

# ON PROPERTIES OF COMPACTA THAT DO NOT REFLECT IN SMALL CONTINUOUS IMAGES

MENACHEM MAGIDOR AND GRZEGORZ PLEBANEK

ABSTRACT. Assuming that there is a stationary set in  $\omega_2$  of ordinals of countable cofinality that does not reflect, we prove that there exists a compact space which is not Corson compact and whose all continuous images of weight  $\leq \omega_1$  are Eberlein compacta. We also prove that under Martin's axiom countable functional tightness does not reflect in small continuous images of compacta.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

There is a significant amount of research related to properties of structures that reflect in substructures of smaller cardinality, see e.g. Bagaria, Magidor, Sakai [2], Koszmider [9, 10], Fuchino and Rinot [5], Tall [18]. Reflection phenomena in topology are usually studied following the following pattern:

**Problem 1.1.** *Does a topological space  $X$  has a property  $(P)$  provided all its subspaces of small cardinality have property  $(P)$ ?*

Tall [18] gives a survey on results and problems of this type. Recently Tkachuk [19] and Tkachuk and Tkachenko [20] have investigated which topological properties reflect in small continuous images which, in particular, amounts to asking the following kind of questions.

**Problem 1.2.** *Does a topological space  $X$  has property  $(P)$  provided every continuous image of  $X$  of weight  $\leq \omega_1$  has property  $(P)$ ?*

Eberlein compacta and Corson compacta are two well-studied classes of compact spaces related to functional analysis, see the next section. Answering two questions of type 1.2 posed in [20], we show in this note that it is relatively consistent that neither Eberlein compactness nor Corson compactness reflects in continuous images of weight  $\leq \omega_1$ . In fact, assuming that there is a stationary set  $S \subseteq \omega_2$  of ordinals of countable cofinality such that  $S \cap \alpha$  is stationary in no  $\alpha < \omega_2$ , we construct a compact space  $K$  of weight  $\omega_2$  which simultaneously answers in the negative both the questions:  $K$  is not Corson compact while all its images of weight at most  $\omega_1$  are Eberlein compacta that can be embedded into a

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 54A25, 54C05, 46B50, 03E10.

This research started while the authors were visiting fellows at the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, in the programme Mathematical, Foundational and Computational Aspects of the Higher Infinite (HIF).

The second author was partially supported by NCN grant 2013/11/B/ST1/03596 (2014-2017).

Hilbert space. In addition, our space  $K$  gives partial negative answers to problems posed by Jardón and Tkachuk ([6], Questions 4.13-15) on the reflection of type 1.1 for Corson compacta and related classes. The construction of the space is given in section 3 and uses the familiar idea of a ladder system associated to the set  $S \subseteq \omega_2$ ; see, for instance, Ciesielski and Pol [4] where a construction of this type was used to solve a problem on the structure of  $C(K)$  spaces.

In the final section of this note we give a partial negative answer to another problem from [20]: we show, assuming a weak version of Martin's axiom, that countable functional tightness does not reflect in small continuous images of compact spaces.

We wish to thank Vladimir V. Tkachuk for a valuable suggestion linking our results to some questions asked in [6]. We are also grateful to Witold Marciszewski for a historical comment.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

All the spaces we consider are assumed to be Hausdorff. Given a topological space  $X$ ,  $w(X)$  denotes its topological weight, i.e. the minimal size of a base in  $X$ . Recall that a family  $\mathcal{V}$  of nonempty open subsets of  $X$  is a  $\pi$ -base if every nonempty open set in  $X$  contains some  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Our examples will be constructed from some Boolean algebras. If  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a Boolean algebra then we write  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  for its Stone space (of all ultrafilters on  $\mathfrak{A}$ ). We write  $\hat{a} = \{x \in \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A}) : a \in x\}$  for  $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ . Recall that sets  $\hat{a}$  form a base for the topology on  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$ .

