

ULTRAFILTERS AND THE KATĚTOV ORDER

J. CANCINO, O. GUZMÁN AND M. HRUŠÁK

ABSTRACT. We review the use of the Katětov order in the classification of ultrafilters.

1. PROLOGUE: A BRIEF AND SELECTIVE HISTORY OF ULTRAFILTERS

The notions of a *filter* and *ultrafilter* were formally introduced by H. Cartan in 1937 ([39,40]), allegedly after a memorable reunion of the *Bourbaki group* (see [127] for an entertaining narrative), in search of a suitable generalization of the notion of convergence. However, the story does not really start there. One can trace the development of the notion independently as part of three, originally quite separate, endeavors: *topological* - the aforementioned study of convergence, *algebraic* - the study of (principal) *ideals* in rings, and *measure theoretic* - questions related to the *measure extension problem*. We shall go through them one by one next.

Convergence in terms of nets had been developed by E. H. Moore and H. L. Smith [146], G. Birkhoff [10] and J. W. Tukey [182] in parallel to the filter-based treatment of convergence. Some authors (e.g. R. Engelking [65]) attribute the first occurrence of the notion of an ultrafilter to F. Riesz's 1908 paper [154] where on page 23 a family of subsets of a space is defined which if the word *verkettet* is interpreted as "intersect", indeed, defines an ultrafilter, however, in the context of the paper it becomes clear that what he means is the family of sets which *accumulate* to a given point of the space, hence, the family of the positive sets with respect to the neighborhood filter of the point. A *filter base*, as a basis of the neighborhood filter of a point in a space is explicitly defined in L. Vietoris' [188] in 1921. The *space of ultrafilters* $\beta\mathbb{N}$ was first considered by E. Čech [41] in 1937 (no mention of ultrafilters there), though he himself attributes the definition and proof of existence of the so-called *Stone-Čech compactification* of completely regular spaces to A. Tychonoff [184]. B. Pospíšil [151] answering a question posed in [41] then proves that the size of $\beta\mathbb{N}$ is $2^{2^{\omega}}$.

The *measure extension problem* of Lebesgue [128] from 1904 was swiftly solved by Vitali [189] in 1905 in the negative. The *Polish school* of mathematics started looking at variants of the problem, in particular, into the existence of a *diffuse* finite or countably additive measure which measures all subsets of a given set. First, S. Banach and K. Kuratowski [2] in 1929 showed that assuming the Continuum

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 03E05, 03E17, 03E35.

Key words and phrases. Ultrafilters, Katětov order, \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters, generic existence, Borel ideals.

The first author was supported by the "Programme to support prospective human resources – post Ph.D. candidates" of the Czech Academy of Sciences, project L100192251. The second author was supported by the PAPIIT grant IA 104124 and the CONAHCYT grant CBF2023-2024-903. The third author was supported by d by a PAPIIT grant IN101323.

Hypothesis there cannot be a countably additive such measure on the reals and then S. Ulam [186] (1930) showed that the minimal cardinality of a set which admits such a measure has to be inaccessible, hence initiating the study of measurable cardinals. For the finitely additive case A. Tarski [180] in 1930 published his celebrated *prime ideal theorem*, proving the existence of two-valued diffuse finitely additive measures on an arbitrary infinite set, i.e. the characteristic function of a free ultrafilter on the set. Curiously, (as acknowledged by Tarski at the end of his paper) the result is equivalent to a result of S. Ulam [185] published in the previous issue of *Fundamenta Mathematicae*.

Whereas the name filter is descriptively fitting, the dual notion of an *ideal* is not quite as self-explanatory. The reason for this is that the term ideal pre-dates the term filter by almost a full century and has its origin in the *ideal numbers* E. E. Kummer¹ [117] used in the proof of the failure of unique factorization for cyclotomic fields. R. Dedekind [54] then formalized and studied *ideals* as subsets of arbitrary rings. M. H. Stone's *representation* [178] (1936) and *duality* [179] (1937) theorems identified Boolean rings with Boolean algebras and the algebraic ideals with complements of filters. From today's perspective it is astounding that Stone's work precedes the notion of an ultrafilter.

It was P. Samuel [162] who made the natural switch from maximal ideals to ultrafilters in the proof of Stone duality and coined the term *space of ultrafilters* for $\beta\mathbb{N}$ which quickly became an important object of study. W. Rudin [161] in 1956 showed that the space $\mathbb{N}^* = \beta\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{N}$ of *non-principal* ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} is not homogeneous (assuming the Continuum Hypothesis) by noting that under CH there are *P-points* while non-P-points exist in ZFC, hence realizing that not all ultrafilters are the same.

At roughly the same time J. Łoś [129], building on previous work of T. Skolem [171] and E. Hewit [88] introduced the *ultraproduct* and proved his famous theorem. The use of ultraproducts spread quickly through mathematics most notably in model theory, non-standard analysis and the theory of large cardinals (see e.g. [147] and [78, 79]). We refer the interested reader to J. Keisler's survey [111] and the recent book by I. Goldbring [80] for further reading on (the history of) ultraproducts. We only mention the remarkable theorem of Keisler [109] that (assuming the Generalized Continuum Hypothesis) two models are elementarily equivalent if and only if they have isomorphic ultrapowers and D. Scott's [164] incompatibility of measurable cardinals with the Axiom of constructibility.

The study of ultrafilters as combinatorial objects in their own right started in the 1960's through the introduction of several interesting partial orders comparing ultrafilters. J. Isbell [105] in 1965 briefly mentions ultrafilters in his study of the *Tukey order* ([182]) of cofinal types of directed partial orders (the problem whether consistently all free ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} are Tukey-equivalent became known as *Isbell's problem* and will be further discussed in this article). M. E. Rudin [159, 160] studying the topological and similarity types of ultrafilters as points in $\beta\mathbb{N}$, H. J. Keisler [110] comparing ultrapowers, and M. Katětov [107, 108] in the study of descriptive complexity of functions, independently introduced a pre-order on ultrafilters; Rudin and Keisler considered only ultrafilters, while Katětov, in fact, introduced two orders on filters in general which coincide when restricted to ultrafilters. Now, the more restrictive of the two is called *Rudin-Keisler order* and the other

¹Together with K. Weierstrass co-advisor of Georg Cantor.

Katětov order. Yet another order was considered by Z. Frolík [76] in order to give a ZFC proof of W. Rudin's non-homogeneity of $\mathbb{N}^* = \beta\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{N}$. This ordering is refreedom to as the *Rudin-Frolík order*. The curious feature of Z. Frolík's proof is that unlike W. Rudin's CH argument, his does not produce an explicit topological property satisfied by some but not all points of \mathbb{N}^* . This has been rectified only much later by K. Kunen [120] in his construction of *weak P-points* (i.e. ultrafilters which are not accumulation points of any countable subsets of \mathbb{N}^*). G. Choquet [46, 46, 52, 130] and his school [52, 53, 130], in particular, G. Mokobodzki [145] identified important classes of ultrafilters: *selective* ultrafilters (denoted as *absolu*), *Q-points* (as *rare*), *Hausdorff* ultrafilters (denoted as *property C*) and *rapid* ones, and showed that these notions all differ assuming CH. Blass [14] and others later showed how these combinatorial properties correspond to model-theoretic properties of the associated ultrapowers.

At the beginning of the 1970's the study of not only topological but also combinatorial properties of ultrafilters became a very active area of research. Whole PhD theses were dedicated exclusively to the study of ultrafilters, most notably D. Booth's [23], A. Blass's [11], J. Ketonen's [112], R. A. Pitt's [149], R. C. Solomon's [174], M. Dagenet's [50], D. C. Devlin's [55], N. I. Rosen's [55], C. Laflamme's [122], S. García-Ferreira's [77], M. Benedikt's [8] and, more recently, J. Flašková's [72], J. L. Verner's [190], A. Medini's [135] and J. Cancino's [34].

Much work has been done on the Rudin-Keisler and Tukey orders and the topology of $\beta\mathbb{N}$. We refer the reader to the survey [139] by J. van Mill and its update [87] and Dobrinen's survey [57]. One has to highlight the work done by K. Kunen here. First [118] he showed how independent families can be used to remove the give ZFC proofs of results about the Rudin-Keisler order originally proved using CH, then [120] he constructed, in ZFC, weak-P-points, giving the ultimate proof of non-homogeneity of \mathbb{N}^* . Much thanks to Kunen's insight it became clear that selective ultrafilters are special. They are Rudin-Keisler minimal, being selective is equivalent to being both a P-point and a Q-point, and to being Ramsey. A very useful characterization of selective ultrafilters was given by Mathias [134] by proving that an ultrafilter is selective if and only if it intersects every tall analytic ideal. It was only fitting that Kunen [119] proved that selective ultrafilters consistently do not exist. This result was soon followed by A. Miller's proof [141] of the consistency of non-existence of Q-points and Shelah's celebrated construction of the model of ZFC without P-points (see [192] and [43]).

One also has to mention the first monograph dedicated to the theory of ultrafilters by W.W. Comfort and S. Negrepontis [48], the role ultrafilters played in Ramsey theory of semigroups (see [91, 93]), in particular, Hindman's *finite sums theorem* and the corresponding notion of a *union* ultrafilter, the work of A. Blass [13–15] and his students [38, 64, 123–126, 156–158], and the work of J.E. Baumgartner [5–7] which ends this pre-introduction end leads us to the proper text.

2. INTRODUCTION

It is impossible to overstate the importance of ultrafilters in infinite combinatorics, general topology, and model theory. From constructing ultrapowers, finding limits on topological spaces, building compactifications of topological spaces and semigroups, and proving Ramsey-type theorems, applications of ultrafilters can be found across all of mathematics.

The study of ultrafilters is such a big area that it is impossible to survey all of it in a single paper. We will restrict ourselves to ultrafilters over countable sets. Even so, the topic is very extensive, so we will focus on the interaction between ultrafilters and definable ideals. Unfortunately, we will not have the opportunity to talk about the importance of ultrafilters in topology or model theory. Many of the topics that could not be covered in this survey can be consulted in the excellent recent book [80].

The general outline of the paper is as follows: In the third section, we review the preliminaries and notation. In the fourth chapter, we review the Katětov, Rudin-Keisler, Katětov-Blass and Rudin-Blass orderings on ideals. We prove some basic facts regarding definable ideals that will be needed in later chapters. In the fifth chapter, we introduce Baumgartner's notion of \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters, which allows us to classify ultrafilters using analytic (even Borel) ideals. We provide characterizations of some classes of ultrafilters that resemble the characterization of Mathias of selective ultrafilter. Now, our task is to find ways to construct \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters. We do this on chapters sixth where we study generic existence of classes of ultrafilters, and seventh, where we use the parametrized diamonds introduced in [136] to build ultrafilters with special properties. In the last chapter, we tackle the question of: *How different can ultrafilters be?* We review consistency results regarding the non-existence of ultrafilters, we study the Tukey order and Isbell's problem. We also present an axiomatization of a model due to the first author where there are no \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters for any F_σ ideal \mathcal{I} .

3. PRELIMINARIES AND SOME NOTATION

For completeness, we recall the definition of filters and ultrafilters.

Definition 3.1. *Let X be a set and \mathcal{F} a family of subsets of X . We say \mathcal{F} is a filter if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $X \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$.
- (2) If $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, then $A \cap B \in \mathcal{F}$.
- (3) If $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $A \subseteq B$, then $B \in \mathcal{F}$.

A filter \mathcal{U} is called an *ultrafilter* if it is a maximal filter. Unless otherwise specified, we assume that ultrafilters are *not principal*, which means that no singleton belongs to \mathcal{U} .

Ideals are dual to filters. While a filter is a measure or notion of “largeness”, and ideal is an abstraction of “smallness”.

Definition 3.2. *Let X be a set and \mathcal{I} a family of subsets of X . We say \mathcal{I} is an ideal if:*

- (1) $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$ and $X \notin \mathcal{I}$.
- (2) If $A, B \in \mathcal{I}$, then $A \cup B \in \mathcal{I}$.
- (3) If $A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $B \subseteq A$, then $B \in \mathcal{I}$.

Given a set X and $A \subseteq X$, the complement of A relative to X is defined as $A^c = X \setminus A$. If \mathcal{F} is a filter on X , the *dual ideal* of \mathcal{F} is defined as $\mathcal{F}^* = \{A^c \mid A \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Similarly, for an ideal \mathcal{I} , define *dual filter* of \mathcal{I} as $\mathcal{I}^* = \{A^c \mid A \in \mathcal{I}\}$. It is straight forward to see that \mathcal{F}^* is an ideal and \mathcal{I}^* a filter. If \mathcal{I} is an ideal on X , we let $\mathcal{I}^+ = \wp(X) \setminus \mathcal{I}$ be the family of \mathcal{I} -positive sets. If \mathcal{F} is a filter, we define \mathcal{F}^+

$= (\mathcal{F}^*)^+$; it is easy to see that \mathcal{F}^+ is the family of all sets that have non-empty (infinite) intersection with every element of \mathcal{F} . If $A \in \mathcal{I}^+$ then the restriction of \mathcal{I} to A , defined as $\mathcal{I} \upharpoonright A = \wp(A) \cap \mathcal{I}$, is an ideal on A , where $\mathcal{P}(A)$ denotes the powerset of A . An ideal is called *tall* if every infinite set has an infinite subset on the ideal. A stronger notion of tallness is the one of ω -*hitting*; an ideal \mathcal{I} is ω -hitting if for every $\{X_n \mid n \in \omega\} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$, there is a single $A \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $A \cap X_n$ is infinite for every $n \in \omega$. We say that \mathcal{I} is a *P-ideal* if every countable subfamily of \mathcal{I} has a pseudounion in \mathcal{I} .

We now present the Borel ideals that will be critical in the present paper. The reader may read [96] and [97] to learn more about them. For the next definitions, given $n \in \omega$, denote the column $C_n = \{(n, m) \mid m \in \omega\}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{C_n \mid n \in \omega\}$. Given $f \in \omega^\omega$, denote $D(f) = \{(n, m) \mid m \leq f(n)\}$.

