

## A SURVEY OF ULTRAPRODUCT CONSTRUCTIONS IN GENERAL TOPOLOGY

PAUL BANKSTON

*To my early mentors and colleagues: B. Banaschewski, G. Bruns, H. J. Keisler, K. Kunen,  
E. Nelson and M. E. Rudin.*

ABSTRACT. We survey various attempts to transport the ultraproduct construction from the realm of model theory to that of general topology. The category-theoretic perspective has played a key role in many of these attempts.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The ultraproduct construction has a long and distinguished history. While its beginnings go back to the 1930s with K. Gödel (who was proving his completeness theorem) and T. Skolem (who was building nonstandard models of arithmetic), it was not until 1955, when J. Łoś published his fundamental theorem of ultraproducts, that the construction was described explicitly, and its importance to first-order logic became apparent. The understanding of the structure and use of ultraproducts developed rapidly during the next fifteen years or so, culminating in the ultrapower theorem of H. J. Keisler and S. Shelah. (The gist of the theorem is that two relational structures have the same first-order properties if and only if an ultrapower of one is isomorphic to an ultrapower of the other. Keisler established a much stronger statement in the early 1960s using the generalized continuum hypothesis (GCH); and toward the end of the decade, Shelah provided a GCH-free proof of a second stronger statement that is somewhat weaker than Keisler's.) By the late 1960s, the theory of ultraproducts had matured into a major area of investigation in its own right (see [24, 28, 34, 50] for a vastly more detailed account than is possible here), and was ready for export beyond the confines of classical model theory.

Actually the exportation process had already begun by the early 1960s, when I. Fleischer [36] observed that classic ultrapowers are directed limits of powers (and, by implication, that classic ultraproducts are directed limits of products). This observation, illustrating a major strength of category theory (see [60]), provides an abstract reformulation of a concrete construction. One may now start with a category  $\mathbf{C}$  endowed with products (which construction being itself an abstract reformulation of the cartesian product) and directed limits, and define ultraproducts within that category. Going further, any *bridging theorem*, i.e., one that translates a concrete notion into abstract terms involving the ultraproduct (or some other mechanism), becomes available as a definitional vehicle to recast that notion in a

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 03-02, 03C20, 54B10; Secondary 03C52, 03C64, 06D05, 54A25, 54B30, 54B35, 54C10, 54D05, 54D10, 54D15, 54D30, 54D35, 54E52, 54F15, 54F45, 54F50, 54F55, 54F65, 54G10.

*Key words and phrases*. ultraproduct, ultracoproduct, topological space, compactum, continuum.

suitably rich category. T. Ohkuma [70] (and A. Day and D. Higgs [32] a bit later) made good use of this idea, introducing a notion of *finiteness in a category* by means of the simple bridging result that says a relational structure is finite if and only if all diagonal maps from that structure into its ultrapowers are isomorphisms. An object  $A$  in a category  $\mathbf{C}$  equipped with ultraproducts is now defined to be *ultrafinite* if the canonical (diagonal) morphism from  $A$  to any  $\mathbf{C}$ -ultrapower of  $A$  is an isomorphism. Similarly, if  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{op}}$  is the *opposite* of the category  $\mathbf{C}$  (i.e., same objects, arrows reversed), and if  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{op}}$  is equipped with ultraproducts, then an object of  $\mathbf{C}$  is called *ultracofinite* if it is ultrafinite in  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{op}}$ .

In the setting of concrete categories; i.e., those suitably endowed with *forgetful* functors to the category of sets and functions, the notion of ultrafiniteness can easily fail to coincide with that of having finite underlying set. For example, consider  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{CH}$ , the category of *compacta* (i.e., compact Hausdorff spaces) and continuous maps. Then *ultrafinite* in this setting means *having at most one point*. (It is *ultracofinite* that actually coincides with *having finitely many points*.) Another example is  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{BAN}$ , the category of real Banach spaces and nonexpansive homomorphisms. Then *ultrafinite* here means *having finite dimension*, while *ultracofinite* means *being the trivial Banach space*.

I became aware of Fleischer's limit approach to ultraproducts in 1974, late in my career as a graduate student. I was on a visit to McMaster University, and it was there that I became aware of Ohkuma's use of the ultrapower characterization of finiteness. Soon afterward I came to the idea of using the ultrapower theorem in a similar way. My aim was not the abstract reformulation of set-theoretic notions, however, but model-theoretic ones; namely elementary equivalence and elementary embedding (as well as their various derivative notions). I can attribute much of my own development as a mathematician to enlightening talks I had with the universal algebra group at McMaster at that time (namely B. Banaschewski, G. Bruns and E. Nelson), and the papers [9, 11, 23] extend and develop the ideas introduced in [32, 70]. Moreover, my coinage of the term *ultracoproduct*, along with my own investigations of how ultraproducts behave in the *opposite* of the concrete category  $\mathbf{CH}$  (to be discussed in Section 5) can also be traced to Fleischer's approach.

What Fleischer started in 1963 might be regarded as the beginning of the idea of a *model-theoretic study of a class (or category)  $\mathbf{C}$* . This should be immediately contrasted with what might be called  *$\mathbf{C}$ -based model theory*. While the two subject areas may overlap a great deal, there is a difference in emphasis. In the former, one perhaps fixes an autonomous notion of ultraproduct in  $\mathbf{C}$  (hence a mechanism for generating conjectures that stem from known classical results), then tries to establish (functorial) links between  $\mathbf{C}$  and particular classes of models of first-order theories (hence a mechanism for settling some of those conjectures). In the latter, one enriches objects of  $\mathbf{C}$  with extra *functions* and *relations*, possibly nonclassical in nature but recognizable nonetheless, views these enriched objects as models of logical languages, and proceeds to develop new model theories, using more established model theories for guidance. Our study of compacta in [13] and elsewhere exemplifies the former emphasis, while the Banach model theory initiated by C. W. Henson (see [46, 48, 47]), as well as the approaches to topological model theory found in [37, 38, 63, 76], exemplify the latter.

In this paper our primary focus is on how classical ultraproducts can be exported to purely topological contexts, with or without category-theoretic considerations as

motivation. (So the Banach ultraproduct [31], for example, which is the Fleischer ultraproduct in **BAN**, is not directly a subject of our survey.) We begin in the next section with a quick introduction to ultraproducts in model theory; then on, in Section 3, to consider the topological ultraproduct, arguably the most straightforward and naïve way to view the ultraproduct topologically. The motivation in Section 3 is purely model-theoretic, with no overt use of category-theoretic concepts. This is also true in Section 4, where we look at a variation of this construction in the special case of ultrapowers. It is not until Section 5, where ultracoproducts are introduced, that the Fleischer approach to defining ultraproducts plays a significant role. Although the ultracoproduct may be described in purely concrete (i.e., set-theoretic) terms, and is of independent interest as a topological construction, the important point is that category-theoretic language allows one to see this construction as a natural gateway out of the classical model-theoretic context.

The ultraproduct construction in model theory is a quotient of the direct product, where an ultrafilter on the index set dictates how to specify the identification. When we carry out the analogous process in general topology, at least from the viewpoint of Section 3, the *product* in question is not the usual (Tychonoff) product, but the less commonly used (and much worse behaved) box product. (While one could use the usual product instead of the box product, the result would be an indiscrete (i.e., trivial) topological space whenever the ultrafilter was countably incomplete.)

The identification process just mentioned does not require the maximality of the designated ultrafilter in order to be well defined, and may still be carried out using any filter on the index set. The resulting construction, called the reduced product, serves as a generalization of both the direct (box) product and the ultraproduct constructions. In Section 6 we look at some of the recent work on furthering this generalization to include the usual product and some of its relatives. Selected open problems are included at the end of some of the sections.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES FROM MODEL THEORY

First we recall some familiar notions from model theory, establishing our basic notation and terminology in the process.

Given a set  $I$ , the power set of  $I$  is denoted  $\wp(I)$ , and is viewed as a bounded lattice under unions and intersections. (The alphabet of bounded lattices consists of two binary operation symbols,  $\sqcup$  (join) and  $\sqcap$  (meet), plus two constant symbols,  $\top$  (top) and  $\perp$  (bottom).) A *filter* on  $I$  is a filter in the lattice  $\wp(I)$ ; i.e., a collection  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $I$  satisfying:

- (1)  $I \in \mathcal{F}$ ,
- (2) any superset of an element of  $\mathcal{F}$  is also an element of  $\mathcal{F}$ , and
- (3) the intersection of any two elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  is also an element of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

A filter  $\mathcal{F}$  is called *proper* if  $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$ ; an *ultrafilter*  $\mathcal{U}$  is a proper filter on  $I$  that is not contained in any other proper filter on  $I$ ; i.e., a maximal proper filter in the lattice  $\wp(I)$ . In power set lattices the ultrafilters are precisely the *prime* ones; i.e., a proper filter is maximal just in case it contains at least one of two sets if it contains their union. If  $\mathcal{S}$  is any family of subsets of  $I$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$  is said to satisfy the *finite intersection property* if no finite intersection of elements of  $\mathcal{S}$  is empty. Our underlying set theory is Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory with the axiom of choice (ZFC); consequently, any family of subsets of  $I$  that satisfies the finite intersection property must be contained in an ultrafilter on  $I$ . (More generally, if a subset of

a bounded distributive lattice satisfies the finite *meet* property, then that subset is contained in a maximal proper filter in the lattice.)

We start with an alphabet  $L$  of finitary relation and function symbols, including equality. An  $L$ -structure consists of an underlying set  $A$  and an interpretation of each symbol of  $L$ , in the usual way (including the equality symbol  $\approx$  being interpreted as the equality relation). Like many authors (and unlike many others), we use the same font to indicate both a relational structure and its underlying set; being careful to make the distinction clear whenever there is a threat of ambiguity.

If  $\langle A_i : i \in I \rangle$  is an indexed family of  $L$ -structures, and  $\mathcal{F}$  is a filter on  $I$ , the ordinary direct product of the family is denoted  $\prod_{i \in I} A_i$ , with the  $i$ th coordinate of an element  $a$  being denoted  $a(i)$ . (Each symbol of  $L$  is interpreted coordinate-wise.) The binary relation  $\sim_{\mathcal{F}}$  on the product, given by  $a \sim_{\mathcal{F}} b$  just in case  $\{i \in I : a(i) = b(i)\} \in \mathcal{F}$ , is easily seen to be an equivalence relation; and we define  $a/\mathcal{F} := \{b : a \sim_{\mathcal{F}} b\}$ . We denote by  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} A_i$  the corresponding *reduced product*; i.e., the set of  $\sim_{\mathcal{F}}$ -equivalence classes, with the derived interpretation of each symbol of  $L$ . (So, for example, if  $R$  is a binary relation symbol, then  $a/\mathcal{F} R b/\mathcal{F}$  holds in  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} A_i$  just in case  $\{i \in I : a(i) R b(i)\} \in \mathcal{F}$ .) When  $A_i = A$  for each  $i \in I$ , we have the *reduced power*, denoted  $A^I/\mathcal{F}$ . The *canonical diagonal map*  $d: A \rightarrow A^I/\mathcal{F}$ , given by  $a \mapsto (\text{constantly } a)/\mathcal{F}$ , is clearly an embedding of  $L$ -structures.

From here on, unless we specify otherwise, we concentrate on reduced products (powers) in which the filter is an ultrafilter. The corresponding constructions are called *ultraproducts* (*ultrapowers*), and the fundamental theorem of ultraproducts is the following. (We follow the standard notation regarding satisfaction of substitution instances of first-order formulas. That is, if  $\varphi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  is a first-order  $L$ -formula with free variables from the set  $\{x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$ , and if  $A$  is an  $L$ -structure with  $n$ -tuple  $\langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle \in A^n$ , then  $A \models \varphi[a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}]$  means that the sentence got from  $\varphi$  by substituting each free occurrence of  $x_i$  with a new constant symbol denoting  $a_i$ ,  $i < n$ , is true in  $A$ . (See also [24, 28, 50].))

**Theorem 2.1** (Łoś' Fundamental Theorem of Ultraproducts: [28]). *Let  $\langle A_i : i \in I \rangle$  be a family of  $L$ -structures, with  $\mathcal{D}$  an ultrafilter on  $I$  and  $\varphi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  a first-order  $L$ -formula. Given an  $n$ -tuple  $\langle a_0/\mathcal{D}, \dots, a_{n-1}/\mathcal{D} \rangle$  from the ultraproduct, then  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} A_i \models \varphi[a_0/\mathcal{D}, \dots, a_{n-1}/\mathcal{D}]$  if and only if  $\{i \in I : A_i \models \varphi[a_0(i), \dots, a_{n-1}(i)]\} \in \mathcal{D}$ .*

By a *level zero formula*, we mean a Boolean combination of atomic formulas. If  $k$  is any natural number, define a *level  $k+1$  formula* to be a level  $k$  formula  $\varphi$  preceded by a string  $Q$  of quantifiers of like parity (i.e., either all universal or all existential) such that, if  $\varphi$  begins with a quantifier, then the parity of that quantifier is not the parity of the quantifiers of  $Q$ . A level  $k$  formula beginning with  $\forall$  (for all) (resp.,  $\exists$  (there exists)) is called a  $\Pi_k^0$  formula (resp.,  $\Sigma_k^0$  formula). Formulas with a well-defined level are said to be in *prenex form*, and elementary first-order logic provides an effective procedure for converting any  $L$ -formula to a logically equivalent formula (with the same free variables) in prenex form. A function  $f: A \rightarrow B$  between  $L$ -structures is an *embedding of level  $\geq k$*  if for each  $L$ -formula  $\varphi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  of level  $k$ , and  $n$ -tuple  $\langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle \in A^n$ , it is the case that  $A \models \varphi[a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}]$  if and only if  $B \models \varphi[f(a_0), \dots, f(a_{n-1})]$ . It is easy to see that the embeddings of level  $\geq 0$  are precisely the usual model-theoretic embeddings; the embeddings of level  $\geq 1$  are also called *existential embeddings*. (Existential embeddings have been of

considerable interest to algebraists and model theorists alike.) If a function  $f$  is of level  $\geq k$  for all  $k < \omega$ , we call it an *embedding of level  $\geq \omega$* . Now an *elementary embedding* is one that preserves the truth of all first-order formulas, even those without an obvious level; so elementary embeddings are clearly of level  $\geq \omega$ . The effective procedure for converting formulas into prenex form, then, assures us of the converse. We are taking pains to point this out because, as we shall see, the notion of embedding of level  $\geq k$  can be given a precise abstract meaning, devoid of reference to first-order formulas (see Theorem 2.3 below). This makes it possible to speak of *morphisms of level  $\geq \alpha$* , where  $\alpha$  is an arbitrary ordinal; and there is no *a priori* reason why this hierarchy should terminate at level  $\geq \omega$ . (See also Section 5.)