We shall use the following result which is a very particular case of the Mardešić factorization theorem [14]. We enclose the sketch of a direct argument.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be any Boolean algebra. If  $L$  is a continuous image of  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  and  $w(L) \leq \omega_1$  then there is a subalgebra  $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$  such that  $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq \omega_1$  and  $L$  is a continuous image of  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $L$  has a base  $\mathcal{U}$  of cardinality  $\leq \omega_1$  such that every  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  is  $F_\sigma$ . Let  $f : \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow L$  be a continuous surjection. For every  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ , the set  $f^{-1}(U)$  is of type  $F_\sigma$  so it can be written as a union of countably many sets of the form  $\hat{a}$ ,  $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ .

It follows that there is  $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$  of size at most  $\omega_1$  such that, writing  $\pi : \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow \text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$  for the natural projection, we have  $f(x) = f(y)$  whenever  $x, y \in \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  and  $\pi(x) = \pi(y)$ . Hence we can write  $f = f' \circ \pi$ , where  $f' : \text{ult}(\mathfrak{B}) \rightarrow L$ . It follows that  $f'$  is continuous and the proof is complete.  $\square$

A compact space  $K$  is said to be *Eberlein compact* if it is homeomorphic to a weakly compact subset of some Banach space; equivalently, by the classical Amir-Lindenstrauss theorem,  $K$  is Eberlein compact if it can be embedded into

$$c_0(\kappa) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^\kappa : \{\alpha : |x_\alpha| \geq \varepsilon\} \text{ is finite for every } \varepsilon > 0\},$$

for some  $\kappa$ . Here  $c_0(\kappa)$  is equipped with the topology inherited from  $\mathbb{R}^\kappa$  (this topology agrees on bounded sets with the weak topology of the Banach space  $c_0(\kappa)$ ).

In particular, if  $n \in \omega$  then every compact subset of

$$\sigma_n(\kappa) = \{x \in 2^\kappa : |\{\alpha : |x_\alpha| \neq 0\}| \leq n\},$$

is Eberlein compact. In fact it is uniform Eberlein compact in the sense that it can be embedded as a weakly compact subspace of a Hilbert space (note that  $\sigma_n(\kappa)$  is a bounded subset of  $l_2(\kappa)$ ).

A compact space  $K$  is said to be *Corson compact* if there is  $\kappa$  such that  $K$  is homeomorphic to a subset of the  $\Sigma$ -product of real lines

$$\Sigma(\mathbb{R}^\kappa) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^\kappa : |\{\alpha : x_\alpha \neq 0\}| \leq \omega\}.$$

Since  $c_0(\kappa) \subseteq \Sigma(\mathbb{R}^\kappa)$ , the class of Corson compacta contains (properly) the class of Eberlein compacta. Negrepointis [15] and Kalenda [7] offer extensive surveys on Eberlein and Corson compacta and related classes. We only recall here that both uniform Eberlein compacta and Corson compacta are stable under continuous images, see e.g. [15], 6.26 and [7], p. 2.

A family  $\mathcal{F}$  in a Boolean algebra is said to be *centred* if  $a_1 \cap a_2 \cap \dots \cap a_k \neq 0$  for every natural number  $k$  and every  $a_i \in \mathcal{F}$ . We shall use the following standard fact.

**Lemma 2.2.** *For a Boolean algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  the following are equivalent*

- (i) *ult( $\mathfrak{A}$ ) is Corson compact;*
- (ii) *there is a family  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$  generating  $\mathfrak{A}$  and such that every centred subfamily of  $\mathcal{G}$  is countable.*

*Proof.* (i)  $\rightarrow$  (ii). Since  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  is Corson compact and zerodimensional,  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  is homeomorphic to a compact space  $K$  contained in  $\Sigma(2^\kappa)$  for some  $\kappa$ . The algebra of clopen subsets of  $K$  is generated by the family  $\mathcal{C} = \{C_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ , where  $C_\alpha = \{x \in K : x_\alpha = 1\}$ . Every centred subfamily of  $\mathcal{C}$  is countable by the definition of  $\Sigma(2^\kappa)$ .

