $F_0 = X$;
- (2) $F_{\alpha+1} \subset F_\alpha = \text{Int}(\overline{F_\alpha})$;
- (3) $F_\alpha \setminus \overline{F_{\alpha+1}} \neq \emptyset$;
- (4) $F_\xi = \text{Int}(\bigcap_{\alpha \in \xi} \overline{F_\alpha})$ if the ordinal ξ is limit;
- (5) $\text{Int}(\bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \overline{F_\alpha}) = \emptyset$.

Fix any family $\mathcal{G} = \{G_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ such that $\bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \overline{G_\alpha} = \emptyset$, which exists by Claim 1. For each $\alpha \in \lambda$ let $H_\alpha = \text{Int}(\overline{G_\alpha})$. Since $\overline{H_\alpha} = \overline{G_\alpha}$ we deduce that

$$\text{Int}(\bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} H_\alpha) \subset \text{Int}(\bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \overline{H_\alpha}) = \text{Int}(\bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \overline{G_\alpha}) = \emptyset.$$

Put $F_0 = X$. Assume that we already constructed $F_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ for each $\alpha < \xi$. Depending on ξ we do the following:

- assuming that $\xi = \theta + 1$, fix any $x \in F_\theta$ and find $P \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $x \notin \overline{P}$. Observe that the set P exists, because the filter \mathcal{F} is free. Put $F_\xi = \text{Int}(\overline{F_\theta} \cap \overline{H_\theta} \cap \overline{P})$.
- if ξ is limit, then put $F_\xi = \text{Int}(\bigcap_{\alpha < \xi} \overline{F_\alpha})$.

Note that the definition of λ implies that $F_\xi \neq \emptyset$ for each $\xi \in \lambda$. One can easily check that the constructed above family $\{F_\alpha, \alpha \in \lambda\}$ satisfies conditions (1)–(5).

For each $\alpha \in \lambda$ let $D_\alpha = F_\alpha \setminus \overline{F_{\alpha+1}}$.

Claim 2. *The set $D = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda} D_\alpha$ is open and dense in X .*

Proof. Being a union of open sets, the set D is open. To derive a contradiction, assume that the set D is not dense. Then there exists a nonempty open set $V \subset X \setminus D$. Since $F_0 = X$, $V \subset F_0$. Assume that for any $\alpha \in \xi$ we have that $V \subset \overline{F_\alpha}$. If $\xi = \eta + 1$, then $V \subset \overline{F_\eta}$ and $V \cap (F_\eta \setminus \overline{F_\xi}) = \emptyset$, because $F_\eta \setminus \overline{F_\xi} \subset D$ and $V \cap D = \emptyset$. Condition (2) implies that $V \subset \overline{F_\xi}$. If the ordinal ξ is limit, we get that $V \subset \overline{F_\alpha}$ for every $\alpha \in \lambda$. Then $V \subset \bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \overline{F_\alpha}$. Since V is open we get that $V \subset \text{Int}(\bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \overline{F_\alpha}) = F_\xi$. The above arguments provide that $V \subset \bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \overline{F_\alpha} = \emptyset$ which contradicts the choice of V . Hence the set D is dense. \square

By $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ we denote the filter generated by the base $\mathcal{B} = \{\text{Int}(\overline{F}) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Let us check that the filter $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ is λ -complete. For this fix any family $\{\text{Int}(\overline{F_\alpha}) : \alpha < \beta < \lambda\} \subset \mathcal{B}$. Since the filter \mathcal{F} is open, $\text{Int}(\overline{F_\alpha}) \in \mathcal{F}$ for each $\alpha \in \beta$. By the λ -completeness of the filter \mathcal{F} , the set $Z = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \beta} \text{Int}(\overline{F_\alpha})$ belongs to \mathcal{F} . Since $Z \subset \text{Int}(\overline{F_\alpha})$ we get that $\text{Int}(\overline{Z}) \subset \text{Int}(\overline{\text{Int}(\overline{F_\alpha})}) = \text{Int}(\overline{F_\alpha})$ for every $\alpha \in \beta$. It follows that $\text{Int}(\overline{Z}) \subset Z$, witnessing that $Z \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$. Hence the filter $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ is λ -complete.

For each $F \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$ let $W_F = \{\xi \in \lambda : D_\xi \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$. Consider the filter \mathcal{W} on the cardinal λ generated by the family $\{W_F : F \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}\}$. The λ -completeness of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ implies that the filter \mathcal{W} is λ -complete as well. To show that \mathcal{W} is an ultrafilter, consider any partition $\lambda = M \cup N$. Let $I = \bigcup_{\alpha \in M} D_\alpha$ and $J = \bigcup_{\alpha \in N} D_\alpha$. Clearly, the disjoint sets I, J are open and $D = I \cup J$. Since D is an open dense subset of X and the filter \mathcal{F} is an open ultrafilter, we get that $D \in \mathcal{F}$. Lemma 2.1 implies that either $I \in \mathcal{F}$ or $J \in \mathcal{F}$. Since the sets I and J are open and disjoint, we have that $\text{Int}(\overline{I}) \cap \text{Int}(\overline{J}) = \emptyset$. Assuming that $I \in \mathcal{F}$ we get that $\text{Int}(\overline{I}) \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$ and $M = W_{\text{Int}(\overline{I})} \in \mathcal{W}$. Otherwise, $\text{Int}(\overline{J}) \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$ and $N = W_{\text{Int}(\overline{J})} \in \mathcal{W}$. Hence \mathcal{W} is a λ -complete ultrafilter, witnessing that the cardinal λ is measurable. \square

According to [3] a space X is called *screened* if any open cover \mathcal{V} of a space X admits a refinement $\mathcal{W} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{W}_n$, where for each $n \in \omega$ the family \mathcal{W}_n consists of pairwise disjoint open sets. By Corollary 2.4 from [3], every paracompact space is screened.

Proposition 2.3. *There exists a screened space X possessing a free ω_1 -complete closed ultrafilter if and only if there exists a measurable cardinal.*

Proof. The “if” part of the proof is similar to those of Theorem 2.2.

Assume that a screened space X possesses a free ω_1 -complete closed ultrafilter \mathcal{F} . Consider the open cover $\mathcal{V} = \{X \setminus F : F \in \mathcal{F}, F \text{ is closed}\}$. Since the space X is screened, the cover \mathcal{V} admits a refinement $\mathcal{W} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{W}_n$, where for each $n \in \omega$ the family \mathcal{W}_n consists of pairwise disjoint open sets. For each $n \in \omega$ let $\mathbf{W}_n = \bigcup \mathcal{W}_n$. Note that if $\mathbf{W}_n \notin \mathcal{F}$, then the maximality of \mathcal{F} implies that the closed set $X \setminus \mathbf{W}_n$ belongs to \mathcal{F} . Consider the set $M = \{n \in \omega : \mathbf{W}_n \in \mathcal{F}\}$. If $\mathbf{W}_n \notin \mathcal{F}$ for all $n \in \omega$, then, by the ω_1 -completeness of \mathcal{F} , $\emptyset = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} (X \setminus \mathbf{W}_n) \in \mathcal{F}$ which implies a contradiction. Hence the set M is not empty. Fix any $n \in M$. Enumerate \mathcal{W}_n as $\{W_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$. For any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ define $H_F = \{\alpha \in \kappa : F \cap W_\alpha \neq \emptyset\}$. Consider the filter \mathcal{H} on κ generated by the base $\{H_F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. By the definition of the cover \mathcal{V} , $W_\alpha \notin \mathcal{F}$ for any $\alpha \in \kappa$. Therefore, the filter \mathcal{H} is nonprincipal. Since the filter \mathcal{F} is ω_1 -complete, then so is \mathcal{H} . Pick any subset $A \subset \kappa$. Assume that $A \notin \mathcal{H}$. Then for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ the set $F \cap (\bigcup_{\alpha \in \kappa \setminus A} W_\alpha) \neq \emptyset$. It follows that $F \cap (X \setminus (\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} W_\alpha)) \neq \emptyset$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$.

Since the set $G = X \setminus (\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} W_\alpha)$ is closed and \mathcal{F} is a closed ultrafilter, we get that $G \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $\mathcal{H} \ni H_G \subset \kappa \setminus A$, witnessing that $\kappa \setminus A \in \mathcal{H}$. Hence \mathcal{H} is a nonprincipal ω_1 -complete ultrafilter. \square

Lemma 2.4. *An ω_1 -complete filter \mathcal{F} on a space X is an F_σ ultrafilter if and only if \mathcal{F} is a closed ultrafilter.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Fix any $F \in \mathcal{F}$. There exists an F_σ set $B \subset F$ which belongs to \mathcal{F} . Then $B = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} B_i$ where the sets B_i are closed. To derive a contradiction, assume that there exists no $i \in \omega$ such that $B_i \in \mathcal{F}$. Taking into account that the sets B_i are closed and \mathcal{F} is an F_σ ultrafilter, we get that $X \setminus B_i \in \mathcal{F}$ for any $i \in \omega$. Since the filter \mathcal{F} is ω_1 -complete, the set $C = \bigcap_{i \in \omega} (X \setminus B_i)$ belongs to \mathcal{F} . But $B \cap C = \emptyset$ which implies a contradiction. Hence there exists $i \in \omega$ such that $B_i \in \mathcal{F}$. This provides that \mathcal{F} is a closed filter. At this point it is easy to see that \mathcal{F} is a closed ultrafilter.

(\Leftarrow) Fix any F_σ subset $B \subset X$ such that $B \notin \mathcal{F}$. Find closed sets $B_i, i \in \omega$ such that $B = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} B_i$. Since \mathcal{F} is a closed ultrafilter, for each $i \in \omega$ there exists $F_i \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F_i \cap B_i = \emptyset$. Then $F = \bigcap F_i \in \mathcal{F}$ and $F \cap B = \emptyset$, witnessing that \mathcal{F} is an F_σ ultrafilter. \square

A space X is called *perfectly normal* if it is normal and every closed subset in X is G_δ . For a filter \mathcal{F} on a space X by $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ we denote the closed filter on X generated by the family $\{\overline{F} : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

Lemma 2.5. *If \mathcal{F} is a free ω_1 -complete G_δ ultrafilter on a perfectly normal space X , then $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is a free ω_1 -complete closed ultrafilter.*

Proof. Clearly, the filter $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is ω_1 -complete. Consider any closed set A such that $A \notin \overline{\mathcal{F}}$. Assuming that $A \in \mathcal{F}$ we obtain that $A = \overline{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$, which implies a contradiction. Thus, $A \notin \mathcal{F}$. The perfect normality of the space X implies that the set A is G_δ . Since \mathcal{F} is a G_δ ultrafilter we obtain that $X \setminus A \in \mathcal{F}$. Since every open subset of X is F_σ there exists closed sets $B_i, i \in \omega$ such that $X \setminus A = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} B_i$. Bearing in mind that closed sets are G_δ in X , similarly as in the proof of Lemma 2.4 one can check that there exists $i \in \omega$ such that $B_i \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $B_i = \overline{B_i} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ and $A \cap B_i = \emptyset$. \square

Theorem 2.2, Proposition 2.3 and lemmas 2.4, 2.5 imply the following:

Theorem 2.6. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- *there exists a space X possessing a free ω_1 -complete open ultrafilter;*
- *there exists a screened space X possessing a free ω_1 -complete closed ultrafilter;*
- *there exists a screened space X possessing a free ω_1 -complete F_σ ultrafilter;*
- *there exists a perfectly normal screened space X possessing a free ω_1 -complete G_δ ultrafilter;*
- *there exists a measurable cardinal.*

Note that each metrizable space is perfectly normal, paracompact and, thus, screened. Theorem 2.6 implies the following.

Theorem 2.7. *For any property $R \in \{\text{open, closed, } G_\delta, F_\sigma\}$ there exists a metrizable space X possessing a free ω_1 -complete R ultrafilter if and only if there exists a measurable cardinal.*

Next we present a few examples of spaces with nice topological properties possessing a free ω_1 -complete closed (G_δ , resp.) ultrafilter. The following simple lemma shows that this kind of examples cannot be Lindelöf.

Lemma 2.8. *A space X is Lindelöf if and only if X possesses no free ω_1 -complete filters.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Fix any free filter \mathcal{F} on a Lindelöf space X . Then every point $x \in X$ possesses an open neighbourhood $V(x)$ such that $X \setminus V(x) \in \mathcal{F}$. Since X is Lindelöf the open cover $\{V(x) : x \in X\}$ has a countable subcover $\{V(x_n) : n \in \omega\}$. Then $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} (X \setminus V(x_n)) = \emptyset$. Hence \mathcal{F} cannot be ω_1 -complete.

(\Leftarrow) Assume that a space X is not Lindelöf. Then there exists an open cover \mathcal{C} which doesn't have a countable subcover. Then the family $\{X \setminus \bigcup A : A \in [\mathcal{C}]^\omega\}$ generates a free ω_1 -complete filter. \square

In what follows in this chapter we assume that ordinals carry the order topology. A filter \mathcal{F} on an ordinal λ of uncountable cofinality is called a *club filter* if \mathcal{F} is generated by closed unbounded subsets of λ . For more about the club filter see Chapter II.6 of [20]. By $cf(\lambda)$ we denote the cofinality of λ . The next lemma shows that Proposition 2.3 fails without the assumption of being screened.

Lemma 2.9. *For each ordinal λ of uncountable cofinality the club filter is a free $cf(\lambda)$ -complete closed ultrafilter.*

Proof. Fix any bounded closed subset $A \subset \lambda$. Then the set $\{\alpha \in \lambda : \alpha > \sup A\}$ is an element of the club filter disjoint with A . Hence the club filter is a closed ultrafilter. Since each element of λ has a bounded open neighborhood, the club filter is free. Finally, the $cf(\lambda)$ -completeness of the club filter follows from [20, Lemma 6.8]. \square

By \mathfrak{t} we denote the minimal cardinality of a maximal tower on ω . See [1] for more details. It is known that $\omega_1 \leq \mathfrak{t} \leq \mathfrak{c}$.