- The ideal fin is the ideal of finite subsets of ω .
- The *eventually different* ideal \mathcal{ED} is the ideal on ω^2 generated by \mathcal{C} and the graphs of functions from ω to ω .
- The ideal $\mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}}$ is the restriction of \mathcal{ED} to $\Delta = \{(n, m) \mid m \leq n\}$.
- The ideal $\text{fin} \times \text{fin}$ is the ideal on ω^2 generated by $\mathcal{C} \cup \{D(f) \mid f \in \omega^\omega\}$.
- The ideal conv is the ideal on $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ generated by all convergent sequences.
- The *nowhere dense ideal*, nwd is the ideal of nowhere dense subsets of the rational numbers.
- The *summable ideal* is the ideal $\mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{n}} = \left\{ A \subseteq \omega \mid \sum_{n \in A} \frac{1}{n+1} < \infty \right\}$.
- The *density zero ideal* is the ideal $\mathcal{Z} = \left\{ A \subseteq \omega \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A \cap [2^n, 2^{n+1})|}{2^n} = 0 \right\}$.
- The ideal \mathcal{R} is the ideal on ω generated by the homogenous sets of the random graph.
- The ideal \mathcal{G}_{FC} is the ideal on $[\omega]^2$ generated by (the edges) of all finitely chromatic graphs.
- The non-flat ideal nflat is the ideal on $[\omega]^{<\omega}$ generated by $\{[\omega]^n : n \in \omega\} \cup \{X_f : f \in (\omega \setminus \{0\})^\omega \text{ is increasing}\}$, where $X_f = \{s \in [\omega]^{<\omega} : (\exists k \in s)(s \cap (k, f(k)] \neq \emptyset)\}$.

Other than the non-flat ideal these ideals are Borel of low complexity:

Ideal	Borel Complexity
fin	F_σ
\mathcal{ED}	F_σ
$\mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}}$	F_σ
\mathcal{R}	F_σ
$\mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{n}}$	F_σ
\mathcal{G}_{FC}	F_σ
nwd	$F_{\sigma\delta}$
\mathcal{Z}	$F_{\sigma\delta}$
conv	$F_{\sigma\delta\sigma}$
$\text{fin} \times \text{fin}$	$F_{\sigma\delta\sigma}$

We actually do not know whether nflat is Borel (it is clearly analytic).

We now recall the combinatorial properties of ultrafilters on countable sets that are most used in the literature.

Definition 3.3. Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter in ω .

- (1) \mathcal{U} is selective (or Ramsey) if for every partition $\{P_n \mid n \in \omega\}$ of ω , either there is $n \in \omega$ such that $P_n \in \mathcal{U}$ or there is $X \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $|X \cap P_n| \leq 1$ for every $n \in \omega$.
- (2) \mathcal{U} is a P -point if for every decreasing $\{X_n \mid n \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ there is $X \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $X \subseteq^* X_n$ for every $n \in \omega$.
- (3) \mathcal{U} is a Q -point if for every partition $\{P_n \mid n \in \omega\}$ of ω into finite sets, there is $X \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $|X \cap P_n| \leq 1$ for every $n \in \omega$.
- (4) \mathcal{U} is rapid if the enumerative functions of the sets in \mathcal{U} is a dominating family in (ω^ω, \leq^*) .
- (5) \mathcal{U} is Hausdorff if for every $f, g \in \omega^\omega$, either $\{n \mid f(n) = g(n)\} \in \mathcal{U}$ or there is $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $f[U] \cap g[U] = \emptyset$.

It is well-known that an ultrafilter is selective if and only if it is both a P -point and a Q -point, all Q -points are rapid and all selective ultrafilters are Hausdorff.

Let $A, B \subseteq \omega$. By $A \subseteq^* B$ (A is almost contained in B) we mean that $A \setminus B$ is finite. We say that A is a *pseudounion* (*pseudointersection*) of a family $\mathcal{H} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ if A almost contains (is almost contained) in every $B \in \mathcal{H}$.

Topology turns out to be extremely useful when studying ideals and filters on the natural numbers. We endow $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ with the natural topology that makes it homeomorphic to 2^ω , the Cantor space. In this way, the topology of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ has a subbase the sets of the form $\langle n \rangle_0 = \{A \subseteq \omega \mid n \notin A\}$ and $\langle n \rangle_1 = \{A \subseteq \omega \mid n \in A\}$, for $n \in \omega$. We view filters as subspaces of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$. All notions of Borel, analytic meager are referred to this topology. A major topic on descriptive set theory if that nicely definable subspaces have very nice and desirable properties, this also applies for filters and ideals.

We will frequently refer to the *cardinal invariants of the continuum*. An excellent reference for this topic is [12]. The simplest cardinal invariant is \mathfrak{c} , which is the size of the real numbers. Given $f, g \in \omega^\omega$, define $f \leq^* g$ if there are only finitely many n for which $g(n) < f(n)$. We say a family $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ is *unbounded* if there is no $g \in \omega^\omega$ such that $f \leq^* g$ for every $f \in \mathcal{B}$. On the other hand, a family $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ is *dominating* if for every $f \in \omega^\omega$, there is $g \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $f \leq^* g$. The *unboundedness number* \mathfrak{b} is the least size of an unbounded family, while the *dominating number* \mathfrak{d} is the smallest size of a dominating family. It is straightforward to see that $\omega_1 \leq \mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{d} \leq \mathfrak{c}$. We say that $\mathcal{P} = \{P_n \mid n \in \omega\}$ is an *interval partition* if it is a partition of ω in (finite) intervals. There is an equivalent reformulation of \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{d} using interval partitions. Given \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{R} interval partitions, define $\mathcal{P} \leq^* \mathcal{R}$ if almost all intervals from \mathcal{R} contain (at least) one interval from \mathcal{P} . In this way, \mathfrak{b} is the smallest size of an unbounded family of interval partitions, while \mathfrak{d} is the least size of a dominating family of interval partitions. Let $A, B \subseteq \omega$. We say that A *decides* B if $A \subseteq^* B$ or $A \subseteq^* B^c$. A *reaping family* $\mathcal{R} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is a family deciding each subset of ω . The *reaping number* \mathfrak{r} is the least size of a reaping family. Now, a family \mathcal{R} is σ -*reaping* if for every $\{X_n \mid n \in \omega\} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$, there is a single $R \in \mathcal{R}$ that decides each X_n . The σ -*reaping number* \mathfrak{r}_σ is the least size of a σ -reaping family. It is currently unknown if \mathfrak{r} and \mathfrak{r}_σ are equal. It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{r} \leq \mathfrak{r}_\sigma \leq \mathfrak{c}$. The ultrafilter number \mathfrak{u} is the smallest size of a base of an ultrafilter. Clearly we have that $\mathfrak{r} \leq \mathfrak{u} \leq \mathfrak{c}$.

Definition 3.4. Let X a set and \mathcal{I} an ideal on X .

- (1) $\text{add}(\mathcal{I})$ is the smallest size of an unbounded family in (\mathcal{I}, \subseteq) .
- (2) $\text{cov}(\mathcal{I})$ is the smallest size of a family $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ such that $\bigcup \mathcal{D} = X$.
- (3) $\text{non}(\mathcal{I})$ is the smallest size of a subset of X that is not in \mathcal{I} .
- (4) $\text{cof}(\mathcal{I})$ is the smallest size of cofinal family in (\mathcal{I}, \subseteq) .

It is easy to see that $\text{add}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \text{cov}(\mathcal{I})$, $\text{non}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \text{cof}(\mathcal{I}) \leq 2^{|X|}$. In general, there is no relation between $\text{cov}(\mathcal{I})$ and $\text{non}(\mathcal{I})$. In case \mathcal{I} is an ideal on ω , the three cardinals defined above are trivial. However, in [31] Brendle and Shelah found analogues of these invariants that are useful for ideals on countable sets, we recall their definitions. They defined these for filters, the notation used here follows [89].

Definition 3.5. Let \mathcal{I} be a tall ideal on ω . Define:

- (1) $\text{add}^*(\mathcal{I})$ is the smallest size of an unbounded family in $(\mathcal{I}, \subseteq^*)$.
- (2) $\text{cov}^*(\mathcal{I})$ is the smallest size of a family $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ such that for every $X \in [\omega]^\omega$, there is $A \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $A \cap X$ is infinite.
- (3) $\text{non}^*(\mathcal{I})$ is the smallest size of a family $\mathcal{H} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ such that for every $A \in \mathcal{I}$, there is $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $A \cap H$ is finite.

Once again, it is easy to see that $\text{add}^*(\mathcal{I}) \leq \text{cov}^*(\mathcal{I})$, $\text{non}^*(\mathcal{I}) \leq \text{cof}(\mathcal{I})$ and in general there is no relationship between $\text{cov}^*(\mathcal{I})$ and $\text{non}^*(\mathcal{I})$.

By \mathcal{M} we denote the ideal of meager sets on 2^ω . In this way, $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M})$ we denote the smallest size of a family of meager sets that are needed to cover 2^ω (equivalently, any perfect Polish space). It is well-known that $\omega_1 \leq \text{cov}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \mathfrak{d}$, while there is no ZFC provable relation between \mathfrak{b} and $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M})$.

Meagerness of filters can be reformulated in a very useful combinatorial way, as we will now review.

Definition 3.6. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω and $\mathcal{P} = \{P_n \mid n \in \omega\}$ an interval partition. We say that \mathcal{I} is a Talagrand partition of \mathcal{I} if for every $X \in [\omega]^\omega$ we have that $\bigcup_{n \in X} P_n \in \mathcal{I}^+$.

The following is a very important theorem, the reader may consult the book [3] for a proof.

Theorem 3.7 (Talagrand [181]). Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal. The following are equivalent:

- (1) \mathcal{I} has the Baire property.
- (2) \mathcal{I} is meager.
- (3) \mathcal{I} has a Talagrand partition.
- (4) The enumerative functions from the elements of \mathcal{I}^* is bounded.

In this paper, a tree $p \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ is closed under taking initial segments. We denote $[p]$ the set of cofinal branches of p .

4. ORDERINGS ON IDEALS AND ULTRAFILTERS

Since filters, ideals and ultrafilters play a fundamental role in infinite combinatorics, we need ways to classify and study them. As mentioned in the introduction, the Katětov, Rudin-Keisler and Tukey orderings have proven to be invaluable tools for their study.

Definition 4.1. Let X, Y be two sets, \mathcal{I} an ideal on X , \mathcal{J} an ideal on Y and $f : X \rightarrow Y$.

- (1) f is a Katětov function from \mathcal{I} to \mathcal{J} if for every $A \subseteq Y$, the following holds: If $A \in \mathcal{J}$, then $f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{I}$.
- (2) f is a Rudin-Keisler function from \mathcal{I} to \mathcal{J} if for every $A \subseteq Y$, the following holds: $A \in \mathcal{J}$ if and only if $f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{I}$.
- (3) f is a Katětov-Blass function from \mathcal{I} to \mathcal{J} if it is a Katětov function and it is finite to one.
- (4) f is a Rudin-Blass function from \mathcal{I} to \mathcal{J} if it is a Rudin-Keisler function and it is finite to one.
- (5) $\mathcal{J} \leq_K \mathcal{I}$ if there is a Katětov function from \mathcal{I} to \mathcal{J} . The orders \leq_{KB} , \leq_{RK} and \leq_{RB} are defined analogously.
- (6) \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} are Katětov equivalent (denoted as $\mathcal{I} =_K \mathcal{J}$) if $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{J} \leq_K \mathcal{I}$. Rudin-Keisler, Katětov-Blass and Rudin-Blass equivalences are defined analogously.

The following is a list of easy facts regarding the orderings of ideals. We will be using these properties implicitly throughout the text.

Lemma 4.2. Let \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} be ideals on ω and $X \subseteq \omega$.

- (1) If $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$, then $\mathcal{I} \leq_{KB} \mathcal{J}$.
- (2) If $\mathcal{I} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{J}$, then $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}$.
- (3) $\text{fin} \leq_{KB} \mathcal{I}$.
- (4) \mathcal{I} is Katětov equivalent to fin if and only if \mathcal{I} is not tall.
- (5) If $X \in \mathcal{I}^+$, then $\mathcal{I} \leq_{KB} \mathcal{I} \restriction X$.
- (6) If $X \in \mathcal{I}^*$, then $\mathcal{I} =_{RB} \mathcal{I} \restriction X$.
- (7) If $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}$, then $\text{cov}^*(\mathcal{J}) \leq \text{cov}^*(\mathcal{I})$.
- (8) If $\mathcal{I} \leq_{KB} \mathcal{J}$, then $\text{non}^*(\mathcal{I}) \leq \text{non}^*(\mathcal{J})$.
- (9) \mathcal{I} is meager if and only if $\text{fin} \leq_{RB} \mathcal{I}$.

The following equivalence of the Katětov order is often useful:

Lemma 4.3. Let X, Y be two sets, \mathcal{I} an ideal on X , \mathcal{J} an ideal on Y and $f : X \rightarrow Y$. The following are equivalent:

- (1) f is a Katětov function from \mathcal{I} to \mathcal{J} .
- (2) For every $A \subseteq X$, if $A \in \mathcal{I}^+$, then $f[A] \in \mathcal{J}^+$.

Evidently, if $\mathcal{I} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{J}$, then $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}$. However, in general the orderings are very different. For example, the ideal fin is Katětov-below any ideal, yet if \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter, it is easy to see that $\text{fin} \not\leq_{RK} \mathcal{U}^*$. Nevertheless, these two orderings coincide when restricted to maximal ideals:

Lemma 4.4. Let \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} ultrafilters on ω . The following are equivalent:

- (1) $\mathcal{U}^* \leq_K \mathcal{V}^*$.
- (2) $\mathcal{U}^* \leq_{RK} \mathcal{V}^*$.

The following is an important theorem of Mary Ellen Rudin and Saharon Shelah,

Theorem 4.5 (Shelah-Rudin [169]). *There are 2^c many \leq_{RK} -incomparable ultrafilters.*

Although the Rudin-Keisler order has been studied extensively, many questions remain unsolved (see

Problem 4.6 (van Mill [139]). *Is there an ultrafilter that is \leq_{RK} -comparable to any other ultrafilter?*

It is not hard to prove that there is no such ultrafilter in case that $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{c}$. In [92] Hindman obtained some partial results in case \mathfrak{c} is singular and Butkovičová [33] in case there is a $\kappa < \mathfrak{c}$ such that $2^\kappa > \mathfrak{c}$. It should be mentioned here that it is a theorem of ZFC that there are no least or largest ultrafilters in either the Rudin-Keisler or the Rudin-Blass orders.