(ii)  $\rightarrow$  (i). Take  $f : \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow 2^\mathcal{G}$ , where  $f(x)(G) = 1$  if  $G \in x$  and  $= 0$  otherwise. Then  $f$  is continuous, and  $f[\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})] \subseteq \Sigma(2^\mathcal{G})$  since every ultrafilter on  $\mathfrak{A}$  contains at most countably many generators from  $\mathcal{G}$ . Moreover,  $f$  is injective since  $\mathcal{G}$  generates  $\mathfrak{A}$ .  $\square$

### 3. ON EBERLEIN AND CORSON COMPACTA

Let  $\gamma$  be a limit ordinal. A set  $F \subseteq \gamma$  is said to be *closed* if it is closed in the interval topology defined on ordinals smaller than  $\gamma$ . Such a set  $F$  is *unbounded* in  $\gamma$  if for every  $\beta < \gamma$  there is  $\alpha \in F$  such that  $\beta < \alpha$ . A set  $S \subseteq \gamma$  is *stationary* if  $S \cap F \neq \emptyset$  for every closed and unbounded  $F \subseteq \gamma$ .

It is not difficult to check that the set  $S_\omega = \{\alpha < \omega_2 : \text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega\}$  is stationary in  $\omega_2$ . However, such a set reflects in the sense that, for instance,  $S_\omega \cap \omega_1$  is stationary in  $\omega_1$ . We shall work assuming the following.

**Axiom 3.1.** There is a stationary set  $S \subseteq \omega_2$  such that

- (a)  $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega$  for every  $\alpha \in S$ ;
- (b)  $S \cap \beta$  is not stationary in  $\beta$  for every  $\beta < \omega_2$  with  $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega_1$ .

Note that in 3.1(b) we can say that  $S \cap \beta$  is not stationary in  $\beta$  for every limit  $\beta < \omega_2$  because if  $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega$  then  $\beta$  is a limit of a sequence of successor ordinals.

Basic information on 3.1 can be found in Jech [13]; recall that 3.1 follows from Jensen's principle  $\square_{\omega_1}$  ([13], Lemma 23.6) and hence it holds true in the constructible universe ([13], Theorem 27.1). In fact one cannot deny 3.1 and prove the consistency of the the statement *every stationary set  $S \subseteq \{\alpha < \omega_2 : \text{cf}(\alpha) = \omega\}$  reflect at some  $\gamma < \omega_2$*  without assuming the existence of large cardinals, see Magidor [12] and [13], page 697.

**Construction 3.2.** Throughout this section we consider the space  $K = \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$ , where the Boolean algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  is defined as follows.

Fix a set  $S \subseteq \omega_2$  as in 3.1. For every  $\alpha \in S$  we pick an increasing sequence  $(p_n(\alpha))_{n < \omega}$  of ordinals such that  $p_n(\alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$ . Put

$$A_\alpha = \{p_n(\alpha) : n < \omega\}, \quad \text{and} \quad X = \bigcup_{\alpha \in S} A_\alpha.$$

Finally, let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be the algebra of subsets of  $X$  generated by finite subsets of  $X$  together with the family  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha \in S\}$ .

We shall prove that  $K = \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  is not Corson compact because  $S$  is stationary in  $\omega_2$  while the absence of stationary reflection for  $S$  implies that  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$  is Eberlein compact for every small subalgebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *If  $\mathfrak{A}$  is the algebra defined in 3.2 then the space  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  is not Corson compact*

*Proof.* Suppose that there is a family  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$  as in Lemma 2.2(ii). Note that every  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  is either countable or co-countable in  $X$ . The family  $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : |X \setminus G| \leq \omega\}$  is centred so it is at most countable. Hence, replacing every  $G \in \mathcal{G}_0$  by its complement, we may assume that every  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  is countable.

Let  $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : |G| = \omega\}$ . Note that every  $G \in \mathcal{G}_1$  is, modulo a finite set, a finite union of sets  $A_\alpha$ .

For every  $\alpha \in S$  there must be  $G_\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_1$  such that  $|A_\alpha \cap G_\alpha| = \omega$ . Indeed, otherwise  $A_\alpha$  would be almost disjoint from every  $G \in \mathcal{G}_1$  so would not be in the algebra generated by  $\mathcal{G}$ . Note that the function  $\alpha \rightarrow G_\alpha$  is finite-to-one.