Proposition 2.10. *There exists a separable first-countable normal locally compact space X of cardinality ω_1 which possesses a free ω_1 -complete closed ultrafilter. Moreover, if $\mathfrak{t} = \omega_1$, then X can be made sequentially compact.*

Proof. The space X will be a subspace of a space constructed by Franklin and Rajagopalan in [15] (see also Example 7.1 in [8]). Fix an increasing maximal tower $\mathcal{T} = \{T_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \kappa\}$ on ω . That is $\mathcal{T} \subset [\omega]^\omega$, $T_\alpha \subset^* T_\beta$, $|T_\beta \setminus T_\alpha| = \omega$ for any $\alpha \in \beta$, and there exists no subset $P \subset \omega$ such that $|\omega \setminus P| = \omega$ and $T_\alpha \subset^* P$ for all $\alpha \in \kappa$. The maximality of the tower \mathcal{T} implies that the ordinal κ is uncountable. Consider the space $Y(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T} \cup \omega$ which is topologized as follows. Points of ω are isolated and a basic open neighborhood of $T \in \mathcal{T}$ has the form

$$B(S, T, F) = \{P \in \mathcal{T} \mid S \subset^* P \subseteq^* T\} \cup ((T \setminus S) \setminus F),$$

where $S \in \mathcal{T} \cup \{\emptyset\}$ satisfies $S \subset^* T$ and F is a finite subset of ω . By Example 7.1 from [8], $Y(\mathcal{T})$ is separable normal locally compact and sequentially compact. Note that the subspace \mathcal{T} of $Y(\mathcal{T})$ is homeomorphic to the ordinal κ . Let $X = \omega \cup \{T_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ be a subspace of $Y(\mathcal{T})$. It is easy to see that the subspace $Z = \{T_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ of X is homeomorphic to the cardinal ω_1 . Lemma 2.9 implies that the subspace Z possesses a free ω_1 -complete closed ultrafilter \mathcal{F} . Since the set Z is closed in X , the filter \mathcal{F} is a free ω_1 -complete closed ultrafilter on X . Since ω is a dense subset of X , the space X is separable. Being an open subspace of a locally compact space Y , the space X remains locally compact. First-countability of X follows from the definition of topology on Y . Consider any two closed disjoint subsets A, B of X . If $|A| = |B| = \omega_1$, then $A \cap Z$ and $B \cap Z$ are closed unbounded. It follows that $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts our assumption. Hence without loss of generality we can assume that the set A is countable. Let $\xi = \sup\{\alpha \in \omega_1 : T_\alpha \in A\}$ and $R = \omega \cup \{T_\alpha : \alpha \leq \xi\}$. Put $C = B \cap R$. Clearly, C and A are disjoint closed subsets of an open countable subset R of X . Hence there exist disjoint open subsets $U(A)$ and $U(C)$ of R such that $A \subset U(A)$ and $C \subset U(C)$. Moreover, the definition of the topology on X implies that we lose no generality assuming that $(U(A) \cup U(C)) \cap \omega \subset T_\xi$. It is easy to check that the set $W = (\omega \setminus T_\xi) \cup \{T_\alpha : \alpha > \xi\}$ is open. Then the open sets $U(A)$ and $U(B) = U(C) \cup W$ are disjoint and contain the sets A and B , respectively. Hence the space X is normal.

If $\mathfrak{t} = \omega_1$, then we can assume that $\kappa = \omega_1$. In this case $X = Y(\mathcal{T})$ is sequentially compact and satisfies other mentioned properties (see [15] or Example 7.1 from [8] for more details). \square

Recall that a space X is called *countably compact* if X possesses no free closed filters with countable base.

Lemma 2.11. *Any free closed filter on a countably compact space can be enlarged to a free ω_1 -complete closed ultrafilter.*

Proof. Let X be a countably compact space possessing a free closed filter \mathcal{F}' . Enlarge \mathcal{F}' to a free closed ultrafilter \mathcal{F} . By the countable compactness of X , the family $\{\bigcap H : H \in [\mathcal{F}]^{\leq \omega}\}$ generates an ω_1 -complete free closed filter \mathcal{H} . Taking into account the maximality of \mathcal{F} and the inclusion $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}$, we obtain that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{H}$ is an ω_1 -complete free closed ultrafilter. \square

The *club principle* is the following consistent with ZFC statement: There is a sequence $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1, \alpha \text{ limit}\}$ such that for every α , A_α is cofinal in α and for every uncountable $X \subset \omega_1$ the set $\{\alpha \in \omega_1 : A_\alpha \subset X\}$ is not empty. The club principle was introduced by Ostaszewski [28] and usually is denoted by \clubsuit .

According to [13] an uncountable space X is called *sub-Ostaszewski* if every open subset of X is either countable or co-countable. By [13, Proposition 2.10] each sub-Ostaszewski space X has size ω_1 . Proposition 2.2 from [13] implies that and at most one point in X has no countable open neighborhood. Note that the subspace $Y = \{x \in X : x \text{ possesses a countable open neighborhood}\}$ of X is not Lindelöf, witnessing that X is not hereditary Lindelöf. By [13, Proposition 2.4], any sub-Ostaszewski space is hereditary separable. Recall that a hereditary separable regular space which is not hereditary Lindelöf is called an *S-space* [37]. By the famous result of Todorčević [41], there is a model of ZFC which contains no S-spaces and, as a consequence, no regular sub-Ostaszewski spaces.

Lemma 2.12. (\clubsuit) *There exists a perfectly normal hereditary separable first-countable locally compact space X which possesses a free ω_1 -complete filter \mathcal{F} which is simultaneously closed G_δ , F_σ and Borel ultrafilter.*

Proof. In [28] it was proved that assuming \clubsuit there exists a topology τ on ω_1 such that $X = (\omega_1, \tau)$ is a sub-Ostaszewski space which satisfies conditions mentioned in the statement of the lemma. Moreover, for any $\xi \in \omega_1$ the initial segment $\{\alpha : \alpha \leq \xi\}$ is open. It is straightforward to check that every Borel subset of X is either countable or co-countable.

Consider the filter \mathcal{F} generated by the family $\{\omega_1 \setminus \xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$. Clearly, the filter \mathcal{F} is ω_1 -complete. Since initial segments are open in X , the filter \mathcal{F} is free and closed. Consequently, the filter \mathcal{F} is F_σ and Borel. Since for every $\xi \in \omega_1$ the complement $\omega_1 \setminus (\omega_1 \setminus \xi)$ is countable, \mathcal{F} is a G_δ filter. Let us show that \mathcal{F} is simultaneously closed, F_σ , G_δ and Borel ultrafilter.

Pick any Borel set $A \subset X$ such that $A \notin \mathcal{F}$. Since any Borel set in X is either countable or co-countable, we get that the set A is countable. Then $\omega_1 \setminus (\sup A + 1) \in \mathcal{F}$ is a set disjoint with A . Hence \mathcal{F} is simultaneously closed, F_σ , G_δ and Borel ultrafilter. \square

The example constructed in the proof of Lemma 2.12 can be made countably compact [28]. But for this we need to assume \diamond instead of \clubsuit . For more information about \diamond see Chapter II.7 of [20]. Thus, we get the following:

Proposition 2.13. (\diamond) *There exists a hereditary separable perfectly normal first-countable locally compact countably compact space which possesses a free ω_1 -complete filter \mathcal{F} which is simultaneously closed G_δ , F_σ and Borel ultrafilter.*

Weiss [44] showed that MA implies that every perfectly normal countably compact space is compact. Moreover, Nyikos and Zdomskyy [27] proved that under PFA every first-countable separable normal countably compact space is compact. Thus, Proposition 2.13 cannot be proved within ZFC.

We finish this chapter with an auxiliary proposition about characters of open ultrafilters.

A *character* of a filter \mathcal{F} is the cardinal $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = \min\{|\mathcal{B}| : \mathcal{B} \text{ is a base of } \mathcal{F}\}$. Let

$$u = \min\{\chi(\mathcal{F}) : \mathcal{F} \text{ is a nonprincipal ultrafilter on } \omega\}.$$

A space X is called *CCC* if every pairwise disjoint family of open subsets of X is countable.

Proposition 2.14. *Let \mathcal{F} be a free open ultrafilter on a CCC space X . Then $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \geq u$.*

Proof. First we construct a special countable family of pairwise disjoint open subsets of X . Let U_0 be any open subset of X which doesn't belong to \mathcal{F} . Assume that we already constructed pairwise disjoint open subsets U_α , $\alpha \in \xi \in \omega_1$ such that for any $\delta \in \xi$, $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \delta} U_\alpha \notin \mathcal{F}$. If $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \xi} U_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\{U_\alpha : \alpha \in \xi\}$ is our desired family. Otherwise, the set $T = X \setminus \overline{\bigcup_{\alpha \in \xi} U_\alpha}$ is nonempty, as it belongs to \mathcal{F} (see Lemma 2.1). Pick any $x \in T$. Since the filter \mathcal{F} is free, there exists an open neighborhood $U(x) \subset T$ of x such that $U(x) \notin \mathcal{F}$. Then put $U_\xi = U(x)$. Note that the CCC property of the space X ensures that our induction will stop at some countable limit step, i.e., there exists a countable limit ordinal θ such that $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \theta} U_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$. Enumerate the family $\{U_\alpha : \alpha \in \theta\}$ as $\{V_n : n \in \omega\}$. For any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ consider the set $H_F = \{n \in \omega : F \cap V_n \neq \emptyset\}$. Observe that $\mathcal{H} = \{H_F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is the filter on ω . Pick any subset $A \subset \omega$. Lemma 2.1 implies that either $\bigcup_{n \in A} V_n \in \mathcal{F}$ or $\bigcup_{n \in \omega \setminus A} V_n \in \mathcal{F}$. In the first case the set $\bigcup_{n \in A} V_n \in \mathcal{F}$ is a witness for $A \in \mathcal{H}$. In the second case the set $\bigcup_{n \in A} V_n \in \mathcal{F}$ is a witness for $\omega \setminus A \in \mathcal{H}$. Hence \mathcal{H} is an ultrafilter. Observe that for any base \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{F} the family $\{H_B : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a base of \mathcal{H} . Since $\chi(\mathcal{H}) \geq \mathfrak{u}$ we get that $\chi(\mathcal{F}) \geq \mathfrak{u}$. \square

3. GENERAL FACTS ABOUT THE POSET OF FREE OPEN FILTERS ON A GIVEN SPACE

In this section we investigate properties of a poset $\mathbf{OF}(X)$. Results of this section will be used in the next ones. A space X is called *locally H-closed* if for each $x \in X$ there exists an open neighborhood U of x such that \overline{U} is H-closed. Next we recall the definition of Katetov H-extension which will be useful later on.

Definition 3.1. The Katetov H-extension $K(X)$ of a space X is the set

$$X \cup \{\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{F} \text{ is a free open ultrafilter on } X\}$$

endowed with the topology τ which satisfies the following conditions:

- X is an open subspace of $(K(X), \tau)$;
- open neighborhood base at $\mathcal{F} \in K(X) \setminus X$ consists of the sets $\{\mathcal{F}\} \cup F$, where $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is open.

For any space X , the Katetov extension $K(X)$ is the supremum of $\mathbf{H}(X)$ and it can be considered as a generalization of the Čech-Stone compactification (see [31] or [33] for more details).

A topological space X is called *almost H-closed* if it admits a unique free open ultrafilter. The following lemma is a consequence of Theorem 4.1 from [16].

Lemma 3.2. *Every almost H-closed space is locally H-closed.*

Let X be a locally H-closed non-H-closed space. Let \mathcal{F}_{inf} be the filter generated by the base $\{X \setminus K : K \text{ is an H-closed subspace of } X\}$.

Lemma 3.3. *For any locally H-closed non-H-closed space X the filter \mathcal{F}_{inf} is the infimum of $\mathbf{OF}(X)$.*

Proof. Clearly, \mathcal{F}_{inf} is a free open filter on X . To derive a contradiction, assume that there exists a free open filter \mathcal{H} on X such that $\mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}} \not\subset \mathcal{H}$. Then there exists an H-closed subset K of X such that $H \cap K \neq \emptyset$ for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Then the trace of \mathcal{H} on K is a free open filter, which contradicts the H-closedness of K . \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let X be an almost H-closed space and \mathcal{T} be a nonempty subset of $\mathbf{OF}(X)$. Then $\inf \mathcal{T} = \bigcap \mathcal{T}$, and $\sup \mathcal{T}$ exists and is generated by the family $\bigcup \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. By the definition of the order on $\mathbf{OF}(X)$, to prove that $\inf \mathcal{T} = \bigcap \mathcal{T}$ it suffices to show that $\bigcap \mathcal{T}$ is a free open filter. Since the space X is almost H-closed, there exists a unique free open ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_{sup} which contains every element of \mathcal{T} . By Lemma 3.2, X is locally H-closed. Lemma 3.3 implies that the filter \mathcal{F}_{inf} is the infimum of $\mathbf{OF}(X)$. Hence $\mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}} \subset \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\text{sup}}$ for each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}$. At this point it is clear that $\bigcap \mathcal{T}$ is a free filter. To prove that the filter $\bigcap \mathcal{T}$ is open fix any $F \in \bigcap \mathcal{T}$. Since

the set \mathcal{T} consists of open filters, for each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}$ there exists an open set $O_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $O_{\mathcal{F}} \subset F$. Then $H = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}} O_{\mathcal{F}}$ is open, $H \in \bigcap \mathcal{T}$ and $H \subset F$, witnessing that $\bigcap \mathcal{T}$ is a free open filter.

Since for each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\text{sup}}$, the family $\bigcup \mathcal{T}$ is centered. Let \mathcal{H} be the filter generated by the family $\bigcup \mathcal{T}$. Since each filter $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}$ is free and $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}$, the filter \mathcal{H} is free as well. The definition of the order on $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ implies that to complete the proof it remains to show that the filter \mathcal{H} is open. For this fix any $H \in \mathcal{H}$. It follows that there exist $\mathcal{F}_0, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{n-1} \in \mathcal{T}$ and elements $F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$, $i \in n$ such that $\bigcap_{i \in n} F_i \subset H$. Since the filters \mathcal{F}_i , $i \in n$ are open, for every $i \in n$ there exists an open set $O_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ such that $O_i \subset F_i$. Observe that the open set $\bigcap_{i \in n} O_i \subset H$ belongs to \mathcal{H} . \square

Corollary 3.5. *Let \mathcal{T} be a nonempty linearly ordered subset of $\mathbf{OF}(X)$. Then $\text{sup } \mathcal{T} = \bigcup \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.4, it suffices to show that $\bigcup \mathcal{T}$ is a filter. Fix any finite subset $\{F_i : i \in n\} \subset \bigcup \mathcal{T}$. By the linearity of \mathcal{T} , there exists $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\{F_i : i \in n\} \subset \mathcal{F}$. It follows that $\bigcap_{i \in n} F_i \in \mathcal{F} \subset \bigcup \mathcal{T}$. Hence $\bigcup \mathcal{T}$ is a filter. \square

A lattice (L, \vee, \wedge) is called *distributive* if $x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$. It is well-known that the latter condition is equivalent to its dual: $x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z)$.

