

# CROWDED RATIONAL ULTRAFILTERS

EVA COPLAKOVA AND KLAAS PIETER HART

ABSTRACT. We prove that if every family in  $({}^\omega\omega, \leq^*)$  of size less than  $\mathfrak{c}$  is bounded then there exists a point  $p$  in  $\mathbb{Q}^*$  such that  $p$  generates an ultrafilter in the set-theoretic sense on  $\mathbb{Q}$  and such that  $p$  has a base consisting of sets that are homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{Q}$ . This is a partial answer to Question 30 (Problem 229) in [1].

## 1. GRUFF ULTRAFILTERS

Let  $X$  be a metrizable space without isolated points. We shall call a point  $p$  of the Čech-Stone remainder  $X^*$  *gruff* if it generates an ultrafilter on the set  $X$ ; conversely, an ultrafilter on the set  $X$  will be called gruff if it has a base consisting of closed sets of the space  $X$ . Thus we are able to speak unambiguously about gruff ultrafilters on  $X$ .

It is easily seen that every point in  $X^*$  that contains a discrete set is gruff. On the other hand, there is no gruff remote point, as every gruff ultrafilter contains a nowhere dense set. E. van Douwen in [2] studied the question whether there can exist a gruff ultrafilter which does not contain a scattered set; such an ultrafilter is said to be *crowded*. One of the reasons for this is that such ultrafilters provide examples of particularly nice points of  $X^*$  that are totally non-remote: if  $p$  is a crowded gruff ultrafilter and if  $A \in p$  then there is  $B \in p$  such that  $B$  is nowhere dense in  $A$ .

It is not difficult to see that there are no crowded gruff ultrafilters on the real line  $\mathbb{R}$ : Every closed non-scattered set is of cardinality  $\mathfrak{c}$  and so a crowded gruff ultrafilter would be uniform and would therefore be generated by more than  $\mathfrak{c}$  sets. However,  $\mathbb{R}$  has only  $\mathfrak{c}$  closed sets, so no family of closed sets can generate a uniform ultrafilter.

The situation is somewhat different if we consider the space  $\mathbb{Q}$  of rational numbers. E. van Douwen proved in [2] that under CMA (Martin's Axiom for countable posets) there are crowded gruff ultrafilters on  $\mathbb{Q}$ . We shall show that the existence of gruff ultrafilters on  $\mathbb{Q}$  follows from  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$ , where  $\mathfrak{b}$  is the minimal cardinality of an unbounded subset in  $({}^\omega\omega, \leq^*)$ . This is of interest because it shows that there are gruff ultrafilters in Laver's model for the Borel Conjecture; CMA is certainly false in that model.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$  then there exists a crowded gruff ultrafilter on  $\mathbb{Q}$ .*

We shall need two lemmas proved by E. van Douwen in [2], albeit in a slightly different form. Let us call a nonempty set without isolated points *crowded*.

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 54D80, Secondary: 03E35, 04A20.

*Key words and phrases.* ultrafilter, gruff, bounding number, rational numbers.

**Lemma 2.** *Every crowded and unbounded subset of  $\mathbb{Q}$  has a closed, crowded and unbounded subset.*

*Proof.* Let  $F$  be a crowded and unbounded subset of  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a countable clopen base for  $\mathbb{Q}$  which is closed under finite unions and consists of bounded sets. Consider the countable poset  $\mathbb{P}$  defined by

$$\langle p, U \rangle \in \mathbb{P} \quad \text{iff} \quad p \in [F]^{<\omega}, \quad U \in \mathcal{U} \text{ and } p \cap U = \emptyset$$

ordered by

$$\langle p, U \rangle \leq \langle q, V \rangle \quad \text{iff} \quad p \supseteq q \text{ and } U \supseteq V.$$