It follows that for every  $\alpha \in S$  there is  $\varphi(\alpha) < \alpha$  such that  $\varphi(\alpha) \in G_\alpha$ . By the pressing down lemma, there is  $\xi$  such that the set  $\{\alpha \in S : \varphi(\alpha) = \xi\}$  is stationary. It follows that  $\{G \in \mathcal{G}_1 : \xi \in G\}$  is of cardinality  $\omega_2$ , and this is a contradiction.  $\square$

The second part of the argument is based on the following auxiliary result which is stated in a slightly stronger form suitable for inductive argument.

**Lemma 3.4.** *For every  $\beta, \gamma$  such that  $\beta < \gamma < \omega_2$  there is a family*

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta, \gamma) = \{B_\alpha : \alpha \in S \cap (\beta, \gamma)\},$$

such that

- (i)  $B_\alpha \subseteq A_\alpha \setminus \beta$  and  $|A_\alpha \setminus B_\alpha| < \omega$  for every  $\alpha \in S \cap (\beta, \gamma)$ ;
- (ii)  $B_\alpha \cap B_{\alpha'} = \emptyset$  whenever  $\alpha, \alpha' \in S \cap (\beta, \gamma)$  and  $\alpha \neq \alpha'$ .

*Proof.* We prove the assertion by induction on  $\gamma$ .

For the successor step  $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma + 1$  there is nothing to prove in case  $\gamma \notin S$ . Suppose  $\gamma \in S$  and take  $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \gamma)$  satisfying (i) and (ii). Then  $B_\alpha \cap A_\gamma$  is finite for every  $\alpha < \gamma$ ,  $\alpha \in S$  and therefore

$$\{B_\alpha \setminus A_\gamma : \alpha \in (\beta, \gamma) \cap S\} \cup \{A_\gamma \setminus \beta\},$$

is the required family for the interval  $(\beta, \gamma)$ .

Suppose that  $\gamma$  is a limit ordinal. Then  $S \cap \gamma$  is not stationary in  $\gamma$  so there is a closed unbounded set  $C \subseteq \gamma$  such that  $C \cap S = \emptyset$ . In other words,  $S \cap \gamma$  is contained in a set  $\gamma \setminus C$  which is open and hence is a union of disjoint subintervals.

Fix  $\beta < \gamma$ . If  $\xi, \eta \in C$ ,  $\beta < \xi < \eta$  and  $(\xi, \eta) \cap C = \emptyset$  then we can apply the inductive assumption to  $S \cap (\xi, \eta)$  and get the required family  $\mathcal{B}(\xi, \eta)$ . The union of families obtained in this way is clearly the family that satisfies (i) and (ii).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** *For every algebra  $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ , where  $\mathfrak{A}$  is as in 3.2, if  $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq \omega_1$  then the space  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$  is uniform Eberlein compact.*

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma < \omega_2$  and let  $\mathfrak{B}_\gamma$  be a subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{A}$  generated by all finite sets in  $X$  and the family  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\}$ . It follows directly from Lemma 3.4 that  $\mathfrak{B}_\gamma$  has a generating family  $\mathcal{G}$  such that are no three different elements in  $\mathcal{G}$  having nonempty intersection. Then the space  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{B}_\gamma)$  can be embedded into  $\sigma_2(2^\gamma)$  (as in Lemma 2.2) so it is uniform Eberlein compact.

Now every subalgebra  $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$  of size  $\leq \omega_1$  is included in  $\mathfrak{B}_\gamma$  for some  $\gamma < \omega_2$ . Hence  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$  is a continuous image of  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{B}_\gamma)$  and thus it is uniform Eberlein compact as well.  $\square$

The following answers simultaneously, subject to our set-theoretic assumption, Questions 4 and 5 in [20].