Another simple question about the Rudin-Keisler and Rudin-Blass orders is the following:

Problem 4.7 (H.-Sanchis-Tamariz-Mascarúa [102]). *Is there an ultrafilter that has the same RK- and RB-predecessors?*

Of course, every P-point is such, but it seems unknown whether such an ultrafilter exist in ZFC.

We will now prove that the Katětov order is both \mathfrak{c}^+ -directed downwards and upwards when restricted to tall ideals. This means that every family of ideals of size \mathfrak{c} has a lower and an upper bound in the Katětov order. This is an unpublished result of A. Blass, which appeared in [25]. We first need the following:

Definition 4.8. *Let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \omega^\omega$. We say that \mathcal{P} is an independent family of functions if for every $f_0, \dots, f_n \in \mathcal{P}$ distinct and $m_0, \dots, m_n \in \omega$, there are infinitely many $a \in \omega$ such that $f_i(a) = m_i$ for every $i \leq n$.*

It is easy to construct large independent families:

Lemma 4.9. *There is a perfect $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ family of functions.*

Proof. Let \mathbb{P} be the set of all $p \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ with the following properties:

- (1) p is a finite tree.
- (2) Every node in p has an extension to the last level of p .

Order $p \leq q$ if p is an end-extension of q . Given a filter $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, define $T_G = \bigcup_{p \in G} p$.

It is not hard to find countably many dense sets of \mathbb{P} and a sufficiently generic filter G such that $\mathcal{P} = [T_G]$ is a perfect family of functions. \square

We can now prove the following:

Proposition 4.10 (Blass, see [25]). *The Katětov order is \mathfrak{c}^+ -directed upwards and downwards when restricted to tall ideals.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{\mathcal{I}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ be a family of tall ideals on ω . We want to find a lower and upper bound of \mathcal{L} in the Katětov order.

We first find an upper bound. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ be an independent family of functions. Define \mathcal{J} the ideal generated by $\bigcup_{\alpha < \mathfrak{c}} f_\alpha^{-1}(\mathcal{I}_\alpha)$. We claim that \mathcal{J} is a proper ideal. To prove this, it is enough to show that for every $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathfrak{c}$ and $A_{\alpha_0}, \dots, A_{\alpha_n} \subseteq \omega$ with $A_{\alpha_i} \in \mathcal{I}_{\alpha_i}$, the set $B = \bigcup_{i \leq n} f_{\alpha_i}^{-1}(A_{\alpha_i})$ is coinfinite. Since each A_{α_i} is a proper subset of ω , we choose $m_i \notin A_{\alpha_i}$. Since \mathcal{P} is independent, it follows that there are infinitely many $a \in \omega$ such that $f_i(a) = m_i$ for every $i \leq n$, so $a \notin B$.

Finally, it is clear that f_α is a Katětov function from \mathcal{J} to \mathcal{I}_α , so \mathcal{J} is a \leq_K -upper bound of \mathcal{L} .

In order to find a lower bound let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_\alpha \mid \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ be a MAD family. Define an ideal \mathcal{K} such that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{K}^+$ and $\mathcal{K} \restriction A_\alpha$ is Katětov equivalent to \mathcal{I}_α . Since \mathcal{A} is maximal and each \mathcal{I}_α is tall, it follows that \mathcal{K} is tall. Since each \mathcal{I}_α is Katětov equivalent to a restriction of \mathcal{K} , it follows that \mathcal{K} is a \leq_K -lower bound of \mathcal{L} . \square

The next lemma will be used in the proof of Proposition 5.8. It first appeared in [126]:

Lemma 4.11 (C. Laflamme, J. P. Zhu [126]). *There exist a family $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ such that $|\mathcal{D}| = \mathfrak{d}$ and for any two ultrafilters $\mathcal{V} \leq_{RB} \mathcal{U}$, there is $h \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $h(\mathcal{U}) \leq_{RB} \mathcal{V}$. Moreover, for each $h \in \mathcal{D}$, there is a partition $\{I_n : n \in \omega\}$ of ω into intervals such that $h(k) = n$ if and only if $k \in I_n$.*

A simple Baire category argument shows that there are no G_δ ideals (see [3]). In this way, F_σ is the lowest possible complexity of an ideal. In [132] Mazur found a very simple representation of F_σ -ideals, which we will review now.

Definition 4.12. *We say $\varphi : \wp(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a lower semicontinuous submeasure if the following hold:*

- (1) $\varphi(\omega) = \infty$.
- (2) $\varphi(A) \leq \varphi(B)$ whenever $A \subseteq B$.
- (3) $\varphi(A \cup B) \leq \varphi(A) + \varphi(B)$ for every $A, B \subseteq \omega$.
- (4) $\varphi(A) < \infty$ for every finite $A \subseteq \omega$.
- (5) If $A \subseteq \omega$, then $\varphi(A) = \sup\{\varphi(A \cap n) \mid n \in \omega\}$.

Given a lower semi-continuous submeasure φ we define the following ideals:

- (1) $\text{fin}(\varphi) = \{A \subseteq \omega \mid \varphi(A) < \infty\}$.
- (2) $\text{exh}(\varphi) = \{A \subseteq \omega \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(A \setminus n) = 0\}$.

The theorem of Mazur is as follows,

Theorem 4.13 (Mazur [132]). *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{I} is F_σ .
- (2) There is a lower semicontinuous submeasure φ such that $\mathcal{I} = \text{fin}(\varphi)$.

It follows from the theorem that all analytic P -ideals are actually $F_{\sigma\delta}$. The following theorem by Grebík and Vidnyánszky is worth pointing out.

Theorem 4.14 (Grebík, Vidnyánszky [82]). *Every tall analytic ideal contains a tall F_σ -ideal.*

Similar to the theorem of Mazur, Solecki found a very nice and useful representation of analytic P -ideals.

Theorem 4.15 (Solecki [172]). *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω .*

- (1) \mathcal{I} is an analytic P -ideal if and only if there is a lower semicontinuous submeasure φ such that $\mathcal{I} = \text{exh}(\varphi)$.
- (2) \mathcal{I} is an F_σ P -ideal if and only if there is a lower semicontinuous submeasure φ such that $\mathcal{I} = \text{exh}(\varphi) = \text{fin}(\varphi)$.

Using submeasures, we can define the following important class of ideals:

Definition 4.16. Let $g : \omega \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a function such that $\sum_{n \in \omega} g(n)$ diverges to infinity. Define $\varphi_g : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ as $\varphi_g(A) = \sum_{n \in A} g(n)$, for each $A \in \mathcal{P}(\omega)$. It turns out that φ_g is a lower semicontinuous submeasure on ω , so it defines an ideal which we denote by $\mathcal{J}_g = \text{fin}(\varphi_g)$.

Ideals of this form are known as *summable ideals*. Obviously, the summable ideal is of this form.

Proposition 4.17. For any $g : \omega \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ be such that $\sum_{n \in \omega} g(n)$ diverges to infinity. Then:

- (1) \mathcal{J}_g is an F_σ and a P -ideal.
- (2) \mathcal{J}_g is a tall ideal if and only if $\langle g(n) : n \in \omega \rangle$ converges to 0.

The following two operations are often useful, they are used to push and pull-back ultrafilters through functions:

Definition 4.18. Let X, Y be two sets, \mathcal{I} an ideal on X , \mathcal{J} an ideal on Y and $f : X \longrightarrow Y$.

- (1) $f(\mathcal{I})$ is an ideal on Y defined as $f(\mathcal{I}) = \{A \subseteq Y \mid f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{I}\}$.
- (2) $f^{-1}(\mathcal{J})$ is a (possibly improper) ideal on X generated by $\{f^{-1}(B) \mid B \in \mathcal{J}\}$.

In the above situation, note that since $f^{-1}(B \cup C) = f^{-1}(B) \cup f^{-1}(C)$ for $B, C \subseteq Y$, it follows that a set $D \subseteq X$ is in $f^{-1}(\mathcal{J})$ if and only if there is $B \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $D \subseteq f^{-1}(B)$. In this way, $f^{-1}(\mathcal{J}) = \{A \subseteq X \mid f[A] \in \mathcal{J}\}$. Note that it is very possible that $f^{-1}(\mathcal{J})$ is a trivial ideal. In fact we have the following:

Lemma 4.19. Let X, Y be two sets, \mathcal{J} an ideal on Y and $f : X \longrightarrow Y$. The following are equivalent:

- (1) $f^{-1}(\mathcal{J})$ is a proper ideal.
- (2) $\text{im}(f) \in \mathcal{J}^+$.

We have the following:

Proposition 4.20. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω , $f : \omega \longrightarrow \omega$ and $X = \text{im}(f)$. If $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is a proper ideal, then the following holds:

- (1) $\mathcal{I} \leq_K f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ as witnessed by f .
- (2) $\mathcal{I} \restriction X \leq_{RK} f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ as witnessed by f .
- (3) $\mathcal{I} \restriction X \leq_{RB} f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ if f is finite to one.
- (4) If $X \in \mathcal{I}^*$, then $\mathcal{I} \leq_{RK} f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$.
- (5) If \mathcal{J} is an ideal on ω such that f is a Katětov function from \mathcal{J} to \mathcal{I} , then $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq \mathcal{J}$.

Lemma 4.21. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω and $f : \omega \longrightarrow \omega$.

- (1) $f(\mathcal{I})$ is the ideal generated by $\{f[B^c]^c \mid B \in \mathcal{I}\}$.
- (2) $\text{cof}(f(\mathcal{I})) \leq \text{cof}(\mathcal{I})$.
- (3) $f(\mathcal{I}) \leq_K \mathcal{I}$.

We will now prove a result regarding the complexity of these ideals.

Proposition 4.22. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω and $f : \omega \longrightarrow \omega$.

- (1) If \mathcal{I} is Borel (analytic), then $f(\mathcal{I})$ is Borel (analytic).

- (2) If \mathcal{I} is analytic, then $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is analytic.
 (3) If \mathcal{I} is Borel and f is finite to one, then $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is Borel. Moreover, the Borel complexity of $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is at most the Borel complexity of \mathcal{I} .

Proof. Before starting the proof, we make some (well-known) remarks. Define the functions $F, G : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ where $F(A) = f^{-1}(A)$ and $G(A) = f[A]$.

Claim 4.23. (1) F is continuous.
 (2) If f is finite to one, then G is continuous.

In both cases, it is enough to see that the preimage of every element of the subbase $\{\langle n \rangle_i \mid n \in \omega \wedge i \in 2\}$ is open. In the case of F :

$$\begin{aligned} F^{-1}(\langle n \rangle_1) &= \{A \mid n \in F(A)\}, \\ &= \{A \mid n \in f^{-1}(A)\}, \\ &= \{A \mid f(n) \in A\}, \\ &= \langle f(n) \rangle_1. \\ F^{-1}(\langle n \rangle_0) &= \{A \mid n \notin F(A)\}, \\ &= \{A \mid n \notin f^{-1}(A)\}, \\ &= \{A \mid f(n) \notin A\}, \\ &= \langle f(n) \rangle_0. \end{aligned}$$

Now, assuming f is finite to one:

$$\begin{aligned} G^{-1}(\langle n \rangle_1) &= \{A \mid n \in G(A)\}, \\ &= \{A \mid n \in f[A]\}, \\ &= \bigcup_{f(m)=n} \langle m \rangle_1. \\ G^{-1}(\langle n \rangle_0) &= \{A \mid n \notin G(A)\}, \\ &= \{A \mid n \notin f[A]\}, \\ &= \mathcal{P}(\omega) \setminus \bigcup_{f(m)=n} \langle m \rangle_1. \end{aligned}$$

Since f is finite to one, it follows that $\bigcup_{f(m)=n} \langle m \rangle_1$ is clopen, so $G^{-1}(\langle n \rangle_0)$ is open. Now, we have that $F^{-1}(\mathcal{I}) = f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$, so the first point of the proposition follows. We now prove the second point, so assume that \mathcal{I} is an analytic ideal. It then follows that $F[\mathcal{I}] = \{f^{-1}(A) \mid A \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is an analytic set. Since $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I}) = \{B \mid \exists A \in F[\mathcal{I}](A \subseteq B)\}$, we get that $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is analytic as well.

Finally, assume that \mathcal{I} is Borel and f is finite to one. We now have that $G^{-1}(\mathcal{I}) = f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$, so $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is Borel. \square

Lemma 4.24. Let \mathcal{I} be a tall analytic P -ideal.

- (1) If $X \in \mathcal{I}^+$, then $\mathcal{I} \restriction X$ is an analytic P -ideal.
 (2) There is a tall summable ideal \mathcal{J} such that $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$.
 (3) If $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ is finite to one, then $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is an analytic P -ideal.

Proof. The first point is trivial. We prove the second point. Let φ be a lower semi-continuous submeasure such that $\mathcal{I} = \text{exh}(\varphi)$. Define the function $g : \omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by $g(n) = \varphi(\{n\})$. It is not difficult to verify that $\mathcal{J}_g \subseteq \mathcal{I}$.

We now prove the third point. Assume $f \in \omega^\omega$ is finite to one. By Proposition 4.22, it is enough to prove that $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is a P -ideal. It is enough to prove that for every $\{B_n \mid n \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, the family $\{f^{-1}(B_n) \mid n \in \omega\}$ has a pseudounion. Since \mathcal{I} is a P -ideal, we know there is $A \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $B_n \subseteq^* A$ for every $n \in \omega$. Since f is finite to one, it follows that $f^{-1}(B_n) \subseteq^* f^{-1}(A)$ for every $n \in \omega$. \square

In the next section will need the following theorem, which was proved in [99]:

Theorem 4.25 (H.-Meza-Minami, [99]). *Let \mathcal{I} be a Borel ideal on ω . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{I} is ω -hitting.
- (2) $\mathcal{ED}_{fin} \leq_{KB} \mathcal{I}$.