**Corollary 2.2** (Diagonal Theorem). *The canonical diagonal embedding from a relational structure into an ultrapower of that structure is an elementary embedding.*

A first-order formula containing no free variables is called a *sentence*, and two  $L$ -structures  $A$  and  $B$  are called *elementarily equivalent* (denoted  $A \equiv B$ ) if they satisfy the same  $L$ -sentences. Clearly if there is an elementary embedding from one  $L$ -structure into another, then the two structures are elementary equivalent; in particular, because of Corollary 2.2, if some ultrapower of  $A$  is isomorphic to some ultrapower of  $B$ , then  $A \equiv B$ . By the same token, if  $f: A \rightarrow B$  is a map between  $L$ -structures, then  $f$  is an elementary embedding as long as there are ultrafilters  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  (on sets  $I$  and  $J$  respectively) and an isomorphism  $h: A^I/\mathcal{D} \rightarrow B^J/\mathcal{E}$  such that the compositions  $e \circ f$  and  $h \circ d$ , with the corresponding diagonal embeddings, are equal. The converses of these two statements are also true. (Indeed, the converse of the second follows from the converse of the first using the method of expanding the alphabet  $L$  by adding constants denoting all the elements of  $A$ .) This fact, called the (Keisler-Shelah) ultrapower theorem, is a milestone in model theory, with a very interesting history (see, e.g., [28]). Its importance, in part, is that it allows many basic notions of first-order model theory to be formulated in abstract terms, i.e., in terms of mapping diagrams; it is what we called a bridging theorem in the Introduction. The obvious central notions are elementary equivalence and elementary embedding, but there are also derivative notions (e.g., prime model) readily definable in terms of these. Other derivative notions are less obvious. For example the following result is stated and used extensively in [81], and is an application of Keisler's model extension theorem (see [78]).

**Theorem 2.3.** *A function  $f: A \rightarrow B$  between  $L$ -structures is an embedding of level  $\geq k+1$  if and only if there is an elementary embedding  $e: A \rightarrow C$  and an embedding of level  $\geq k$   $g: B \rightarrow C$  such that  $e = g \circ f$ .*

Theorem 2.3, in conjunction with the ultrapower theorem, is another bridging theorem; as the elementary embedding  $e$  may be taken to be an ultrapower diagonal embedding. Thus the notion of embedding of level  $\geq k$  has an abstract reformulation. Indeed, because of the inductive flavor of Theorem 2.3, that notion may be formally extended into the transfinite levels. What is more, because the notion of existential embedding is now available in abstract form, we can export such notions as model completeness to the category-theoretic setting.

We begin to see how these ideas may be exploited when we survey the topological ultraproduct in Section 5. (We use the infix *co* because we are dealing with the opposite of the concrete category **CH** of compacta and continuous maps.)

Using the ultrapower theorem as a bridge, abstract model-theoretic notions are imported, only in dual form, and made concrete once again. In order for this to be a productive enterprise, however, it is necessary to use more of the theorem than simply the *gist* form stated above. We therefore end this section with statements of both Keisler's GCH version and Shelah's subsequent GCH-free version. (We employ standard notation as regards cardinals and ordinals; see, e.g., [28]. In particular, if  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$  are cardinals, then  $\kappa^+$  is the cardinal successor of  $\kappa$ ; and  $\kappa^\lambda$  is the cardinal exponential, the cardinality of the set of all functions from  $\lambda$  into  $\kappa$ . If  $S$  is any set, its cardinality is denoted  $|S|$ .)

**Theorem 2.4** (Keisler's Ultrapower Theorem: [28, 77]). *Let  $\lambda$  be an infinite cardinal where the GCH holds (i.e.,  $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$ ), and let  $I$  be a set whose cardinality is  $\lambda$ . Then there is an ultrafilter  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $I$  such that if  $L$  is an alphabet with at most  $\lambda$  symbols, and if  $A$  and  $B$  are elementarily equivalent  $L$ -structures of cardinality at most  $\lambda^+$ , then  $A^I/\mathcal{D}$  and  $B^I/\mathcal{D}$  are isomorphic.*

**Theorem 2.5** (Shelah's Ultrapower Theorem: [77]). *Let  $\lambda$  be an infinite cardinal, with  $\mu := \min\{\alpha : \lambda^\alpha > \lambda\}$ , and let  $I$  be a set whose cardinality is  $\lambda$ . Then there is an ultrafilter  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $I$  such that if  $L$  is an alphabet, and if  $A$  and  $B$  are elementarily equivalent  $L$ -structures of cardinality less than  $\mu$ , then  $A^I/\mathcal{D}$  and  $B^I/\mathcal{D}$  are isomorphic.*

### 3. TOPOLOGICAL ULTRAPRODUCTS

The topological ultraproduct first made a brief appearance in the Soviet mathematical literature of the mid 1960s. In [1] N. Š. Al'fiš proved several elementary results, but the subject lay dormant until ten years later when I rediscovered it while working on my doctoral dissertation [4].

Following established usage, a *topological space* consists of an underlying set  $X$  and a family  $\mathcal{T}$  of subsets of  $X$ , called a *topology*; members of  $\mathcal{T}$  being called *open sets*. All a family of subsets has to do to be called a topology is to be closed under arbitrary unions and finite intersections. As with the case of relational structures, we use the same symbol to indicate both a topological space and its underlying set (using disambiguating notation, such as  $\langle X, \mathcal{T} \rangle$ , only when necessary). If  $\mathcal{B}$  is an *open base* for a topology  $\mathcal{T}$  on  $X$  (so arbitrary unions of members of  $\mathcal{B}$  form the topology  $\mathcal{T}$ ), then we write  $\mathcal{T} = \tau(\mathcal{B})$ , the topology *generated* by  $\mathcal{B}$ .

Let  $\langle \langle X_i, \mathcal{T}_i \rangle : i \in I \rangle$  be an indexed family of topological spaces, with  $\mathcal{F}$  a filter on  $I$ . Then the reduced product  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{T}_i$  of the topologies may easily be identified with a family of subsets of the reduced product  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} X_i$  of the underlying sets, and this family qualifies as an open base for a topology  $\tau(\prod_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{T}_i)$  on  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} X_i$ , which we call the *reduced product topology*. The resulting *topological reduced product* is denoted (when we can get away with it)  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} X_i$ ; and the canonical basic open sets  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} U_i \in \prod_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{T}_i$  are called *open reduced boxes*. At the two extremes, we have:

- (1)  $\mathcal{F}$  is minimal, i.e.,  $\mathcal{F} = \{I\}$ , in which case  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} X_i$  is the box product  $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$  (with *open boxes* for canonical basic open sets); and
- (2)  $\mathcal{F}$  is maximal, i.e., an ultrafilter, in which case  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} X_i$  is the topological ultraproduct (with *open ultraboxes* for canonical basic open sets).

Clearly the quotient map  $x \mapsto x/\mathcal{F}$  from  $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$  to  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} X_i$  is a continuous open map from the box product to the ultraproduct. (An interesting technical question

concerns when that map is closed as well. This was originally posed in [6], and M. S. Kurilić gave a complicated but interesting answer in [57].)

There is a certain amount of flexibility built into the definition of topological reduced product; in that one may obtain an open base for the reduced product topology by taking open reduced boxes  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} U_i$ , where, for each  $i \in I$ , the sets  $U_i$  range over an open base for the topology  $\mathcal{T}_i$ . This flexibility extends to closed bases as well, in the case of ultraproducts. Recall that a family  $\mathcal{C}$  is a *closed base* for  $\mathcal{T}$  if  $\mathcal{T}$ -closed sets (i.e., complements in  $X$  of members of  $\mathcal{T}$ ) are intersections of subfamilies taken from  $\mathcal{C}$ . One may obtain a closed base for the ultraproduct topology by taking *closed* ultraboxes  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} C_i$ , where, for each  $i \in I$ , the sets  $C_i$  range over a closed base for the topology  $\mathcal{T}_i$ . (The reader interested in nonstandard topology may want to compare the topological ultrapower topology with A. Robinson's *Q-topology* [73].)

The connection between topological ultraproducts and usual ultraproducts should be rather apparent, but we will find it convenient to spell things out. By the *basoid alphabet* we mean the alphabet  $L_{\text{BAS}} := \{P, B, \varepsilon, \approx\}$ , where the first two symbols are unary relation symbols standing for *points* and *basic open sets*, respectively, and the third, a binary relation symbol, stands for *membership*. If  $X$  is any set and  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \wp(X)$ , then  $\langle X, \mathcal{S} \rangle$  may be naturally viewed as the  $L_{\text{BAS}}$ -structure  $\langle X \cup \mathcal{S}, X, \mathcal{S}, \varepsilon \rangle$ , where set-theoretic membership is restricted to  $X \times \mathcal{S}$ . An  $L_{\text{BAS}}$ -structure is called a *basoid* if it is (isomorphic to) such a structure, where  $\mathcal{S}$  is an open base for a topology on  $X$ . The basoid is called *topological* if  $\mathcal{S}$  is itself a topology. Every basoid has a uniquely associated topological basoid; the second is said to be *generated* from the first. It is a routine exercise to show that there is a first-order  $L_{\text{BAS}}$ -sentence whose models are precisely the basoids. Thus ultraproducts of basoids are basoids by Theorem 2.1, and we obtain  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} \langle X_i, \mathcal{T}_i \rangle$  as the topological basoid generated from the usual ultraproduct of the basoids  $\langle X_i, \mathcal{T}_i \rangle$ .

The alphabet  $L_{\text{BAS}}$  is a natural springboard for topological model theory: Allow extra relation and function symbols to range over points, and build various languages from there. This is a one-sorted approach, which is quite sensible, but which turns out to be somewhat cumbersome in practice for the purposes of exposition. Other approaches in the literature start with a first-order alphabet  $L$ , and expand the first-order language over  $L$  in various ways. For example, there is the extra-quantifiers approach, exemplified by J. Sgro's  $L_Q$  [76] (patterned after Keisler's  $L_Q$  [53]); also the two-sorted approach, exemplified by the *invariant* languages  $L_t$  of T.A. McKee [63] and S. Garavaglia [38]. (The two worked independently, with McKee confining himself to the case  $L = \{\approx\}$ ; see also [37].) There is an extensive model theory for  $L_t$  which we cannot possibly survey adequately. (The interested reader is urged to consult the Flum-Ziegler monograph [37].) However, since this model theory includes a nice ultrapower theorem, we take a few lines to describe these languages and state the theorem.

One starts with an ordinary first-order alphabet  $L$ , adds new variables to stand for sets, and then adds the intersorted binary relation symbol  $\varepsilon$  for membership. Atomic formulas consist of the first-order atomic formulas from  $L$ , plus the intersorted formulas of the form  $t \varepsilon U$ , where  $t$  is a first-order term (from  $L$ ) and  $U$  is a set variable. The language  $L_2$  consists of the closure of the atomic formulas under the logical connectives  $\neg$  (not),  $\vee$  (or) and  $\wedge$  (and), and the quantifiers  $\exists$  (there exists) and  $\forall$  (for all), applied to variables of either sort. A formula  $\varphi$  of  $L_2$  is *positive* (resp., *negative*) in the set variable  $U$  if each free occurrence of  $U$  in  $\varphi$

lies within the scope of an even (resp., odd) number of negation symbols. We then define  $L_t$  to be the smallest subset  $K$  of  $L_2$  satisfying:

- (1) the atomic formulas are in  $K$ ;
- (2)  $K$  is closed under the logical connectives, as well as quantification over point variables; and
- (3) if  $t$  is a first-order term and  $\varphi \in K$  is positive (resp., negative) in  $U$ , then  $(\forall U(\neg(t \varepsilon U) \vee \varphi)) \in K$  (resp.,  $(\exists U((t \varepsilon U) \wedge \varphi)) \in K$ ).

By a *basoid  $L$ -structure*, we mean a pair  $\langle A, \mathcal{B} \rangle$ , where  $A$  is an  $L$ -structure and  $\mathcal{B}$  is an open base for some topology on  $A$ . It should then be clear what it means for a basoid  $L$ -structure to be a *model* of a sentence  $\varphi$  of  $L_2$ , as well as what it means for two basoid  $L$ -structures to be *isomorphic*. If  $\langle A_1, \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle$  and  $\langle A_2, \mathcal{B}_2 \rangle$  are two basoid  $L$ -structures, then these structures are *homeomorphic* just in case  $\langle A_1, \tau(\mathcal{B}_1) \rangle$  and  $\langle A_2, \tau(\mathcal{B}_2) \rangle$  are isomorphic. We may now state the topological version of the ultrapower theorem, due to Garavaglia, as follows.

**Theorem 3.1** (Garavaglia's Ultrapower Theorem: [37, 38]). *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two basoid  $L$ -structures. Then  $A$  and  $B$  satisfy the same  $L_t$ -sentences if and only if some ultrapower of  $A$  is homeomorphic to some ultrapower of  $B$ .*

In [4, 6], two spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  are said to be *power equivalent* if some ultrapower of  $X$  is homeomorphic to some ultrapower of  $Y$ . It is not hard to show directly (Theorem A2.3 in [6]) that power equivalence is really an equivalence relation, and it is of some interest to see just how strong an equivalence relation it is. We use the well-known  $T_n$ -numbering of the separation axioms (*à la* [86]); but note that, for the purposes of this paper, we assume the  $T_1$  axiom (i.e., singletons are closed) whenever we talk about separation axioms involving arbitrary closed sets. Thus *regularity* (resp., *normality*), the property of being able to separate a closed set from a point outside that set (resp., two disjoint closed sets) with disjoint open sets, presupposes the  $T_1$  axiom, and is synonymous with the  $T_3$  (resp.,  $T_4$ ) axiom. Similarly, we assume  $T_1$  when we define *complete regularity* (or, the *Tychonoff property*, sometimes referred to as the  $T_{3.5}$  axiom) as the property of being able to separate a closed set from a point outside that set, with a continuous real-valued function. A space is said to be *self-dense* if it has no isolated points. The following tells us that power equivalence is not very discriminating.

**Theorem 3.2** (Theorem A2.6 in [6]). *Any two nonempty self-dense  $T_3$ -spaces are power equivalent.*

*Remark 3.2.1.* The proof of Theorem 3.2 uses a combination of model theory and topology. In particular, it makes use of the Löwenheim-Skolem theorem and a result of W. Sierpiński [79], to the effect that any two nonempty, countable, second countable, self-dense  $T_3$ -spaces are homeomorphic.

With any apparatus that produces new objects from old, an important issue concerns the idea of preservation. In the context of the topological ultrapower construction, we may phrase the following general problem.

**Problem 3.3** (General Preservation Problem). *Given topological properties  $P$  and  $Q$ , and a property  $R$  of ultrafilters, decide the following: For any  $I$ -indexed family  $\langle X_i : i \in I \rangle$  of topological spaces and any ultrafilter  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $I$ , if  $\{i \in I : X_i \text{ has property } P\} \in \mathcal{D}$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}$ -almost every  $X_i$  has property  $P$ ) and  $\mathcal{D}$  has property  $R$ , then  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$  has property  $Q$ .*

*Remark 3.3.1.* The general problem, as stated in Problem 3.3, is not quite as general as it could be. The property  $P$  could actually be a family  $\mathcal{P}$  of properties, and the clause “ $\mathcal{D}$ -almost every  $X_i$  has property  $P$ ” could read “ $\mathcal{D}$ -almost every  $X_i$  has property  $P$  for all  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ .” The vast majority of instances of this problem do not require the added generality, however. (One obvious exception: Consider, for  $n < \omega$ , the property  $P_n$  that says that there are at least  $n$  points, and set  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_n : n < \omega\}$ . If  $R$  is the property of being nonprincipal and  $Q$  is the property of being infinite, then this instance of the more general version of Problem 3.3 has an affirmative answer.)