The set $\mathbf{H}(X)$ of all H-extensions of a space X carries a natural partial order \leq defined as follows: for any $Y, Z \in \mathbf{H}(X)$, $Y \leq Z$ if there exists a continuous surjection $f : Z \rightarrow Y$ such that $f(x) = x$ for any $x \in X$. It can be checked [24] that $\mathbf{H}(X)$ is a complete upper semilattice with respect to this order, i.e. each subset $A \subset \mathbf{H}(X)$ has supremum in $\mathbf{H}(X)$. Order properties of compactifications and H-extensions were investigated in [5, 22, 23, 26, 36].

Theorem 3.6. *For a topological space X the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) X is almost H-closed;
- (2) the posets $\mathbf{H}(X)$ and $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ are order isomorphic;
- (3) the poset $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is a complete distributive lattice;
- (4) the poset $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is a lattice.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Let us show that any proper extension of X has a singleton remainder. To derive a contradiction, assume that Y is an extension of X such that $Y \setminus X$ contains two distinct points a, b . By Zorn's Lemma, the traces of the filters $\mathcal{N}(a)$ and $\mathcal{N}(b)$ on X can be enlarged to open ultrafilters \mathcal{F}_a and \mathcal{F}_b , respectively. Since the space Y is Hausdorff, there exists $U_a \in \mathcal{N}(a)$ and $U_b \in \mathcal{N}(b)$ such that $U_a \cap U_b = \emptyset$. Therefore the filters \mathcal{F}_a and \mathcal{F}_b are distinct which contradicts to the almost H-closedness of X . Define $\phi : \mathbf{H}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{OF}(X)$ by $\phi(Y) = \mathcal{F}_y$ where $Y \setminus X = \{y\}$ and \mathcal{F}_y is the trace of the filter $\mathcal{N}(y)$ (whose base consists of open neighborhoods of y) on X . Clearly, the filter \mathcal{F}_y is open and free, witnessing that the map ϕ is well-defined. At this point it is straightforward to check that ϕ is an injective order homomorphism between posets $\mathbf{H}(X)$ and $\mathbf{OF}(X)$. Fix any free open filter \mathcal{F} on X . Let τ be the topology on the set $X \cup \{\mathcal{F}\}$ which satisfies the following conditions:

- X is an open subspace of $(X \cup \{\mathcal{F}\}, \tau)$;
- the family $\{\{\mathcal{F}\} \cup F : F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } F \text{ is open}\}$ forms a base at \mathcal{F} .

Then $Y = (X \cup \{\mathcal{F}\}, \tau) \in \mathbf{H}(X)$ and $\phi(Y) = \mathcal{F}$ which implies that the map ϕ is surjective.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). Assume that the space X possesses two distinct free open ultrafilters $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$. Then there exist $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset$. It follows that there exists no open filter \mathcal{H} on X such that $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{F}_2 \subset \mathcal{H}$. Consequently, the poset $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ does not have a supremum. On the other hand, the Katetov extension $K(X)$ is the supremum of $\mathbf{H}(X)$ (see [31]). Hence the posets $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ and $\mathbf{H}(X)$ cannot be order isomorphic.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). Since (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) the space X is almost H-closed. Lemma 3.2 implies that X is locally H-closed. By the previous arguments, we have that each H-closed extension of X has a singleton remainder. Proposition 1 from [17] provides that the set of all H-closed extensions with a singleton remainder of a space X forms a complete sublattice of $\mathbf{H}(X)$. Hence the lattice $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is complete.

Consider any free open filters \mathcal{F} , \mathcal{G} , \mathcal{H} on X . Lemma 3.4 implies that the filter $\mathcal{F} \wedge (\mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{H})$ is generated by the family $\mathcal{A} = \{F \cup (G \cap H) : F \in \mathcal{F}, G \in \mathcal{G}, H \in \mathcal{H}\}$, and the filter $(\mathcal{F} \wedge \mathcal{G}) \vee (\mathcal{F} \wedge \mathcal{H})$ is generated by the family $\mathcal{B} = \{(F \cup G) \cap (F \cup H) : F \in \mathcal{F}, G \in \mathcal{G}, H \in \mathcal{H}\}$. Obviously, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$ witnessing that the lattice $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is distributive.

The implication (3) \Rightarrow (4) is trivial.

(4) \Rightarrow (1). Assume that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is a nonempty lattice and nonetheless X admits two distinct free open ultrafilters $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$. Then there exists $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset$. Since $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is a lattice there exists a filter $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{OF}(X)$ such that $\mathcal{G} = \max\{\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2\}$. It follows that $\{F_1, F_2\} \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2 \subset \mathcal{G}$, which implies a contradiction. \square

Recall that a lattice is distributive if and only if it contains as a sublattice none of the following two lattices:




FIGURE 1. Non-distributive lattices.

The latter fact and Theorem 3.6 imply the following:

Corollary 3.7. *There exist five-element lattices which cannot be isomorphic to $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ for any space X .*

Corollary 3.7 implies the following natural problem, which will be studied in the next sections.

Problem 3.8. Characterise finite lattices which can be represented as the lattice $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ for some Hausdorff space X .

Lemma 3.9. *Let X be an almost H -closed space and $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathbf{OF}(X)$. Then $\text{Int}(\overline{F}) \in \mathcal{F}_2$ for each $F \in \mathcal{F}_1$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{F}_{sup} and \mathcal{F}_{inf} be the supremum and infimum, respectively, of the lattice $\mathbf{OF}(X)$. Note that for any $F \subset X$ and open filter \mathcal{F} on X , $\overline{F} \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if $\text{Int}(\overline{F}) \in \mathcal{F}$. Taking into account the latter argument, it suffices to check that for each $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{sup}}$, $\overline{F} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. To derive a contradiction, assume that there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{sup}}$ such that $\overline{F} \notin \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. It follows that for each $H \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$ the set $H \setminus \overline{F}$ is nonempty. Then the family $\{H \setminus \overline{F} : H \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}\}$ forms a base of some free open filter on X which is not contained in the filter \mathcal{F}_{sup} . The obtained contradiction completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Corollary 3.10. *Let X be an almost H -closed space and \mathcal{U} be a unique free open ultrafilter on X . Then the family $\{\text{Int}(\overline{U}) : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is a base of the filter \mathcal{F}_{inf} .*

Proof. Clearly, the filter \mathcal{W} generated by the family $\{\text{Int}(\overline{U}) : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is an open filter. Note that for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, $\overline{U} = \text{Int}(\overline{U})$. Since the filter \mathcal{U} is free, the filter \mathcal{W} is free as well. Lemma 3.9 provides that the filter \mathcal{W} is contained in any other free open filter on X . Lemma 3.3 implies that $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. \square

The following lemma is useful for the investigation of finite and linear posets of free open filters.

Lemma 3.11. *Let \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H} be two distinct free open filters on a space X such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}$ and there exists no open filter \mathcal{G} satisfying $\mathcal{F} \subsetneq \mathcal{G} \subsetneq \mathcal{H}$. Let P be any open set which belongs to $\mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{F}$. By \mathcal{T}_P we denote the filter generated by the family $\{F \cap (X \setminus P) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Then the following statements hold:*

- (1) *the filter \mathcal{H} is generated by the family $\mathcal{F} \cup \{P\}$;*
- (2) *the filter \mathcal{F} is generated by the family $\{T \cup H : T \in \mathcal{T}_P \text{ and } H \in \mathcal{H}\}$;*
- (3) *\mathcal{T}_P is a free open ultrafilter on $X \setminus P$;*
- (4) *if for any open filter \mathcal{G} on X the inclusion $\mathcal{F} \subsetneq \mathcal{G}$ implies that $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{G}$, then \mathcal{F} is generated by the family $\{U \subset X : U \text{ is open and } U \cap (X \setminus P) \in \mathcal{T}_P\}$.*

If, moreover, the space X is almost H -closed, then

- (5) *\mathcal{T}_P traces an open ultrafilter on $\overline{P} \setminus P$.*

Proof. 1. Observe that the filter \mathcal{G} generated by the family $\mathcal{F} \cup \{P\}$ is open and satisfies $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ which implies that either $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H}$. Since $P \notin \mathcal{F}$ we deduce that $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H}$.

2. Let \mathcal{Z} be the filter generated by the family $\{T \cup H : T \in \mathcal{T}_P, H \in \mathcal{H}\}$. Consider any $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$. By the definition of \mathcal{Z} , there exist $T \in \mathcal{T}_P$ and $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $T \cup H \subset Z$. By item (1), the filter \mathcal{H} is generated by the family $\mathcal{F} \cup \{P\}$. It follows that there exists an element $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F \cap P \subset H$. By the definition of \mathcal{T}_P , there exists $G \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $G \subset F$ and $G \cap (X \setminus P) \subset T$. The choice of F implies that $G \cap P \subset F \cap P \subset H$. Thus, $G \subset T \cup H \subset Z$ witnessing that $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{F}$. To show the converse inclusion, fix any $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Put $H = F \cap P \in \mathcal{H}$ and $T = F \cap (X \setminus P) \in \mathcal{T}_P$. Obviously, $T \cup H \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $T \cup H = F$ witnessing that $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{F}$.

3. Clearly, \mathcal{T}_P is a free open filter on $X \setminus P$. To derive a contradiction, assume that the trace of \mathcal{T}_P on $X \setminus P$ is properly contained in an open filter \mathcal{U} on $X \setminus P$. It follows that there exists a set $U \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \mathcal{T}_P$ which is open in $X \setminus P$. Then there exists an open set $V \subset X$ such that $V \cap (X \setminus P) = U$. Let $W = V \cup P$. Consider the filter \mathcal{Z} generated by the family $\mathcal{F} \cup \{W\}$. Since the set W is open we get that \mathcal{Z} is an open filter. By the definition of \mathcal{Z} , $\mathcal{F} \subsetneq \mathcal{Z} \subsetneq \mathcal{H}$ which implies a contradiction.

4. Assume that for any open filter \mathcal{G} on X the inclusion $\mathcal{F} \subsetneq \mathcal{G}$ implies that $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{G}$. Consider the filter \mathcal{Z} which is generated by the family $\{U \subset X : U \text{ is open and } U \cap (X \setminus P) \in \mathcal{T}_P\}$. Obviously the filter \mathcal{Z} is open and $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{Z}$. If $\mathcal{Z} \neq \mathcal{F}$, the assumption of the statement implies that $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{Z}$. But this is not possible, since $P \notin \mathcal{Z}$. Hence $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{F}$.

5. By Lemma 3.9, $\overline{P} \setminus P \in \mathcal{T}_P$. At this point item (5) follows from item (3). \square

4. LINEARLY ORDERED FINITE LATTICES OF FREE OPEN FILTERS

In what follows ordinals are assumed to carry the discrete topology, if the converse not stated. The Čech-Stone compactification of a space X is denoted by $\beta(X)$. For a cardinal κ we shall identify a point $\alpha \in \kappa \subset \beta(\kappa)$ with the corresponding principal ultrafilter. A space X is called *scattered* if each subspace of X contains an isolated point. A *height* of a scattered space X is the minimal ordinal $ht(X)$ such that the $ht(X)$ -th Cantor-Bendixson derivative of X is empty. Recall that Cantor-Bendixson derivatives of a scattered space X is defined by transfinite induction as follows, where X' is the set of all accumulation points of X :

- $X^0 = X$;
- $X^{\alpha+1} = (X^\alpha)'$;
- $X^\alpha = \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} X^\beta$, if α is limit ordinal.

The set $X^\alpha \setminus X^{\alpha+1}$ is called the α -th *Cantor-Bendixson level* of X and is denoted by $X^{(\alpha)}$.

A subset X of a space Y is called *strongly discrete* if there exists a family $(U_x)_{x \in X}$ of open pairwise disjoint subsets of Y such that $U_x \cap X = \{x\}$ for every $x \in X$. The following lemma is a folklore. Nonetheless, we give an easy proof of it.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $X = \{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ be a strongly discrete subset of $\beta(\kappa)$. Then the space \overline{X} is homeomorphic to $\beta(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Since the set X is strongly discrete there exists a family $\{A_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda\}$ of open pairwise disjoint subsets of $\beta(\kappa)$ such that $X \cap A_\alpha = \{x_\alpha\}$ for any $\alpha \in \lambda$. Since the space $\beta(\kappa)$ is zero-dimensional, with no loss of generality we can assume that A_α is closed for each $\alpha \in \lambda$. Fix any function $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Define the function $f_1 : \kappa \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as follows:

$$f_1(\xi) = \begin{cases} f(x_\alpha), & \text{if } \xi \in A_\alpha \cap \kappa; \\ 0, & \text{if } \xi \in \kappa \setminus (\bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda} A_\alpha). \end{cases}$$

By the definition of $\beta(\kappa)$, there exists a continuous extension $\hat{f}_1 : \beta(\kappa) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of f_1 . Let $g = \hat{f}_1|_{\overline{X}}$. Since $\hat{f}_1(x_\alpha) = f(x_\alpha)$, g is a continuous extension of f . Hence every function $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ can be extended to a continuous function $g : \overline{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Corollary 3.6.3 from [14] implies that \overline{X} is homeomorphic to $\beta(X)$. Since X is a discrete set of cardinality λ , the space \overline{X} is homeomorphic to $\beta(\lambda)$. \square

Let ρ be an equivalence relation on a set X . Then for each $x \in X$ such that $x\rho y$ iff $x = y$ we denote the equivalence class $\{x\}$ simply by x . Recall that for a point x of a space X by $\mathcal{N}(x)$ we denote the filter generated by open neighborhoods of x . The following scheme was invented by Mooney [24] and it will be crucial in constructing almost H-closed spaces with certain properties of their lattices of free open filters.