5. \mathcal{I} -ULTRAFILTERS

The following notion was formally introduced by J. Baumgartner in [5].

Definition 5.1. *Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on ω , X a set and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ closed under subsets and that contains all singletons.*

- (1) \mathcal{U} is an \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter if for every function $g : \omega \rightarrow X$, there is $A \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $g[A] \in \mathcal{I}$.
- (2) \mathcal{U} is a weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter if for every finite to one function $g : \omega \rightarrow X$, there is $A \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $g[A] \in \mathcal{I}$.

Baumgartner was obviously unaware of the work of M. Daguenet [52] who considered the same notion almost 20 years earlier, and, in particular, showed that P -points are exactly the $\text{fin} \times \text{fin}$ -ultrafilters, in the form of an instance of the following simple lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω and \mathcal{U} an ultrafilter on ω .*

- (1) \mathcal{U} is an \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter if and only if $\mathcal{I} \not\leq_K \mathcal{U}^*$.
- (2) \mathcal{U} is a weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter if and only if $\mathcal{I} \not\leq_{KB} \mathcal{U}^*$.

It is easy to find ultrafilters that are not \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters, just extend \mathcal{I}^* to any ultrafilter. The notions of (weak) \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters allows us to classify ultrafilters using Borel ideals as parameters. In practice, it turns out that most of the more interesting combinatorial properties of ultrafilters can be reformulated in terms of \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters.

Remark 5.3. *The following table summarizes the relationships between combinatorial properties of ultrafilters and the ideals (or classes of ideals) which characterize these:*

Type of Ultrafilter	\mathcal{I} -ultrafilter	weak \mathcal{U} -ultrafilter	Reference
Selective	\mathcal{ED}		[96]
Selective	\mathcal{R}		[96]
Selective	tall analytic ideals		[134]
P -point	$\text{fin} \times \text{fin}$		[52]
P -point	conv		[5]
Q -point		$\mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}}$	[96]
Rapid		tall analytic P -ideals	[187]
Hausdorff	\mathcal{G}_{FC}		[98]
Non-flat	nflat		[67, 115]

We make one comment on the non-flat type of ultrafilters. The original formulation was given for *flat ultrafilters* in [67], in connection with the space of bounded operators of a separable, infinite dimensional complex Hilbert space. Later it was found that flat ultrafilters are those whose dual ideal is Katětov above the ideal nflat , i.e., ultrafilters such that $\text{nflat} \leq_K \mathcal{U}^*$, giving a purely combinatorial characterization ([115, 116]). It is known that P -points are non-flat, however, the existence of nflat -ultrafilters in ZFC remains unknown.

Problem 5.4 (Farah-Phillip-Steprans [67]). *Does ZFC prove the existence of a nflat -ultrafilter?*

There are other natural classes of combinatorial properties of ultrafilters which can be characterized as \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters (see [7, 9, 27, 28, 42, 53, 67, 69–71, 75, 83, 85, 94, 95, 114, 125, 131, 156, 157, 175, 176]).

The reader may note from the table above that there may be non-Katětov equivalent ideals \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} for which the classes of \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters and \mathcal{J} -ultrafilters coincide. At the moment, it is not clear if there is a combinatorial characterization of when two different ideals induce the same class of ultrafilters. This topic was studied by R. Filipów, K. Kowitz and A. Kwela in [69] where (among other results) they proved the following:

Theorem 5.5 (Filipów-Kowitz-Kwela [69]). *Assume CH. Let \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} be ideals on ω such that \mathcal{I} is tall, \mathcal{J} is Katětov uniform and $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathcal{J}$ is σ -closed. There is an \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter that is not a \mathcal{J} -ultrafilter if and only if $\mathcal{I} \not\leq_K \mathcal{J}$.*

Here, \mathcal{J} is *Katětov uniform* if it is Katětov equivalent to all its restrictions. An extreme case where many different ideals give raise to the same class of ultrafilters is the model constructed by the first author in [35], where all tall F_σ ideals induce the same class of ultrafilters.

We now introduce the following notion, which can be viewed as an ultrafilter that “has no interesting combinatorial properties”.

Definition 5.6. *Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on ω . We say that \mathcal{U} is unremarkable if $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{U}^*$ for every analytic ideal \mathcal{I} .*

Since there are only \mathfrak{c} -many analytic ideals, Proposition 4.10 yields the following:

Proposition 5.7. *There is an unremarkable ultrafilter.*

On the other hand, assuming additional hypothesis to ZFC we can obtain stronger versions of this proposition.

Proposition 5.8. *Assume $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$. Then there is an ultrafilter all of whose Rudin-Blass predecessors are unremarkable.*

An ultrafilter like the one in the previous proposition can not be constructed just on the basis of ZFC, since in the Miller's model p -points are dense in the Rudin-Blass ordering. Moreover, in Miller's model, \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters are dense in the Rudin-Blass ordering whenever \mathcal{I} is an analytic p -ideal ([36]). Hausdorff ultrafilters are also dense in the Rudin-Blass ordering in the Miller's model, as was proved in [4]. The best known ZFC approximation to an ultrafilter like in Proposition 5.8 was given in [126] by presenting an ultrafilter all of whose Rudin-Blass predecessors are Katětov-Blass above \mathcal{ED}_{fin} , that is, no RB-predecessor is a Q -point.

Theorem 5.9 (C. Laflamme, J. P. Zhu [126]). *There is an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} such that for all $\mathcal{V} \leq_{RB} \mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{ED}_{fin} \leq_{KB} \mathcal{V}$. Therefore, no Rudin-Blass predecessor of \mathcal{U} is a Q -point.*

Note that the previous theorem implies that for any ideal \mathcal{I} which is KB-below the ideal \mathcal{ED}_{fin} , there is an ultrafilter for which all RB-predecessors are KB-above \mathcal{I} . We don't know of any other ideal having this property.

Definition 5.10. *Given two ideals on ω \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} , we say they are compatible if $\mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}$ generates a proper ideal, in which case we denote by $\langle \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J} \rangle$ the ideal that $\mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}$ generates.*

Lemma 5.11. *If \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} are analytic, then $\langle \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J} \rangle$ is analytic.*

Proof. Note that $\bigcup : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \times \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ is continuous, $\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}$ is analytic and $\langle \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J} \rangle = \bigcup(\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J})$ \square

Lemma 5.12. *Let \mathcal{I} be a meager ideal on ω and $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ a finite to one function. Then $f(\mathcal{I})$ is meager.*

Proof. Let $\{I_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a partition of ω into intervals witnessing that \mathcal{I} is meager. Define a sequence of natural numbers $\langle k_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ as follows:

- (1) $k_0 = 0$.
- (2) Once k_n is defined, let k_{n+1} be big enough so there is $m \in \omega$ such that $I_m \subseteq f^{-1}[[k_n, k_{n+1})]$.

Now define $J_n = [k_n, k_{n+1})$ for each $n \in \omega$. We claim that $\{J_n : n \in \omega\}$ witnesses $f(\mathcal{I})$ is meager. Assume otherwise there is $A \in [\omega]^\omega$ such that $\bigcup_{n \in A} J_n \in f(\mathcal{I})$. Then $f^{-1}[\bigcup_{n \in A} J_n] \in \mathcal{I}$. However, by construction $\{k_j : j \in \omega\}$, for each $n \in A$, there is $m_n \in \omega$ such that $I_{m_n} \subseteq f^{-1}[J_n]$. So, for all $n \in \omega$, $I_{m_n} \subseteq f^{-1}[\bigcup_{n \in A} J_n]$, which implies $f^{-1}[\bigcup_{n \in A} J_n] \notin \mathcal{I}$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 5.13. *Let $\{\mathcal{I}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ be a \subseteq -increasing family of meager ideals on ω where $\lambda < \mathfrak{b}$. Then $\mathcal{I} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \mathcal{I}_\alpha$ is a meager ideal.*

Proof. It is clear that \mathcal{I} is an ideal, so all we have to prove is that \mathcal{I} is indeed a meager ideal. For each $\alpha < \lambda$, let $\mathcal{P}_\alpha = \{I_n^\alpha : n \in \omega\}$ be a Talagrand partition for \mathcal{I}_α is a meager ideal, that is, for any $X \in \mathcal{I}_\alpha$. Now, since $\lambda < \mathfrak{d}$, there is an interval partition $\{\mathcal{P}_n : n \in \omega\}$ such that for each $\alpha < \lambda$, there is $k \in \omega$ such that for all $n \geq k$, \mathcal{P}_n contains some interval from \mathcal{P}_α . This implies that \mathcal{P} witnesses that \mathcal{I} is a meager ideal. \square

Lemma 5.14. *Let \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} be ideals on ω and $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ such that $f(\mathcal{I}) = \text{fin}$. Then:*

- (1) *If $\text{im}(f) \in \mathcal{J}^+$, then $f^{-1}(\mathcal{J})$ and \mathcal{I} are compatible.*
- (2) *If \mathcal{J} is meager, $\text{im}(f) \in \mathcal{J}^+$ and f is finite to one, then $\langle f^{-1}(\mathcal{J}) \cup \mathcal{I} \rangle$ is meager.*
- (3) *If \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} are analytic, then $\langle f^{-1}(\mathcal{J}) \cup \mathcal{I} \rangle$ is analytic.*

Proof. (1) Let us assume that $f^{-1}(\mathcal{J})$ and \mathcal{I} are not compatible, so there are $A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $B \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $\omega = A \cup f^{-1}[B]$. Then, for each $n \notin B$, we should have $f^{-1}(\{n\}) \subseteq A$. Since $\text{im}(f) \in \mathcal{J}^+$, we have $\text{im}(f) \setminus B$ is infinite, so for each $n \in \text{im}(f) \setminus B$, $f^{-1}(\{n\}) \subseteq A$, that is $f^{-1}(\omega \setminus B) \subseteq A$, which contradicts that $A \in \mathcal{I}$.

(2) Let $\langle I_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be a Talagrand partition for \mathcal{J} . For each $n \in \omega$, define $D_n = f^{-1}(I_n)$. Clearly $\{D_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a partition of ω into finite sets. We claim that for any $X \in \langle f^{-1}(\mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{I}) \rangle$, X contains at most finitely many sets D_n . Suppose otherwise there is $X \in \langle f^{-1}(\mathcal{J}) \cup \mathcal{I} \rangle$ such that for infinitely many $n \in \omega$, $D_n \subseteq X$. We can assume $X = A \cup f^{-1}[B]$ where $A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $B \in \mathcal{J}$. Let $Z = \bigcup \{D_n : D_n \subseteq X\}$, so $Z \subseteq X$ and it is the union of infinitely many sets D_n .

Therefore, there are infinitely many $n \in \omega$ such that $I_n \subseteq f(Z)$, so $f(Z) \in \mathcal{J}^+$, and we can find $Y \in [\omega]^\omega$ and $\{k_n : n \in Y\}$ such that $k_n \in I_n \setminus B$ and $I_n \subseteq f(Z)$. Then, for each $n \in Y$, $f^{-1}(\{k_n\}) \subseteq A$, which implies $A \in \mathcal{I}^+$, a contradiction.

(3) Follows directly from Lemma 5.11. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.8. Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ be the family given by Lemma 4.11, let \mathcal{A} be the family of all analytic tall ideals and fix $\{(h_\alpha, \mathcal{J}_\alpha) : \alpha < 2^\omega\}$ an enumeration of $\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{A}$. By recursion we construct a family of ideals $\{\mathcal{I}_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathfrak{d}\}$ such that for each $\alpha < 2^\omega$:

- (1) \mathcal{I}_α is meager.
- (2) $\mathcal{I}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\alpha+1}$.
- (3) If α is a limit ordinal, $\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{I}_\beta \subseteq \mathcal{I}_\alpha$.
- (4) There is $g_\alpha : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ such that $g_\alpha \circ h_\alpha$ is Katětov from \mathcal{I}_α to \mathcal{J}_α .

We start with $\mathcal{I}_0 = h_0^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_0)$. Suppose \mathcal{I}_α has been defined. By Lemma 5.12, we have that $h_{\alpha+1}(\mathcal{I}_\alpha)$ is a meager ideal, so there is a finite to one function $g_{\alpha+1}$ such that $\text{fin} = g_{\alpha+1} \circ h_{\alpha+1}(\mathcal{I}_\alpha)$. Let $f_{\alpha+1} = g_{\alpha+1} \circ h_{\alpha+1}$. By clause (2) of Lemma 5.14, \mathcal{I}_α and $f_{\alpha+1}^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_{\alpha+1})$ are compatible so $\langle \mathcal{I}_\alpha \cup f_{\alpha+1}^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_{\alpha+1}) \rangle$ is a proper ideal. Define $\mathcal{I}_{\alpha+1} = \langle \mathcal{I}_\alpha \cup f_{\alpha+1}^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_{\alpha+1}) \rangle$. This finishes the successor step. Now assume α is a limit ordinal and \mathcal{I}_β has been defined for all $\beta < \alpha$. Let $\mathcal{I}'_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{I}_\beta$. By Lemma 5.13, \mathcal{I}'_α is a meager ideal, Lemma 5.12 implies $h_\alpha(\mathcal{I}'_\alpha)$ is meager. Let g_α be a finite to one function such that $\text{fin} = g_\alpha(h_\alpha(\mathcal{I}'_\alpha))$, let $f_\alpha = g_\alpha \circ h_\alpha$. By clause (2) from Lemma 5.14, $\langle \mathcal{I}'_\alpha \cup f_\alpha^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_\alpha) \rangle$ is a meager ideal. Then define $\mathcal{I}_\alpha = \langle \mathcal{I}'_\alpha \cup f_\alpha^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_\alpha) \rangle$. This finishes the construction.