In [6] we define a topological property/class  $P$  to be *closed* if Problem 3.3 has an affirmative answer for  $Q = P$  and  $R$  nonrestrictive.  $P$  is *open* if its negation is closed. It is a straightforward exercise to show:

- (1) axioms  $T_0$  through  $T_3$  are closed [1, 6] and open [6]; and
- (2) compactness and connectedness are open properties that are not closed [1, 6].

A little less straightforward to show is the fact that  $T_{3.5}$  is closed. It should come as no surprise to general topologists that neither  $T_{3.5}$  nor  $T_4$  is open, and that  $T_4$  is not closed either. The proofs of these *negative* facts above are actually of more value than the facts themselves because they bring in new ideas and engender related results that take a more *positive* form. For this reason we take a few paragraphs to elaborate on some of their key points.

Consider first why  $T_{3.5}$  is a closed class of spaces. Recall the well-known characterization of O. Frink [84] that a  $T_1$ -space  $X$  is completely regular if and only if it has a *normal disjunctive lattice base*; that is, if there is a bounded sublattice  $\mathcal{C}$  of the bounded lattice of closed subsets of  $X$  satisfying:

- (1)  $\mathcal{C}$  is a closed base for the topology on  $X$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{C}$  is meet-dense in the closed-set lattice);
- (2) (normality) for each disjoint pair  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$  there exist  $C', D' \in \mathcal{C}$  with  $C \cap C' = D \cap D' = \emptyset$  and  $C' \cup D' = X$ ; and
- (3) (disjunctivity) for each two distinct elements of  $\mathcal{C}$ , there is a nonempty element of  $\mathcal{C}$  that is contained in one of the first two elements and is disjoint from the other.

(A good source on basic distributive lattice theory is [2].) If  $\langle X_i : i \in I \rangle$  is a family of spaces such that  $\mathcal{D}$ -almost every  $X_i$  is completely regular, then for  $\mathcal{D}$ -almost every  $i \in I$ , there is a normal disjunctive lattice base  $\mathcal{C}_i$  for  $X_i$ . It follows quickly that  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{C}_i$  is a normal disjunctive lattice base for  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$ .

Of the twelve preservation results above that concern  $T_0$ – $T_4$ , only the first nine are apparently positive. Nevertheless, it so happens that the last three are corollaries of positive results. Indeed, one can show that both  $T_{3.5}$  and  $T_4$  are not open properties in one go, with the help of Theorem 3.2. A space  $X$  is *linearly orderable* (a *LOTS*) if  $X$  has a linear ordering whose open intervals constitute an open base for  $X$ .  $X$  is *linearly uniformizable* (a *LUTS*) if the topology on  $X$  is induced by a uniformity that has a linearly ordered base under inclusion. (See, e.g., [86]. For example, if  $\rho$  is a metric inducing the topology on  $X$ , then  $\{\{ \langle x, y \rangle : \rho(x, y) < \epsilon \} : \epsilon > 0\}$  is a linearly ordered uniform base that witnesses the fact that  $X$  is a LUTS.) Suppose  $\mathcal{D}$ -almost every  $X_i$  is a LOTS with inducing linear order  $\leq_i$  (resp., a LUTS with inducing linearly ordered uniform base  $\mathcal{U}_i$ ).

Then  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} \leq_i$  (resp.,  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{U}_i$ ) is a linear ordering (resp., a linearly ordered uniform base) that induces the ultraproduct topology on  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$ . (The *LOTS* part of this observation also appears in [1].) Now every *LOTS* is hereditarily normal; indeed every *LUTS* is hereditarily paracompact Hausdorff. So let  $X$  be any regular space. Then  $X \times \mathbb{R}$ , the topological product of  $X$  with the real line, is self-dense and regular. By Theorem 3.2, there is an ultrapower  $(X \times \mathbb{R})^I/\mathcal{D}$  that is homeomorphic to an ultrapower of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and is hence both a *LOTS* and a *LUTS*. It is easy to show that ultrapowers commute with finite products. Thus the ultrapower  $X^I/\mathcal{D}$  embeds in an ultrapower of the reals, and is hence hereditarily normal (indeed, hereditarily paracompact Hausdorff). The following theorem, whose proof we have just outlined, immediately implies the failure of  $T_{3.5}$  and  $T_4$  to be open properties.

**Theorem 3.4** (Corollary A2.7 in [6]). *Every regular space has a hereditarily paracompact Hausdorff ultrapower.*

We now turn to the problem of showing that normality is not a closed property. First some notation: If  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$  are cardinals, we write  $\kappa^\lambda$  to indicate the  $\lambda$ -fold usual topological power of the ordinal space  $\kappa$  (as well as the cardinal exponentiation). The following positive result clearly implies that normality fails to be closed.

**Theorem 3.5** (Corollary of Theorem 8.2 in [6]). *Let  $X$  be any space that contains an embedded copy of  $2^{\omega_2}$ , and let  $\mathcal{D}$  be any nonprincipal ultrafilter on a countably infinite set  $I$ . Then  $X^I/\mathcal{D}$  is not normal.*

The proof of Theorem 3.5, being interesting in its own right, deserves a bit of discussion.

Of course, if  $X$  fails to be regular, so does any ultrapower; thus it suffices to confine our attention to regular  $X$ . In that case any embedded copy  $Y$  of  $2^{\omega_2}$ , being compact, is closed in the Hausdorff space  $X$ ; hence  $Y^I/\mathcal{D}$  is closed in  $X^I/\mathcal{D}$ . It is therefore enough to show that  $Y^I/\mathcal{D}$  is nonnormal.

This brings us to the important class of  $P$ -spaces. Following the terminology of [39, 84], we call a space  $X$  a  $P$ -space if every countable intersection of open sets is an open set. More generally, following the Comfort-Negrepointis text [30], let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal. A point  $x$  in a space  $X$  is called a  $P_\kappa$ -point if for every family  $\mathcal{U}$  of fewer than  $\kappa$  open neighborhoods of  $x$ , there is an open neighborhood of  $x$  that is contained in each member of  $\mathcal{U}$ .  $X$  is a  $P_\kappa$ -space if each point of  $X$  is a  $P_\kappa$ -point. In  $P_\kappa$ -spaces, intersections of fewer than  $\kappa$  open sets are open; the  $P$ -spaces/points are just the  $P_{\omega_1}$ -spaces/points. (In [5, 6], the  $P_\kappa$ -spaces are called  $\kappa$ -open. While it is convenient to have a concise adjectival form of *being a  $P_\kappa$ -space*, there was already one in the literature,  $\kappa$ -additive, due to R. Sikorski [80], which we adopt here.)

It is very hard for a topological ultraproduct not to be a  $P$ -space. To be specific, define an ultrafilter  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $I$  to be  $\kappa$ -regular if there is a family  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ , of cardinality  $\kappa$ , such that each member of  $I$  is contained in only finitely many members of  $\mathcal{E}$ . It is well known [30] that  $|I|^+$ -regular ultrafilters cannot exist, that  $|I|$ -regular ultrafilters exist in abundance, that  $\omega$ -regularity is the same as countable incompleteness, and that nonprincipal ultrafilters on countably infinite sets are countably incomplete. The following not only says that  $\kappa$ -regularity in ultrafilters produces  $\kappa^+$ -additivity in topological ultraproducts (deciding affirmatively an instance of Problem 3.3), it actually *characterizes* this property of ultrafilters.

**Theorem 3.6** (Additivity Lemma: Theorem 4.1 in [6]). *An ultrafilter is  $\kappa$ -regular if and only if all topological ultraproducts via that ultrafilter are  $\kappa^+$ -additive ( $P_{\kappa^+}$ -spaces).*

*Remark 3.6.1.* There is a model-theoretic analogue to Theorem 3.6: Just replace *additive* with *universal*. (See Theorem 4.3.12 and Exercise 4.3.32 in [28].)

Given any space  $X$  and cardinal  $\kappa$ , we denote by  $(X)_\kappa$  the space whose underlying set is  $X$ , and whose topology is the smallest  $\kappa$ -additive topology containing the original topology of  $X$ . If  $\kappa$  is a *regular* cardinal (so  $\kappa$  is not the supremum of fewer than  $\kappa$  smaller cardinals; for example  $\kappa$  could be a successor cardinal), then one may obtain an open base for  $(X)_\kappa$  by taking intersections of fewer than  $\kappa$  open subsets of  $X$ . (See, e.g., [30] for an extensive treatment of this kind of topological operation.)

The adjective *regular*, as used in technical mathematics, is probably the most overloaded word in mathematical English. Already in this paper it has three senses, modifying the nouns *space*, *ultrafilter*, and *cardinal* in completely unrelated ways. In other areas of mathematics as well, the word is used with abandon. In algebra, functions, rings, semigroups, permutations and representations can all be regular; in homotopy theory, fibrations can be regular; and in analysis, Banach spaces, measures and points can be regular too. (*Regular* modifies *ring* in the same way that it modifies *semigroup*, but otherwise there are no apparent similarities in the senses to which it is used.) The list, I am sure, goes on.

Returning to the proof outline of Theorem 3.5, recall the diagonal map  $d$  from a set  $X$  into an ultrapower  $X^I/\mathcal{D}$  of that set. If the ultrapower is a topological one,  $d$  is not necessarily continuous; consider, for example the case where  $X$  is the real line and  $\mathcal{D}$  is a countably incomplete ultrafilter. The image  $d[X]$  of  $X$  under  $d$  then carries the discrete topology. The following uses Theorem 3.6.

**Theorem 3.7** (Theorem 7.2 in [6]). *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a regular ultrafilter on a set of cardinality  $\kappa$ , with  $X$  a topological space. Then the diagonal map, as a map from  $(X)_{\kappa^+}$  to  $X^I/\mathcal{D}$ , is a topological embedding.*

Suppose  $Y$  is a compactum and  $\mathcal{D}$  is an ultrafilter on  $I$ . Then for each  $a/\mathcal{D} \in X^I/\mathcal{D}$ , there is a unique point  $x \in X$  such that for each open set  $U$  containing  $x$ , the open ultracube  $U^I/\mathcal{D}$  contains  $a/\mathcal{D}$ . Let  $\lim_{\mathcal{D}}(a/\mathcal{D})$  denote this unique point. Then the function  $\lim_{\mathcal{D}}$  is continuous (Theorem 7.1 in [6]), and is related to the standard part map in nonstandard analysis [73]. But more is true, thanks to Theorem 3.7.

**Theorem 3.8** (A consequence of Corollary 7.3 of [6]). *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a regular ultrafilter on a set of cardinality  $\kappa$ , with  $Y$  a compactum. Then the limit map  $\lim_{\mathcal{D}}$ , as a map from  $Y^I/\mathcal{D}$  to  $(Y)_{\kappa^+}$ , is a continuous left inverse for the diagonal map  $d$ . As a result, the diagonal  $d[Y]$ , a homeomorphic copy of  $(Y)_{\kappa^+}$ , is a closed subset of  $Y^I/\mathcal{D}$ .*

We are just about done with Theorem 3.5. In a preliminary version of [56], K. Kunen shows that  $(2^{\mathfrak{c}^+})_{\omega_1}$  is nonnormal, where  $\mathfrak{c} := 2^{\aleph_0}$  is the power of the continuum; and in [33], E. K. van Douwen uses an earlier result of C. Borges [27] to replace  $\mathfrak{c}$  with  $\omega_1$ . So let  $Y$  now be the compactum  $2^{\omega_2}$ , with  $\mathcal{D}$  any nonprincipal ultrafilter on a countably infinite set  $I$ . In order to show  $Y^I/\mathcal{D}$  is nonnormal, it suffices to show some closed subset is nonnormal. This is true, though, since  $(Y)_{\omega_1}$

is nonnormal and, by Theorem 3.8, sits as a closed subset of  $Y^I/\mathcal{D}$ . This completes our discussion of Theorem 3.5.

What Borges' result cited above actually says is that the space  $(\kappa^{\kappa^+})_\kappa$  is nonnormal whenever  $\kappa$  is a regular cardinal. It is quite easy to show from this that, for any infinite cardinal  $\kappa$ ,  $(2^{\kappa^{++}})_{\kappa^+}$  is not normal either. This, together with the additivity lemma (Theorem 3.6) and some arguments to show how easy it is for paracompactness to be present in  $P$ -spaces, gives rise to a characterization of the GCH in terms of topological ultraproducts.

Recall that the *weight* of a space  $X$  is the greater of  $\aleph_0$  and the least cardinality of an open base for the topology on  $X$ . For each infinite cardinal  $\kappa$ , let  $UP_\kappa$  be the following assertion.

$UP_\kappa$ : If  $I$  is a set of cardinality  $\kappa$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$  is a regular ultrafilter on  $I$ , and  $\langle X_i : i \in I \rangle$  is an  $I$ -indexed family of spaces,  $\mathcal{D}$ -almost each of which is regular and of weight at most  $2^\kappa$ , then  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$  is paracompact Hausdorff.

The main result of [5] (see also W. W. Comfort's survey article [29]) is the following.

**Theorem 3.9** (Theorem 1.1 in [5]).  *$UP_\kappa$  holds if and only if the GCH holds at level  $\kappa$  (i.e.,  $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$ ).*

*Remark 3.9.1.* The proof of Theorem 3.9 allows several alternatives to  $UP_\kappa$ . In particular, *regular* (as the word applies to spaces) may be replaced by *normal*; even by *compact Hausdorff*. Also *paracompact Hausdorff* may be replaced by *normal*.

*Remark 3.9.2.* Topological ultraproducts are continuous open images of box products, and there are many inevitable comparisons to be made between the two constructions. In particular, let  $BP_\kappa$  be the statement that the box product of a  $\kappa$ -indexed family of compact Hausdorff spaces, each of weight at most  $2^\kappa$ , is paracompact Hausdorff. In [56] it is proved that the CH (i.e., the GCH at level  $\omega$ ) implies  $BP_\omega$ . Since  $(2^{\omega_2})_{\omega_1}$  is nonnormal, the compactum  $2^{\omega_2}$  stands as a counterexample to  $BP_\omega$  if the CH fails, and as an absolute counterexample to  $BP_\kappa$  for  $\kappa > \omega$ .

We now turn to the exhibition of Baire-like properties in topological ultraproducts. If  $\kappa$  is an infinite cardinal, define a space  $X$  to be  $\kappa$ -Baire (or, a  $B_\kappa$ -space) if intersections of fewer than  $\kappa$  dense open subsets of  $X$  are dense. Of course, every space is a  $B_\omega$ -space, and various forms of the Baire category theorem say that completely metrizable spaces and compact Hausdorff spaces are  $\omega_1$ -Baire. Finally, one topological form of Martin's axiom (MA, see, e.g., [26]) says that if  $X$  is compact Hausdorff and satisfies the *countable chain condition* (i.e., there is no uncountable family of pairwise disjoint nonempty open subsets of  $X$ ), then  $X$  is  $\mathfrak{c}$ -Baire.