Construction 1. Let X be a non-H-closed topological space and x^* be any non-isolated point of X . Let $K(X)$ be the Katětov extension of X .

Consider the Tychonoff product $K(X) \times \{0, 1\}$ where the set $\{0, 1\}$ carries the discrete topology. Let Y be the quotient space $(K(X) \times \{0, 1\})/\rho$ where the equivalence relation ρ is defined as follows: $(a, i) \sim (b, j)$ iff $a = b$ and $i = j$, or $a = b \in K(X) \setminus X$. Finally, put $M(X, x^*) = Y \setminus \{(x^*, 0)\}$. One can easily check that the space $M(X, x^*)$ is scattered if and only if X is scattered.

Lemma 4.2. *Let \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} be filters on a set X and \mathcal{A} a finite family of subsets of X such that $\bigcup \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$. If for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ traces of the filters \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} on A coincide, then $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. Fix any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ let $F_A = F \cap A$. By the assumption, for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $\bigcup \mathcal{A} \supset G_A \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $G_A \cap A \subset F_A$. Then $\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} G_A \in \mathcal{G}$ and $(\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} G_A) \subset \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} F_A \subset F$, witnessing that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$. Similarly one can show the converse inclusion. \square

The following theorem provides an affirmative answer to Questions 2, 3 and a partial answer to Problem 3.8.

Theorem 4.3. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a scattered space M such that $\mathbf{OF}(M)$ is an n -element chain.*

Proof. Fix any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We divide our proof into two steps. At the first step we construct a desired space M . At the second step we will show that $\mathbf{OF}(M)$ is an n -element chain.

Step 1. We start with the construction of a scattered subspace $X \subset \beta(\omega)$ such that $\omega \subset X$, $ht(X) = n + 1$, $X^{(n)}$ consists of one point which we denote by x^* and X satisfies the following condition:

(*) for each $m < n$ the family $\{U \cap X^{(m)} : U \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)\}$ is an ultrafilter on $X^{(m)}$.

Let $X_0 = \omega$. Assume that the strongly discrete subset $X_i \subset \beta(\omega)$ is already constructed for some $i \in n - 1$. Then put X_{i+1} to be any countable infinite discrete subset of $\overline{X_i} \setminus X_i$. The countability of X_{i+1} provides that the set X_{i+1} is strongly discrete in $\beta(\omega)$. This way we construct the sets X_i for $i \leq n - 1$. Finally, fix any point $x^* \in \overline{X_{n-1}} \setminus X_{n-1}$ and let X be the set $\bigcup_{i \in n} X_i \cup \{x^*\} \subset \beta(\omega)$ endowed with the subspace topology. One can easily check that X is scattered, $X^{(i)} = X_i$ for $i < n$

and $X^{(n)} = \{x^*\}$. It follows that $ht(X) = n + 1$. To check condition (*) fix any $m < n$. We can assume that $m > 0$, because condition (*) obviously holds in the case $m = 0$. Since X_m is a countable strongly discrete subset of $\beta(\omega)$, Lemma 4.1 implies that the subspace $\overline{X^{(m)}}$ is homeomorphic to $\beta(\omega)$. Since $x^* \in \overline{X^{(m)}}$ we obtain that the family $\{U \cap X^{(m)} : U \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)\}$ is a base of some ultrafilter on $X^{(m)}$.

Finally, let $M = M(X, x^*)$. Since X is scattered, the space M is scattered as well (see Construction 1).

Step 2. Let us check that $\mathbf{OF}(M)$ is an n -element chain. For this fix any free open filter \mathcal{F} on M . By Construction 1, the subspace $M \setminus ((X \setminus \{x^*\}) \times \{0\})$ is H-closed. Hence $(X \setminus \{x^*\}) \times \{0\} \in \mathcal{F}$. Note that $\omega \times \{0\}$ is a dense open discrete subspace of $(X \setminus \{x^*\}) \times \{0\}$. Thus $F \cap (\omega \times \{0\}) \neq \emptyset$ for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$. By the definition of M , $\{H \times \{0\} : H \in x^*\}$ is the only free in M open filter on $\omega \times \{0\}$. Therefore, the filter \mathcal{F} traces on $\omega \times \{0\}$ the mentioned above ultrafilter.

Let k be the maximal integer such that $F \cap (X^{(k)} \times \{0\}) \neq \emptyset$ for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$. For $m < k$ by Φ_m we denote the filter $\{(U \cap X^{(m)}) \times \{0\} : U \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)\}$ on $X^{(m)} \times \{0\}$. Let us show that for each $m \leq k$ the trace of the filter \mathcal{F} on the set $X^{(m)} \times \{0\}$ coincides with Φ_m . By condition (*), for any $m \leq k$ the filter Φ_m is an ultrafilter. Hence it suffices to show that $\Phi_m \subset \{F \cap (X^{(m)} \times \{0\}) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ for any $m \leq k$. For this, fix any $m \leq k$ and $(U \cap X^{(m)}) \times \{0\} \in \Phi_m$, where $U \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)$. With no loss of generality we can assume that U is a basic open neighborhood of x^* , that is an ultrafilter $x \in X$ belongs to U iff $U \cap \omega \in x$. Since the trace of \mathcal{F} on $\omega \times \{0\}$ coincides with $\{H \times \{0\} : H \in x^*\}$ there exists an open set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F \cap (\omega \times \{0\}) \subset (U \cap \omega) \times \{0\}$. Let us show that $F \cap (X^{(m)} \times \{0\}) \subset (U \cap X^{(m)}) \times \{0\}$. Indeed, take any point $(z, 0) \in F \cap (X^{(m)} \times \{0\})$. By the definition of the space X , z is an ultrafilter on ω . Since the set F is open and $F \cap (\omega \times \{0\}) \subset (U \cap \omega) \times \{0\}$, we get that $U \cap \omega$ is an element of the ultrafilter z . Consequently, $(z, 0) \in U \times \{0\}$, by the choice of U . Hence $F \cap (X^{(m)} \times \{0\}) \subset (U \cap X^{(m)}) \times \{0\}$, witnessing that $\Phi_m = \{F \cap (X^{(m)} \times \{0\}) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ for each $m \leq k$.

By $\Phi^{\leq k}$ we denote the open filter on M generated by the family $\{(U \cap (\bigcup_{i \leq k} X^{(i)})) \times \{0\} : U \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)\}$. By the arguments above, for each $i \leq k$ traces of the filters \mathcal{F} and $\Phi^{\leq k}$ on $X^{(i)} \times \{0\}$ coincide. Taking into account that $\bigcup_{i \leq k} (X^{(i)} \times \{0\}) \in \mathcal{F} \cap \Phi^{\leq k}$, Lemma 4.2 implies that $\mathcal{F} = \Phi^{\leq k}$.

To sum up, the space M admits exactly n distinct free open filters, namely, $\Phi^{\leq k}$, $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. Moreover, $\Phi^{\leq k} \subset \Phi^{\leq m}$ iff $m \leq k$. Hence $\mathbf{OF}(M)$ is an n -element chain. \square

Assume that for each $\alpha \in \kappa$, \mathcal{F}_α is a filter on a set X_α . Then for a set $A \subset \kappa$ by $\bigwedge_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ we denote the filter on the set $\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} X_\alpha$ generated by the family $\{\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} F_\alpha : F_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha\}$.

Proposition 4.4. *For each cardinal κ there exists a space Y which possesses exactly κ -many free open filters.*

Proof. If $\kappa < \omega$, then the statement follows from Theorem 4.3. So, fix any infinite cardinal κ . For each $\alpha \in \kappa$ let X_α be a space admitting a unique free open filter \mathcal{F}_α , which exists by Theorem 4.3. Let Y be the disjoint union $\bigsqcup_{\alpha \in \kappa} X_\alpha \sqcup \{z\}$ endowed with the topology τ satisfying the following conditions:

- X_α is an open subspace of (Y, τ) for each $\alpha \in \kappa$;
- open neighborhood base at z consists of the sets $Y \setminus (\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} X_\alpha)$, where $A \in [\kappa]^{< \omega}$, i.e., A is a finite subset of κ .

We claim that the set of all free open filters on the space Y coincides with the set $\{\bigwedge_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{F}_\alpha : A \in [\kappa]^{< \omega}\}$ which has cardinality κ . By the definition of the topology on Y , any filter of the form $\bigwedge_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{F}_\alpha$, $A \in [\kappa]^{< \omega}$ is open and free. So, it remains to show the converse inclusion. For this fix any free open filter \mathcal{F} on the space Y . Since \mathcal{F} is free there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $z \notin \overline{F}$. It follows that there

exists a finite subset $A \subset \kappa$ such that $F \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} X_\alpha$. Let

$$B = \{\alpha \in \kappa : T \cap X_\alpha \neq \emptyset \text{ for each } T \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

The arguments above imply that $B \subset A$. The set B is nonempty, because otherwise there would exist elements $F_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$, $\alpha \in A$ such that $F_\alpha \subset \bigcup_{\beta \in A} X_\beta$ and $F_\alpha \cap X_\alpha = \emptyset$ implying that $\emptyset = \bigcap_{\alpha \in A} F_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ which is impossible. Since for each $\alpha \in B$ the space X_α possesses the unique free open filter \mathcal{F}_α we obtain that for each $\alpha \in B$ the trace of the filter \mathcal{F} on X_α coincides with \mathcal{F}_α . Since the subspaces X_α , $\alpha \in \kappa$ are clopen and pairwise disjoint it is straightforward to check that $\mathcal{F} = \bigwedge_{\alpha \in B} \mathcal{F}_\alpha$. \square

A *character* of a filter \mathcal{F} is the smallest cardinal κ such that \mathcal{F} possesses a base of size κ . A subset A of a poset P is called an *antichain* if $a \not\leq b$ for any two distinct elements $a, b \in A$. The next proposition shows that a lattice of free open filters can contain arbitrary large chains and antichains.

Proposition 4.5. *For every cardinal κ there exists an almost H -closed space X such that the lattice $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ contains a chain and an antichain of cardinality $> 2^\kappa$.*

Proof. Let κ be any infinite cardinal and $K(\kappa)$ be the Katetov extension of the discrete space κ . Fix an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on κ such that every element of \mathcal{U} has cardinality κ . For instance, one can consider any ultrafilter which contains the filter $\{S \subset \kappa : |\kappa \setminus S| < \kappa\}$. By X we denote the subspace $K(\kappa) \setminus \{\mathcal{U}\}$ of $K(\kappa)$. Since κ is a dense discrete subspace of X , \mathcal{U} is the unique free open ultrafilter on X . Consider the coarsest free open filter \mathcal{F}_{inf} on X . Corollary 3.10 implies that \mathcal{F}_{inf} is generated by the family $\{\text{Int}(\overline{U}) : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$. Put $X^* = X \setminus \kappa$ and let \mathcal{G} be the trace of the filter \mathcal{F}_{inf} on the set X^* . Clearly, the character of \mathcal{U} is at most 2^κ . It follows that the character of the filter \mathcal{G} is $\leq 2^\kappa$ as well. It is easy to see that the closure of every subset $A \in [\kappa]^\kappa$ in $K(\kappa)$ is open and homeomorphic to $K(\kappa)$. It follows that every element $G \in \mathcal{G}$ has cardinality $> 2^\kappa$. The latter two facts imply that \mathcal{G} is not an ultrafilter on $X \setminus \kappa$ and the set \mathbf{A} of all ultrafilters on $X \setminus \kappa$ which contain \mathcal{G} has cardinality $> 2^\kappa$. It is straightforward to check that for each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbf{A}$ the filter

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{F \cup U : F \in \mathcal{F}, U \in \mathcal{U}\}$$

on X is open and free. Then the family $\{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{F} \in \mathbf{A}\} \subset \mathbf{OF}(X)$ forms an antichain of cardinality $> 2^\kappa$.

Pick any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbf{A}$ such that $\{S \subset X^* : |X^* \setminus S| \leq 2^\kappa\} \subset \mathcal{F}$, which exists as every element of \mathcal{G} has cardinality $> 2^\kappa$. Let λ be the character of \mathcal{F} . Taking into account that $\lambda \geq 2^\kappa$ and the character of $\mathcal{G} \leq 2^\kappa$, one can inductively construct a family $\{B_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ such that for each $\alpha \in \lambda$, B_α doesn't belong to the filter generated by the family $\mathcal{G} \cup \{B_\xi : \xi \in \alpha\}$. For each $\alpha \in \lambda$ let \mathcal{H}_α be the filter on X^* generated by the set $\{B_\xi : \xi \in \alpha\} \cup \mathcal{G}$. Then for every $\alpha \in \lambda$, the filter

$$\mathcal{F}_\alpha = \{H \cup U : H \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha, U \in \mathcal{U}\}$$

on X is free and open. Moreover, $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_\beta$ if and only if $\alpha \in \beta$. Hence the set $\{\mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda\} \subset \mathbf{OF}(X)$ is a chain of cardinality $\lambda > 2^\kappa$. \square

5. INFINITE LINEAR ORDERS

For a subset $A \subset \kappa$ put $\langle A \rangle = \{\mathcal{F} \in \beta(\kappa) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Recall that the set $\langle A \rangle$ is clopen in $\beta(\kappa)$. Let \mathcal{F} be an ultrafilter on κ . We write that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \alpha$ (and say that the *height* of \mathcal{F} is greater than α) if there exists a scattered space $X \subset \beta(\kappa)$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $\mathcal{F} \in X^{(\alpha)}$ and for any $\xi \in \alpha$ the open neighborhood filter of \mathcal{F} traces on $X^{(\xi)}$ an ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_ξ ;
- (2) for any $0 < \gamma \leq \alpha$, for each selector $\langle F_\xi \in \mathcal{F}_\xi : \xi \in \gamma \rangle$ such that the set $U = \bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} F_\xi$ is open in X there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} X^{(\xi)}) \subset U$.

Recall that, by Lemma 4.1, if for some $\xi \in \alpha$ the set $X^{(\xi)}$ is strongly discrete in $\beta(\kappa)$, then \mathcal{F}_ξ is an ultrafilter.