**Theorem 3.6.** *Assume 3.1. There is a scattered compact space  $K$  with the third derivative empty such that*

- (i)  $K$  is not Corson compact (in fact it is not  $\omega_2$ -Corson compact in the sense of [7]);
- (ii) If  $L$  is a continuous image of  $K$  and  $w(L) \leq \omega_1$  then  $L$  is uniform Eberlein compact.

*Proof.* We take  $K = \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$ , where  $\mathfrak{A}$  is the algebra defined above in 3.2. Since  $K$  is a Stone space of an algebra generated by an almost disjoint family, it is clear that  $K^{(3)} = \emptyset$ . Indeed, every ultrafilter  $x \in \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  is either principal or there is a unique  $\alpha$  such that  $A_\alpha \in x$  or else  $x \in K^{(2)}$  is the unique ultrafilter containing all  $X \setminus A_\alpha$ .

Then  $K$  is not Corson compact by Lemma 3.3. If  $L$  is a continuous images of  $K$  and  $w(L) \leq \omega_1$  then  $L$  is uniform Eberlein compact by Theorem 2.1, Lemma 3.5 and the fact that uniform Eberlein compacta are stable under continuous images.  $\square$

As we mentioned in the introduction, the space  $K$  from Theorem 3.6 settles in the negative some reflection problems of type 1.1.

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $(P)$  be a property of compact space that is stable under taking closed subspaces. If  $K$  is a compact space and all continuous images of weight  $\leq \omega_1$  have property  $(P)$  then all closed subsets  $L$  of  $K$  of cardinality  $\leq \omega_1$  have property  $(P)$ .*

*Proof.* Take a closed subspace  $L \subseteq K$  with  $|L| \leq \omega_1$ . Then there is a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of continuous functions  $K \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \omega_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  distinguishes points of  $L$ . Let  $g : K \rightarrow [0, 1]^{\mathcal{F}}$  be the diagonal mapping, i.e.  $g(x)(f) = f(x)$  for  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then  $\tilde{K} = g[K] \subseteq [0, 1]^{\mathcal{F}}$  so  $w(\tilde{K}) \leq |\mathcal{F}| \leq \omega_1$  and hence  $\tilde{K}$  has property  $(P)$ . It follows that  $\tilde{L} = g[L] \subseteq \tilde{K}$  also has property  $(P)$ , and  $\tilde{L}$  is homeomorphic to  $L$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.8.** *Assume 3.1 and take the space  $K$  as in Theorem 3.6. Then  $K$  is not Corson compact while for every  $Y \subseteq K$ , if  $|Y| \leq \omega_1$  then  $\bar{Y}$  is uniform Eberlein compact.*

*Proof.* Recall that  $X$  was defined as the union of all the sets  $A_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in S$ . If  $Y \subseteq X$  and  $|Y| \leq \omega_1$  then  $Y \subseteq X \cap \gamma$  for some  $\gamma < \omega_2$  and this easily implies that  $|\bar{Y}| \leq \omega_1$ . If  $Y \subseteq K^{(1)}$  then  $\bar{Y} \subseteq Y \cup \{\infty\}$ , where  $\infty$  is the only point in  $K^{(2)}$ .

We conclude that  $|\bar{Y}| \leq \omega_1$  for every  $Y \subseteq K$  with  $|Y| \leq \omega_1$  and the assertion follows from Lemma 3.7  $\square$

The corollary above gives partial negative answers to problems posed by Jardón and Tkachuk ([6], Questions 4.13-15) if we assume the continuum hypothesis together with 3.1, so for instance if we are in the constructible universe.

#### 4. ON COUNTABLE FUNCTIONAL TIGHTNESS

**Definition 4.1.** For a topological space  $X$  and a cardinal number  $\kappa$  we write  $\tau_0(X) \leq \kappa$  if every function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous provided  $f|_Y : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous for every subspace  $Y \subseteq X$  with  $|Y| \leq \kappa$ . The corresponding cardinal number  $\tau_0(X)$  is called the *functional tightness* of the space  $X$ .

Recall that  $\tau(X)$ , the tightness of a space  $X$  is defined so that for every  $A \subseteq X$  and every  $x \in \bar{A}$  there is  $B \subseteq A$  such that  $|B| \leq \tau(X)$  and  $x \in \bar{B}$ . The following fact can be found in [1].