What we are working toward is an analogue of Theorem 3.6, with  $P$  replaced with  $B$ . What has been achieved in this connection is interesting, if imperfect, and begs for improvement.

For any set  $S$  and cardinal  $\lambda$ , let  $\wp_\lambda(S)$  be the set of all subsets of  $S$  of cardinality less than  $\lambda$ . If  $\mathcal{D}$  is an ultrafilter on a set  $I$ , a map  $F: \wp_\omega(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  is *monotone* (resp., *multiplicative*) if  $F(s) \supseteq F(t)$  whenever  $s \subseteq t$  (resp.,  $F(s \cup t) = F(s) \cap F(t)$ ). The ultrafilter  $\mathcal{D}$  is called  $\lambda$ -good if:

- (1)  $\mathcal{D}$  is countably incomplete, and

- (2) for every  $\mu < \lambda$  and every monotone  $F: \wp_\omega(\mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ , there exists a multiplicative  $G: \wp_\omega(\mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  such that  $G(s) \subseteq F(s)$  for all  $s \in \wp_\omega(\mu)$ .

(This notion is due to Keisler.)

Every countably incomplete ultrafilter is  $\omega_1$ -good, and every  $\lambda$ -good ultrafilter is  $\mu$ -regular for all  $\mu < \lambda$ . Consequently, if  $|I| = \kappa$ , the maximal degree of goodness an ultrafilter on  $I$  could hope to have is  $\kappa^+$ . The existence of good ultrafilters (i.e.,  $\kappa^+$ -good ultrafilters on sets of cardinality  $\kappa$ ) was first proved by Keisler under the hypothesis  $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$ , and later by Kunen without this hypothesis. (See [30], where it is shown that there are as many good ultrafilters on a set as there are ultrafilters.) Good ultrafilters produce saturated models (see Theorem 6.1.8 in [28]), and the production of saturated models necessitates goodness (see Exercise 6.1.17 in [28]). Finally, and most importantly, good ultrafilters play a crucial role in the proofs of both ultrapower theorems (Theorems 2.4 and 2.5). Our analogue of Theorem 3.6 is the following affirmative answer to the general preservation problem (Problem 3.3).

**Theorem 3.10** (Theorem 2.2 in [7]). *If an ultrafilter is  $\kappa$ -good, then all topological ultraproducts via that ultrafilter are  $\kappa$ -Baire ( $B_\kappa$ -spaces) (as well as being  $\lambda^+$ -additive for all  $\lambda < \kappa$ ).*

*Remark 3.10.1.* Theorem 3.6 is actually key to the proof of Theorem 3.10. We do not know whether producing topological ultraproducts that are  $\kappa$ -Baire as well as  $\lambda^+$ -additive for all  $\lambda < \kappa$  is sufficient to show an ultrafilter to be  $\kappa$ -good.

Topological ultraproduct methods have proven useful in the study of the  $\eta_\alpha$ -sets of F. Hausdorff [44]. Recall that, for any infinite cardinal  $\alpha$ , a linear ordering  $\langle A, < \rangle$  is an  $\eta_\alpha$ -set if whenever  $B$  and  $C$  are subsets of  $A$  of cardinality less than  $\alpha$ , and every element of  $B$  lies to the left of every element of  $C$ , then there is some element of  $A$  lying to the right of every element of  $B$  and to the left of every element of  $C$ . The  $\eta_\omega$ -sets are just the dense linear orderings without endpoints, and Hausdorff [44] invented the famous *back-and-forth* method to show that any two  $\eta_\alpha$ -sets of cardinality  $\alpha$  are order isomorphic. He was also able to establish the existence of  $\eta_{\alpha^+}$ -sets of cardinality  $2^\alpha$  (and L. Gillman showed how to exhibit two distinct such orderings whenever  $\alpha^+ < 2^\alpha$ ). Gillman and B. Jónsson proved that  $\eta_\alpha$ -sets of cardinality  $\alpha$  exist precisely under the condition that  $\alpha = \sup\{\alpha^\lambda : \lambda < \alpha\}$ . (The interested reader should consult [30, 39].) Denote by  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  the (unique, when it exists)  $\eta_\alpha$ -set of cardinality  $\alpha$ . ( $\mathbb{Q}_\omega$  is, of course, the rational line  $\mathbb{Q}$ .) In [12], we use topological ultraproduct methods to establish properties of  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ , viewed as a LOTS. In particular,  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  is both  $\alpha$ -additive and  $\alpha$ -Baire, and the following is true.

**Theorem 3.11** (Theorem 3.14 of [12]). *If  $X$  is a nonempty space that embeds in  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ , then  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  can be partitioned into homeomorphic copies of  $X$ , each of which is closed and nowhere dense in  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ .*

We end this section with one more preservation result about topological ultraproducts. Its main interest is that its proof apparently needs to involve two cases, depending upon whether the ultrafilter is countably complete or countably incomplete. Also it involves a topological property that illustrates a general machinery for producing new properties from old.

By Theorem 3.6, every topological ultraproduct via a countably incomplete ultrafilter is a  $P$ -space. Now if a  $P$ -space is also  $T_1$ , then it has the curious property

of being *pseudo-finite* (or, a *cf-space*, see [51]); i.e., one having no infinite compact subsets. Another way of saying this is that the only compact subsets of  $X$  are the ones that have to be, based on cardinality considerations alone.

There is a general phenomenon taking place here. Namely, if  $P$  is any topological property, let  $\text{spec}(P)$  be the set of cardinals  $\kappa$  such that every space of cardinality  $\kappa$  has property  $P$ ; and denote by *anti- $P$*  the class of spaces  $X$  such that if  $Y$  is a subspace of  $X$  and  $Y$  has property  $P$ , then  $|Y| \in \text{spec}(P)$ . For example, if  $P$  is the property of compactness (resp., connectedness, being self-dense), then *anti- $P$*  is the property of pseudo-finiteness (resp., total disconnectedness, being scattered). The modifier *anti-* was introduced in [8], and it has been studied in its own right by a number of people. (See, e.g., [61, 62, 64, 72].) Concerning topological ultraproducts, what we showed in [8] is the following affirmative answer to Problem 3.3.

**Theorem 3.12** (Corollary 3.6 of [8]). *Topological ultraproducts of pseudo-finite Hausdorff spaces are pseudo-finite Hausdorff.*

*Remark 3.12.1.* Of course, topological ultraproducts of Hausdorff spaces, via countably incomplete ultrafilters, are pseudo-finite Hausdorff (by Theorem 3.6 plus basic facts). One must argue quite differently when the ultrafilters are countably complete. In this case cardinal measurability is involved, and pseudo-finiteness on the part of the factor spaces is essential; moreover the argument does not work if the Hausdorff condition is eliminated (or even weakened to  $T_1$ ). One needs to know that if a set has a certain cardinality, then the cardinality of its closure cannot be too much greater. The  $T_2$  axiom assures us of this, but the  $T_1$  axiom does not. (Consider any infinite set with the cofinite topology.) So, for example, we do not know whether a topological ultraproduct of pseudo-finite  $T_1$ -spaces is pseudo-finite, without assuming countable incompleteness on the part of the ultrafilter.

### Open Problems 3.13.

- (1) (See Theorem 3.4) *Can a topological ultraproduct be normal without being paracompact?*
- (2) (See Theorem 3.10 and Remark 3.10.1) *If all topological ultraproducts via  $\mathcal{D}$  are  $\kappa$ -Baire, as well as  $\lambda^+$ -additive for all  $\lambda < \kappa$ , is  $\mathcal{D}$  necessarily  $\kappa$ -good?*
- (3) (See Theorem 3.11) *Is there a nice topological characterization of  $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$  for uncountable  $\alpha$ ? (Candidate: being regular self-dense, of cardinality = weight =  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha$ -additive and  $\alpha$ -Baire. It is definitely not enough to exclude the  $\alpha$ -Baire part, as Example 3.11 in [12] shows.)*
- (4) (See Theorem 3.12 and Remark 3.12.1) *Is pseudo-finiteness (= anti-compactness) generally preserved by topological ultraproducts?*

## 4. COARSE TOPOLOGICAL ULTRAPOWERS

There is a natural variation on the definition of the ultraproduct topology in cases where all the factor spaces are the same. In this section we consider ultrapowers only, and restrict the ultrapower topology to the one generated by just the open ultracubes. This is what we call the *coarse topological ultrapower*. That is, if  $\langle X, \mathcal{T} \rangle$  is a topological space and  $\mathcal{D}$  is an ultrafilter on a set  $I$ , then the family of open ultracubes  $\{U^I/\mathcal{D} : U \in \mathcal{T}\}$  forms an open base for the coarse ultrapower topology. Note that, with regard to this topology, the natural diagonal map  $d: X \rightarrow X^I/\mathcal{D}$  is a topological embedding. We denote the coarse topological ultrapower by  $[X^I/\mathcal{D}]$ .

(For those interested in nonstandard topology, there is a connection between coarse topological ultrapowers and Robinson's *S-topology* [73].)

Quite straightforwardly, one may obtain a closed base for the coarse ultrapower topology by taking all closed ultracubes. However, it is generally not true that an open (resp., closed) base for the coarse ultrapower topology may be obtained by taking ultracubes from an open (resp., closed) base for the original space. (Indeed, let  $X$  be infinite discrete, with  $\mathcal{B}$  the open base of singleton subsets of  $X$ .)

Our main interest in this section is the question of when coarse topological ultrapowers satisfy any of the usual separation axioms. If the ultrafilter is countably complete, then the diagonal map is a homeomorphism whenever the space has cardinality below the first measurable cardinal. While this may be an interesting avenue of research, there are no results at this time that we know of; and we therefore confine attention to countably incomplete ultrafilters. For each  $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 3.5, 4\}$ , define an ultrafilter  $\mathcal{D}$  to be a  $T_r$ -ultrafilter if it is countably incomplete, and for some infinite space  $X$ , the coarse ultrapower  $[X^I/\mathcal{D}]$  is a  $T_r$ -space. The reader should have no difficulty in constructing coarse topological ultrapowers that are not  $T_0$ -spaces, so the question of the mere existence of  $T_0$ -ultrafilters will doubtless come to mind. The good news is that the  $T_0$  property for ultrafilters follows from combinatorial properties that arise in consequence of MA, and are fairly well understood. We currently do not know whether  $T_0$ -ultrafilters exist absolutely, however.

First, we may reduce the existence question to the case of ultrafilters on a countably infinite set;  $\omega$ , say. The reason is that if  $\mathcal{D}$  is a  $T_0$ -ultrafilter on an infinite set  $I$  and  $[X^I/\mathcal{D}]$  is  $T_0$ , then we may partition  $I$  into countably many subsets, none of which is in  $\mathcal{D}$ , and build a function  $f$  from  $I$  onto  $\omega$  such that the images of the members of the partition of  $I$  partition  $\omega$  into infinite sets. Then  $\mathcal{E} := \{S \subseteq \omega : f^{-1}[S] \in \mathcal{D}\}$  is clearly a countably incomplete ultrafilter. Moreover  $f$  induces an embedding of  $[X^\omega/\mathcal{E}]$  into  $[X^I/\mathcal{D}]$ ; hence  $\mathcal{E}$  is a  $T_0$ -ultrafilter.

In [75] B. Scott defines an ultrafilter  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\omega$  to be *separative* if whenever  $f, g: \omega \rightarrow \omega$  are two functions that are  $\mathcal{D}$ -distinct (i.e.,  $\{n < \omega : f(n) \neq g(n)\} \in \mathcal{D}$ ), then their Stone-Ćech lifts  $f^\beta$  and  $g^\beta$  disagree at the point  $\mathcal{D} \in \beta(\omega)$  (i.e., there is some  $J \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $f[J] \cap g[J] = \emptyset$ ). Scott's main results in [75] include the facts that selective ultrafilters are separative, and that the properties of separativity and being a  $P$ -point in  $\beta(\omega) \setminus \omega$  are not implicationally related. From MA, one may infer the existence of selective ultrafilters; hence the consistency of separative ultrafilters is assured. By the famous Shelah  $P$ -point independence theorem [88],  $P$ -points cannot be shown to exist in  $\beta(\omega) \setminus \omega$ , using ZFC alone. We do not know whether the same can be said for separative ultrafilters, but strongly suspect so. The following is an amalgam of several results in [10].

**Theorem 4.1.** *Fix  $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 3.5\}$ . Then an ultrafilter on  $\omega$  is  $T_r$  if and only if it is separative.*

*Remark 4.1.1.* That  $\mathcal{D}$  is separative if it is  $T_0$  is straightforward (Proposition 2.1 in [10]). Assuming  $\mathcal{D}$  is separative, it is shown in [10] that a coarse  $\mathcal{D}$ -ultrapower of  $X$  is:

- (1)  $T_1$  if  $X$  is a *weak  $P$ -space* (i.e., no point is in the closure of any countable subset of the complement of the point);
- (2)  $T_2$  if  $X$  is  $T_2$  and a  $P$ -space;
- (3)  $T_{3.5}$  if  $X$  is  $T_4$  and a weak  $P$ -space; and

- (4) *strongly zero dimensional* (i.e., disjoint zero sets are separable by disjoint closed open sets) if  $X$  is  $T_4$  and a  $P$ -space.

We do not know whether coarse topological ultrapowers (of infinite spaces, via countably incomplete ultrafilters) can ever be normal.

**Open Problem 4.2** (See Theorem 4.1 and Remark 4.1.1). *Are there (consistently) any  $T_4$ -ultrafilters?*

## 5. TOPOLOGICAL ULTRACOPRODUCTS

Most algebraists at all familiar with the classical reduced product construction know how to define it in terms of direct limits of products (*à la* Fleischer [36]). Indeed, in his introductory article in the *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*, P. Eklof [34] goes this route, but then says:

“Although the shortest approach to the definition of reduced products is via the notion of direct limit, this approach is perhaps misleading since it is the concrete construction of the direct limit rather than its universal mapping properties which will be of importance in the sequel.”

Eklof quite sensibly proceeds to focus on the concrete (i.e., set-based) construction since it is the classical results from first-order model theory that are of primary interest to a beginning reader. But now consider the problem of giving an explicit topological description of the Stone space of an ultraproduct of Boolean lattices, purely in terms of the Stone spaces of those lattices. Because of the duality theorem of M. H. Stone (see [52]), coupled with the limit definition of ultraproducts, this space must be an inverse limit of coproducts. To be more definite, suppose  $\langle X_i : i \in I \rangle$  is an  $I$ -indexed family of Boolean (i.e., totally disconnected compact Hausdorff) spaces, with  $\mathcal{D}$  an ultrafilter on  $I$ . Letting  $B(X)$  denote the Boolean lattice of closed open subsets of  $X$ , the operator  $B(\ )$  is contravariantly functorial, with *inverse* given by the *maximal spectrum* functor  $S(\ )$ . (For a Boolean lattice  $A$ , the points of  $S(A)$  are the maximal proper filters in  $A$ ; if  $a \in A$  and  $a^\# := \{M \in S(A) : a \in M\}$ , then the set  $A^\# := \{a^\# : a \in A\}$  forms a (closed) lattice base for a totally disconnected compact Hausdorff topology on  $S(A)$ .)