Consider

$$\mathcal{D} = \{C_x : x \in \mathbb{Q}\} \cup \{D_n : n \in \omega\} \cup \{E_{x,n} : x \in \mathbb{Q}, n \in \omega\},$$

where  $C_x = \{\langle p, U \rangle \in \mathbb{P} : x \in p \cup U\}$ ,  $D_n = \{\langle p, U \rangle \in \mathbb{P} : (\exists x \in p) |x| > n\}$  and  $E_{x,n} = \{\langle p, U \rangle \in \mathbb{P} : x \in p \Rightarrow (\exists y \in p) 0 < |x - y| < 2^{-n}\}$ . The family  $\mathcal{D}$  is a countable family of dense subsets of the poset  $\mathbb{P}$ ; hence, by the Rasiowa-Sikorski Theorem, there is a filter  $G$  on  $\mathbb{P}$  that meets them all. Define

$$K = \bigcup \{p : (\exists U \in \mathcal{U}) \langle p, U \rangle \in G\}$$

and

$$W = \bigcup \{U : \langle \emptyset, U \rangle \in G\}.$$

Clearly  $K \subseteq F$  and  $K \cap W = \emptyset$ . For every  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$  we have  $G \cap C_x \neq \emptyset$  so  $K \cup W = \mathbb{Q}$ . It follows that  $K$  is closed. It is also easily seen that  $K$  is crowded and unbounded.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a free filterbase consisting of closed and crowded sets which extends the filter of co-bounded clopen sets. Define, for  $R \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$  and  $F \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ ,*

$$K_R(F) = \bigcup \{L \subseteq F : L \text{ is crowded and } L \subseteq \overline{L \cap R}\}.$$

*Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ . Then either for  $R = A$  or for  $R = \mathbb{Q} \setminus A$  the collection*

$$\mathcal{F}^+ = \mathcal{F} \cup \{K_R(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

*is a free filterbase consisting of closed, crowded and unbounded sets.*

*Proof.* First we show that for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  the set  $K_R(F)$  is either empty or closed and crowded. Assume  $K_R(F)$  is non-empty. Then it is crowded, being a union of crowded sets. It also satisfies  $K_R(F) \subseteq \overline{K_R(F) \cap R}$  and hence we have

$$\overline{K_R(F)} \subseteq \overline{K_R(F) \cap R} \subseteq \overline{\overline{K_R(F)} \cap R},$$

so  $K_R(F)$  is closed.

Observe that  $K_R(F) \subseteq K_R(G)$  if  $F \subseteq G$ . Now it is easy to see that for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  there is  $R \in \{A, \mathbb{Q} \setminus A\}$  such that  $K_R(F)$  is unbounded. For suppose both  $K_A(F)$  and  $K_{\mathbb{Q} \setminus A}(F)$  are bounded. Let  $H \in \mathcal{F}$  be such that  $H \subseteq F \setminus (K_A(F) \cup K_{\mathbb{Q} \setminus A}(F))$ . Then both  $K_A(H)$  and  $K_{\mathbb{Q} \setminus A}(H)$  are empty, which is impossible.

Now we show that for either  $R = A$  or  $R = \mathbb{Q} \setminus A$  the set  $K_R(F)$  is unbounded for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . If it were not true then there are  $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $K_A(F)$  and  $K_{\mathbb{Q} \setminus A}(G)$  both bounded. Let  $H \in \mathcal{F}$  be such that  $H \subseteq F \cap G$ . Clearly,  $K_A(H) \subseteq K_A(F)$  and  $K_{\mathbb{Q} \setminus A}(H) \subseteq K_{\mathbb{Q} \setminus A}(G)$ , hence  $K_A(H)$  and  $K_{\mathbb{Q} \setminus A}(H)$  are both bounded, which is a contradiction.

Let  $R \in \{A, \mathbb{Q} \setminus A\}$  be such that  $K_R(F)$  is closed, crowded and unbounded for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and let  $\mathcal{F}^+ = \mathcal{F} \cup \{K_R(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . To show that  $\mathcal{F}^+$  is a filterbase it suffices to show that  $\{K_R(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is a filterbase because  $K_R(F) \subseteq F$  for all  $F$ . But if  $\mathcal{F}_0 \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\omega}$  then there is  $G \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $G \subseteq \bigcap \mathcal{F}_0$ ; then also  $K_R(G) \subseteq \bigcap \{K_R(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}_0\}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $\{A_\xi : \xi \in \mathfrak{c}\}$  enumerate  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q})$ . By transfinite recursion on  $\xi \in \mathfrak{c}$  we shall construct families  $\mathcal{F}_\xi \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q})$  such that for every  $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{c}$

- (i) if  $\xi < \eta$  then  $\mathcal{F}_\xi \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\eta$ ,
- (ii)  $\mathcal{F}_\xi$  is a free filterbase on  $\mathbb{Q}$  consisting of closed, crowded and unbounded subsets of  $\mathbb{Q}$ ;
- (iii)  $\mathcal{F}_\xi$  is of cardinality less than  $\mathfrak{c}$ , and
- (iv) there is  $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi+1}$  such that  $F \subseteq A_\xi$  or  $F \cap A_\xi = \emptyset$ .