Now define $\mathcal{I} = \bigcup_{\alpha < 2^\omega} \mathcal{I}_\alpha$ and let \mathcal{U} be any ultrafilter such that $\mathcal{I}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. We claim that no RB-predecessor of \mathcal{U} is a \mathcal{J} -ultrafilter for any analytic ideal \mathcal{J} . Let $\mathcal{V} \leq_{\text{RB}} \mathcal{U}$ and an analytic ideal \mathcal{J} be arbitrary. Then, by the choice of the family \mathcal{D} (see Lemma 4.11), there is $h \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $h(\mathcal{U}) \leq_{\text{RB}} \mathcal{V}$. There is $\alpha < 2^\omega$ such that $(h_\alpha, \mathcal{J}_\alpha) = (h, \mathcal{J})$. Thus, $g_\alpha \circ h_\alpha$ is a Katětov function from \mathcal{I}_α to \mathcal{J} , so for any $X \in \mathcal{J}$, $(g_\alpha \circ h_\alpha)^{-1}[X] \in \mathcal{I}_\alpha$, that is, $h_\alpha^{-1}[g_\alpha^{-1}[X]] \in \mathcal{I}_\alpha$, so $h_\alpha^{-1}[g_\alpha^{-1}[X]] \in \mathcal{U}^*$, which in turn implies $g_\alpha^{-1}[X] \in h_\alpha(\mathcal{U})^*$. Since $h = h_\alpha$, we have proved that

$\mathcal{J} \leq_{\text{KB}} h(\mathcal{U})^*$. Since $h(\mathcal{U}) \leq_{\text{RB}} \mathcal{V}$, this implies that $\mathcal{J} \leq_{\text{KB}} \mathcal{V}^*$, so \mathcal{U} is not a \mathcal{J} -ultrafilter. Since $\mathcal{V} \leq_{\text{RB}} \mathcal{U}$ and \mathcal{J} were arbitrary, we have that no RB-predecessor of \mathcal{U} is a \mathcal{J} -ultrafilter, for any analytic ideal \mathcal{J} . \square

Under CH, the Proposition 5.8 can be strengthened to Rudin-Keisler ordering.

Proposition 5.15. *Assume CH. There is an ultrafilter all of whose Rudin-Keisler predecessors are unremarkable.*

Proof. Let $\{(f_\alpha, \mathcal{I}_\alpha) : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ be an enumeration of all ordered pairs (f, \mathcal{I}) such that $f \in \omega^\omega$ and \mathcal{I} is an analytic ideal. By recursion we construct a sequence $\{\mathcal{J}_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ such that:

- (1) $\mathcal{J}_0 = [\omega]^{<\omega}$.
- (2) \mathcal{J}_α is an analytic ideal.
- (3) If $\alpha < \beta$, then $\mathcal{J}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{J}_\beta$.
- (4) $\mathcal{I}_\alpha \leq_K \mathcal{J}_{\alpha+1}$.

At limit steps α we define $\mathcal{J}_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{J}_\beta$. Note that \mathcal{J}_α is analytic since the countable union of analytic sets is analytic. Now suppose \mathcal{J}_α has been defined and we have to define $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha+1}$. By clause (1) from Lemma 4.22, $f_\alpha(\mathcal{J}_\alpha)$ is analytic, so by Talagrand's theorem there is $h_\alpha : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ such that $h(f_\alpha(\mathcal{J}_\alpha))$ is the ideal of finite sets. Define $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha+1}$ to be the ideal generated by $\mathcal{J}_\alpha \cup \{(h_\alpha \circ f_\alpha)^{-1}[A] : A \in \mathcal{I}_\alpha\}$. By clause (2) from Lemma 5.14, we have that $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha+1}$ is a proper ideal, and by 5.11, $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha+1}$ is also an analytic ideal. It is clear from the construction that $\mathcal{I}_\alpha \leq_K \mathcal{J}_{\alpha+1}$. This finishes the construction. Now define $\mathcal{H} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} \mathcal{J}_\alpha$, which is a proper ideal, and let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter extending \mathcal{H}^* . Let us see that \mathcal{U} satisfies the lemma. Let \mathcal{I} be an analytic ideal and $f \in \omega^\omega$. By construction, there is $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that $(\mathcal{I}, f) = (\mathcal{I}_\alpha, f_\alpha)$. Then, for any $A \in \mathcal{I}$, $f_\alpha^{-1}[h_\alpha^{-1}[A]] = (h_\alpha \circ f_\alpha)^{-1}[A] \in \mathcal{U}^*$, which means that $h_\alpha^{-1}[A] \in f_\alpha(\mathcal{U})^*$. Thus, h_α witnesses $\mathcal{I} \leq_K f(\mathcal{U})^*$. \square

In [134] Mathias obtained a very nice characterization of Ramsey ultrafilters: *An ultrafilter is Ramsey if and only if it has non empty intersection with every tall analytic ideal* (with the aid of large cardinals, this can be extended to a larger class of ideals, see [193] for more details). We aim to obtain analogous characterizations for other classes of ultrafilters.

Proposition 5.16. *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal and \mathcal{U} an ultrafilter. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{U} is an (weak) \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter.
- (2) $\mathcal{U} \cap f^{-1}(\mathcal{I}) \neq \emptyset$ for every $f \in \omega^\omega$ (that is finite to one).
- (3) If \mathcal{J} is an ideal on ω such that $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}$ ($\mathcal{I} \leq_{\text{KB}} \mathcal{J}$), then $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset$.
- (4) If \mathcal{J} is an ideal on ω for which there is $X \in \mathcal{I}^+$ such that $\mathcal{I} \restriction X \leq_{\text{RK}} \mathcal{J}$, ($\mathcal{I} \restriction X \leq_{\text{RB}} \mathcal{J}$), then $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. We only prove the version corresponding to \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters, the one for weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters is analogous.

Clearly 1) and 2) are equivalent. We prove that 1) implies 3) by contrapositive. Assume there is an ideal \mathcal{J} on ω such that $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}$ but $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{U} = \emptyset$. This means that $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^*$, so $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{U}^*$.

We will now prove that 3) implies 4). Let \mathcal{J} be an ideal on ω for which there is $X \in \mathcal{I}^+$ such that $\mathcal{I} \restriction X \leq_{\text{RK}} \mathcal{J}$. It follows that $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}$, so $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset$.

We now prove that 4) implies 2). Let $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$, we need to find $A \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $f[A] \in \mathcal{I}$. If $f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is not a proper ideal, there is nothing to do. Assume that it is a proper ideal and let $X = \text{im}(f)$. We know that $X \in \mathcal{I}^+$ and $\mathcal{I} \restriction X \leq_{\text{RK}} f^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ (see Proposition 4.20), so we are done. \square

In the case that \mathcal{I} is definable, by applying Proposition 4.22, we have the following:

Proposition 5.17. *Let \mathcal{I} be an analytic ideal and \mathcal{U} an ultrafilter. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{U} is a \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter.
- (2) If \mathcal{J} is an analytic ideal on ω such that $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}$, then $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset$.
- (3) If \mathcal{J} is an analytic ideal on ω for which there is $X \in \mathcal{I}^+$ such that $\mathcal{I} \restriction X \leq_{\text{RB}} \mathcal{J}$, then $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset$.

In case for \mathcal{I} -weak ultrafilters and for \mathcal{I} is Borel, we only need to check the intersection for Borel ideals.

Proposition 5.18. *Let \mathcal{I} be a Borel (analytic) ideal and \mathcal{U} an ultrafilter. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{U} is an \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter.
- (2) If \mathcal{J} is a Borel (analytic) ideal on ω such that $\mathcal{I} \leq_{\text{KB}} \mathcal{J}$, ($\mathcal{I} \leq_{\text{KB}} \mathcal{J}$) then $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset$.
- (3) If \mathcal{J} is a Borel (analytic) ideal on ω for which there is $X \in \mathcal{I}^+$ such that $\mathcal{I} \restriction X \leq_{\text{RB}} \mathcal{J}$, then $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset$.

Now we will give the following theorem, which encompasses all the characterizations that we know of ultrafilters in the style of Mathias's characterization of Ramsey ultrafilters.

Theorem 5.19. *Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on ω . Then:*

- (1) (Mathias [134]) \mathcal{U} is selective if and only if $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$ for every tall analytic ideal \mathcal{I} .
- (2) \mathcal{U} is selective if and only if $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$ for every tall F_σ (or Borel) ideal \mathcal{I} .
- (3) (Hrušák-Reyes Saenz [101]) \mathcal{U} is a Q -point if and only if $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$ for every ω -hitting Borel ideal \mathcal{I} .
- (4) (Vojtáš [187]) \mathcal{U} is rapid if and only if $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$ for all analytic P -ideal \mathcal{I} .

Proof. The first point is a direct application of Theorem 5.3 and Proposition 5.17. The second point follows immediately from the first and the theorem of Grebík and Vidnyánszky 4.14. Alternatively, it is enough to note that in order for an ultrafilter to satisfy the partition relation $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow (\mathcal{U})_2^2$, it is only needed to intersect F_σ ideals, since the ideal of monochromatic sets of a coloring has this complexity. Point 3 follows from Theorems 5.3, 4.25 and Proposition 5.18. Point 4 follows by Theorem 5.3 and Lemma 4.24. \square

Regarding Vojtáš' characterization of a rapid ultrafilter, we would like to mention the following refinement due to J. Flašková and the first author (see [74] and [36]).

Theorem 5.20 (Flašková [74], C. [36]). *(1) There is a family \mathcal{D} of summable ideals of size \mathfrak{d} such that an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} is rapid if and only if $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$ for every $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{D}$.*

- (2) If \mathcal{D} is a family of summable ideals of size less than \mathfrak{d} , then there is a non-rapid ultrafilter \mathcal{U} such that $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$ for every $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{D}$.

We have established the importance of \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters. Naturally, now the question is how to build them. There are several methods, but there are more questions than answers. For some ideals \mathcal{I} it is possible to find \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters in ZFC, while for others it is consistent that they do not exist. Moreover, there are ideals, such as the zero density ideal \mathcal{Z} for which it is unknown if it is consistent that \mathcal{Z} -ultrafilters do not exist. A characterization of the ideals for which their respective ultrafilters exist in ZFC is unknown. Two canonical constructions to build \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters are the “generic existence method” and with the aid of parameterized diamonds, two methods we will explore below. Of course, there are other constructions, such as Todorcevic’s ingenious construction of a selective ultrafilter under $\mathfrak{m} > \omega_1$ (see [183]).

6. GENERIC EXISTENCE OF \mathcal{I} -ULTRAFILTERS

The “generic existence method” is probably the most direct of straight forward approach to build a combinatorial object. In our context, we simply have to list all the requirements that we need to satisfy and try to solve them recursively, in at most \mathfrak{c} steps. Of course, there is a risk that the recursion cannot continue, so often a cardinal invariant hypothesis is needed to ensure that the recursion does not get stuck before we can satisfy all the requirements. Although it is not always possible to perform a generic existence construction, it is very important to understand when it is possible and what are the obstructions for achieving such construction.

Definition 6.1. Let \mathcal{P} be a property which an ultrafilter may or may not have. We say that ultrafilters with property \mathcal{P} exist generically if for every filter \mathcal{F} generated by less than \mathfrak{c} many sets, can be extended to an ultrafilter with property \mathcal{P} .

The relevant cardinal invariant in our context is the “exterior cofinality” of an ideal. This cardinal was studied by Brendle and Flásková in [28] and by Hong and Zhang in [94].

Definition 6.2. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . The exterior cofinality of \mathcal{I} (also called the generic existence number of \mathcal{I}) is defined as $\mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I}) = \min\{\text{cof}(\mathcal{J}) \mid \mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{J}\}$.

The next lemma is useful to work with the generic existence numbers.

Lemma 6.3. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . The following cardinal invariants are equal.

- (1) $\mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I})$.
- (2) $\min\{\text{cof}(\mathcal{J}) \mid \mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}\}$.
- (3) $\min\{\text{cof}(\mathcal{J}) \mid \mathcal{I} \leq_{KB} \mathcal{J}\}$.

Proof. Denote $\mu = \min\{\text{cof}(\mathcal{J}) \mid \mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}\}$ and $\mu_0 = \min\{\text{cof}(\mathcal{J}) \mid \mathcal{I} \leq_{KB} \mathcal{J}\}$. It is clear that $\mu \leq \mu_0 \leq \mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I})$, so it is enough to prove that $\mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \mu$. Let \mathcal{J} be an ideal such that $\text{cof}(\mathcal{J}) = \mu$ and $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}$. Find $f \in \omega^\omega$ a Katětov function from \mathcal{J} to \mathcal{I} . It follows that $\mathcal{I} \subseteq f(\mathcal{J})$. In this way, $\mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \text{cof}(f(\mathcal{J})) \leq \mu$ (see Lemma 4.21). \square

We now write some basic remarks regarding this cardinal invariant.

Lemma 6.4. Let \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} be tall ideals on ω .

- (1) $\omega_1 \leq \mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \mathfrak{c}$.
- (2) $\text{non}^*(\mathcal{I}) \leq \mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \text{cof}(\mathcal{I})$.
- (3) If $\mathcal{I} \leq_\kappa \mathcal{J}$, then $\mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{J})$.

The following is a very important theorem, which enable us to perform generic existence constructions of ultrafilters.

Theorem 6.5 (Brendle-Flašková [28], Hong-Zhang [94]). *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters exist generically.
- (2) Weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters exist generically.
- (3) $\mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathfrak{c}$.

Proof. Obviously the first point implies the second one. We now argue that point 2 implies point 3 by proving that if $\mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I}) < \mathfrak{c}$, then weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters do not exist generically. Let \mathcal{J} be an ideal extending \mathcal{I} such that $\text{cof}(\mathcal{J}) < \mathfrak{c}$. It is clear that every ultrafilter extending \mathcal{J}^* is not a weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter.

We now prove that if $\mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathfrak{c}$, then \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters exist generically. Let \mathcal{F} be a filter such that $\kappa = \text{cof}(\mathcal{F}) < \mathfrak{c}$. Fix an enumeration $\omega^\omega = \{f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$. We recursively define $\{\mathcal{F}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ a family of filters such that for every $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$, the following holds:

- (1) $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}$.
- (2) If $\xi < \alpha$, then $\mathcal{F}_\xi \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\alpha$.
- (3) If α is limit, then $\mathcal{F}_\alpha = \bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} \mathcal{F}_\xi$.
- (4) $\text{cof}(\mathcal{F}_\alpha) \leq \kappa + |\alpha|$.
- (5) There is $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha+1}$ such that $f_\alpha[A] \in \mathcal{I}$.