**Lemma 4.2.** *The functional tightness  $\tau_0(X)$  does not exceed the density of  $X$  for every space  $X$ . In particular,  $\tau_0(X) \leq \tau(X)$ .*

Tkachuk (see Theorem 2.11 in [19]) proved that if  $K$  is a compact space of uncountable tightness then  $K$  has a continuous image  $L$  of uncountable tightness with  $w(L) = \omega_1$ .

Recall that  $\tau_0(2^\kappa) = \omega$  if and only if there are no measurable cardinals  $\leq \kappa$ , see Uspenskii [21], cf. [16]. Using this theorem it is noted in [20] that if there are measurable cardinals then the countable functional tightness does not reflect in small continuous images of compacta.

Let  $\lambda$  be the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$ . Write  $\mathcal{N}$  for the ideal of  $\lambda$ -null sets. Recall that the assertion  $\text{cov}(\mathcal{N}) > \omega_1$  means that  $[0, 1]$  cannot be covered by  $\omega_1$ -many sets from  $\mathcal{N}$ .

We shall work in the measure algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  of the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$ ; the corresponding measure on  $\mathfrak{A}$  is still denoted by  $\lambda$ . The following is an immediate consequence of a result due to Kamburelis [8], Lemma 3.1; see also [3], Theorem 4.4.

**Theorem 4.3.** *If  $\text{cov}(\mathcal{N}) > \omega_1$  then every continuous image of  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  of  $\pi$ -weight  $\leq \omega_1$  is separable.*

We can now give a (partial) negative solution to Question 4.3 from [20].

**Theorem 4.4.** *Assuming  $\text{cov}(\mathcal{N}) > \omega_1$ , there is a compact space  $S$  with  $\tau_0(S) > \omega$ , such that  $\tau_0(L) = \omega$  for every continuous image  $L$  of  $S$  of weight  $\omega_1$ .*

Our result is based on the construction described in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $(s_n)_n$  be a pairwise disjoint sequence in  $\mathfrak{A}^+$ . Let*

$$\mathcal{F} = \{a \in \mathfrak{A} : \lim_n \lambda(a \cap s_n) / \lambda(s_n) = 1\},$$

$$F = \{x \in \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A}) : \mathcal{F} \subseteq x\}.$$

Then

- (i)  $\mathcal{F}$  is a non-principal filter in  $\mathfrak{A}$ ;
- (ii)  $F$  is a closed subset of  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  with empty interior;
- (iii) for every countable  $Y \subseteq \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A}) \setminus F$  we have  $\bar{Y} \cap F = \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* Part (i) follows by standard calculations and part (ii) is a direct consequence of (i). We shall check (iii). Let  $Y = \{y_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A}) \setminus F$ . For every  $n$  we have  $y_n \notin F$  so there is  $a_0^n \in y_n$  such that  $-a_0^n \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then we choose a decreasing sequence  $(a_k^n)_k$  such that

- (a)  $a_k^n \leq a_0^n$ ,  $a_k^n \in y_n$  for every  $k$
- (b)  $\lim_k \lambda(a_k^n) = 0$ .

The following fact can be proved by a standard diagonalization (cf. [11]).

CLAIM. There is a function  $g : \omega \rightarrow \omega$  such that writing  $a_g := \bigcup_{n \in \omega} a_{g(n)}^n$ , we have  $\widehat{a}_g \cap F = \emptyset$ .

Using Claim we get  $Y \subseteq \widehat{a}_g$  and it follows that  $\bar{Y} \cap F = \emptyset$ . □

*Proof.* (of Theorem 4.4). Let  $S$  be the Stone space of the measure algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Take the set  $F \subseteq S$  from Lemma 4.5. Then condition (iii) implies that the function  $\chi_F : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous on every countable subspace of  $S$ . But  $\chi_F$  is clearly not continuous because the interior of  $\mathcal{F}$  is empty. Hence  $\tau_0(S) > \omega$ .