Lemma 5.1. *Let \mathcal{F} be an ultrafilter on κ . If $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \alpha$, then $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \xi$ for any $\xi \in \alpha$.*

Proof. Fix any scattered space $X \subset \beta(\kappa)$ which is a witness for $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \alpha$, i.e., X satisfies conditions (1) and (2) above. Fix any $\xi \in \alpha$. Consider the subspace $Y = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \xi} X^{(\gamma)} \cup \{\mathcal{F}\}$ of X . At this point it is straightforward to check that the space Y is a witness for $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \xi$. \square

We shall write $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) = \alpha$ if $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \xi$ for any $\xi \in \alpha$, but $\neg(\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \alpha)$. Lemma 5.1 implies that if $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) = \alpha$, then $\neg(\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \delta)$ for any $\delta \geq \alpha$. Clearly, $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) = 1$ if and only if \mathcal{F} is a principal ultrafilter. The next lemma shows that consistently there exist free ultrafilters of height 2.

Lemma 5.2. $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) = 2$ for each P-point $\mathcal{F} \in \omega^*$.

Proof. To derive a contradiction, assume that there exists a scattered subspace $X \subset \beta(\omega)$ and a P-point $\mathcal{F} \in \omega^*$ such that $\mathcal{F} \in X^{(2)}$ and \mathcal{F} traces on the set $X^{(1)}$ an ultrafilter which we denote by \mathcal{F}_1 . Consider any countable family $\{H_n : n \in \omega\} \subset \mathcal{F}_1$. By the definition of \mathcal{F}_1 , for every $n \in \omega$ there exists $F_n \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\langle F_n \rangle \cap X^{(1)} \subset H_n$. Since \mathcal{F} is a P-point, there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F \subset^* F_n$ for any $n \in \omega$. Taking into account that $X^{(1)}$ consists of free ultrafilters, we obtain that $\langle F \rangle \cap X^{(1)} \subset \langle F_n \rangle \cap X^{(1)} \subset H_n$ for every $n \in \omega$. Thus, $\langle F \rangle \cap X^{(1)} \subset \bigcap_{n \in \omega} H_n$, witnessing that the ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_1 is ω_1 -complete. By [18, Lemma 10.2], the cardinality of the set $X^{(1)}$ is larger than some measurable cardinal. On the other hand, $|X^{(1)}| \leq \mathfrak{c}$ which implies a contradiction. \square

The defined above stratification of ultrafilters is motivated by the following result, whose proof resembles Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 4.3.

Proposition 5.3. *If there exists an ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on κ such that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \alpha$, then for every $\theta \leq \alpha$ there exists a scattered space M such that $\mathbf{OF}(M)$ is order isomorphic to $(\theta + 1, \geq)$.*

Proof. Consider any ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on κ of height $> \alpha$. Then there exists a scattered subspace $Y \subset \beta(\kappa)$ such that $\mathcal{F} \in Y^{(\alpha)}$, for any $\xi \in \alpha$ the filter $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F})$ traces on $Y^{(\xi)}$ an ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_ξ , and for any $\gamma \leq \alpha$, for each selector $\langle F_\xi \in \mathcal{F}_\xi : \xi \in \gamma \rangle$ such that the set $U = \bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} F_\xi$ is open in Y there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} Y^{(\xi)}) \subset U$. With no loss of generality we can assume that $\kappa \subset Y$. Fix any $\theta \leq \alpha$. Set $X = \bigcup_{\xi \in \theta} Y^{(\xi)} \cup \{\mathcal{F}\}$. Let $M = M(X, \mathcal{F})$. Construction 1 implies that the space M is scattered.

Let us show that $\mathbf{OF}(M)$ is order isomorphic to $(\theta + 1, \geq)$. For this fix any free open filter \mathcal{H} on M . By Construction 1, the subspace $M \setminus ((X \setminus \{\mathcal{F}\}) \times \{0\})$ is H-closed. Hence $(X \setminus \{\mathcal{F}\}) \times \{0\} \in \mathcal{H}$. Note that $\kappa \times \{0\}$ is a dense open discrete subspace of $(X \setminus \{\mathcal{F}\}) \times \{0\}$. Thus $H \cap (\kappa \times \{0\}) \neq \emptyset$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Observe that $\{F \times \{0\} : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is the only free in M open filter on $\kappa \times \{0\}$. Therefore, the filter \mathcal{H} traces on $\kappa \times \{0\}$ the mentioned above ultrafilter.

Let γ be the smallest ordinal such that exists $H \in \mathcal{H}$ which satisfies $H \cap (X^{(\gamma)} \times \{0\}) = \emptyset$. For $\beta \in \gamma$ by Φ_β we denote the filter on $X^{(\beta)} \times \{0\}$ which is generated by the family $\{U \times \{0\} : U \in \mathcal{F}_\beta\}$. We claim that for each $\beta \in \gamma$ the trace of the filter \mathcal{H} on the set $X^{(\beta)} \times \{0\}$ coincides with Φ_β . By the definition of X , for any $\beta \in \gamma$ the filter Φ_β is an ultrafilter. Hence it suffices to show that $\Phi_\beta \subset \{H \cap (X^{(\beta)} \times \{0\}) : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$ for any $\beta \in \gamma$. For this, fix any $\beta \in \gamma$ and $U \times \{0\} \in \Phi_\beta$, where $U \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$. With no loss of generality we can assume that $U = \langle V \rangle \cap X^{(\beta)}$ where $V \in \mathcal{F}$. Since the trace of \mathcal{H} on $\kappa \times \{0\}$ coincides with $\{F \times \{0\} : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ there exists an open set $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $H \cap (\kappa \times \{0\}) \subset (V \cap \kappa) \times \{0\}$. Let us show that

$$H \cap (X^{(\beta)} \times \{0\}) \subset (\langle V \rangle \cap X^{(\beta)}) \times \{0\} = U \times \{0\}.$$

Pick any point $(z, 0) \in H \cap (X^{(\beta)} \times \{0\})$. Note that $z \in X^{(\beta)}$ is an ultrafilter on κ . Since the set H is open and taking into account the definition of the topology on X , we get that V is an element of the ultrafilter z . Consequently, $(z, 0) \in (\langle V \rangle \cap X^{(\beta)}) \times \{0\} = U \times \{0\}$. Hence $H \cap (X^{(\beta)} \times \{0\}) \subset U \times \{0\}$, witnessing that $\Phi_\beta = \{H \cap (X^{(\beta)} \times \{0\}) : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$ for each $\beta \in \gamma$.

By $\Phi^{<\gamma}$ we denote the open filter on M generated by the family $\{(\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\beta \in \gamma} X^{(\beta)})) \times \{0\} : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. By the arguments above, for each $\beta \in \gamma$ the traces of the filters \mathcal{H} and $\Phi^{<\gamma}$ on $X^{(\beta)} \times \{0\}$ coincide. Let us show that $\mathcal{H} = \Phi^{<\gamma}$. Pick any element $(\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\beta \in \gamma} X^{(\beta)})) \times \{0\} \in \Phi^{<\gamma}$. There exists an open set $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $H_1 \cap (\kappa \times \{0\}) \subset F \times \{0\}$. By the definition of γ , there exists an open set $H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $H_2 \cap (X^{(\gamma)} \times \{0\}) = \emptyset$. Put $H = H_1 \cap H_2$. Using similar arguments as above it can be proved that $H \subset (\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\beta \in \gamma} X^{(\beta)})) \times \{0\}$. Hence $\Phi^{<\gamma} \subset \mathcal{H}$. To show the converse inclusion, fix any open set $H \in \mathcal{H}$. For each $\beta \in \gamma$, the set $F_\beta = \{z \in X^{(\beta)} : (z, 0) \in H\}$ belongs to the filter \mathcal{F}_β . Since the set H is open in M , the set $\bigcup_{\beta \in \gamma} F_\beta$ is open in X . By the choice of \mathcal{F} , there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\beta \in \gamma} X^{(\beta)}) \subset \bigcup_{\beta \in \gamma} F_\beta$. Consequently, $(\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\beta \in \gamma} X^{(\beta)})) \times \{0\} \subset H$, witnessing that $\Phi^{<\gamma} = \mathcal{H}$.

To sum up, $\mathbf{OF}(M) = \{\Phi^{<\gamma}, \gamma \in \theta + 1\}$, and $\Phi^{<\gamma_1} \subset \Phi^{<\gamma_2}$ iff $\gamma_2 \leq \gamma_1$. Hence $\mathbf{OF}(M)$ is order isomorphic to $(\theta + 1, \geq)$. \square

A subset A of a scattered space X is called *high* if $X^{(\alpha)} \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for every $\alpha \in ht(X)$.

Theorem 5.4. (CH) *There exists an ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on ω such that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \omega$.*

Proof. Observe that during step 1 of the proof of Theorem 4.3 for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we constructed a countable scattered subspace $X_n \subset \beta(\omega)$ which satisfies the following conditions:

- $ht(X_n) = n + 1$ and $X_n^{(n)} = \{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ (we denoted the filter \mathcal{F}_n by x^*);
- For each $m \in n$ the Cantor-Bendixson level $X_n^{(m)}$ is strongly discrete, implying that the filter $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_n)$ traces on $X_n^{(m)}$ an ultrafilter.

Consider any partition $\{P_n : n \in \omega\}$ of ω into disjoint infinite subsets. For each $n \in \omega$, X_n is homeomorphic to a subspace of $\langle P_n \rangle \cong \beta(\omega)$. Let Y be a topological sum of $\{X_n : n \in \omega\}$. Identify Y with a subspace of $\beta(\omega)$ such that $X_n \subset \langle P_n \rangle$. Enumerate the set of all high open subsets of Y as $\{U_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$. Moreover, we assume that each high open subset of Y appears cofinally many times in the enumeration. Also, enumerate all subsets of ω as $\{B_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$. Note that the latter two enumerations require CH. The desired ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on ω will be constructed by recursion of length ω_1 . Fix any $\beta \in \omega_1$ and assume that we already constructed a family $\mathcal{V}_\beta = \{V_\alpha : \alpha \in \beta\}$ of subsets of ω which satisfies the following conditions:

- (a) the family \mathcal{V}_β is centered and, thus, generates a filter which we denote by \mathcal{W}_β ;
- (b) for any $\alpha \in \beta$ either $B_\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\beta$ or $\omega \setminus B_\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\beta$;
- (c) for any $W \in \mathcal{W}_\beta$ the set $\langle W \rangle$ is high in Y , i.e., $\langle W \rangle \cap Y^{(m)} \neq \emptyset$ for any $m \in \omega$.

The filter \mathcal{W}_β is an approximation of the desired filter \mathcal{F} . At stage β two cases are possible:

- (i) for any $n \in \omega$ there exists $W_n \in \mathcal{W}_\beta$ such that $\langle W_n \rangle \cap Y^{(n)} \subset U_\beta$;
- (ii) there exists $n \in \omega$ such that $\langle W \rangle \cap (Y^{(n)} \setminus U_\beta) \neq \emptyset$ for any $W \in \mathcal{W}_\beta$.

If case (ii) holds, then put $V_\beta = \omega$. Informally speaking the set U_β is at this stage “irrelevant” for our filter \mathcal{W}_β .

Assume that case (i) holds. Since the ordinal β is countable the filter \mathcal{W}_β admits a countable nested base $\mathcal{B} = \{C_n : n \in \omega\}$, i.e., $C_n \subset C_m$ whenever $m \leq n$. Moreover, with no loss of generality we can assume that $C_n \subset \bigcap_{i \leq n} W_i$ for any $n \in \omega$.

First we inductively construct an auxiliary strongly discrete set $E_\beta = \{e_n : n \in \omega\} \subset Y$. Assume that some $n \in \omega$ we already constructed a set $\{e_k : k \in n\}$ such that $e_k \in \langle C_k \rangle \cap X_{\phi(k)}^{(k)}$ and $\phi(k_1) \neq \phi(k_2)$ for any distinct $k_1, k_2 \in n$. Taking into account that the set $T = \bigcup_{i \in n} X_{\phi(i)}$ is not high and the set $\langle C_n \rangle$ is high, we get that there exists a point $e_n \in \langle C_n \rangle \cap (Y^{(n)} \setminus T)$. Let k be the unique positive integer such that $e_n \in X_k$ and set $\phi(n) = k$. Recall that we identify Y with the subspace of $\beta(\omega)$, so we consider points $e_n, n \in \omega$ as ultrafilters on ω . For every $n \in \omega$ fix any element $S_n \in e_n$

such that $S_n \subset X_{\phi(n)} \cap C_n$ and $\langle S_n \rangle \cap Y^{(n)} = \{e_n\}$, which exists since the set $\langle C_n \rangle \cap X_{\phi(n)} \ni e_n$ is open in Y and the set $Y^{(n)}$ is discrete. Note that the equality $\langle S_n \rangle \cap Y^{(n)} = \{e_n\}$ implies that $\langle S_n \rangle \cap Y \subset \bigcup_{i \leq n} Y^{(i)}$. Finally set $V'_\beta = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} S_n$. The choice of S_n , $n \in \omega$ together with the injectivity of the function ϕ ensure that

$$\langle V'_\beta \rangle \cap Y = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} (\langle S_n \rangle \cap Y) \subset \bigcup_{n \in \omega} (\langle C_n \rangle \cap \bigcup_{i \leq n} Y^{(i)}) \subset \bigcup_{n \in \omega} (\langle \bigcap_{i \leq n} W_i \rangle \cap \bigcup_{i \leq n} Y^{(i)}) \subset U_\beta.$$

Claim. At least one of the following assertions holds:

- (†) for any $W \in \mathcal{W}_\beta$ the set $Z = \langle W \cap V'_\beta \cap B_\beta \rangle$ is high;
- (††) for any $W \in \mathcal{W}_\beta$ the set $Z = \langle W \cap V'_\beta \cap (\omega \setminus B_\beta) \rangle$ is high.