Assume \mathcal{F}_α is already defined, we will find $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha+1}$. Since $\text{cof}(\mathcal{F}_\alpha) < \mathfrak{ge}(\mathcal{I})$, it follows that $\mathcal{I} \not\leq_\kappa \mathcal{F}_\alpha^*$. In particular, f_α is not a Katětov function from \mathcal{F}_α^* to \mathcal{I} . This means that there is $A \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha^+$ such that $f_\alpha[A] \in \mathcal{I}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha+1}$ be the filter generated by $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \cup \{A\}$. This finishes the construction.

Any ultrafilter extending $\bigcup_{\alpha < \mathfrak{c}} \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ is an \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter. \square

We now present the following chart, containing some of the ideals and their exterior cofinalities.

Ideal	\mathfrak{ge}	Ultrafilter	Reference
$\text{fin} \times \text{fin}$	\mathfrak{d}	P -point	[94]
conv	\mathfrak{d}	P -point	[28]
\mathcal{ED}	$\text{cov}(\mathcal{M})$	Selective	[94]
\mathcal{R}	$\text{cov}(\mathcal{M})$	Selective	[28]
nwd	$\text{cof}(\mathcal{M})$	Nowhere dense	[27]
mz	$\max\{\text{non}(\mathcal{E}), \mathfrak{d}\}$	Measure zero	[27]

For more computations of the exterior cofinality, see [28].

7. SIMPLE EXISTENCE UNDER PARAMETRIZED DIAMONDS.

Generic existence of \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters is a rather powerful kind of existence when compared to the simple existence of \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters. In this section we turn our

attention to two cardinal invariants on ideals which, in the presence of parametrized diamond principles, imply the simple existence of \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters. The parametrized diamonds are guessing principles introduced by Džamonja, Moore and the third author in [136]. These principles are weakenings of Jensen's diamond, but they have the advantage that they are valid in a large number of models, even in models where the Continuum Hypothesis fails.

Definition 7.1. *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . The cardinal invariant $\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I})$ is defined as follows:*

$$\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I}) = \min\{|\mathcal{D}| : (\forall f \in \omega^\omega)(\exists A \in \mathcal{D})(f[A] \in \mathcal{I})\}$$

Let FtO denote the family of finite to one functions from ω to ω . Then $\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I})$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I}) = \min\{|\mathcal{D}| : (\forall f \in \text{FtO})(\exists A \in \mathcal{D})(f[A] \in \mathcal{I})\}$$

We will now introduce the principles $\diamond(\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I}))$ and $\diamond(\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I}))$ that we will use to build \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters. This is a particular instance of the diamond principles from [136]. We will say that a function $F : 2^{<\omega_1} \rightarrow X$ is a Borel function if for all $\alpha < \omega$, $F \upharpoonright 2^\alpha$ is Borel.

Definition 7.2. *Let \mathcal{I} a Borel ideal. The parametrized diamond principle $\diamond(\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I}))$ is the following assertion:*

- * *For any Borel function $F : 2^{<\omega_1} \rightarrow \omega^\omega$, there is a function $g : \omega_1 \rightarrow [\omega]^\omega$ such that for all $f \in 2^{\omega_1}$ the set $\{\alpha \in \omega_1 : F(f \upharpoonright \alpha)[g(\alpha)] \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is stationary.*

The function g is called a $\diamond(\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I}))$ -guessing sequence.

The principle $\diamond(\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I}))$ is defined in a similar way (the function F takes values in FtO instead of ω^ω).

Proposition 7.3 (C. [34]). *Let \mathcal{I} be a Borel ideal. Then:*

- (1) $\diamond(\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I}))$ *implies the existence of \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters*
- (2) $\diamond(\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I}))$ *implies the existence of weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters.*

Proof. The two proofs are similar, so we only prove the first one. We can assume that the domain of the function F consists of ordered pairs (f, \vec{A}) , where $f \in \omega^\omega$ and $\vec{A} = \langle A_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ is a sequence of countable length of infinite subsets of ω . Define $F(f, \vec{A})$ as follows:

- (1) If \vec{A} is a centered family, let $p(\vec{A})$ be a pseudointersection of $\langle A_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ (defined in a recursive or in a Borel way), and $\varphi_{\vec{A}} : \omega \rightarrow A_\alpha$ be its increasing enumeration. Then make $F(f, \vec{A}) = f \circ \varphi_{\vec{A}}$.
- (2) If \vec{A} is not a centered family, then $F(f, \vec{A}) = id$.

Let g be a $\diamond(\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I}))$ -guessing sequence for F . Then construct a sequence $\vec{B} = \langle B_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1 \rangle$ as follows. Start with $B_n = \omega \setminus n$ and suppose $\langle B_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ has been defined. Then define $B_\alpha = \varphi_{\langle B_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle}[g(\alpha)]$. Clearly, \vec{B} is a \subseteq^* -decreasing sequence of sets, so it is centered.

Let us see that \vec{B} is a witness for $\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I})$. Pick any $f \in \omega^\omega$ and consider (f, \vec{B}) . Then the set $\{\alpha \in \omega_1 : F(f, \vec{B} \upharpoonright \alpha)[g(\alpha)] \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is stationary. Let $\alpha \in \omega_1$ be such that $F(f, \vec{B} \upharpoonright \alpha)[g(\alpha)] \in \mathcal{I}$. Since $\vec{B} \upharpoonright \alpha$ is a centered family, it follows from the definition of F that $F(f, \vec{B} \upharpoonright \alpha) = f \circ \varphi_{\vec{B} \upharpoonright \alpha}$, so $f \circ \varphi_{\langle B_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle}[g(\alpha)] = f[\varphi_{\langle B_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle}[g(\alpha)]] = f[B_\alpha]$, and due to the choice of α , $f[B_\alpha] \in \mathcal{I}$.

Let \mathcal{U} be any ultrafilter extending \vec{B} . It is clear that \mathcal{U} is an \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter. \square

Proposition 7.4 (C. [34]). *Let \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} be ideals on ω . Then:*

- (1) *If $\mathcal{I} \leq_K \mathcal{J}$, then $\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{J}) \leq \mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I})$.*
- (2) *If $\mathcal{I} \leq_{KB} \mathcal{J}$, then $\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{J}) \leq \mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I})$.*

Proposition 7.5 (C. [34]). *If \mathcal{I} is an ideal on ω such that for some $n, k \in \omega$ there exists a coloring $\varphi : [\omega]^n \rightarrow k$ whose homogeneous sets are in the ideal \mathcal{I} , then $\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \max\{\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{r}_\sigma\}$.*

Proposition 7.6 (C. [34]). *For any meager ideal \mathcal{I} , $\min\{\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{d}\} \leq \mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I})$.*

For the next proposition, \mathfrak{r}_{part} is the minimal cardinality of a family $\mathcal{R} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ such that for any partition $\{P_n : n \in \omega\}$ into infinite sets, there is $A \in \mathcal{R}$ such that either, there is $n \in \omega$ such that $A \subseteq P_n$, or for all $n \in \omega$, $A \cap P_n$ is finite.

Proposition 7.7 (C. [34]).

- (1) $\mathfrak{z}(\text{conv}) = \mathfrak{r}_\sigma$.
- (2) $\mathfrak{r} \leq \mathfrak{z}(\text{nwd}) \leq \mathfrak{r}_\sigma$.
- (3) $\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{ED}_{fin}) = \mathfrak{d}$.
- (4) $\mathfrak{z}(\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}) = \mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}) = \mathfrak{r}_{part}$.
- (5) $\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{ED}) = \mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{ED}) = \max\{\mathfrak{r}_{part}, \mathfrak{d}\}$.
- (6) $\max\{\mathfrak{r}_{part}, \mathfrak{d}\} \leq \mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{R}) \leq \mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{R}) \leq \max\{\mathfrak{r}_\sigma, \mathfrak{d}\}$.
- (7) *If \mathcal{I} is an analytic p -ideal, $\min\{\mathfrak{r}_\sigma, \mathfrak{d}\} \leq \mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \mathfrak{d}$.*
- (8) $\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{Z}) = \mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{SC}) = \min\{\mathfrak{r}_\sigma, \mathfrak{d}\}$.

8. HOW DIFFERENT CAN ULTRAFILTERS BE?

At first glance, all ultrafilters might look the same. We may ask, how can we build two really different ultrafilters? From a topological point of view, this question translates to whether ω^* is homogeneous. As mentioned in the introduction, this led Rudin to introduce P -points and thus finding really different ultrafilters under the Continuum Hypothesis. Some time later, Frolik proved from ZFC that ω^* is not homogeneous. Finally, it was Kunen who explicitly found ultrafilters with different topological properties. Van Mill continued with this task by finding many points on ω^* with different topological type (see [139]). Although the question in the topological sense is completely resolved, there are still several criteria for which there is still no complete answer. Naturally, assuming the Continuum Hypothesis, it is possible to build all kind of ultrafilters. So the question really is if we can find a model where all ultrafilters are as similar as possible.

Without a doubt, the best-known types of ultrafilters are the selective, P -points and Q -points. In each case, it is known that its existence cannot be proven from ZFC. In Kunen [119] he proved that in the random model there are no selective ultrafilters. In [141] and [140], Miller proved that there are no Q points in the Laver and Miller models. Finally, Shelah proved (see [192] and [165]) that it is consistent that there are no P -points. In [43] the second author and Chodounský proved that there are no P -points in the Silver model. Regarding nwd -ultrafilters, in Shelah [167] build a model where they do not exist. The method developed by Shelah was later expanded by Brendle in [27]. Recently, the first author build a model where there are no \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters, for any ideal \mathcal{I} that is F_σ .

Regarding the existence of P -points and Q -points, the following is known:

- Proposition 8.1.** (1) $\mathfrak{d} = \omega_1$ implies that there is a Q -point.
 (2) (Ketonen [113]) $\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c}$ implies that there is a P -point.
 (3) In this way, $\mathfrak{c} \leq \omega_2$ implies that there is either a P -point or a Q -point.

The following problem is one of the most important open question regarding ultrafilters on countable sets, see [143]

Problem 8.2. *Is it consistent that there are no P -points and no Q -points?*

One of the first difficulties in building a model where there are no P -points and no Q -points, is that the continuum must be larger than ω_2 . In this way, we can not use usual countable support iterations of proper forcings since they do not allow us to pass ω_2 , while usual finite support iterations are also ruled out since they add Cohen reals. Although Proposition 8.1 points out to a deeper problem. In order to destroy Q -points, we need to add unbounded reals; however, adding unbounded reals cofinally often will create P -points. It is the general belief that it should be possible to build a model without a P -point or a Q -point, but the reality could be completely different.

As we have discussed before, ultrafilters can be classified using Borel ideals and the Katětov order. We may wonder if this classification can be trivial; is it possible that every ultrafilter is Katětov above every tall Borel ideal? (in other words, if every ultrafilter is unremarkable). Is it possible to find a Borel ideal \mathcal{I} for which we can prove in ZFC that \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters exist? According to Theorem 6.5, it is enough to find a Borel ideal for which exterior cofinality is provable to be \mathfrak{c} . An old construction of Pospíšil (see [151]) can be used to find an analytic ideal with that property.

Definition 8.3. Let \mathcal{P} be an independent family. By $\text{Pos}(\mathcal{P})$ denote the ideal generated by $\{A^c \mid A \in \mathcal{I}\} \cup \{\bigcap C \mid C \in [\mathcal{I}]^\omega\}$.

We now have the following:

Proposition 8.4 ([151], [85]). Let \mathcal{P} be an independent family.

- (1) $\text{Pos}(\mathcal{P})$ is a proper ideal.
 (2) If $|\mathcal{P}| = \mathfrak{c}$, then $\text{gc}(\text{Pos}(\mathcal{P})) = \mathfrak{c}$.
 (3) If \mathcal{P} is perfect, then $\text{Pos}(\mathcal{P})$ is an analytic ideal.

Proof. For the first point, we need to prove that $\omega \notin \text{Pos}(\mathcal{P})$. Let $A_0, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{I}$ and $C_0, \dots, C_n \in [\mathcal{I}]^\omega$. We need to show that $X = (\bigcup A_i^c) \cup (\bigcap C_0) \cup \dots \cup (\bigcap C_n)$ is co-infinite. Since each C_i is infinite, we can choose $B_i \in C_i$ such that $B_i \notin \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$. It follows that $(\bigcap C_0) \cup \dots \cup (\bigcap C_n) \subseteq B_0 \cup \dots \cup B_n$. Since \mathcal{I} is independent, $(\bigcup A_i^c) \cup (\bigcup B_i)$ has infinite complement, so we are done.

We now prove the second point by contradiction. Assume that $|\mathcal{P}| = \mathfrak{c}$ and there is an ideal \mathcal{I} with $\text{cof}(\mathcal{I}) < \mathfrak{c}$ and $\text{Pos}(\mathcal{P}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be a base of size less than \mathfrak{c} . It follows that there must be $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\{A_n \mid n \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ such that $A_n^c \subseteq B$ for every $n \in \omega$. In this way, $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} A_n^c \subseteq B$, so $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} A_n^c \in \mathcal{I}$. However, we know that $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} A_n$ is also in \mathcal{I} , which entails that $\omega \in \mathcal{I}$.

We leave the computation of the complexity of the ideal to the reader. \square

We conclude:

Corollary 8.5. *There is an analytic ideal \mathcal{I} for which \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters exist generically.*

We can now obtain a Borel ideal as above appealing to the following theorem of H. Sakai:

Theorem 8.6 (Sakai [163]). *Every analytic ideal is contained in a Borel ideal.*

The theorem of Sakai uses the Luzin separation theorem and does not provide an explicit complexity of the Borel ideal. In [85] the second and third author found a variation $\text{Pos}(\mathcal{P})$ (named $\text{Pos}_B(\mathcal{P})$) that is $F_{\sigma\delta\sigma}$ and extends $\text{Pos}(\mathcal{P})$. In particular, it follows that $\text{gc}(\text{Pos}_B(\mathcal{P})) = \mathfrak{c}$. Hence we conclude:

Theorem 8.7 ([85]). *There is an $F_{\sigma\delta\sigma}$ -ideal \mathcal{I} for which \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters exist generically.*

Moreover, using ideas from [28], it is proved in [85] that the complexity $F_{\sigma\delta\sigma}$ is optimal.