So Stone duality tells us that  $S(\prod_{\mathcal{D}} B(X_i))$  is an inverse limit of coproducts; hence a subspace of  $\beta(\bigsqcup_{i \in I} X_i)$ , the Stone-Čech compactification of the disjoint union of the spaces  $X_i$ . Here is one way (out of many) to describe this space in purely topological terms (see [14]). Let  $Y$  be  $\bigsqcup_{i \in I} X_i$  ( $:= \bigcup_{i \in I} (X_i \times \{i\})$ ), and let  $q: Y \rightarrow I$  take an element to its index. Then there is the natural Stone-Čech lift  $q^\beta: \beta(Y) \rightarrow \beta(I)$  ( $I$  having the discrete topology), and it is not hard to show that  $S(\prod_{\mathcal{D}} B(X_i))$  is naturally homeomorphic to  $(q^\beta)^{-1}[\mathcal{D}]$ , the inverse image of  $\mathcal{D} \in \beta(I)$  under  $q^\beta$ . Let us denote this space  $\sum_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$ . It is rightfully called an *ultracoproduct* because it is category-theoretically dual to the usual ultraproduct in a very explicit way. What makes this whole exercise interesting is that our explicit description of  $\sum_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$  requires nothing special about the spaces  $X_i$  beyond the Tychonoff separation axiom. Indeed, the construction just described, what we call the *topological ultracoproduct*, is the Fleischer-style ultraproduct for  $\mathbf{CH}^{\text{op}}$ . And while the topological ultracoproduct makes sense for arbitrary Tychonoff spaces ( $\sum_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$  is actually a compactification of the topological ultraproduct  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$ , see further discussion below), one does not get anything new in the more general setting.

That is,  $\sum_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$  is naturally homeomorphic to  $\sum_{\mathcal{D}} \beta(X_i)$  (see [13]). For this reason we confine our attention to ultraproducts of compacta.

*Remark 5.0.1.* The ultraproduct construction, though not named as such, was actually first considered by J. Mioduszewski [65], in the study of *continua*, i.e., connected compacta. He restricted his attention to the ultraproduct of the disjoint union of a countable infinity of copies of the closed unit interval, viewed as  $(q^\beta)^{-1}[\mathcal{D}]$  above, in order to count the number of composants of the Stone-Ćech remainder of the half-open unit interval. M. Smith [82, 83] and J.-P. Zhu [89] went on to use the construction to find indecomposable subcontinua of this well-studied nonmetrizable continuum. (See also the survey by K. P. Hart [42].)

If each  $X_i$  is the same compactum  $X$ , then we have the *topological ultracopower*  $XI \setminus \mathcal{D}$ , a subspace of  $\beta(X \times I)$ . In this case there is the Stone-Ćech lifting  $p^\beta$  of the natural first-coordinate map  $p: X \times I \rightarrow X$ . Its restriction to the ultracopower is a continuous surjection, called the *codiagonal map*, and is officially denoted  $p_{X, \mathcal{D}}$  (with the occasional notation-shortening alias possible). This map is dual to the natural diagonal embedding from a relational structure to an ultrapower of that structure, and is not unlike the standard part map from nonstandard analysis. (It is closely related to  $\lim_{\mathcal{D}}$ , introduced after Theorem 3.7. In fact it is a function extension, as we shall see below.)

With the codiagonal map so defined, it is an easy exercise to show that being ultracofinite in the category **CH** is the same as having finitely many points. (Being ultrafinitary in this category is equivalent to having at most one point because **CH**-ultraproducts via countably incomplete ultrafilters must have trivial topologies.)

Stone duality is a contravariant equivalence between the categories **BS** of Boolean spaces and continuous maps and **BL** of Boolean lattices and homomorphisms. From our perspective, **BL** is an interesting participant in the duality because it has abstract products, all cartesian, and its class of objects is one that is first-order definable. This tells us its Fleischer-style ultraproduct construction is the usual one. For the purposes of this paper, let us call a concrete category **C** *Stone-like* if there is a contravariant equivalence between **C** and some concrete category **A**, with usual (cartesian) products; where the objects of **A** are the models of a first-order theory, and the morphisms of **A** are the functions that preserve atomic formulas. Then clearly any Stone-like category has an ultraproduct construction, in the Fleischer sense of forming inverse limits of coproducts. Thus **BS** is Stone-like; another good example is the category **CAG** of compact Hausdorff abelian groups and continuous group homomorphisms. The reason **CAG** is Stone-like is that there is the well-known duality theorem of Pontryagin-van Kampen that matches this category with the category **AG** of abelian groups and homomorphisms. (It goes much further in fact; see, e.g., [49, 86].) But while the ultraproduct constructions in **BL** and **AG** are exactly the same, the ultraproduct constructions in **BS** and **CAG** are quite different [15].

Any time a concrete category **C** has an abstract ultra(co)product construction, there are two clear lines of investigation that present themselves. First one may study the construction *per se* in set-theoretic terms, by means of the underlying set functor; second one may view the construction as a vehicle for establishing abstract formulations of various model-theoretic notions (thanks to the ultrapower theorem). The second line is more *global* in flavor; it is part of a study of the category **C** as a whole. For example, one may wish to know whether **C** is Stone-like. (As explained

in [9], the full subcategory **TDCAG** of totally disconnected compact Hausdorff abelian groups, a category with an abstract ultracoproduct construction, is not Stone-like because it has ultracofinite objects with infinite endomorphism sets.) Not surprisingly, it is a combination of these two lines that gives the best results.

Now we have seen that there is an abstract ultracoproduct construction, as well as an abstract ultracoproduct construction, in the category **CH**. As we saw earlier, the first construction is uninteresting because it almost always results in the trivial topology. The story is quite different for the second, however. For one thing, it extends the corresponding construction in the full subcategory **BS**, so there is an immediate connection with model-theoretic ultraproducts. (In fact there is generally a natural isomorphism between  $B(\sum_{\mathcal{D}} X_i)$  and  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} B(X_i)$ . This implies, of course, that ultracoproducts of continua are also continua [9, 13].) For another thing, there is the fact that a compactum  $X$  is finite if and only if all codiagonal maps  $p_{X,\mathcal{D}}$  are homeomorphisms (ultracofinite = finite).

In light of the above, a natural conjecture to make is that **CH** is Stone-like; and after many years of study, everything known so far about the topological ultracoproduct points to an affirmative answer (in contrast to the situation with **TDCAG**). I first posed the question in the McMaster algebra seminar in 1974, and expressed then my belief that the conjecture is false, despite much evidence to the contrary. At the time I had little more to go on than the empirical observation that there were already quite a few duality theorems involving **CH**, e.g., those of Banaschewski, Morita, Gel'fand-Kolmogorov and Gel'fand-Naïmark, and none of them were of the right kind. Almost ten years (and several partial answers, see [9]) later, there came confirmation of my belief from two independent quarters.

**Theorem 5.1** (B. Banaschewski [3] and J. Rosický [74]). ***CH** is not a Stone-like category.*

Of course, what Banaschewski and Rosický independently prove are two somewhat different-sounding statements that each implies Theorem 5.1. The importance of their finding is that it underscores the point that dualized model-theoretic analogues of classical results, automatically theorems in Stone-like categories, are merely conjectures in **CH**. (Shining example: R. L. Vaught's elementary chains theorem, see Theorem 5.13 below.)

Because of the failure of **CH** to be Stone-like (perhaps this *failure* is a virtue in disguise), one is forced to look elsewhere for model-theoretic aids toward a reasonable study of topological ultracoproducts. Fortunately there is a finitely  $\Pi_2^0$ -axiomatizable Horn class of bounded distributive lattices, the so-called *normal disjunctive* lattices (also called Wallman lattices), comprising precisely the (isomorphic copies of) normal disjunctive lattice bases for compacta. (To be more specific: The normal disjunctive lattices are precisely those bounded lattices  $A$  such that there exists a compactum  $X$  and a meet-dense sublattice  $\mathcal{A}$  of the closed set lattice  $F(X)$  of  $X$  such that  $A$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{A}$ .) We go from bounded distributive lattices to spaces, as in the case of Stone duality, by means of the maximal spectrum  $S(\ )$  (pioneered by H. Wallman [85] in the non-Boolean setting).  $S(A)$  is defined exactly as above, and is generally a compact space for any bounded distributive lattice  $A$ . Normality, the condition that if  $a$  and  $b$  are disjoint ( $a \sqcap b = \perp$ ), then there are  $a', b'$  such that  $a \sqcap a' = b \sqcap b' = \perp$  and  $a' \sqcup b' = \top$ , ensures that the maximal spectrum topology is Hausdorff. Disjunctivity, which says that for any two distinct lattice elements there is a nonbottom element that is below one and disjoint from

the other, ensures that the map  $a \mapsto a^\sharp$  takes  $A$  isomorphically onto the canonical closed set base  $A^\sharp$  for  $S(A)$ .  $S(\ )$  is contravariantly functorial: If  $f: A \rightarrow B$  is a homomorphism of normal disjunctive lattices and  $M \in S(B)$ , then  $f^S(M)$  is the unique maximal filter extending the prime filter  $f^{-1}[M]$ . (For normal lattices, each prime filter is contained in a unique maximal one.)

It is a relatively easy task to show, then, that  $S(\ )$  converts ultraproducts to ultracoproducts. Furthermore,  $f^S: S(B) \rightarrow S(A)$  is a homeomorphism if  $f: A \rightarrow B$  is a *separative* embedding; i.e., an embedding such that if  $b \sqcap c = \perp$  in  $B$ , then there exists  $a \in A$  such that  $f(a) \geq b$  and  $f(a) \sqcap c = \perp$ . Because of this, there is a degree of flexibility in how we may obtain  $\sum_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$ : simply choose a lattice base  $\mathcal{A}_i$  for each  $X_i$  and apply  $S(\ )$  to the ultraproduct  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{A}_i$ . So, taking each  $\mathcal{A}_i$  to be  $F(X_i)$ , we infer very quickly that  $\sum_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$  contains the topological ultraproduct  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$  as a densely-embedded subspace. Also we get an easy concrete description of the codiagonal map  $p: XI \setminus \mathcal{D} \rightarrow X$ : If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a lattice base for  $X$  and  $y \in XI \setminus \mathcal{D} = S(\mathcal{A}^I / \mathcal{D})$ , then  $p(y)$  is that unique  $x \in X$  such that if  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  contains  $x$  in its interior, then  $A^I / \mathcal{D} \in y$ . (So  $p$  does indeed extend  $\lim_{\mathcal{D}}$ , as claimed earlier.)

We now officially define two compacta  $X$  and  $Y$  to be *co-elementarily equivalent* if there are ultracoproducts  $p: XI \setminus \mathcal{D} \rightarrow X$ ,  $q: YJ \setminus \mathcal{E} \rightarrow Y$ , and a homeomorphism  $h: XI \setminus \mathcal{D} \rightarrow YJ \setminus \mathcal{E}$ . (Recall the definition of power equivalence in Section 3.) A function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is a *co-elementary map* if there are  $p, q$ , and  $h$  as above such that the compositions  $f \circ p$  and  $q \circ h$  are equal. These definitions come directly from the ultrapower theorem. Furthermore, because of Theorem 2.3, we may define the level of a map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  as follows:  $f$  is a map of *level*  $\geq 0$  if  $f$  is a continuous surjection. If  $\alpha$  is any ordinal,  $f$  is a map of *level*  $\geq \alpha + 1$  if there are maps  $g: Z \rightarrow Y$  and  $h: Z \rightarrow X$  such that  $g$  is co-elementary,  $h$  is of level  $\geq \alpha$ , and  $f \circ h = g$ . If  $\alpha$  is a positive limit ordinal,  $f$  is a map of *level*  $\geq \alpha$  if  $f$  is a map of level  $\geq \beta$  for all  $\beta < \alpha$ . (Because of the definition of *co-elementary map*,  $g: Z \rightarrow Y$  may be taken to be an ultracoproduct codiagonal map.) A map of level  $\geq 1$  is also called *co-existential*.

The reader may be wondering whether we are justified in the terminology *co-elementary equivalence*, as there is nothing in the definition above that ensures the transitivity of this relation. The answer is that we are so justified; but we need the maximal spectrum functor  $S(\ )$ , plus the full power of the ultrapower theorem (i.e., Theorem 2.5) to show it (Theorem 3.2.1 in [13]). By the same token, one also shows that compositions of co-elementary maps are co-elementary (Theorem 3.3.2 in [13]), and that compositions of maps of level  $\geq \alpha$  are of level  $\geq \alpha$  (Proposition 2.5 in [19]).

*Remark 5.1.1.* Because of how it translates ultraproducts of lattices to ultracoproducts of compacta, the maximal spectrum functor also translates elementary equivalence between lattices to co-elementary equivalence between compacta. Furthermore, if  $f: A \rightarrow B$  is an elementary embedding (resp., embedding of level  $\geq \alpha$ ), then  $f^S: S(B) \rightarrow S(A)$  is a co-elementary map (resp., map of level  $\geq \alpha$ ). Nevertheless the spectrum functor falls far short of being a duality, except when restricted to the Boolean lattices. For this reason one must take care not to jump to too many optimistic conclusions; such as assuming, e.g., that if  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is a co-existential map, then there must be lattice bases  $\mathcal{A}$  for  $X$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  for  $Y$  and an existential embedding  $g: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that  $f = g^S$ . (Of course, for level  $\geq 0$ , this is obvious: Pick  $\mathcal{A} = F(X)$ ,  $\mathcal{B} = F(Y)$ , and  $g = f^F$ . However,  $f^F$  is not an

existential embedding unless it is already an isomorphism (a slight adjustment of the proof of Proposition 2.8 in [18]).) This *representation problem* has yet to be solved.

The infrastructure for carrying out a dualized model-theoretic study of compacta is now in place. Because of Stone duality, dualized model theory for Boolean spaces is perfectly reflected in the ordinary model theory of Boolean lattices, but Theorem 5.1 tells us there is no hope for a similar phenomenon with compacta in general. For example, one may use the Tarski invariants theorem [28], plus Stone duality, to show that there are exactly  $\aleph_0$  co-elementary equivalence classes in **BS**; however, one must work directly to get the number of co-elementary equivalence classes in **CH**.