Proof. To derive a contradiction assume that both assertions fail. Then there exist $W_1, W_2 \in \mathcal{W}_\beta$ and $n_1, n_2 \in \omega$ such that for every $m \geq n = \max\{n_1, n_2\}$ the following equalities hold:

$$\langle W_1 \cap V'_\beta \cap B_\beta \rangle \cap Y^{(m)} = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \langle W_2 \cap V'_\beta \cap (\omega \setminus B_\beta) \rangle \cap Y^{(m)} = \emptyset.$$

Put $W = W_1 \cap W_2$. Since

$$V'_\beta \cap W \subset (W_1 \cap V'_\beta \cap B_\beta) \cup (W_2 \cap V'_\beta \cap (\omega \setminus B_\beta))$$

we obtain that for any $m \geq n$

$$\langle V'_\beta \cap W \rangle \cap Y^{(m)} \subset \langle W_1 \cap V'_\beta \cap B_\beta \rangle \cap Y^{(m)} \cup \langle W_2 \cap V'_\beta \cap (\omega \setminus B_\beta) \rangle \cap Y^{(m)} = \emptyset.$$

On the other hand, there exists $m \geq n$ such that $C_m \subset W$ and

$$e_m \in C_m \cap \langle V'_\beta \rangle \cap Y^{(m)} \subset \langle W \cap V'_\beta \rangle \cap Y^{(m)} = \emptyset,$$

which implies a contradiction. \square

If assertion (†) of Claim 5 holds, then put $V_\beta = V'_\beta \cap B_\beta$. Otherwise, set $V_\beta = V'_\beta \cap (\omega \setminus B_\beta)$. Clearly, the family $\mathcal{V}_{\beta+1} = \{V_\alpha : \alpha \in \beta + 1\}$ satisfies the inductive hypothesis. So, after completing the induction we obtain a centered family $\mathcal{V}_{\omega_1} = \{V_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$. Let \mathcal{F} be the filter generated by the family \mathcal{V}_{ω_1} . Fix any subset $B \subset \omega$. There exists $\xi \in \omega_1$ such that $B = B_\xi$. By the construction of the family \mathcal{V}_{ω_1} , either $V_\xi \subset B_\xi$ or $V_\xi \subset \omega \setminus B_\xi$. Thus, either $B \in \mathcal{F}$ or $\omega \setminus B \in \mathcal{F}$, witnessing that \mathcal{F} is an ultrafilter. Let $M = Y \cup \{\mathcal{F}\}$ be the subspace of $\beta(\omega)$. The definition of \mathcal{F} (see condition (c)) implies that $M^{(\omega)} = \{\mathcal{F}\}$. By \mathcal{F}_n we denote the trace of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F})$ on $M^{(n)}$. Observe that the definition of Y implies that for each $n \in \omega$ the set $M^{(n)} = Y^{(n)}$ is strongly discrete. Hence \mathcal{F}_n is an ultrafilter for every $n \in \omega$.

So, to prove that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \omega$ it remains to show that for any $0 < \gamma \leq \omega$ for each selector $\langle F_\xi \in \mathcal{F}_\xi : \xi \in \gamma \rangle$ such that the set $U = \bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} F_\xi$ is open in M , there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} M^{(\xi)}) \subset U$. It is easy to see that for $\gamma < \omega$ the latter condition is automatically fulfilled, as the filter \mathcal{F} is closed under finite intersections. Consider any selector $\langle F_n \in \mathcal{F}_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that the set $U = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} F_n$ is open in M . Since the set U is open and high in Y there exists a cofinal subset $\Xi \subset \omega_1$ such that $U = U_\xi$ for any $\xi \in \Xi$. For each $n \in \omega$ there exists a basic open neighborhood $\langle O_n \rangle$ of \mathcal{F} which witnesses that $F_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$, that is, $\langle O_n \rangle \cap M^{(n)} = \langle O_n \rangle \cap Y^{(n)} \subset F_n$. By the construction of \mathcal{F} for each $n \in \omega$ there exists $m(n) \in \omega$ and a family $\{V_{\xi_0}, \dots, V_{\xi_{m(n)}}\} \subset \mathcal{V}_{\omega_1}$ such that $\bigcap_{i \leq m(n)} V_{\xi_i} \subset O_n$. Set $\delta_n = \max\{\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{m(n)}\}$. Since the set Ξ is unbounded in ω_1 there exists $\mu \in \Xi$ such that $\mu > \sup\{\delta_n : n \in \omega\}$. Then at stage μ of our induction the set $U = U_\mu$ will be already “relevant” for the approximating filter \mathcal{W}_μ , that is case (i) holds. Taking into account that $Y = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} M^{(n)}$, the inclusion $\langle V_\mu \rangle \cap Y \subset \langle V'_\mu \rangle \cap Y \subset U$ implies that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \omega$. \square

Proposition 5.3 and Theorem 5.4 imply the following:

Corollary 5.5. (CH) *There exists a scattered space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is isomorphic to $(\omega + 1, \geq)$.*

However, we don't know the answer to the following problem:

Problem 5.6. Does there exist an ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on ω with $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \omega$ in ZFC?

The following lemma justifies why we considered ordinals with the reversed order.

Lemma 5.7. *If for a scattered space X , $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is order isomorphic to an ordinal α , then α is finite.*

Proof. Let X be a scattered space such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is isomorphic to an ordinal α . By Theorem 3.6, the space X possesses a unique free open ultrafilter \mathcal{U} . Since $X^{(0)}$ is a dense open subspace of X , $X^{(0)} \in \mathcal{U}$. Since $X^{(0)}$ is discrete, the filter \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter. Let \mathcal{F}_{inf} be the infimum of $\mathbf{OF}(X)$. Set $N = \min\{\xi \in ht(X) : \text{exists } F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}} \text{ such that } F \cap X^{(\xi)} = \emptyset\}$. If the ordinal N is infinite, then for each $n \in \omega$ consider a free open filter \mathcal{F}_n generated by the set $\mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}} \cup \{\bigcup_{i \leq n} X^{(i)}\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{F}_m \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_n$ whenever $n < m$. Thus, the lattice $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ contains an infinite decreasing chain $\{\mathcal{F}_n : n \in \omega\}$, which contradicts our assumption. Hence $N \in \omega$. At this point, using Lemma 3.11, it is straightforward to check that $\mathbf{OF}(X) = \{\mathcal{F}_i : i \in N\}$ which implies that $\alpha = N$ is finite. \square

Nevertheless, the following problem remains open:

Problem 5.8. Does there exist a space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is order isomorphic to an infinite ordinal?

Proposition 5.9. *Let \mathcal{F} be an ultrafilter on a measurable cardinal μ such that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \alpha \in \mu$. Then for every $n \in \omega$ there exists an ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_n on μ such that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}_n) > \alpha + n$.*

Proof. Assume that for some $n \in \omega$ there exists an ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on a measurable cardinal μ such that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \alpha + n$. Let X be a scattered subspace of $\beta(\mu)$ which is a witness of $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \alpha + n$. That is,

- (1) $\{\mathcal{F}\} = X^{(\alpha+n)}$ and for any $\xi \in \alpha + n$ the filter $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F})$ traces on $X^{(\xi)}$ an ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_ξ ;
- (2) for any $0 < \gamma \leq \alpha + n$, for each selector $\langle F_\xi \in \mathcal{F}_\xi : \xi \in \gamma \rangle$ such that the set $U = \bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} F_\xi$ is open in X there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} X^{(\xi)}) \subset U$.

Let $Y = X \times \mu$, where μ endowed with the discrete topology. For every $\xi \in \mu$ by X_ξ and \mathcal{F}_ξ we denote the set $X \times \{\xi\}$ and the point (\mathcal{F}, ξ) , respectively. Being a topological sum of μ -many disjoint copies of X , the space Y can be identified with a scattered subspace of $\beta(\mu)$ such that the set $Y^{(\alpha+n)} = \{\mathcal{F}_\xi : \xi \in \mu\}$ is strongly discrete in $\beta(\mu)$. By Lemma 4.1, the set $\text{cl}_{\beta(\mu)}(\{\mathcal{F}_\xi : \xi \in \mu\})$ is homeomorphic to $\beta(\mu)$. Then there exists an ultrafilter \mathcal{W} on μ such that $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{W})$ traces on the set $\{\mathcal{F}_\xi : \xi \in \mu\}$ a μ -complete ultrafilter. We claim that the scattered subspace $Z = Y \cup \{\mathcal{W}\}$ is a witness for $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{W}) > \alpha + n + 1$. It is straightforward to check that $\mathcal{W} \in Z^{(\alpha+n+1)}$ and for every $\xi \in \alpha + n + 1$ the trace of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{W})$ on $Z^{(\xi)}$ (which we denote by \mathcal{W}_ξ) is an ultrafilter. Fix any $0 < \gamma \leq \alpha + n + 1$ and selector $\langle W_\xi \in \mathcal{W}_\xi : \xi \in \gamma \rangle$ such that the set $U = \bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} W_\xi$ is open in Z . Then for each $\xi \in \gamma$ there exists a $A_\xi \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $\langle A_\xi \rangle \cap Z^{(\xi)} \subset W_\xi$. Since $|\gamma| \leq |\alpha| < \mu$ and the ultrafilter $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha+n}$ is μ -complete, the set $V = \bigcap_{\xi \in \gamma} (\langle A_\xi \rangle \cap Z^{(\alpha+n)}) \in \mathcal{W}_{\alpha+n}$. Let $D = \{\delta \in \mu : \mathcal{F}_\delta \in V\}$. For each $\xi \in \gamma$ and $\delta \in D$ the choice of A_ξ implies that the set W_ξ belongs to the trace of the filter $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_\delta)$ on $Z^{(\xi)}$. For every $\delta \in \mu$ put $U_\delta = U \cap X_\delta$. Since the sets U and X_δ are open in Z , for every $\delta \in \mu$ the set U_δ is open too. The definition of the space Y implies that for each $\delta \in D$ and $\xi \in \gamma$ the set $U_\delta \cap Z^{(\xi)}$ belongs to the trace of the filter $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_\delta)$ on $X_\delta^{(\xi)}$. Since for each $\delta \in D$ the space X_δ is a witness for $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}_\delta) > \alpha + n$ there exists $F_\delta \in \mathcal{F}_\delta$ such that $\langle F_\delta \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} X_\delta^{(\xi)}) \subset U_\delta$. Then it is easy to check that $W = \bigcup_{\delta \in D} F_\delta \in \mathcal{W}$ and

$$\langle W \rangle \cap \left(\bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} Z^{(\xi)} \right) = \bigcup_{\delta \in D} (\langle F_\delta \rangle) \cap \bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} Z^{(\xi)} \subset \bigcup_{\delta \in D} U_\delta \subset U.$$

\square

Theorem 5.4, Proposition 5.3 and Proposition 5.9 imply the following:

Corollary 5.10. (CH) For any measurable cardinal κ and $n \in \omega$ there exists an ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on κ such that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \omega + n$.

Corollary 5.11. Assuming CH and the existence of a measurable cardinal, for every $n \in \omega$ there exists a scattered space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is isomorphic to $(\omega + n + 1, \geq)$.

The next theorem shows that the existence of a measurable cardinal is a necessary assumption, if we want to construct a space X with $\mathbf{OF}(X) \cong (\alpha + 1, \geq)$ for $\alpha > \omega$ using techniques of Proposition 5.3.

Theorem 5.12. If there exists an ultrafilter \mathcal{F} such that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \alpha > \omega$, then there exists a measurable cardinal.

Proof. Assume that there exists a cardinal κ and an ultrafilter $\mathcal{F} \in \beta(\kappa)$ such that $\mathfrak{h}(\mathcal{F}) > \alpha > \omega$. Then there exists a scattered subspace $X \subset \beta(\kappa)$ satisfying the following two conditions:

- (1) $X^{(\alpha)} = \{\mathcal{F}\}$ and for any $\xi \in \alpha$ the open neighborhood filter of \mathcal{F} traces on $X^{(\xi)}$ an ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_ξ ;
- (2) for any $0 < \gamma \leq \alpha$, for each selector $\langle F_\xi \in \mathcal{F}_\xi : \xi \in \gamma \rangle$ such that the set $U = \bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} F_\xi$ is open in X there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{\xi \in \gamma} X^{(\xi)}) \subset U$.

Lemma 5.1 implies that we lose no generality assuming $\alpha = \omega + 1$. To derive a contradiction, assume that there exists no measurable cardinal. Then the ultrafilters \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}_ω are not ω_1 -complete, which implies the existence of families $\{H_n : n \in \omega\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and $\{G_n : n \in \omega\} \subset \mathcal{F}_\omega$ such that $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} H_n = \emptyset = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} G_n$. By the definition of \mathcal{F}_ω , for every $n \in \omega$ there exists $T_n \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\langle T_n \rangle \cap X^{(\omega)} \subset G_n$. For every $n \in \omega$ put $S_n = \bigcap_{i \leq n} H_n \cap (\bigcap_{i \leq n} T_n)$. Then $\{S_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a decreasing sequence of elements of \mathcal{F} such that $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} S_n \subset \bigcap_{n \in \omega} H_n = \emptyset$ and $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} (\langle S_n \rangle \cap X^{(\omega)}) \subset \bigcap_{n \in \omega} G_n = \emptyset$. For any $n \in \omega$ put $F_n = \langle S_n \rangle \cap X^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}_n$. Since $S_n \subset S_m$ whenever $m \leq n$, the set $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} F_i$ is open in X . Condition (2) implies the existence of a set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{i \in \omega} X^{(i)}) \subset \bigcup_{i \in \omega} F_i$. Denote $G = \langle F \rangle \cap X^{(\omega)} \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$. Since the set $\Phi = \langle F \rangle \cap (\bigcup_{i \in \omega} X^{(i)})$ is open, $\Phi \subset \bigcup_{i \in \omega} F_i$ and the set $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} F_i$ is open, we get that the set $(\bigcup_{i \in \omega} F_i) \cup G$ is open as well. Since $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} (\langle S_n \rangle \cap X^{(\omega)}) = \emptyset$ there exists $n \in \omega$ such that $W = G \setminus (\langle S_n \rangle \cap X^{(\omega)}) \neq \emptyset$. Consider any ultrafilter $\mathcal{U} \in W$. It follows that $S_n \notin \mathcal{U}$, witnessing that $\kappa \setminus S_n \in \mathcal{U}$. Since the set $(\bigcup_{i \in \omega} F_i) \cup G$ is open in X there exists $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\langle U \rangle \cap X \subset (\bigcup_{i \in \omega} F_i) \cup G$. Then $V = U \cap (\kappa \setminus S_n) \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\langle V \rangle \cap X \subset (\bigcup_{i \in \omega} F_i) \cup G$. Taking into account that $\mathcal{U} \in X^{(\omega)}$, $\emptyset \neq \langle V \rangle \cap X^{(n)} \subset F_n$. But since $V \cap S_n = \emptyset$, the definition of F_n implies that $\langle V \rangle \cap F_n = \emptyset$. The obtained contradiction completes the proof. \square

We finish this section with the lemma implying that not every linear lattice can be represented as $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ for some space X .