Theorem 8.8 ([85]). *It is consistent that \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters do not exist generically for every $F_{\sigma\delta}$ -ideal \mathcal{I} .*

Of course, the theorem above does not rule out the existence of \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters for $F_{\sigma\delta}$ or even F_σ ideals. In fact, it is not even known if there are \mathcal{Z} -ultrafilters in ZFC.

Problem 8.9 (H. [97]). *Are there \mathcal{Z} -ultrafilters in ZFC?*

Problem 8.10 (G.-H. [85]). *Is it consistent that there are no \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters for any $F_{\sigma\delta}$ -ideal \mathcal{I} ?*

In general, we would like to understand for which Borel ideals \mathcal{I} , does ZFC imply the existence of \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters (or weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters). The case of F_σ ideals was solved by the first author in [35], where it was proved that consistently there are no weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters for any F_σ ideal \mathcal{I} . There is a way to present the results from [35] in an axiomatic framework employing the principle of Near Coherence of Filters.

Definition 8.11 (Blass [16]). *Let \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} be two non-principal ultrafilters on ω . We say that \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are nearly coherent if there is a finite to one function $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ such that $f(\mathcal{U}) = f(\mathcal{V})$.*

The Near Coherence of Filters, denoted by NCF, is the assertion that any two different ultrafilters on ω are nearly coherent.

The NCF principle has some quite interesting consequences, among them we can find the following:

Theorem 8.12 (Blass [16]). *The Near Coherence of Filters principle implies the following:*

- (1) *There are no Q -points.*
- (2) $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{d}$.
- (3) *The P -points are dense in the Rudin-Keisler ordering.*
- (4) *For any family $\{\mathcal{U}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ of ultrafilters where $\lambda < \mathfrak{d}$, there is a finite to one function $h : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ such that for all $\alpha, \beta \in \lambda$, $h(\mathcal{U}_\alpha) = h(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$.*

Theorem 8.13. *Assume NCF and let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω .*

- (1) *If $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I})$, then there is no \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter.*
- (2) *If $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I})$, then there is no weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{U} be an non-principal ultrafilter on ω , we need to find a function $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ such that $\mathcal{I} \cap f(\mathcal{U}) = \emptyset$. Let $\lambda = \mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{I})$. Let \mathcal{V}_0 be an ultrafilter generated by less than λ sets. By NCF, there is a finite to one function $h : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ such that $h(\mathcal{U}) = h(\mathcal{V}_0)$. Since \mathcal{V}_0 is generated by less than λ sets, $h(\mathcal{U})$ is also generated by less than λ sets. Let \mathcal{B} be an ultrafilter base for $h(\mathcal{U})$ of cardinality smaller than λ . Then there is a function $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ such that $f(\mathcal{B}) \cap \mathcal{I} = \emptyset$. Therefore, we also get $f(h(\mathcal{U})) \cap \mathcal{I} = \emptyset$, so $f \circ h$ witnesses \mathcal{U} is not a \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter.

Note that if $\mathfrak{u} < \mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I})$ we can take the function $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ to be finite to one, so $f \circ h$ is finite to one; thus, in this case there are not even weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilters. \square

Note that from Proposition 7.7 we have that $\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{ED}_{fin}) = \mathfrak{d}$. It is well known that in the Miller's model $\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c}$ and the Near Coherence of Filters holds, so the previous theorem gives us a proof that in the Miller's model there is no Q -point. It turns out that this can be generalized to the case of ideals of Borel complexity F_σ .

Theorem 8.14 (C. [35]). *The conjunction of the next assertions is relatively consistent:*

- (1) *The Near Coherence of Filters.*
- (2) *For any F_σ ideal \mathcal{I} , $\mathfrak{z}_{fin}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathfrak{c}$.*

Therefore, it is relatively consistent that for any F_σ ideal \mathcal{I} , there is no weak \mathcal{I} -ultrafilter.

Note that the previous theorem implies that no $F_{\sigma\delta\sigma}$ -ideal from Proposition 8.7 can be extended to an F_σ -ideal.

Another way to classify ultrafilters is with the *Tukey order*, which is used to study directed sets (that is, partial orders in which any two elements have a common upper bound).

Definition 8.15. *Let $\mathbb{D} = (D, \leq_D)$ and $\mathbb{E} = (E, \leq_E)$ two directed partial orders.*

- (1) *Let $f : D \rightarrow E$. We say that f is a cofinal function from \mathbb{D} to \mathbb{E} if it maps cofinal subsets of \mathbb{D} to cofinal subsets of \mathbb{E} .*
- (2) *We say that $\mathbb{E} \leq_T \mathbb{D}$ (\mathbb{E} is Tukey below \mathbb{D}) if there is a cofinal function from \mathbb{D} to \mathbb{E} .*
- (3) *We say \mathbb{E} and \mathbb{D} are Tukey equivalent (denoted $\mathbb{D} =_T \mathbb{E}$) if $\mathbb{E} \leq_T \mathbb{D}$ and $\mathbb{D} \leq_T \mathbb{E}$.*

The Tukey order can be formulated in terms of the Katětov order as follows: for every directed set \mathbb{D} , define $\text{ncf}(\mathbb{D})$ as the ideal on \mathbb{D} of all non cofinal subsets of \mathbb{D} . It follows that $\mathbb{E} \leq_T \mathbb{D}$ if and only if $\text{ncf}(\mathbb{E}) \leq_K \text{ncf}(\mathbb{D})$. Moreover, if we define $\text{bnd}(\mathbb{D})$ as the ideal of bounded subsets of \mathbb{D} , it is also possible to prove that $\mathbb{E} \leq_T \mathbb{D}$ if and only if $\text{bnd}(\mathbb{D}) \leq_K \text{bnd}(\mathbb{E})$. In this way, we get the following:

Lemma 8.16. *Let $\mathbb{D} = (D, \leq_D)$ and $\mathbb{E} = (E, \leq_E)$ two directed partial orders. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathbb{E} \leq_T \mathbb{D}$.
- (2) *There is $f : D \rightarrow E$ that maps cofinal subsets of \mathbb{D} to cofinal subsets of \mathbb{E} .*
- (3) *There is $g : E \rightarrow D$ that maps unbounded subsets of \mathbb{E} to unbounded subsets of \mathbb{D} (a function with this property is called a Tukey function).*

An example of a directed set is $([\kappa]^{<\omega}, \subseteq)$ (where κ is an infinite cardinal). These directed sets play a crucial role in the study of the Tukey order:

Lemma 8.17. *Let $\mathbb{D} = (D, \leq_D)$ be a directed set. If $|D| \leq \kappa$, then $\mathbb{D} \leq_{\mathcal{T}} [\kappa]^{<\omega}$.*

Proof. Take an enumeration (maybe with repetitions) $D = \{d_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \kappa\}$. Define $f : [\kappa]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow D$ such that if $s = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$, then $d_{\alpha_1}, \dots, d_{\alpha_n} \leq_D f(s)$. It is easy to see that f is a cofinal function. \square

The following types of sets are useful:

Definition 8.18. *Let $\mathbb{D} = (D, \leq_D)$ be a directed set. We say that $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ is strongly unbounded if no infinite subset of \mathcal{B} has an upper bound.*

We now have a simple description of the Tukey class of $_{\mathcal{T}}[\kappa]^{<\omega}$.

Lemma 8.19. *Let $\mathbb{D} = (D, \leq_D)$ be a directed set.*

- (1) *If \mathbb{D} has a strongly unbounded subset of size κ , then $[\kappa]^{<\omega} \leq_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{D}$.*
- (2) *If $\mathbb{D} = \kappa$ and has a strongly unbounded subset of size κ , then $[\kappa]^{<\omega} =_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{D}$.*

Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on ω . It follows that \mathcal{U} is a directed set when ordered with the reverse inclusion (it is also a directed set when ordered with inclusion, but a trivial one). It follows that every ultrafilter is Tukey below $[\mathfrak{c}]^{<\omega}$. This is the motivation for the following definition:

Definition 8.20. *Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on ω . We say that \mathcal{U} is Tukey top if $\mathcal{U} =_{\mathcal{T}} [\mathfrak{c}]^{<\omega}$.*

Equivalently, \mathcal{U} is Tukey top if there is $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ of size \mathfrak{c} such that for every $\mathcal{B} \in [\mathcal{W}]^\omega$, we have that $\cap \mathcal{B} \notin \mathcal{U}$.

Proposition 8.21 (Isbell [106]). *There is a Tukey top ultrafilter.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be an independent family of size \mathfrak{c} and \mathcal{U} any ultrafilter extending $\text{Pos}(\mathcal{P})^*$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ is a strongly unbounded set. \square

However, the following is unknown:

Problem 8.22 (Isbell [106]). *Is there a non-Tukey top ultrafilter?*

As far as we know, it might be consistent that all ultrafilters have the same Tukey type. It is known that consistently the problem has an affirmative answer. In fact, Dobrinen and Todorćević proved in [59] that P -points are not Tukey top. They also introduced the following class of ultrafilters:

Definition 8.23. *Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on ω . We say that \mathcal{U} is basically generated if there is a base $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ closed under intersections such that every convergent sequence on \mathcal{B} (when viewed as a subspace of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$) has a bounded (in \mathcal{U}) subsequence.*

This is a variation of the notion of *basic directed set* introduced earlier by Solecki and Todorćević in [173]. The following is proved in [59]:

Proposition 8.24 (Dobrinen-Todorćević [59]). (1) *Every P -point is basically generated.*

- (2) *If \mathcal{U} is basically generated, then $[\omega_1]^{<\omega} \not\leq_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{U}$. In particular, \mathcal{U} is not Tukey top.*

(3) *The class of basically generated ultrafilters is closed under taking limits.*

We would also like to highlight the following (particular case) of a Theorem of Dobrinen and Todorćević, which says that Tukey functions between P -points may be assumed to be continuous:

Theorem 8.25 (Dobrinen-Todorćević [59]). *Let \mathcal{U} be a P -point and \mathcal{V} an ultrafilter such that $\mathcal{V} \leq_T \mathcal{U}$. There is a continuous and monotone $f : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ such that $f \restriction \mathcal{U}$ is a cofinal function from \mathcal{U} to \mathcal{V} .*

Proposition 8.26. *Any non P -point ultrafilter is Tukey above (ω^ω, \leq^*) .*

Proof. Let $\{A_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a partition of ω witnessing \mathcal{U} is not a P -point, and such that $\min(A_n) < \min(A_{n+1})$ for all $n \in \omega$. Then, for each $X \in \mathcal{U}$, there are infinitely many $n \in \omega$ such that $A_n \cap X$ is infinite. For each $X \in \mathcal{U}$, define $f_X : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ as $f_X(n) = \min A_{k_n} \cap X$ where $k_n \in \omega$ is the minimal $l \geq n$ such that $X \cap A_l$ is infinite. Let us see that any cofinal $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, the set $\{f_X : X \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is cofinal in (ω^ω, \leq^*) . Fix $h \in \omega^\omega$, define $X^h = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} A_n \setminus h(n)$. We can assume h is strictly increasing. Since $\{A_n : n \in \omega\}$ witness \mathcal{U} is not a P -point, we have $X^h \in \mathcal{U}$. Since \mathcal{D} is cofinal in \mathcal{U} , there is $B \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $B \subseteq X^h$. It is easy to see that $h \leq f_B$. \square

Proposition 8.27. *It is consistent that all ultrafilters are Tukey above (ω^ω, \leq^*) .*

To learn more about the Tukey order on ultrafilters, the reader may consult the paper [59], the survey [57] and the references in there.

It has been very fruitful to study the preservation of ultrafilters under forcing. Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on ω and \mathbb{P} a forcing notion. Unless \mathbb{P} does not add new reals, \mathcal{U} will no longer be an ultrafilter after forcing with \mathbb{P} . However, it might still generate an ultrafilter.

Definition 8.28. *\mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on ω and \mathbb{P} a partial order. We say that \mathbb{P} preserves \mathcal{U} if \mathcal{U} generates an ultrafilter after forcing with \mathbb{P} . Equivalently, for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and \dot{X} such that $p \Vdash \dot{X} \subseteq \omega$, there are $q \leq p$ and $A \in \mathcal{U}$ such that either $q \Vdash A \subseteq \dot{X}$ or $q \Vdash A \cap \dot{X} = \emptyset$.*

Evidently, if \mathbb{P} does not add new reals, then \mathbb{P} preserves all ultrafilters. On the other hand, any filter adding either a Cohen, random or dominating real will destroy all ultrafilters. As it is often the case, preservation under Sacks forcing is particularly interesting, as we will now see. The following theorem is basically a compilation of results obtained independently by Miller, Eisworth (unpublished) and Yiparaki.

Theorem 8.29 (Eisworth, Miller [142], Yiparaki [191]). *Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on ω . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Sacks forcing preserves \mathcal{U} .*
- (2) *There is a forcing \mathbb{P} that adds reals and preserves \mathcal{U} .*
- (3) *For every $p \in \mathbb{S}$ and $c : p \longrightarrow 2$, there is $q \leq p$ and $A \in \mathcal{U}$ such that c is constant on $q \restriction A$.*
- (4) *For every $p \in \mathbb{S}$, there is $q \leq p$ and $A \in \mathcal{U}$ such that either $A \subseteq x$ for every $x \in [q]$ or $A \cap x = \emptyset$ for every $x \in [q]$.*

It is interesting to compare \mathbb{S} preservability with being Tukey top.

Corollary 8.30. *Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on ω .*

- (1) The following are equivalent:
 - (a) \mathcal{U} is Tukey top.
 - (b) There is $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ of size \mathfrak{c} such that if $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is infinite, then $\bigcap \mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{U}^*$.
- (2) The following are equivalent:
 - (a) \mathcal{U} is not preserved by Sacks forcing.
 - (b) There is a perfect $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ such that if $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ is perfect, then $\bigcap \mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{U}^*$.