It is easily seen that  $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{\xi \in \mathfrak{c}} \mathcal{F}_\xi$  is a base of a crowded gruff ultrafilter.

We proceed to the construction. Let

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \{[n, \infty) : n \in \omega\}.$$

This guarantees that every filter extending  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is free and consists of unbounded sets. If  $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$  is a limit ordinal we let  $\mathcal{F}_\xi = \bigcup_{\eta \in \xi} \mathcal{F}_\eta$ ; note that  $|\mathcal{F}_\xi| < \mathfrak{c}$  because  $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{b}$  is regular.

Suppose  $\mathcal{F}_\xi$  is a free filterbase consisting of closed, crowded and unbounded subsets of  $\mathbb{Q}$  and of cardinality less than  $\mathfrak{c}$ . We have to decide  $A_\xi$ . By Lemma 3 there is  $R \in \{A_\xi, \mathbb{Q} \setminus A_\xi\}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_\xi^+ = \mathcal{F}_\xi \cup \{K_R(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi\}$  is a free filterbase consisting of closed, crowded and unbounded sets. Enumerate the complement of  $R$ :

$$\mathbb{Q} \setminus R = \{x_n : n \in \omega\}.$$

For every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^+$  let  $\tilde{F}$  be a closed, crowded and unbounded subset of  $F \cap R$ ; such a set exists by Lemma 2 because  $K_R(F) = \overline{K_R(F)} \cap R \subseteq \overline{F} \cap R$  and so  $F \cap R$  contains a crowded unbounded set. Define  $f_F \in {}^\omega \omega$  by

$$f_F(n) = \min\{m \in \omega : (x_n - 2^{-m}, x_n + 2^{-m}) \cap \tilde{F} = \emptyset\}.$$

The set

$$C(f_F) = \mathbb{Q} \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \omega} (x_n - 2^{-f_F(n)}, x_n + 2^{-f_F(n)})$$

is a closed superset of  $\tilde{F}$ , hence unbounded and not scattered.

Consider the family  $\mathcal{E} = \{f_F : F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^+\}$ . Because  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$  and  $|\mathcal{E}| < \mathfrak{c}$  the family  $\mathcal{E}$  is bounded. Let  $g \in {}^\omega \omega$  be such that  $g^* \geq f_F$  for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^+$  and let

$$C(g) = \mathbb{Q} \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \omega} (x_n - 2^{-g(n)}, x_n + 2^{-g(n)}).$$

We shall show that for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^+$  the set  $C(g) \cap F$  contains a closed, crowded and unbounded set.

Let  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^+$ . The set  $C(f_F) \setminus C(g)$  is bounded; hence there is a clopen bounded set  $D$  containing  $C(f_F) \setminus C(g)$ . Clearly  $\tilde{F} \setminus D$  is closed, crowded and unbounded. We also have  $\tilde{F} \subseteq C(f_F)$  and  $\tilde{F} \subseteq F$ , hence  $\tilde{F} \setminus D \subseteq C(f_F) \setminus D \subseteq C(g)$  and so  $\tilde{F} \setminus D$  is a closed, crowded and unbounded subset of  $F \cap C(g)$ .

For every  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^+$  let  $F' \subseteq C(g) \cap F$  be closed and crowded such that the set  $C(g) \cap F \setminus F'$  is scattered. The existence of such a set follows from the Cantor-Bendixson Theorem. The family

$$\mathcal{F}_{\xi+1} = \mathcal{F}_\xi^+ \cup \{F' : F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^+\}$$

is as required.  $\square$

## 2. $n$ -GRUFF ULTRAFILTERS

Let  $n$  be a positive natural number. A point  $p$  in  $\mathbb{Q}^*$  is said to be  $n$ -gruff if it is the intersection of  $n$  ultrafilters on  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

The existence of crowded  $n$ -gruff ultrafilters on  $\mathbb{Q}$  follows from CMA, as shown by E. van Douwen in [2]. By slightly modifying the proof of Theorem 1 it is not difficult to show that the same can be proved under  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$ :

**Theorem 4.** *If  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$  then there exists a crowded  $n$ -gruff ultrafilter on  $\mathbb{Q}$ .*

The proof of Theorem 4 is almost identical to that of Theorem 1 so we will indicate only the main differences.

Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a family of subsets of  $\mathbb{Q}$ . A set  $F \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$  is said to be  $\mathcal{B}$ -good if  $F \subseteq \overline{F \cap B}$  for every  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ .

Fix a collection  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $n$  disjoint dense subsets of  $\mathbb{Q}$  such that  $\bigcup \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{Q}$ . Observe that every  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  must be crowded and unbounded.

**Lemma 5.** *Every crowded, unbounded and  $\mathcal{H}$ -good subset of  $\mathbb{Q}$  has a closed, crowded, unbounded and  $\mathcal{H}$ -good subset.*

*Proof.* The proof is almost the same as the proof of Lemma 2. The only difference is the choosing of the dense subsets  $D_n$  and  $E_{x,n}$ :

$$D_n = \{ \langle p, U \rangle \in \mathbb{P} : (\forall H \in \mathcal{H}) (\exists x \in p \cap H) |x| > n \}$$

and

$$E_{x,n} = \{ \langle p, U \rangle \in \mathbb{P} : x \in p \Rightarrow (\forall H \in \mathcal{H}) (\exists y \in p \cap H) 0 < |x - y| < 2^{-n} \}.$$

$\square$

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a free filterbase consisting of closed, crowded and  $\mathcal{H}$ -good sets and which extends the filter of co-bounded clopen sets. Define, for  $F \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $H_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  and  $R \subseteq H_0$ ,*

$$K_R(F) = \bigcup \{ L \subseteq F : L \text{ is crowded and } \mathcal{H}_R\text{-good} \},$$

*where  $\mathcal{H}_R = (\mathcal{H} \setminus \{H_0\}) \cup \{R\}$ . Let  $A \subseteq H_0$ . Then either for  $R = A$  or for  $R = H_0 \setminus A$  the collection*

$$\mathcal{F}^+ = \mathcal{F} \cup \{K_R(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

*is a free filterbase consisting of closed, crowded, unbounded and  $\mathcal{H}$ -good sets.*

*Proof.* Follow the proof of Lemma 3. It is easily seen that we can also guarantee  $\mathcal{H}$ -goodness.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Fix an enumeration of  $\bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{P}(H)$ :

$$\bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{P}(H) = \{A_\xi \subseteq \mathbb{Q} : \xi \in \mathfrak{c}\}.$$

By transfinite recursion on  $\xi \in \mathfrak{c}$  we construct families  $\mathcal{F}_\xi \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q})$  such that for every  $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{c}$  they satisfy the conditions (i), (ii), (iii) in the proof of Theorem 1 together with

- (iv)\* there is  $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi+1}$  such that  $F \cap H \subseteq A_\xi$  or  $F \cap A_\xi = \emptyset$ , where  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  is such that  $A_\xi \subseteq H$ , and
- (v) each  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$  is  $\mathcal{H}$ -good.

The construction is now exactly the same as in the proof of Theorem 1 except that Lemmas 5 and 6 guarantee  $\mathcal{H}$ -goodness of the elements of the filterbases  $\mathcal{F}_\xi$ . Also note that (iv)\* ensures that the restriction of  $\mathcal{F}$  to  $H$  generates an ultrafilter on  $H$  for each  $H \in \mathcal{H}$ , and that  $\mathcal{F}$  is the intersection of those ultrafilters because  $\mathcal{H}$  is a finite partition of  $\mathbb{Q}$ .  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Klaas Pieter Hart and Jan van Mill, *Open problems on  $\beta\omega$* , Open Problems in Topology (Jan van Mill and George M. Reed, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990, pp. 97–125.
- [2] Eric K. van Douwen, *Better closed ultrafilters on  $\mathbb{Q}$* , Topology and its Applications **47** (1992), 173–177.

FACULTY OF TECHNICAL MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, TU DELFT, POSTBUS 5031,  
2600 GA DELFT, THE NETHERLANDS

*E-mail address:* E.Coplakova@twi.tudelft.nl

FACULTY OF TECHNICAL MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, TU DELFT, POSTBUS 5031,  
2600 GA DELFT, THE NETHERLANDS

*E-mail address:* K.P.Hart@twi.tudelft.nl