Let now  $L$  be a continuous image of  $S$  such that  $w(L) \leq \omega_1$ . Then  $L$  is separable by Theorem 4.3 and  $\tau_0(L) = \omega$  by Lemma 4.2, so the proof is complete. □

*Remark 4.6.* We enclose some remarks concerning Theorem 4.4

- (1) Lemma 4.4 originates in Kunen [11]; see Plebanek [17] for other applications.
- (2) In fact, under  $\text{MA}(\omega_1)$  one can check that in the proof we actually get  $\tau_0(S) > \omega_1$ , since under  $\text{MA}(\omega_1)$  one can strengthen (iii) of Lemma 4.5 to saying that  $\overline{Y} \cap F = \emptyset$  for every  $Y \subseteq S \setminus F$  with  $|Y| \leq \omega_1$ .
- (3) The proof of 4.4 says a bit more, that  $\tau_0(L) = \omega$  whenever  $L$  is a continuous image of  $S$  having a  $\pi$ -base of cardinality  $\leq \omega_1$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] A.V. Arhangel'skii, *Functional tightness,  $Q$ -spaces and  $\tau$ -embeddings*, Com. Math. Univ. Car. 24 (1983), 105-120.
- [2] J. Bagaria, M. Magidor and H. Sakai, *Reflection and indescribability in the constructible universe*, Israel J. Math. 208 (2015), 1-11.
- [3] P. Borodulin-Nadzieja and G. Plebanek, *Measures on Suslinean spaces*, preprint (2015).
- [4] K. Ciesielski, R. Pol, *A weakly Lindelöf function space  $C(K)$  without any continuous injection into  $c_0()$* , Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math. 32 (1984), 681-688.
- [5] S. Fuchino and A. Rinot, *Openly generated Boolean algebras and the Fodor-type Reflection Principle*, Fund. Math. 212 (2011), 261-283.
- [6] D. Jardón, V.V. Tkachuk, *Splittability over some classes of Corson compact spaces*, Topology Appl. 184 (2015), 41-49.
- [7] O. Kalenda, *Valdivia compact spaces in topology and Banach space theory*, Extracta Math. 15 (2000), 185.
- [8] A. Kamburelis, *Iterations of Boolean algebras with measure*, Arch. Math. Logic, 29(1989), 21-28.
- [9] P. Koszmider, *Forcing minimal extensions of Boolean algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 351 (1999), 3073-3117.
- [10] P. Koszmider, *Kurepa trees and topological non-reflection*, Topology Appl. 151 (2005), 77-98.
- [11] K. Kunen, *Some points in  $\beta N$* , Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 80 (1975), 385-398.
- [12] M. Magidor, *Reflecting stationary sets*, J. Symbolic Logic 47 (1982), 755-771.
- [13] T. Jech, *Set Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2003).
- [14] S. Mardešić, *On covering dimension and inverse limits of compact spaces*, Illinois J. Math. 4 (1960), 278-291.
- [15] S. Negrepontis, *Banach spaces and topology*, in: Handbook of set-theoretic topology.
- [16] G. Plebanek, *On the space of continuous functions on a dyadic set*, Mathematika 38 (01), 42-49.
- [17] G. Plebanek, *On Pettis integral and Radon measures*, Fund. Math. 156 (1998), 183-195.
- [18] F. Tall, *Reflection of topological properties to  $\aleph_1$* , 241-247, in: Open Problems in Topology, II, ed. E. Pearl, Elsevier, 2007.
- [19] V.V. Tkachuk, *Reflecting topological properties in continuous images*, Cent. Eur. J. Math. 10 (2012), 456-465.
- [20] M.G. Tkachenko and V.V. Tkachuk, *More reflections in small continuous images*, preprint (2015).
- [21] V.V. Uspenskii, *A characterization of realcompactness in terms of the topology of pointwise convergence on the function space*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 24 (1983), 1211-126.

HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM  
*E-mail address:* mensara@savion.huji.ac.il

INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY, UNIwersytet WROCLAWSKI  
*E-mail address:* grzes@math.uni.wroc.pl