Lemma 5.13. If a poset $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is linear, then for every distinct $a \leq b \in \mathbf{OF}(X)$ there exist distinct $c, d \in \mathbf{OF}(X)$ such that $a \leq c \leq d \leq b$ and there exists no $e \in \mathbf{OF}(X) \setminus \{c, d\}$ satisfying $c \leq e \leq d$.

Proof. Assume that the poset $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is linear. Fix any distinct free open filters $a \subset b$ on X . There exists $F \in b \setminus a$. Set $c = \sup\{y \in \mathbf{OF}(X) : F \notin y\}$ and $d = \inf\{y \in \mathbf{OF}(X) : F \in y\}$. By Theorem 3.6, the filters c and d are well-defined. Lemma 3.4 implies that $F \in d = \bigcap\{y \in \mathbf{OF}(X) : F \in y\}$. By Corollary 3.5, $c = \bigcup\{y \in \mathbf{OF}(X) : F \notin y\}$. It follows that $F \notin c$. Since $F \in d \setminus c$ and the poset $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is linear we get that $c \leq d$. Clearly, $a \leq c \leq d \leq b$. Pick any $e \in \mathbf{OF}(X)$ and assume that $c \leq e \leq d$. Then either $F \in e$ or $F \notin e$. In the first case $e = d$. Otherwise, $e = c$. \square

6. FINITE NONLINEAR LATTICES OF FREE OPEN FILTERS

Assume that for each $n \in \omega$, \mathcal{F}_n is a filter on a set X_n . Then by $\prod_{i \in n} \mathcal{F}_i$ we denote the filter on the set $\prod_{i \in n} X_i$ generated by the family $\{\prod_{i \in n} F_i : F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i, i \in n\}$. If $n = 2$, then the product of filters \mathcal{F}_0 and \mathcal{F}_1 is denoted by $\mathcal{F}_0 \times \mathcal{F}_1$.

The following result was proved by Blass in his PhD-thesis.

Lemma 6.1. *For an ultrafilters \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} on sets X and Y , respectively, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G}$ is an ultrafilter;
- for every function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\bigcap_{x \in F} f(x) \in \mathcal{G}$.

Let $\{\kappa_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ be an increasing sequence of measurable cardinals. For any $i \geq 1$ fix any free κ_i -complete ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_i on κ_i . Let $\kappa_0 = \omega$ and U_0 be any free ultrafilter on ω . For each $0 < m \leq n$ by \mathcal{U}_m we denote the filter $\mathcal{U}_{m-1} \times \mathcal{F}_m$. Lemma 6.1 implies the following.

Corollary 6.2. *For any $m \leq n$, \mathcal{U}_m is an ultrafilter.*

Proof. Assume that for some $m < n$, \mathcal{U}_m is an ultrafilter. Observe that $|\prod_{i \leq m} \kappa_i| = \kappa_m < \kappa_{m+1}$ and the filter \mathcal{F}_{m+1} is κ_{m+1} -complete. Therefore, Lemma 6.1 implies that $\mathcal{U}_{m+1} = \mathcal{U}_m \times \mathcal{F}_{m+1}$ is an ultrafilter. \square

Lemma 6.3. *Let κ be a measurable cardinal, $\mathcal{D} = \{x_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$ be a strongly discrete subset of $\beta(\kappa)$, $\phi : \overline{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow \beta(\kappa)$ be a homeomorphism and $x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}} \setminus \mathcal{D}$. If the ultrafilters x_α , $\alpha \in \kappa$ are κ -complete and $\phi(x)$ is κ -complete, then x is κ -complete.*

Proof. Let us note that the homeomorphism ϕ exists by Lemma 4.1. Since ϕ is a homeomorphism we deduce that $\phi(\mathcal{D}) = \kappa$. To derive a contradiction, assume that x is not κ -complete. Then there exists a cardinal $\lambda < \kappa$ and a family $\{F_\xi : \xi \in \lambda\} \subset x$ such that $\bigcap_{\xi \in \lambda} F_\xi = \emptyset$. For each $\xi \in \lambda$ let $X_\xi = \{x_\alpha : F_\xi \in x_\alpha\}$. Since $x \in \overline{\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}}$ the sets X_ξ are nonempty. Taking into account that ϕ is a homeomorphism, it is easy to see that $\phi(X_\xi) \in \phi(x)$ for each $\xi \in \lambda$. Since the filter $\phi(x)$ is κ -complete the set $\bigcap_{\xi \in \lambda} \phi(X_\xi)$ is nonempty and belongs to $\phi(x)$. Pick any

$$x_\gamma \in \phi^{-1}\left(\bigcap_{\xi \in \lambda} \phi(X_\xi)\right) = \bigcap_{\xi \in \lambda} \phi^{-1}(\phi(X_\xi)) = \bigcap_{\xi \in \lambda} X_\xi.$$

Note that $F_\xi \in x_\gamma$ for each $\xi \in \lambda$. Since the ultrafilter x_γ is κ -complete, the set $\bigcap_{\xi \in \lambda} F_\xi$ belongs to x_γ , and hence it is nonempty, which contradicts the assumption. \square

The next lemma is an analogue of Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 4.3.

Lemma 6.4. *Let κ be a measurable cardinal. Then for each positive integer n there exists a scattered subspace $S \subset \beta(\kappa)$ which consists of κ -complete ultrafilters and satisfies the following conditions:*

- $\kappa \subset S$, $ht(S) = n + 1$ and $S^{(n)} = \{x^*\}$;
- ($*_\kappa$) for each $m < n$ the family $\{U \cap S^{(m)} : U \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)\}$ is a base of some κ -complete ultrafilter on $S^{(m)}$.

Proof. Let $S_0 = \kappa$. Assume that for some $i < n - 1$ we constructed a strongly discrete set $S_i = \{x_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\} \subset \beta(\kappa)$ of cardinality κ which consists of κ -complete ultrafilters. Next we shall construct a strongly discrete subset S_{i+1} . Decompose κ into pairwise disjoint subsets K_ξ , $\xi \in \kappa$ such that $|K_\xi| = \kappa$ and $\bigcup_{\xi \in \kappa} K_\xi = \kappa$. For each $\xi \in \kappa$ let $Y_\xi = \{x_\alpha : \alpha \in K_\xi\}$. Lemma 4.1 implies that for each $\xi \in \kappa$ there exists a homeomorphism $\phi_\xi : \overline{Y_\xi} \rightarrow \beta(\kappa)$. Pick any free κ -complete ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on κ . Let $S_{i+1} = \{\phi_\xi^{-1}(\mathcal{F}) : \xi \in \kappa\}$. Since S_i consists of κ -complete ultrafilters, Lemma 6.3 implies that S_{i+1} also consists of κ -complete ultrafilters. Let us show that S_{i+1} is strongly discrete. Since the set S_i is strongly discrete there exist pairwise disjoint sets $F_\alpha \in x_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \kappa$. Note that for each $\xi \in \kappa$ the set $H_\xi = \bigcup_{\alpha \in K_\xi} F_\alpha$ belongs to $\phi_\xi^{-1}(\mathcal{F})$. Since the sets K_ξ , $\xi \in \kappa$ are pairwise disjoint we get that the sets H_ξ are pairwise disjoint as well, witnessing that the set S_{i+1} is strongly discrete. This way we construct the sets S_i for $i \leq n - 1$. Let \mathcal{F} be a free κ -complete ultrafilter on κ and $\phi : \overline{S_{n-1}} \rightarrow \beta(\kappa)$ is any homeomorphism (which exists by Lemma 4.1). Put $x^* = \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{F})$. Lemma 6.3 ensures that

the ultrafilter x^* is κ -complete. Let S be the subspace $\bigcup_{i \in n} S_i \cup \{x^*\}$ of $\beta(\kappa)$. One can easily check that S is scattered, $S^{(i)} = S_i$ for $i < n$ and $S^{(n)} = \{x^*\}$. It follows that $ht(S) = n + 1$. To check condition $(*_\kappa)$ fix any $m < n$. We can assume that $m > 0$, because the ultrafilter x^* is κ -complete and, therefore, condition $(*_\kappa)$ obviously holds in the case $m = 0$. Since S_m is strongly discrete in $\beta(\kappa)$, Lemma 4.1 implies that the subspace $\overline{S^{(m)}}$ is homeomorphic to $\beta(\kappa)$. Since $x^* \in \overline{S^{(m)}}$ we obtain that the family $\{U \cap S^{(m)} : U \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)\}$ is a base of some ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on $S^{(m)}$. Finally, the κ -completeness of x^* yields that \mathcal{U} is κ -complete as well. \square

Recall that each $n \in \omega$ carries a natural linear order.

Theorem 6.5. *Let $\{\kappa_i : 1 \leq i \leq n-1\}$ be an increasing sequence of measurable cardinals. Then for each sequence $\{m_i : i \in n\}$ of positive integers there exists a Hausdorff space M such that the lattice $\mathbf{OF}(M)$ is order isomorphic to $\prod_{i \in n} m_i$.*

Proof. Similarly as in Theorem 4.3 we shall divide our proof into two steps. At first we construct a space M and then describe the lattice $\mathbf{OF}(M)$.

Step 1. Let $\kappa_0 = \omega$ and S_0 be a scattered subspace of $\beta(\omega)$ of height $m_0 + 1$ such that $S_0^{(m_0)} = \{x_0^*\}$, $\omega \subset S_0$ and S_0 satisfies condition $(*)$ (see Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 4.3). For each $1 \leq i < n$ let S_i be the scattered subspace of $\beta(\kappa_i)$ of height $m_i + 1$ which was constructed in Lemma 6.4. In particular, $\kappa_i \subset S_i$, $S_i^{(m_i)} = \{x_i^*\}$, S_i consists of κ_i -complete ultrafilters and satisfies condition $(*_\kappa)$. For $i \in n$ put

$$E_i = \{x_0^*\} \times \dots \times \{x_{i-1}^*\} \times S_i \times \{x_{i+1}^*\} \times \dots \times \{x_{n-1}^*\}.$$

By X we denote the subspace $(\bigcup_{i \in n} E_i) \cup \prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i$ of the Tychonoff product $\prod_{i \in n} S_i$. Note that by Corollary 6.2, the Tychonoff product $\prod_{i \in n} S_i$ can be naturally identified with a subspace of $\beta(\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i)$. Namely, a point $y = (y_0, \dots, y_{n-1})$ we can identify with the ultrafilter $\phi(y) = \prod_{i \in n} y_i$ on $\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i$. Moreover, the definition of the topology on X provides that ϕ is an embedding of X into $\beta(\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i)$. In particular, it follows that for each $x \in X$ the filter $\mathcal{N}(x)$ traces on $\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i$ an ultrafilter. For convenience we shall denote the point $(x_0^*, \dots, x_{n-1}^*) \in X$ by x^* .

Finally, let $M = M(X, x^*)$ (see Construction 1).

Step 2. Let us check that $\mathbf{OF}(M)$ is order isomorphic to $\prod_{i \in n} m_i$. For this fix any free open filter \mathcal{F} on M . By Construction 1, the subspace $M \setminus ((X \setminus \{x^*\}) \times \{0\})$ is H-closed. Hence $(X \setminus \{x^*\}) \times \{0\} \in \mathcal{F}$. Note that $(\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i) \times \{0\}$ is a dense open discrete subspace of $(X \setminus \{x^*\}) \times \{0\}$. Thus $F \cap ((\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i) \times \{0\}) \neq \emptyset$ for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$. The definition of X implies that the trace of $\mathcal{N}(x^*)$ on $\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i$ coincides with the filter $\prod_{i \in n} x_i^*$. Moreover, Corollary 6.2 implies that $\prod_{i \in n} x_i^*$ is an ultrafilter. By the definition of M , the ultrafilter \mathcal{U} generated by the family $\{F \times \{0\} : F \in \prod_{i \in n} x_i^*\}$ is the unique free open filter on $(\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i) \times \{0\}$. Therefore, the filter \mathcal{F} traces on $(\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i) \times \{0\}$ the ultrafilter \mathcal{U} .

For each $i \in n$ and $m \leq m_i$ put

$$\hat{E}_i^{(m)} = \{x_0^*\} \times \dots \times \{x_{i-1}^*\} \times S_i^{(m)} \times \dots \times \{x_{n-1}^*\},$$

and by Φ_i^m we denote the filter generated by the family

$$\{(U \cap \hat{E}_i^{(m)}) \times \{0\} : U \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)\}.$$

For each $i \in n$ let k_i be the minimal integer such that there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $F \cap (\hat{E}_i^{(m)} \times \{0\}) = \emptyset$. Since $\hat{E}_i^{(m_i)} = \{x^*\}$ for all $i \in n$ and the filter \mathcal{F} is free we get that $0 \leq k_i \leq m_i$, $i \in n$. Let $K = \{i \in n : k_i \neq 0\}$. Note that if $K = \emptyset$, then the filter \mathcal{F} equals to the filter \mathcal{U} .

We claim that for each $i \in K$ and $m \in k_i$, the traces of \mathcal{F} and Φ_i^m on the set $\hat{E}_i^{(m)} \times \{0\}$ coincide. Fix any $i \in K$ and $m \in k_i$. By condition $(*_\kappa)$ (see Lemma 6.4), the filter Φ_i^m is an ultrafilter. Hence it suffices to show that Φ_i^m is contained in the trace of \mathcal{F} on the set $\hat{E}_i^{(m)} \times \{0\}$. For this, fix any

$(\langle U \rangle \cap \hat{E}_i^{(m)}) \times \{0\} \in \Phi_i^m$, where $U \in \prod_{i \in n} x_i^*$. Since the trace of \mathcal{F} on $(\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i) \times \{0\}$ equals to the filter $\{H \times \{0\} : H \in \prod_{i \in n} x_i^*\}$ there exists an open set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F \cap ((\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i) \times \{0\}) \subset U \times \{0\}$. Let us show that $F \cap (\hat{E}_i^{(m)} \times \{0\}) \subset (\langle U \rangle \cap \hat{E}_i^{(m)}) \times \{0\}$. Indeed, take any point

$$(x_0^*, \dots, x_{i-1}^*, z, x_{i+1}^*, \dots, x_{n-1}^*, 0) \in F \cap (\hat{E}_i^{(m)} \times \{0\}).$$

By the definition of the space S_i , z is an ultrafilter on κ_i . Since the set F is open and taking into account the definition of topology on X , we get that the projection on the i -th factor of the set $F \cap ((\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i) \times \{0\})$ is an element of the ultrafilter z . Consequently, the projection of U on the i -th factor is an element of z . Then, by the choice of U ,

$$(x_0^*, \dots, x_{i-1}^*, z, x_{i+1}^*, \dots, x_{n-1}^*, 0) \in (\langle U \rangle \cap \hat{E}_i^{(m)}) \times \{0\}.$$

Hence $F \cap (\hat{E}_i^{(m)} \times \{0\}) \subset (\langle U \rangle \cap \hat{E}_i^{(m)}) \times \{0\}$, witnessing that for each $i \in K$ and $m \in k_i$ the traces of Φ_i^m and \mathcal{F} on the set $\hat{E}_i^{(m)} \times \{0\}$ coincide.