**Theorem 5.2** (Diversity Theorem).

- (1) (Theorem 3.2.5 in [13]) *There are exactly  $\mathfrak{c}$  co-elementary equivalence classes in **CH**.*
- (2) (Theorem 1.5 in [15]) *For each  $0 < \alpha \leq \omega$ , there is a family of  $\mathfrak{c}$  metrizable compacta, each of dimension  $\alpha$ , no two of which are co-elementarily equivalent.*
- (3) (Theorem 2.11 in [16]) *There is a family of  $\mathfrak{c}$  locally connected metrizable (i.e., Peano) continua, no two of which are co-elementarily equivalent.*

Another example concerns various statements of the Löwenheim-Skolem theorem. The weakest form, for Boolean lattices, says that every infinite Boolean lattice is elementarily equivalent to a countable one. Now Stone duality equates the cardinality of an infinite Boolean lattice with the weight of its maximal spectrum space (in symbols,  $|A| = w(S(A))$ ); hence we infer immediately that every Boolean space is co-elementarily equivalent to a metrizable one (since, for compacta, metrizability = weight  $\aleph_0$ ). The same is true for compacta in general, by use of the Löwenheim-Skolem theorem for normal disjunctive lattices. This was first proved by R. Gurevič [41], in response to a question raised in [13].

**Theorem 5.3** (Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem: Proposition 16 in [41]). *For every compactum  $X$ , there is a metrizable compactum  $Y$  and a co-elementary map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ . In particular, every compactum is co-elementarily equivalent to a metrizable one.*

Theorem 5.3 has several sharper versions; one is Theorem 1.7 in [15], which sees the Löwenheim theorem as a factorization of maps. The strongest version appears in [21].

**Theorem 5.4** (Löwenheim-Skolem Factorization Theorem: Theorem 3.1 in [21]). *Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a continuous surjection between compacta, with  $\kappa$  an infinite cardinal such that  $w(Y) \leq \kappa \leq w(X)$ . Then there is a compactum  $Z$  and continuous surjections  $g: X \rightarrow Z$  and  $h: Z \rightarrow Y$  such that  $w(Z) = \kappa$ ,  $g$  is a co-elementary map, and  $f = h \circ g$ .*

*Remark 5.4.1.* When restricted to spaces in **BS**, Theorem 5.4 is an immediate corollary of classical model theory. In the absence of a Stone-like duality, though, one must resort to other techniques. The proof in [21] of Theorem 5.4 above actually makes use of some Banach space theory.

Another line of inquiry regarding topological ultraproducts concerns the general preservation problem, Problem 3.3, with  $\sum_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$  in place of  $\prod_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$ . In this new setting, we define a property  $P$  of compacta to be *closed* if for any indexed family  $\langle X_i : i \in I \rangle$  of compacta, and any ultrafilter  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $I$ ,  $\sum_{\mathcal{D}} X_i$  has property  $P$  whenever  $\{i \in I : X_i \text{ has property } P\} \in \mathcal{D}$ .  $P$  is *open* if the complement of  $P$  in  $\mathbf{CH}$  is closed. (Frequently we speak of a subclass  $\mathbf{K}$  of  $\mathbf{CH}$  as being closed or open.)

**Theorem 5.5.**

- (1) *The following properties of compacta are both closed and open: being connected (Proposition 1.5 in [13]); being a Boolean space (Proposition 1.7 in [13]); being a compactum of covering dimension  $n$  ( $n < \omega$ ) (essentially Theorem 2.2.2 in [13]); being a decomposable continuum (Propositions 2.4.4 in [13] and 11 in [41]); being a hereditarily indecomposable continuum (Theorem 4.9 in [22], see also [43, 82]); and being a continuum of multicoherence degree  $n$  ( $n < \omega$ ) (Theorem 5.1 in [22]).*
- (2) *The following properties of compacta are closed, but not open: having infinite covering dimension (see Theorem 2.2.2 in [13]); being a continuum of infinite multicoherence degree (see Theorem 5.1 in [22]); and being a continuum with an indecomposable subcontinuum (see Proposition 2.4.4 in [13], Proposition 11 in [41], Proposition 4.3 in [22], and [82, 83]).*

*Remark 5.5.1.* Given a fixed finite  $n$ , there is a  $(\Pi_2^0)$  sentence  $\varphi_n$ , in the first-order language of bounded lattices, such that the models of  $\varphi$  are precisely those normal disjunctive lattices whose maximal spectra are compacta of covering dimension  $\leq n$ . This derives from a theorem of E. Hemmingsen (Lemma 2.2 and its corollary in [35]) that allows the replacement of *closed set* in statements with *basic closed set* (for a fixed lattice base). Sentences like  $\varphi_n$  are called *base-free*; any time a base-free sentence can be used to define a class of compacta, that class is both closed and open.

*Remark 5.5.2.* The reader may be wondering whether other dimension functions behave as well as covering dimension *vis à vis* ultraproducts, and the short answer is no: There is a compactum  $X$ , due to A. L. Lunc [69, 71] such that  $\dim(X) = 1$  and  $\text{ind}(X) = \text{Ind}(X) = 2$  (where  $\dim$ ,  $\text{ind}$  and  $\text{Ind}$  are covering dimension, small inductive dimension and large inductive dimension, respectively). Using Theorem 5.3, find a metrizable  $Y$  co-elementarily equivalent to  $X$ . Then  $\dim(Y) = 1$  by Theorem 5.5. Since all three dimension functions agree for separable metrizable spaces, we see that the two inductive dimension functions are not preserved by co-elementary equivalence.

*Remark 5.5.3.* Recall that decomposability in a continuum  $X$  means that  $X$  is the union of two proper subcontinua; equivalently, it means that  $X$  has a proper subcontinuum with nonempty interior. It is relatively easy to show that the class of decomposable continua is closed; much less trivial [41] to show the same for the class of indecomposable continua. As an alternative to the ultraproduct argument in [41], Theorem 4.5 in [22] specifies a  $(\Pi_2^0)$  base-free sentence that defines the class of indecomposable continua.

*Remark 5.5.4.* A hereditarily indecomposable continuum is a continuum with no decomposable subcontinua. Thanks to a 1977 *crookedness* criterion for hereditary

indecomposability, due to J. Krasinkiewicz and P. Minc (see [43]), there is a base-free ( $\Pi_2^0$ ) sentence defining the class of hereditarily indecomposable continua.

*Remark 5.5.5.* Multicoherence degree is a numerical measure of *interconnectedness* in continua, invented in the 1930s by S. Eilenberg (see, e.g., [68]). It simply counts the maximum number of *components* (i.e., maximal connected subsets) obtainable in the overlap of two subcontinua whose union is the whole space, and then subtracts 1 when such a maximum exists. The multicoherence degree of  $X$  is denoted  $r(X)$  (defined to be  $\omega$  if the maximum above does not exist). So, for example, the condition  $r(X) = 0$  defines the unicoherent continua, including such spaces as the closed unit interval (as well as the indecomposable continua).  $r(X) = 1$  if  $X$  is, say, a circle. Theorem 5.1 in [22] gives an ultracoproduct argument to show that the class of continua of any fixed finite multicoherence degree  $n$  is both closed and open. However, we do not know of any base-free sentence defining this class. Such a sentence must exist in theory because of the facts that: (a) the property of being a continuum of multicoherence degree  $\leq n$  is closed and open (see Theorem 5.1 in [22]); (b) this property is preserved by the taking of inverse limits with continuous surjections for bonding maps (see Theorem 1 in [67]); and (c) a closed-and-open class is closed under inverse limits with continuous surjective bonding maps if and only if that class is definable with a  $\Pi_2^0$  base-free sentence (see Corollary 1.5 in [22]).

*Remark 5.5.6.* The complement of being a continuum containing an indecomposable subcontinuum, relative to being a continuum, is being a hereditarily decomposable continuum. The existence of indecomposable subcontinua of ultracopowers of the closed unit interval was used to show that the Stone-Ćech remainder of the half-open unit interval is not hereditarily decomposable (see Remark 5.0.1 above). This also shows that being a hereditarily decomposable continuum is not a closed property.

In [21] the class of  $\kappa$ -wide compacta is defined, for each cardinal  $\kappa$ . Membership in this class amounts to having a family of  $\lambda$  pairwise disjoint proper subcontinua with nonempty interiors, for each cardinal  $\lambda < \kappa$ ; so decomposability for a continuum is equivalent to being 2-wide, and all infinite locally connected compacta are  $\aleph_1$ -wide. Using a technique similar to the one Gurevič used to prove Proposition 11 in [41], one can show that the class of  $n$ -wide compacta is both open and closed for each  $n < \omega$ ; consequently that any compactum co-elementarily equivalent to a locally connected compactum is  $\aleph_0$ -wide. The class of  $\aleph_0$ -wide compacta is closed under co-elementary equivalence, but this is hardly the case for the locally connected compacta.

**Theorem 5.6** (Corollary 14 in [41]). *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a nonprincipal ultrafilter on a countably infinite set, with  $X$  an infinite compactum. Then  $XI \setminus \mathcal{D}$  is not locally connected.*

This result was used in [16] (along with regular ultrafilters and the Löwenheim-Skolem theorem) to obtain the following.

**Theorem 5.7** (Theorem 2.10 in [16]). *Let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal, and  $X$  an infinite compactum. Then there is a compactum  $Y$ , of weight  $\kappa$ , that is co-elementary equivalent to  $X$ , but not locally connected.*

The central role of local connectedness in the study of topological ultracoproducts was discovered by R. Gurevič in solving a problem raised in [13]. In an exact

analogy with the concept of categoricity in model theory, define a compactum  $X$  to be *categorical* if any compactum co-elementarily equivalent to  $X$  and of the same weight as  $X$  must also be homeomorphic to  $X$ . For example, the Cantor discontinuum  $2^\omega$  is categorical because its Boolean lattice of closed open sets is the unique (up to isomorphism) countable atomless Boolean lattice, and the class of Boolean spaces is both closed and open. One problem I raised was whether the closed unit interval  $[0, 1]$  (or any metrizable continuum that is *nondegenerate*, i.e., having more than one point) is categorical, and Theorem 5.7 provides a negative answer. (The same negative answer was given in [41], but the proof of Proposition 15, a key step, was significantly incomplete.) The question of the existence of categorical continua remains open, but we know from Theorem 5.7 that any categorical compactum must fail to be locally connected. (There is even more: Using a Banach version of the classic Ryll-Nardzewski theorem from model theory, C. W. Henson [45] has informed me that categorical metrizable compacta must fail to be  $\aleph_0$ -wide.)

The concept of categoricity may be relativized to a subclass  $\mathbf{K}$  of  $\mathbf{CH}$  in the obvious way. Thus we could ask about the existence of metrizable compacta in  $\mathbf{K}$  that are categorical *relative* to  $\mathbf{K}$ . When  $\mathbf{K}$  is the locally connected compacta, there is a satisfying answer. Define an *arc* (resp *simple closed curve*) to be a homeomorphic copy of the closed unit interval (resp. the standard unit circle). The following makes important use of a theorem of R. L. Moore (see [66]), which says that a nondegenerate Peano continuum is either an arc or a simple closed curve, or contains a *triod* (i.e., the join of three arcs at a common endpoint).

**Theorem 5.8** (Theorem 0.6 in [14]). *Arcs and simple closed curves are categorical relative to the class of locally connected compacta.*

Getting back to general preservation (Problem 3.3), there is not much known about properties of a topological ultraproduct that are conferred solely by the ultrafilter involved (in analogy with Theorems 3.6 and 3.10). One such is due to K. Kunen [55], and uses a Banach space argument.

**Theorem 5.9** (Kunen [55]). *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a regular ultrafilter on  $I$ , with  $X$  an infinite compactum. Then  $w(XI \setminus \mathcal{D}) = w(X)^{|I|}$ .*

Recall that a  $P_\kappa$ -space is one for which intersections of fewer than  $\kappa$  open sets are open. When  $\kappa$  is uncountable, such spaces are pseudo-finite; hence infinite compacta can never be counted among them. There is a weakening of this property, however, that compacta can subscribe to. Call a space an *almost- $P_\kappa$ -space* if nonempty intersections of fewer than  $\kappa$  open sets have nonempty interior. The following is an easy consequence of the additivity lemma (Theorem 3.6), plus the fact that the topological ultracoproduct contains the corresponding topological ultraproduct as a dense subspace.

**Theorem 5.10** (Theorem 2.3.7 in [13]). *If an ultrafilter is  $\kappa$ -regular, then all topological ultracoproducts via that ultrafilter are almost- $P_{\kappa^+}$ -spaces.*

A little more significant is the following result about ultracopowers. (Compare with Theorem 3.10.)

**Theorem 5.11** (Theorem 2.3.17 in [13]). *If an ultrafilter is  $\kappa$ -good, then all topological ultracopowers via that ultrafilter are  $B_{\kappa^+}$ -spaces.*

The rest of this section concerns what we have informally referred to as the *dualized model theory* of compacta, in exact parallel (only with the arrows reversed) with model-theoretic investigations of well-known classes of relational structures (e.g., linear orders, graphs, groups, fields, etc.). As we saw above, the topological ultracoproduct allows for the definition of co-elementary maps between compacta, as well as for the creation of the hierarchy of classes of maps of level  $\geq \alpha$  for any ordinal  $\alpha$ . When we restrict our attention to Boolean spaces, co-elementary maps and maps of level  $\geq \alpha$  are the Stone duals of elementary embeddings and embeddings of level  $\geq \alpha$ , respectively, between Boolean lattices. This basic correspondence provides us with an abundance of facts about the Boolean setting that we would like to extend to the compact Hausdorff setting. Any failure of extendability would give a new proof of the Banaschewski-Rosický theorem (Theorem 5.1); so far, however, there has been nothing but success (or indecision).

The first obvious question that needs clearing up is whether the levels really go beyond  $\omega$ , and the answer is no.

**Theorem 5.12** (Hierarchy Theorem: Theorem 2.10 in [19]). *Let  $\alpha$  be any infinite ordinal. Then the maps between compacta that are of level  $\geq \alpha$  are precisely the co-elementary maps.*

This leads us to the second question, whether the composition of two maps of level  $\geq \alpha$  is also of level  $\geq \alpha$ . As mentioned above, the answer is yes, but a much stronger result is true. The following is the dual for compacta of a generalization of the original elementary chains theorem of R. L. Vaught.

**Theorem 5.13** ( $\alpha$ -Chains Theorem: Theorem 3.4 in [19]). *Let  $\langle X_n \xleftarrow{f_n} X_{n+1} : n < \omega \rangle$  be a sequence of maps of level  $\geq \alpha$  between compacta, with inverse limit  $X$  and limit maps  $g_n : X \rightarrow X_n$ ,  $n < \omega$ . Then each  $g_n$  is a map of level  $\geq \alpha$ .*

*Remark 5.13.1.* Without much ado, Theorem 5.13 may be extended to arbitrary inverse systems of compacta.

In any model-theoretic study of algebraic systems, the most commonly investigated homomorphisms are the existential embeddings. These are the ones arising from the classical study of algebraically closed fields, for example. When we look at the dual notion of co-existential maps between compacta, a very rich theory emerges. First of all, let us recall some properties of compacta that are preserved by maps of level  $\geq 0$  (alias continuous surjections). These include: having cardinality (or weight)  $\leq \kappa$  ( $\kappa$  any cardinal); being connected; and being locally connected. When we consider preservation by co-existential maps, we obtain preservation for several important properties that are not generally preserved by continuous surjections.

**Theorem 5.14** (various results of [21]). *The following properties of compacta are preserved by co-existential maps: being infinite; being disconnected; having covering dimension  $\leq n$  ( $n < \omega$ ); being an indecomposable continuum; and being a hereditarily indecomposable continuum.*

*Remark 5.14.1.* Co-existential maps cannot raise covering dimension, but they can lower it (Example 2.12 in [21]). Maps of level  $\geq 2$  between compacta must preserve covering dimension, however (see Theorem 2.5 in [20]).

*Remark 5.14.2.* Co-existential maps also cannot raise multicoherence degree for continua. This is Corollary 5.4 in [22], and involves an entirely different approach from that used in Theorem 5.14. Co-existential maps can lower multicoherence degree (see Remark 5.7(iii) in [22]). As in the case of covering dimension, maps of level  $\geq 2$  preserve multicoherence degree (Corollary 5.6 in [22]). The only other result we know of in this connection is S. Eilenberg's 1936 theorem (see, e.g., Theorem 12.33 in [68]), which says that multicoherence degree cannot be raised by maps that are *quasi-monotone* (i.e., such that the pre-image of a subcontinuum with nonempty interior in the image has finitely many components, each mapping onto the subcontinuum).

An important tool in the proof of results such as Theorem 5.14 is the following result, of interest in its own right.

**Theorem 5.15** (Covering Lemma: Theorem 2.4 in [21]). *Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a co-existential map between compacta. Then there exists a  $\cup$ -semilattice homomorphism  $f^*$  from the subcompacta of  $Y$  to the subcompacta of  $X$  such that for each subcompactum  $K$  of  $Y$ :*

- (1)  $f[f^*(K)] = K$ ;
- (2)  $f^{-1}[U] \subseteq f^*(K)$  whenever  $U$  is a  $Y$ -open set contained in  $K$ ;
- (3) the restriction of  $f$  to  $f^*(K)$  is a co-existential map from  $f^*(K)$  to  $K$ ; and
- (4)  $f^*(K) \in \mathbf{K}$  whenever  $K \in \mathbf{K}$  and  $\mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathbf{CH}$  is closed under ultracopowers and continuous surjections.

An easy corollary of Theorem 5.15 is the fact that co-existential maps between compacta are *weakly confluent*; i.e., such that subcontinua of the range are themselves images of subcontinua of the domain. If a subcontinuum of the range is the image of each component of its pre-image, then the map is called *confluent*. Stronger still, a continuous surjection is *monotone* if pre-images of subcontinua of the range are subcontinua of the domain.

**Theorem 5.16** (Theorem 2.7 in [21]). *Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a co-existential map between compacta, where  $Y$  is locally connected. Then  $f$  is monotone.*

Theorem 5.16 is a main ingredient in the following result; another is Proposition 2.7 in [17].

**Theorem 5.17.** *Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a function from an arc to a compactum. The following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $f$  is a co-existential map.
- (2)  $f$  is a co-elementary map.
- (3)  $Y$  is an arc and  $f$  is a monotone continuous surjection.

A class of relational structures is called *elementary* if it is the class of models of a first-order theory. (This is the usage in [28]. In [24], elementary classes are the classes of models of a single sentence; what in [28] are called *basic* elementary classes.) From early work (1962) of T. E. Frayne, A. C. Morel and D. S. Scott (see Theorem 4.1.12 in [28]), a class is elementary if and only if it is closed under the taking of ultraproducts and ultraroots (where, as one might guess,  $A$  is an *ultraroot* of  $B$  just in case  $B$  is isomorphic to an ultrapower of  $A$ ). This characterization is another bridging theorem, allowing us to define a class  $\mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathbf{CH}$  to be *co-elementary* if it is closed under the taking of ultracoproducs and ultracoroots. For example, all

the classes (properties) mentioned in Theorem 5.5 (1) are co-elementary, since they are both closed and open. The class of compacta of infinite covering dimension, while not being open, is still co-elementary. The same may be said for the classes of  $\aleph_0$ -wide compacta and continua of infinite multicoherence degree (but certainly not for the class of locally connected compacta, by Theorem 5.6).

An elementary class of relational structures is called *model complete* (see [59]) if every embedding between members of that class is elementary. Thus we may define, in parallel fashion, the notion of *model cocomplete co-elementary class*. (I apologize for so many uses of *co*.) Because of Stone duality, plus the fact that the class of atomless Boolean lattices is model complete, the class of self-dense Boolean spaces is a model cocomplete class of compacta. The following is an exact analogue of Robinson's test for model completeness, and uses the  $\omega$ -chains theorem (Theorem 5.13).

**Theorem 5.18** (Robinson's Test: Theorem 5.1 in [21]). *A co-elementary class of compacta is model cocomplete if and only if every continuous surjection between members of the class is a co-existential map.*

In model theory, the Chang-Łoś-Suszko theorem (see [28, 78]) tells us that an elementary class is the class of models of a set of  $\Pi_2^0$  sentences if and only if the class is *inductive*; i.e., closed under arbitrary chain unions. In the compact Hausdorff setting, we then define a co-elementary class to be *co-inductive* if that class is closed under the taking of inverse limits, with continuous surjective bonding maps. Examples of co-inductive co-elementary classes are: {compacta}, {compacta of covering dimension  $\leq n$ }, {continua}, {indecomposable continua}, {hereditarily indecomposable continua}, and {continua of multicoherence degree  $\leq n$ }. The co-elementary class of decomposable continua is not co-inductive; indeed a favorite method of constructing indecomposable continua is to take inverse limits of decomposable ones (see [68]). Theorem 1.2 and Corollaries 1.3, 1.5 of [22] lay out a topological analogue of the Chang-Łoś-Suszko theorem (as well as its generalizations to sentences of higher complexity, see [81]).

Define a class  $\mathbf{K}$  of compacta to be  $\kappa$ -categorical, where  $\kappa$  is an infinite cardinal, if: (i)  $\mathbf{K}$  contains compacta of weight  $\kappa$ ; and (ii) any two members of  $\mathbf{K}$  of weight  $\kappa$  are homeomorphic. The class of self-dense Boolean spaces, for example, is  $\aleph_0$ -categorical. The following is an exact analogue of Lindström's test for model completeness, and uses Theorem 5.18 above, as well as a fair amount of topology.

**Theorem 5.19** (Lindström's Test: Theorem 6.4 in [21]). *Any co-inductive co-elementary class of compacta is model cocomplete, provided it contains no finite members and is  $\kappa$ -categorical for some infinite cardinal  $\kappa$ .*

*Remark 5.19.1.* Theorems 5.18 and 5.19 are interesting and reasonably challenging to establish. Unfortunately, they have proven useless in finding new model cocomplete classes; in particular, we know of no model cocomplete classes of continua.

Model cocomplete co-elementary classes are interesting because, in some sense, it is difficult to distinguish their members from one another. This is especially true if they are also *cocomplete*; i.e., consisting of exactly one co-elementary equivalence class. (It is not especially hard to prove that every co-elementary equivalence class is closed, so there is no problem finding cocomplete co-elementary classes.) One way to try to look for examples is via the study of *co-existential closure*. Recall

that in model theory, an  $L$ -structure  $A$  is *existentially closed* relative to a class  $\mathbf{K}$  of  $L$ -structures, of which  $A$  is a member, if every embedding from  $A$  into a member of  $\mathbf{K}$  is existential. Let  $\mathbf{K}^e$  denote the members of  $\mathbf{K}$  that are existentially closed relative to  $\mathbf{K}$ . It is well known (see [28]) that if  $\mathbf{K}$  is an inductive elementary class, then each infinite  $A \in \mathbf{K}$  embeds in some  $A' \in \mathbf{K}^e$ , of cardinality  $|A|$ . In certain special cases,  $\mathbf{K}^e$  has a very elegant characterization. For example, if  $\mathbf{K}$  is the class of fields, then  $\mathbf{K}^e$  is the class of algebraically closed fields (Hilbert's *Nullstellensatz*). Other examples include:

- (1)  $\mathbf{K} = \{\text{linear orderings without endpoints}\}$ ,  $\mathbf{K}^e = \{\text{dense linear orderings without endpoints}\}$ ;
- (2)  $\mathbf{K} = \{\text{abelian groups}\}$ ,  $\mathbf{K}^e = \{\text{divisible abelian groups with infinitely many elements of each prime order}\}$ .

We thus define a compactum  $X \in \mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathbf{CH}$  to be *co-existentially closed* relative to  $\mathbf{K}$  if every continuous surjection from a member of  $\mathbf{K}$  onto  $X$  is co-existential. Let  $\mathbf{K}^c$  denote the members of  $\mathbf{K}$  that are co-existentially closed relative to  $\mathbf{K}$ . An exact analogue to the existence result just cited is the following.

**Theorem 5.20** (Level  $\geq 1$  Existence Theorem: Theorem 6.1 in [21]). *Let  $\mathbf{K}$  be a co-inductive co-elementary class, with  $X \in \mathbf{K}$  infinite. Then  $X$  is a continuous image of some  $X' \in \mathbf{K}^c$ , of weight  $w(X)$ .*

Theorem 5.20 applies, then, to the three co-inductive co-elementary classes  $\mathbf{CH}$ ,  $\mathbf{BS}$ , and  $\mathbf{CON}$ , of compacta, Boolean spaces, and continua respectively. The following *dual Nullstellensatz* for compacta is not difficult to prove.

**Theorem 5.21** (Proposition 6.2 in [21]).  $\mathbf{CH}^c = \mathbf{BS}^c = \{\text{self-dense Boolean spaces}\}$ .

The nature of  $\mathbf{CON}^c$  is apparently much more difficult to discern. If we can show it to be a co-elementary class, then, by Robinson's test (Theorem 5.18), it is model cocomplete. (It is not hard to show that  $\mathbf{K}^c$  is closed under co-elementary images when  $\mathbf{K}$  is a co-elementary class. Thus to show  $\mathbf{K}^c$  to be co-elementary, it suffices to show it is closed under ultraproducts.) With a slight abuse of language, call a member of  $\mathbf{CON}^c$  a *co-existentially closed continuum*. We know from Theorem 5.20 that co-existentially closed continua abound, but the process used to construct them involves direct limits of lattices, and is not very informative. We have few criteria to decide whether a given continuum is co-existentially closed; what we know so far is the following.

**Theorem 5.22** (Corollary 4.3 in [22]). *Every co-existentially closed continuum is a hereditarily indecomposable continuum of covering dimension one.*

*Remark 5.22.1.* Theorem 5.22 has a developmental history that spans a few years. It started out as Proposition 6.3 in [21], that co-existentially closed continua are indecomposable. Adding the conclusion that they are also of covering dimension one (Theorem 4.5 in [19]) followed from an ultraproduct argument applied to the folklore result that every metrizable continuum is a continuous image of a one-dimensional metrizable continuum (see [87]). The next advance came after I found D. Bellamy's theorem that every metrizable continuum is a continuous image of a hereditarily indecomposable metrizable continuum [25]. I was then able to add (Theorem 4.1 in [20]) that metrizable co-existentially closed continua are hereditarily indecomposable (and, in addition, that there are at least two homeomorphism

types of metrizable co-existentially closed continua). The final version stated above came about after I learned of the base-free *crookedness* criterion for hereditary indecomposability (see Remark 5.5.4). This theorem is still a work-in-progress.

### Open Problems 5.23.

- (1) (See Remark 5.1.1) If  $X$  and  $Y$  are co-elementarily equivalent compacta, can one always find lattice bases  $\mathcal{A}$  for  $X$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  for  $Y$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{B}$ ? (This is only one of a host of similar questions. For example, if  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is, say, co-existential, is there an existential embedding  $g: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that  $f = g^S$ ?)
- (2) (See Remark 5.5.5) Specify a  $\Pi_2^0$  base-free definition of the property of being a continuum of multicoherence degree  $\leq n$ .
- (3) (See Theorem 5.7 and subsequent discussion.) Do nondegenerate categorical continua exist? (Henson [45] has expressed the suspicion that the only categorical metrizable compacta are Boolean spaces; we are a little more optimistic in conjecturing that categorical metrizable continua exist, but they are all hereditarily indecomposable.)
- (4) (See Theorem 5.8.) What Peano continua are there (besides arcs and simple closed curves) that are categorical relative to the class of locally connected compacta? (Dendrites and finite graphs are likely candidates, see [68].)
- (5) (See Theorems 3.10 and 5.11.) Do  $\kappa$ -good ultrafilters create ultracoproduct compacta that are  $B_{\kappa^+}$ -spaces?
- (6) (See Theorems 5.15 and 5.16.) Are co-existential maps always confluent? (quasi-monotone?)
- (7) (See Theorem 5.15.) Is there an appropriate version of the covering lemma where co-existential is replaced by of level  $\geq \alpha$  ( $\alpha \geq 1$ )? In the established version, is  $f^* \cap$ -preserving?
- (8) (See Remark 5.19.1.) Are there any model cocomplete co-elementary classes that contain nondegenerate continua?
- (9) (See Theorem 5.22.) Is the class of co-existentially closed continua a co-elementary class? (Yes, if it comprises the hereditarily indecomposable one-dimensional continua. Any positive answer would establish a dual Nullstellensatz for continua.)
- (10) (See Theorem 5.22.) Are any of the familiar hereditarily indecomposable one-dimensional continua co-existentially closed? (A prime candidate is the pseudo-arc, see [58, 68].)

## 6. RELATED CONSTRUCTIONS

Starting with an  $I$ -indexed family  $\langle X_i : i \in I \rangle$  of topological spaces, the box product topology on the set  $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$  is defined by declaring the open boxes  $\prod_{i \in I} U_i$  as basic open sets, where the sets  $U_i$  are open subsets of  $X_i$ ,  $i \in I$ . Alternatively, one forms the usual product topology by restricting attention to those open boxes having the property that  $\{i \in I : U_i \neq X_i\}$  is finite. In [54], C. J. Knight combines these two formations under a common generalization, the  $\mathcal{I}$ -product topologies, as  $\mathcal{I}$  ranges over all ideals of subsets of  $I$  (so  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$ , and  $\mathcal{I}$  is closed under subsets and finite unions), as follows: Take as open base all open boxes  $\prod_{i \in I} U_i$  such that  $\{i \in I : U_i \neq X_i\} \in \mathcal{I}$ . Then the box (resp., usual) product topology is the  $\mathcal{I}$ -product topology for  $\mathcal{I} = \wp(I)$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{I} = \{J \subseteq I : J \text{ finite}\}$ ). (For the trivial ideal

$\mathcal{I} = \{\emptyset\}$ , one trivially obtains the trivial topology.) The collective name for these  $\mathcal{I}$ -product formations, for various ideals  $\mathcal{I}$ , is known as the *ideal product topology*.

In [40], M. Z. Grulović and M. S. Kurilić add a new ingredient to the pot, creating a further generalization that now takes in all ideal product topologies, as well as all reduced product topologies. Known as the *reduced ideal product topology*, it comprises the  $\mathcal{FI}$ -product topologies, as  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  ranges over all pairs where  $\mathcal{F}$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{I}$ ) is a filter (resp., an ideal) on  $I$ : First one takes the  $\mathcal{I}$ -product topology on  $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$ ; then forms the obvious quotient topology on the reduced product  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} X_i$  of underlying sets. Denote this new space by  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{I}} X_i$ . Then the topological reduced product  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}} X_i$  of Section 3 is  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}}^{\wp(I)} X_i$  in this notation. Also, when  $\mathcal{F}$  includes all the complements of members of  $\mathcal{I}$ , it follows that  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{I}} X_i$  has the trivial topology.