For $\vec{v} = (v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}) \in \prod_{i \in n} m_i$ let $K_{\vec{v}} = \{i \in n : v_i \neq 0\}$. By $\Phi_{\vec{v}}$ we denote the filter generated by the family

$$\{(U \cap (\bigcup_{i \in K_{\vec{v}}} \bigcup_{j \in v_i} \hat{E}_i^{(j)} \cup \prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i)) \times \{0\} : U \in \mathcal{N}(x^*)\}.$$


By the arguments above, for each $i \in K_{\vec{v}}$ and $j \in v_i$ the traces of \mathcal{F} and $\Phi_{\vec{v}}$ on the set $\hat{E}_i^{(j)} \times \{0\}$ coincide. Also, recall that the trace of \mathcal{F} on the set $(\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i) \times \{0\}$ is the filter \mathcal{U} which equals to the trace of the filter $\Phi_{\vec{v}}$ on $(\prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i) \times \{0\}$. Taking into account that

$$(\bigcup_{i \in K_{\vec{v}}} \bigcup_{j \in v_i} \hat{E}_i^{(j)} \cup \prod_{i \in n} \kappa_i) \times \{0\} \in \mathcal{F} \cap \Phi_{\vec{v}},$$


Lemma 4.2 implies that $\mathcal{F} = \Phi_{\vec{v}}$.

Since for every $\vec{v} \in \prod_{i \in n} m_i$ the filter $\Phi_{\vec{v}}$ is open and free we get that $\mathbf{OF}(M) = \{\Phi_{\vec{v}} : \vec{v} \in \prod_{i \in n} m_i\}$. It remains to observe that for vectors $\vec{v} = (v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}) \in \prod_{i \in n} m_i$ and $\vec{u} = (u_0, \dots, u_{n-1}) \in \prod_{i \in n} m_i$ the inclusion $\Phi_{\vec{u}} \subset \Phi_{\vec{v}}$ holds if and only if $u_i \geq v_i$ for each $i \in n$. Since for any natural number n the chains (n, \leq) and (n, \geq) are order isomorphic we deduce that the lattice $\mathbf{OF}(M)$ is order isomorphic to $\prod_{i \in n} m_i$. \square

Theorem 4.3 implies that for every lattice L with $|L| \leq 3$ there is a space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is order isomorphic to L . Theorems 4.3 and 6.5 provide that the existence of a measurable cardinal implies that for each lattice L of cardinality 4, there is a space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is order isomorphic to L . Theorem 3.6 yields the existence of two (non-distributive) five-element lattice which are not isomorphic to $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ for any space X . The next example shows that assuming the existence of two measurable cardinals for any five-element distributive lattice L there exists a space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is isomorphic to L . Let $L_0 = \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 1), (2, 2)\}$ and $L_1 = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1), (2, 2)\}$ be the sublattices of ω^2 displayed below.



(A) Lattice L_0



(B) Lattice L_1

Example 6.6. Let $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2$ be measurable cardinals. Then for any $i \in 2$ there exists a space Y_i such that the lattice $\mathbf{OF}(Y_i)$ is isomorphic to L_i .

Proof. Set $\kappa_0 = \omega$ and for every $i \in 3$ fix any κ_i -complete ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_i on κ_i . Let $X_i = \kappa_i \cup \{\mathcal{F}_i\}$ be the subspace of $\beta(\kappa_i)$. For convenience we denote the point $(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) \in \prod_{i \in 3} X_i$ by x^* .

Construction of Y_0 . Let X be the subspace $(X_0 \times X_1 \times \kappa_2) \cup \{x^*\}$ of the Tychonoff product $\prod_{i \in 3} X_i$. Put $Y_0 = M(X, x^*)$ (see Construction 1). Similarly as in the proofs of Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 6.5 one can check that $\mathbf{OF}(Y_0) = \{\Phi_{(i,j)} : (i, j) \in L_0\}$, where the free open filters $\Phi_{(i,j)}$ are defined as follows:

- $\Phi_{(2,2)}$ is generated by the family $\{(\prod_{i \in 3} F_i) \times \{0\} : F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i\}$;
- $\Phi_{(1,2)}$ is generated by the family $\{(F_0 \cup \{\mathcal{F}_0\}) \times F_1 \times F_2 \times \{0\} : F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i\}$;
- $\Phi_{(2,1)}$ is generated by the family $\{F_0 \times (F_1 \cup \{\mathcal{F}_1\}) \times F_2 \times \{0\} : F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i\}$;
- $\Phi_{(1,1)}$ is generated by the family $\{U \cup V : U \in \Phi_{(1,2)} \text{ and } V \in \Phi_{(2,1)}\}$;
- $\Phi_{(0,0)}$ is generated by the family $\{(F_0 \cup \{\mathcal{F}_0\}) \times (F_1 \cup \{\mathcal{F}_1\}) \times F_2 \times \{0\} : F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i\}$.

It is straightforward to check that the map $\phi : \mathbf{OF}(Y_0) \rightarrow L_0$, $\phi(\Phi_{(i,j)}) = (i, j)$ is an order isomorphism.

Construction of Y_1 . Let X be the subspace

$$(X_0 \times \kappa_1 \times \kappa_2) \cup (\{\mathcal{F}_0\} \times \{\mathcal{F}_1\} \times \kappa_2) \cup (\{\mathcal{F}_0\} \times \kappa_1 \times \{\mathcal{F}_2\}) \cup \{x^*\}$$

of the Tychonoff product $\prod_{i \in 3} X_i$. Put $Y_1 = M(X, x^*)$. Similarly as above one can check that $\mathbf{OF}(Y_1) = \{\Phi_{(i,j)} : (i, j) \in L_1\}$, where the free open filters $\Phi_{(i,j)}$ are defined as follows:

- $\Phi_{(2,2)}$ is generated by the family $\{(\prod_{i \in 3} F_i) \times \{0\} : F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i\}$;
- $\Phi_{(1,1)}$ is generated by the family $\{(F_0 \cup \{\mathcal{F}_0\}) \times F_1 \times F_2 \times \{0\} : F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i\}$;
- $\Phi_{(0,1)}$ is generated by the family $\{U \cup (\{\mathcal{F}_0\} \times \{\mathcal{F}_1\} \times F_2 \times \{0\}) : U \in \Phi_{(1,1)} \text{ and } F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2\}$;
- $\Phi_{(1,0)}$ is generated by the family $\{U \cup (\{\mathcal{F}_0\} \times F_1 \times \{\mathcal{F}_2\} \times \{0\}) : U \in \Phi_{(1,1)} \text{ and } F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1\}$;
- $\Phi_{(0,0)}$ is generated by the family $\{U \cup V : U \in \Phi_{(1,0)} \text{ and } V \in \Phi_{(0,1)}\}$.

It is straightforward to check that the map $\phi : \mathbf{OF}(Y_1) \rightarrow L_1$, $\phi(\Phi_{(i,j)}) = (i, j)$ is an order isomorphism. \square

Results of this chapter implies the following natural problem:

Problem 6.7. Does there exist in ZFC a space X such that $\mathbf{OF}(X)$ is a finite nonlinear lattice?

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Blass, *Combinatorial cardinal characteristics of the continuum*, in Handbook of Set Theory, Springer Netherlands, Amsterdam, 2010.
- [2] J. Brown, A. Dow, *Remote points under the continuum hypothesis*, Algebra Universalis **60**:3 (2009), 345–364.
- [3] D. Burke, *Covering properties*, in: K. Kunen, J.E. Vaughan (Eds.), *Handbook of set-theoretic topology*, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1984), 349–416.
- [4] N. Carlson, J. Porter, *On open ultrafilters and maximal points*, Topol. Appl. **156** (2009) 2317–2325.
- [5] R. Chandler, G. Faulkner, *Singular compactifications: the order structure*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **100**:2 (1987) 377–382.
- [6] E. van Douwen, *Existence and applications of remote points*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **84**:1 (1978), 161–163.
- [7] E. van Douwen, *Remote points*, Dissertationes Math. **188** (1981), 1–45.
- [8] E. van Douwen, *The integers and topology*, in: K. Kunen, J.E. Vaughan (Eds.), *Handbook of set-theoretic topology*, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1984), 111–167.
- [9] A. Dow, *Remote points in spaces with π -weight ω_1* , Fund. Math. **124** (1984), 197–205.
- [10] A. Dow, *A separable space with no remote points*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **312**:1 (1989), 335–353.
- [11] A. Dow, T. Peters, *Products and remote points: examples and counterexamples*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **104**:4 (1988), 1296–1304.
- [12] A. Dow, T. Peters, *Game strategies yield remote points*, Topology Appl. **27**:3 (1987), 245–256.
- [13] T. Eisworth, J. Roitman, *CH with no Ostaszewski spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **351**:7 (2009), 2675–2693.
- [14] R. Engelking, *General topology*, Revised and completed ed., Berlin, Heldermann, 1989.
- [15] S. Franklin, M. Rajagopalan, *Some examples in topology*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **155**:2 (1971), 305–314.
- [16] M. Girou, *Properties of locally H-closed spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **113**:1 (1991), 287–295.

- [17] H. Herrlich, *Essential extensions of Hausdorff spaces*, Applied Categorical Structures **2** (1994) 101–105.
- [18] Jech, T. *Set theory*. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [19] M. Koushesh, *Compactification-like extensions*, Dissertationes Math. **476** (2011), 1–88.
- [20] K. Kunen, *Set Theory, Studies in Logic and Foundations of Mathematics*, Vol. 102, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1980.
- [21] C. T. Liu, *The α -closure αX of a topological space X* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **22**:3 (1969), 620–624.
- [22] J. Mack, M. Rayburn, R. Woods, *Lattices of topological extensions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **189** (1974), 163–174.
- [23] F. Mendivil, *Function algebras and the lattice of compactifications*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **127**:6 (1999), 1863–1871.
- [24] D. Mooney, *Spaces with unique Hausdorff extensions*, Topology Appl. **61** (1995), 241–256.
- [25] D. Mooney, *H-bounded sets*, Topology Proceedings **18** (1993), 195–207.
- [26] D. Mooney, T. Richmond, *Cardinality and structure of semilattices of ordered compactifications*, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences **767**:1 (1995), 188–193.
- [27] P. Nyikos, L. Zdomskyy, *Locally compact, ω_1 -compact spaces*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic (accepted), arXiv:1712.03906
- [28] A. Ostaszewski, *On countably compact, perfectly normal spaces*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., **s2-14** no. 3, (1976) 505–516.
- [29] J. Pelant, P. Simon, J. Vaughan, *The smallest number of free closed filters*, Fund. Math. **131** (1988), 215–221.
- [30] J. Porter, *On locally H-closed spaces*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **s3-20**:2 (1970), 193–204.
- [31] J. Porter, C. Votaw, *H-closed extensions I*, Topology Appl. **3**:3 (1973), 211–224.
- [32] J. Porter, C. Votaw, *H-closed extensions II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **202** (1975), 193–209.
- [33] J. Porter, J. Vermeer, R.G. Woods, *H-closed extensions of absolutes*, Houston J. Math. **11**:1 (1985), 109–120.
- [34] J. Porter, R.G. Woods, *Extensions of Hausdorff spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **103**:1 (1982), 111–134.
- [35] J. Porter, R.G. Woods, *Extensions and Absolutes of Hausdorff spaces*, New York, Springer, 1988.
- [36] T. Richmond, *Posets of ordered compactifications*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **47** (1993), 59–72.
- [37] J. Roitman, *Basis S and L*, in: K. Kunen, J.E. Vaughan (Eds.), *Handbook of set-theoretic topology*, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1984), 297–324.
- [38] K. Srivastava, *On singular H-closed extensions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **120**:1 (1994), 295–300.
- [39] J. Terasava, *On the non-normality of $\beta X \setminus \{p\}$ for non-discrete spaces*, Topology Proc. **27**:1 (2003), 335–344.
- [40] M. Tikoo, *Remainders of H-closed extensions*, Topology Appl. **23**:2 (1986), 117–128.
- [41] S. Todorčević, *Forcing positive partition relations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **280**:2 (1983), 703–720.
- [42] A. Veksler, *Maximal nowhere dense sets and their applications to problems of existence of remote points and of weak P-points*, Mathematische Nachrichten **150** (1991), 263–275.
- [43] J. Vermeer, *Closed subspaces of H-closed spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **118**:1 (1985), 229–247.
- [44] W. Weiss, *Countably Compact Spaces and Martin's Axiom*, Can. J. Math. **30**:2 (1978), 243–249.

TU WIEN, INSTITUTE OF DISCRETE MATHEMATICS AND GEOMETRY RESEARCH UNIT 1 (ALGEBRA) TU WIEN,
WIEDNER HAUPTSTRASSE 8–10/104 1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA.

Email address: sbardyla@gmail.com

URL: <http://www.logic.univie.ac.at/~bardylas55/>

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, P.J. ŠAFÁRIK UNIVERSITY IN KOŠICE, SLOVAKIA

Email address: jaroslav.supina@upjs.sk

URL: <https://umv.science.upjs.sk/supina/index.html>

TU WIEN, INSTITUTE OF DISCRETE MATHEMATICS AND GEOMETRY RESEARCH UNIT 1 (ALGEBRA) TU WIEN,
WIEDNER HAUPTSTRASSE 8–10/104 1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA

Email address: lzdomsky@gmail.com

URL: <https://dmg.tuwien.ac.at/zdomskyy/>