Define a filter-ideal pair  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  on  $I$  to satisfy the *density condition* if for every  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  and every  $B \notin \mathcal{F}$ , there exists a  $C \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $C \subseteq A \setminus B$  and  $I \setminus C \notin \mathcal{F}$ . (The use of the word *density* in this definition is justified by the following observation. Consider the quotient partially ordered set  $\wp(I)/\mathcal{F}$ , where  $A, B \subseteq I$  are identified if  $A \cap F = B \cap F$  for some  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then the density condition amounts to the condition that every nonbottom element of  $\wp(I)/\mathcal{F}$  dominates a nonbottom element of  $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{F}$ .) Note that  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \wp(I) \rangle$  satisfies the density condition when  $\mathcal{F}$  is a proper filter (given  $A$  and  $B$ , just let  $C$  be  $A \setminus B$ ), and that  $\langle \{I\}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  satisfies the density condition when every nonempty subset of  $I$  contains a nonempty member of  $\mathcal{I}$ . Also note that if  $\mathcal{F}$  includes all the complements of members of  $\mathcal{I}$ , then  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  does not satisfy the density condition.

The main contribution of [40] is to connect the density condition with the preservation of the separation axioms by reduced ideal products (in a manner not entirely unlike the style of Theorem 4.1). For a topological property  $P$ , say that a filter-ideal pair  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  *preserves*  $P$  if for any  $I$ -indexed family  $\langle X_i : i \in I \rangle$ ,  $\prod_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{I}} X_i$  has property  $P$  whenever  $\{i \in I : X_i \text{ has property } P\} \in \mathcal{F}$ .

**Theorem 6.1** (Grulović-Kurilić [40]). *Let property  $P$  be any of the separation axioms  $T_r$ ,  $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 3.5\}$ . Then a filter-ideal pair  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{I} \rangle$  preserves  $P$  if and only if it satisfies the density condition.*

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. Š. Al'fiš, *On ultraproducts of topological algebras*, Izv. Vysš. Učebn. Zaved. Matematika **1964** (1964), no. 3 (40), 7–16 (Russian). MR 29 #2765
- [2] R. Balbes and P. Dwinger, *Distributive lattices*, University of Missouri Press, Columbia, MO, 1974. MR 51 #10185
- [3] B. Banaschewski, *More on compact Hausdorff spaces and finitary duality*, Canad. J. Math. **36** (1984), no. 6, 1113–1118. MR 86h:18002
- [4] P. Bankston, *Topological ultraproducts*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1974.
- [5] ———, *Topological reduced products and the GCH*, Topology Proc. **1** (1976), 261–267. MR 56 #13141
- [6] ———, *Ultraproducts in topology*, General Topology and Appl. **7** (1977), no. 3, 283–308. MR 56 #16554
- [7] ———, *Topological reduced products via good ultrafilters*, General Topology Appl. **10** (1979), no. 2, 121–137. MR 82g:54017
- [8] ———, *The total negation of a topological property*, Illinois J. Math. **23** (1979), no. 2, 241–252. MR 81b:54003
- [9] ———, *Some obstacles to duality in topological algebra*, Canad. J. Math. **34** (1982), no. 1, 80–90. MR 83i:18012

- [10] ———, *Coarse topologies in nonstandard extensions via separative ultrafilters*, Illinois J. Math. **27** (1983), no. 3, 459–466. MR **85c**:54008
- [11] ———, *Obstacles to duality between classes of relational structures*, Algebra Universalis **17** (1983), no. 1, 87–91. MR **84j**:18005
- [12] ———, *Topological extensions and subspaces of  $\eta_\alpha$ -sets*, Fund. Math. **118** (1983), no. 3, 191–199. MR **85k**:54034
- [13] ———, *Reduced coproducts of compact Hausdorff spaces*, J. Symbolic Logic **52** (1987), no. 2, 404–424. MR **88k**:54021
- [14] ———, *Model-theoretic characterizations of arcs and simple closed curves*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **104** (1988), no. 3, 898–904. MR **89m**:03023
- [15] ———, *Co-elementary equivalence for compact Hausdorff spaces and compact abelian groups*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **68** (1990), no. 1-2, 11–26, Special issue in honor of B. Banaschewski. MR **91k**:03095
- [16] ———, *Taxonomies of model-theoretically defined topological properties*, J. Symbolic Logic **55** (1990), no. 2, 589–603. MR **91g**:03065
- [17] ———, *Co-elementary equivalence, co-elementary maps, and generalized arcs*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125** (1997), no. 12, 3715–3720. MR **98b**:54018
- [18] ———, *On the topological model theory of normal disjunctive lattices*, 1998, Unpublished manuscript.
- [19] ———, *A hierarchy of maps between compacta*, J. Symbolic Logic **64** (1999), no. 4, 1628–1644. MR **2001h**:03069
- [20] ———, *Continua and the co-elementary hierarchy of maps*, Topology Proc. **25** (2000), no. Spring, 45–62. MR **2002j**:54036
- [21] ———, *Some applications of the ultrapower theorem to the theory of compacta*, Appl. Categ. Structures **8** (2000), no. 1-2, 45–66, Papers in honour of Bernhard Banaschewski (Cape Town, 1996). MR **2001f**:54011
- [22] ———, *The Chang-Loś-Suszko theorem in a topological setting*, 2002, Submitted.
- [23] P. Bankston and R. Fox, *On categories of algebras equivalent to a quasivariety*, Algebra Universalis **16** (1983), no. 2, 153–158. MR **84g**:08026
- [24] J. L. Bell and A. B. Slomson, *Models and ultraproducts: An introduction*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1969. MR **42** #4381
- [25] D. P. Bellamy, *Continuous mappings between continua*, Topology Conference, 1979 (Greensboro, NC (1979)), Guilford College, Greensboro, NC, 1980, pp. 101–111. MR **83i**:54032
- [26] H. R. Bennett and T. G. McLaughlin, *A selective survey of axiom-sensitive results in general topology*, Mathematics Series, vol. 12, Texas Technical University, Lubbock, TX, 1976. MR **53** #5306
- [27] C. J. R. Borges, *On a counter-example of A. H. Stone*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **20** (1969), 91–95. MR **40** #6489
- [28] C. C. Chang and H. J. Keisler, *Model theory*, third ed., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990. MR **91c**:03026
- [29] W. W. Comfort, *Ultrafilters: an interim report*, Surveys in general topology, Academic Press, New York, 1980, pp. 33–54. MR **81a**:54007
- [30] W. W. Comfort and S. Negrepontis, *The theory of ultrafilters*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1974. MR **53** #135
- [31] D. Dacunha-Castelle and J. L. Krivine, *Applications des ultraproducts à l'étude des espaces et des algèbres de Banach*, Studia Math. **41** (1972), 315–334. MR **46** #4165
- [32] A. Day and D. Higgs, *A finiteness condition in categories with ultrapowers*, Unpublished manuscript.
- [33] E. K. van Douwen, *Another nonnormal box product*, General Topology and Appl. **7** (1977), no. 1, 71–76. MR **55** #9012
- [34] P. Eklof, *Ultraproducts for algebraists*, Handbook of Mathematical Logic (J. Barwise, ed.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977, pp. 105–137.
- [35] R. Engelking, *Outline of general topology*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1968. MR **37** #5836
- [36] I. Fleischer, *Elementary properties of inductive limits*, Z. Math. Logik Grundlagen Math. **9** (1963), 347–350. MR **28** #1130
- [37] J. Flum and M. Ziegler, *Topological model theory*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 769, Springer, Berlin, 1980. MR **81j**:03059

- [38] S. Garavaglia, *Model theory of topological structures*, Ann. Math. Logic **14** (1978), no. 1, 13–37. MR 58 #10406
- [39] L. Gillman and M. Jerison, *Rings of continuous functions*, D. Van Nostrand, Princeton, 1960. MR 22 #6994
- [40] M. Z. Grulović and M. S. Kurilić, *On the preservation of separation axioms in products*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **33** (1992), no. 4, 713–721. MR 94m:54024
- [41] R. Gurevič, *On ultracoproducts of compact Hausdorff spaces*, J. Symbolic Logic **53** (1988), no. 1, 294–300. MR 89b:03051
- [42] K. P. Hart, *The Čech-Stone compactification of the real line*, Recent progress in general topology (Prague, 1991), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992, pp. 317–352. MR 1 229 130
- [43] K. P. Hart, J. van Mill, and R. Pol, *Remarks on hereditarily indecomposable continua*, Topology Proc. **25** (2000), no. Summer, 179–206. MR 1 925 683
- [44] F. Hausdorff, *Grundzüge der Mengenlehre*, Veit, Leipzig, 1914.
- [45] C. W. Henson, Private communication.
- [46] ———, *Nonstandard hulls of Banach spaces*, Israel J. Math. **25** (1976), no. 1-2, 108–144. MR 57 #1089
- [47] C. W. Henson and J. Iovino, *Banach space model theory, I*, Lecture notes monograph, in preparation.
- [48] C. W. Henson and L. C. Moore, Jr., *Nonstandard analysis and the theory of Banach spaces*, Nonstandard analysis—recent developments (Victoria, B.C. (1980)), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 983, Springer, Berlin, 1983, pp. 27–112. MR 85f:46033
- [49] E. Hewitt and K. A. Ross, *Abstract harmonic analysis. Vol. I*, Academic Press, New York, 1963. MR 28 #158
- [50] W. Hodges, *Model theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. MR 94e:03002
- [51] B. Hutton and I. Reilly, *On compactness and finiteness in topological spaces*, Mat. Vesnik **13(28)** (1976), no. 1, 59–61. MR 53 #14417
- [52] P. T. Johnstone, *Stone spaces*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982. MR 85f:54002
- [53] H. J. Keisler, *Logic with the quantifier “there exist uncountably many”*, Ann. Math. Logic **1** (1970), 1–93. MR 41 #8217
- [54] C. J. Knight, *Box topologies*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **15** (1964), 41–54. MR 28 #3398
- [55] K. Kunen, Private communication.
- [56] ———, *Paracompactness of box products of compact spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **240** (1978), 307–316. MR 58 #24165
- [57] M. S. Kurilić, *Topological ultraproducts: when is the quotient mapping closed?*, Topology Appl. **87** (1998), no. 2, 89–95. MR 99h:54012
- [58] W. Lewis, *The pseudo-arc*, Bol. Soc. Mat. Mexicana (3) **5** (1999), no. 1, 25–77. MR 2000f:54029
- [59] A. Macintyre, *Model completeness*, Handbook of Mathematical Logic (J. Barwise, ed.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977, pp. 139–180.
- [60] S. MacLane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971. MR 50 #7275
- [61] J. Matier and T. B. M. McMaster, *Total negation in general topology*, Irish Math. Soc. Bull. (1990), no. 25, 26–37. MR 93g:54006
- [62] P. T. Matthews and T. B. M. McMaster, *A viewpoint on minimality in topology*, Irish Math. Soc. Bull. (1994), no. 32, 7–16. MR 1 286 398
- [63] T. A. McKee, *Sentences preserved between equivalent topological bases*, Z. Math. Logik Grundlagen Math. **22** (1976), no. 1, 79–84. MR 54 #4970
- [64] T. B. M. McMaster and C. R. Turner, *Iteration of total negation in constrained environments*, Math. Proc. R. Ir. Acad. **101A** (2001), no. 1, 21–26. MR 2003b:54002
- [65] J. Mioduszewski, *On composants of  $\beta\mathbb{R} - \mathbb{R}$* , Proceedings of the Conference on Topology and Measure, I (Zinnowitz, 1974), Part 2 (Greifswald), Ernst-Moritz-Arndt Univ., 1978, pp. 257–283. MR 80g:54031
- [66] R. L. Moore, *Foundations of point set theory*, Colloquium Publications, vol. XIII, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1962. MR 27 #709
- [67] S. B. Nadler, Jr., *Multicoherence techniques applied to inverse limits*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **157** (1971), 227–234. MR 43 #5482
- [68] ———, *Continuum theory*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1992. MR 93m:54002

- [69] K. Nagami, *Dimension theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1970. MR 42 #6799
- [70] T. Ohkuma, *Ultrapowers in categories*, Yokohama Math. J. **14** (1966), 17–37. MR 35 #5374
- [71] A. R. Pears, *Dimension theory of general spaces*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1975. MR 52 #15405
- [72] I. L. Reilly and M. K. Vamanamurthy, *Some topological anti-properties*, Illinois J. Math. **24** (1980), no. 3, 382–389. MR **81j**:54029
- [73] A. Robinson, *Non-standard analysis*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1966. MR 34 #5680
- [74] J. Rosický, *Categories of models*, Seminarberichte Mathematik Informatik Fernuniversität **19** (1984), 337–413.
- [75] B. M. Scott, *Points in  $\beta\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{N}$  which separate functions*, Unpublished manuscript.
- [76] J. Sgro, *Completeness theorems for topological models*, Ann. Math. Logic **11** (1977), no. 2, 173–193. MR 57 #2878
- [77] S. Shelah, *Every two elementarily equivalent models have isomorphic ultrapowers*, Israel J. Math. **10** (1971), 224–233. MR 45 #6608
- [78] J. R. Shoenfield, *Mathematical logic*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1967. MR 37 #1224
- [79] W. Sierpiński, *Sur une propriété topologique des ensembles dénombrables dense en soi*, Fund. Math. (1920), no. 1, 11–16.
- [80] R. Sikorski, *Remarks on some topological spaces of high power*, Fund. Math. **37** (1950), 125–136. MR 12,727e
- [81] H. Simmons, *Existentially closed structures*, J. Symbolic Logic **37** (1972), 293–310. MR 51 #12518
- [82] M. Smith,  *$\beta(X - \{x\})$  for  $X$  not locally connected*, Topology Appl. **26** (1987), no. 3, 239–250. MR **88h**:54038
- [83] ———, *Layers of components of  $\beta([0, 1] \times \mathbb{N})$  are indecomposable*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **114** (1992), no. 4, 1151–1156. MR **92g**:54030
- [84] R. C. Walker, *The Stone-Čech compactification*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1974. MR 52 #1595
- [85] H. Wallman, *Lattices and topological spaces*, Ann. Math. (2) **39** (1938), 112–126.
- [86] S. Willard, *General topology*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1970. MR 41 #9173
- [87] D. C. Wilson, *Open mappings of the universal curve onto continuous curves*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **168** (1972), 497–515. MR 45 #7682
- [88] E. L. Wimmers, *The Shelah  $P$ -point independence theorem*, Israel J. Math. **43** (1982), no. 1, 28–48. MR **85e**:03118
- [89] J.-P. Zhu, *On indecomposable subcontinua of  $\beta[0, \infty) - [0, \infty)$* , Topology Appl. **45** (1992), no. 3, 261–274. MR **94d**:54052

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY, MILWAUKEE, WI 53201-1881

*E-mail address:* paulb@mscs.mu.edu