Although both notions are strikingly similar, it is not obvious if there is any implication between them.

Problem 8.31 (Blass). *What is the relationship between being preserved by Sacks forcing and not being Tukey top?*

It was proved by Bartoszyński, Goldstern, Judah and Shelah (see the Theorem 6.2.2 in the book [3]) that there is an analytic ideal \mathcal{I} such that every ultrafilter \mathcal{U} extending \mathcal{I}^* is not preserved by Sacks forcing (equivalently, is not preserved by any forcing adding new reals). It then follows by Theorem 8.6 that there is a Borel ideal with this property. It was realized by Chodounský, the second and third authors that the density zero filter has this property. In fact, the same is true for being Tukey top.

Theorem 8.32 (Chodounský-G-H [44]). *If \mathcal{U} is not a \mathcal{Z} -ultrafilter (in particular, if $\mathcal{Z}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U}$), then \mathcal{U} is both Tukey top and destroyed by Sacks forcing.*

Proof. For every $n \in \omega$, define $P_n = [2^n, 2^{n+1})$ and $\sigma_n : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $\sigma_n(A) = \frac{|A \cap P_n|}{2^n}$. For $A \subseteq \omega$, denote $\sigma(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n(A \cap P_n)$ in case the limit exists. In this way, \mathcal{Z} is the set of all $A \subseteq \omega$ such that $\sigma(A) = 0$. We now have the following:

Claim 8.33. *There is $p \in \mathbb{S}$ such that:*

- (1) *If $x \in [p]$, then $\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{2}$.*
- (2) *If $\mathcal{B} \subseteq [p]$ is infinite, then $\sigma(\bigcup \mathcal{B}) = 1$ and $\sigma(\bigcap \mathcal{B}) = 0$.*

The idea is to build p such that all any n of its branches are “independent” in almost all of the P_m . The precise construction can be consulted in [44].

Now, let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter such that $\mathcal{Z} \leq_K \mathcal{U}^*$. Pick $f \in \omega^\omega$ a Katětov function and fix p the Sacks tree constructed above. Given $x \in [p]$, denote $x^0 = x$ and $x^1 = \omega \setminus x$. Find $i_x \in 2$ such that $f^{-1}(x^{i_x}) \in \mathcal{U}$. In this way, we can find $i \in 2$ such that $\mathcal{B} = \{x \in [p] \mid i_x = i\}$ has size \mathfrak{c} . For concreteness, assume that $i = 1$ (the other case is similar). We claim that $\{f^{-1}(x^1) \mid x \in \mathcal{B}\} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ is strongly unbounded. Let $\{x_n \mid n \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $C = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} f^{-1}(x_n^1)$. We now have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 f[C] &= f\left[\bigcap_{n \in \omega} f^{-1}(x_n^1)\right] \subseteq \bigcap_{n \in \omega} f[f^{-1}(x_n^1)] \subseteq \\
 &\subseteq \bigcap_{n \in \omega} x_n^1 = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} x_n^c = \left(\bigcup_{n \in \omega} x_n\right)^c
 \end{aligned}$$

So $f[C] \in \mathcal{Z}$. Since f is a Katětov function, we conclude that $C \in \mathcal{U}^*$. The proof that \mathcal{U} is Sacks destructible is similar (see [44] for more details). \square

It was proved by Baumgartner and Laver in [6] that Ramsey ultrafilters are Sacks indestructible. It was later noted that P -points are enough for Sacks preservation. In this way, it is consistent that there are Sacks indestructible ultrafilters. However, the following is unknown:

Problem 8.34 (Miller [142]). *Is it consistent that there are no Sacks indestructible ultrafilters?*

Although Sacks indestructible ultrafilters are very interesting, the indestructibility of P -points is the one that has been studied the most. Miller proved the following theorem:

Theorem 8.35 (Miller [140]). (1) *Let \mathbb{P} be a partial order. If \mathbb{P} adds an unbounded real, then \mathbb{P} destroys all non P -point.*
 (2) *Miller forcing preserves an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} if and only if \mathcal{U} is a P -point.*

It follows by the previous Theorem that if $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}$ is never preserved by Miller forcing, even if \mathcal{U} is preserved. In contrast, if \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are preserved by Sacks forcing, then $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$ is also preserved. One of the reasons that the preservation of P -points is so important is that this property can be iterated, as was proved by Blass and Shelah.

Theorem 8.36 (Blass-Shelah, see [165]). *Let $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \delta \rangle$ be a countable support iteration of proper forcings and \mathcal{U} a P -point. If for every $\alpha < \delta$, we have that $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \Vdash \dot{Q}_\alpha$ preserves \mathcal{U} , then \mathbb{P}_δ preserves \mathcal{U} .*

Since most of our tools for preserving ultrafilters use P -points, it is natural to ask the following:

Problem 8.37 (Nyikos). *Is it consistent that there is an ultrafilter generated by ω_1 many sets, yet there are no P -points?*

A positive solution to this problem was announced in [168], but it has not been published at the moment this paper was written. Zapletal studied the preservation of P -points and Ramsey ultrafilters under definable forcing. In case where a forcing is suitable definable, preservation of this kind of ultrafilters is equivalent to simpler and easier to check conditions.

Theorem 8.38 ((CH+LC) (Zapletal, [194])). *Let \mathbb{P} be a suitably definable proper forcing. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathbb{P} preserves all P -points.
- (2) \mathbb{P} does not add a splitting real and has the weak Laver property.

Theorem 8.39 ((LC) (Zapletal, [193])). *Let \mathbb{P} be a suitably definable proper forcing and \mathcal{U} a Ramsey ultrafilter. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathbb{P} preserves \mathcal{U} and it generates a Ramsey ultrafilter in the extension.
- (2) \mathbb{P} does not add a splitting real and is ω^ω -bounding.

The LC above denotes a large cardinal hypothesis. In practice, it is often the case that no large cardinals are needed at all. The reader may find more information (as well as the definition of the undefined notions) in Zapletal's book [193].

We started this section wondering how different ultrafilters can be. It is worth pointing out that all selective ultrafilters are equal in some sense. This can be seen from the following theorem of Todorćević:

Theorem 8.40 ((LC) Todorćevic, see [66]). *Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{U} is selective.
- (2) \mathcal{U} is $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$ -generic over $L(\mathbb{R})$.

A similar characterization of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathcal{I}$ generic ultrafilters for \mathcal{I} an F_σ -ideal was found by Chodounský and Zapletal in [45].

REFERENCES

- [1] Balcar, Bohuslav; Pelant, Jan; Simon, Petr The space of ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} covered by nowhere dense sets. *Fund. Math.* 110 (1980), no. 1, 11–24.
- [2] Stefan Banach and Kazimierz Kuratowski, Sur une généralisation du problème de la mesure, *Fund. Math.* 14 (1929), 127–131.
- [3] Bartoszyński, Tomek; Judah, Haim Set theory. On the structure of the real line. A K Peters, Ltd., Wellesley, MA, 1995. xii+546 pp. ISBN: 1-56881-044-X
- [4] Bartoszyński, Tomek ; Shelah, Saharon . On the density of Hausdorff ultrafilters. *Logic Colloquium 2004*, 18–32, *Lect. Notes Log.*, 29, Assoc. Symbol. Logic, Chicago, IL, 2008.
- [5] Baumgartner, James E. Ultrafilters on ω . *J. Symbolic Logic* 60 (1995), no. 2, 624–639.
- [6] Baumgartner, James E.; Laver, Richard Iterated perfect-set forcing. *Ann. Math. Logic* 17 (1979), no. 3, 271–288.
- [7] Baumgartner, James E.; Taylor, Alan D. Partition theorems and ultrafilters. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 241 (1978), 283–309.
- [8] Benedikt, Michael Abraham Nonstandard analysis and special ultrafilters. Thesis (Ph.D.)–The University of Wisconsin - Madison. 1993. 149 pp
- [9] Michael Benedikt, Ultrafilters which extend measures, *J. Symb. Log.*, 63 (1998), no. 2, 638–662.
- [10] G. Birkhoff. Moore-Smith Convergence in General Topology. *Ann. of Math.*, Jan., 1937, Second Series, Vol. 38, No. 1 (Jan., 1937), pp. 39–56.
- [11] Blass, Andreas Raphael ORDERINGS OF ULTRAFILTERS. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Harvard University. 1970.
- [12] Blass, Andreas. Combinatorial cardinal characteristics of the continuum. *Handbook of set theory*. Vols. 1, 2, 3, 395–489, Springer, Dordrecht, 2010
- [13] Blass, Andreas The Rudin-Keisler ordering of P-points. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 179 (1973), 145–166.
- [14] Blass, Andreas A model-theoretic view of some special ultrafilters. *Logic Colloquium '77* (Proc. Conf., Wrocław, 1977), pp. 79–90, *Stud. Logic Found. Math.*, 96, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1978.
- [15] Blass, Andreas. Some initial segments of the Rudin-Keisler ordering. *J. Symbolic Logic* 46 (1981), no. 1, 147–157.
- [16] Blass, Andreas. Near coherence of filters. I. Cofinal equivalence of models of arithmetic. *Notre Dame J. Formal Logic* 27 (1986), no. 4, 579–591.
- [17] Blass, Andreas Ultrafilters and set theory. *Ultrafilters across mathematics*, 49–71, *Contemp. Math.*, 530, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [18] Blass, Andreas; Dobrinen, Natasha; Raghavan, Dilip The next best thing to a P-point. *J. Symb. Log.* 80 (2015), no. 3, 866–900.
- [19] Blass, Andreas ; Hindman, Neil . Sums of ultrafilters and the Rudin-Keisler and Rudin-Frolík orders. *General topology and applications* (Middletown, CT, 1988), 59–70, *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, 123, Dekker, New York, 1990.
- [20] Blass, Andreas ; Hrušák, Michael ; Verner, Jonathan . On strong P-points. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 141 (2013), no. 8, 2875–2883.
- [21] Blass, Andreas ; Shelah, Saharon . There may be simple P_{\aleph_1} - and P_{\aleph_2} -points and the Rudin-Keisler ordering may be downward directed. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 33 (1987), no. 3, 213–243.
- [22] Błaszczyk, Aleksander; Shelah, Saharon Regular subalgebras of complete Boolean algebras. *J. Symbolic Logic* 66 (2001), no. 2, 792–800.

- [23] Booth, David Douglas COUNTABLY INDEXED ULTRAFILTERS. Thesis (Ph.D.)—The University of Wisconsin - Madison. 1969. 50 pp
- [24] David Booth, "Ultrafilters on a countable sets," *Ann. Math. Logic* 2 (1970) 1–24.
- [25] Borodulin-Nadzieja, Piotr; Farkas, Barnabás Cardinal coefficients associated to certain orders on ideals. *Arch. Math. Logic* 51 (2012), no. 1-2, 187–202.
- [26] Christian Bräuninger, Heike Mildenberger, A simple P_{\aleph_1} -point and a simple P_{\aleph_1} -point. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 25 (2023), no. 12, pp. 4971–4996
- [27] Brendle, Jörg Between P-points and nowhere dense ultrafilters. *Israel J. Math.* 113 (1999), 205–230.
- [28] Brendle, Jörg; Flašková, Jana Generic existence of ultrafilters on the natural numbers. *Fund. Math.* 236 (2017), no. 3, 201–245.
- [29] Brendle, Jörg; Farkas, Barnabás; Verner, Jonathan Towers in filters, cardinal invariants, and Luzin type families. *J. Symb. Log.* 83 (2018), no. 3, 1013–1062.
- [30] Brendle, Jörg ; Parente, Francesco . Orderings of ultrafilters on Boolean algebras. *Topology Appl.* 323 (2023), Paper No. 108279, 16 pp.
- [31] Brendle, Jörg ; Shelah, Saharon . Ultrafilters on ω —their ideals and their cardinal characteristics. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 351 (1999), no. 7, 2643–2674.
- [32] Brendle, Jörg ; Yatabe, Shunsuke. Forcing indestructibility of MAD families. (English summary) *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 132 (2005), no. 2-3, 271–312.
- [33] Butkovičová, Eva . A remark on incomparable ultrafilters in the Rudin-Keisler order. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 112 (1991), no. 2, 577–578.
- [34] Cancino-Manríquez, J., Combinatorial properties of filters and ideals, Thesis (Ph.D.)-PCCM UMSNH-UNAM, 2021.
- [35] Cancino-Manríquez, J. Every maximal ideal may be Katětov above of all F_σ ideals. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 375 (2022), no. 3, 1861–1881.
- [36] Cancino-Manríquez, J. (2022). \mathcal{I} -Ultrafilters in the Rational Perfect set model. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 1–20. doi:10.1017/jsl.2022.81
- [37] Cancino, Jonathan; Guzmán, Osvaldo; Miller, Arnold W. Ideal independent families and the ultrafilter number. *J. Symb. Log.* 86 (2021), no. 1, 128–136.
- [38] Canjar, R. Michael, Mathias forcing which does not add dominating reals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 104 (1988), no. 4, 1239–1248.
- [39] H. Cartan. Théorie des filtres. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 205:595–598, 1937.
- [40] H. Cartan. Filtrés et ultrafiltrés. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 205:777–779, 1937.
- [41] E. Čech, On bicomact spaces. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 38 (1937), no. 4, 823–844.
- [42] Chetcuti, Emmanuel; Zamora-Aviles, Beatriz On the commutant of $B(H)$ in its ultrapower. *Israel J. Math.* 255 (2023), no. 1, 423–451.
- [43] Chodounský, David; Guzmán, Osvaldo There are no P-points in Silver extensions. *Israel J. Math.* 232 (2019), no. 2, 759–773.
- [44] Chodounský, David; Guzmán, Osvaldo; Hrušák, Michael HL ideals and Sacks indestructible ultrafilters. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 175 (2024), no. 1, part B, Paper No. 103326, 16 pp.
- [45] Chodounský, David ; Zapletal, Jindřich. Ideals and their generic ultrafilters. *Notre Dame J. Form. Log.* 61 (2020), no. 3, 403–408.
- [46] G. Choquet, Construction d'ultrafiltres sur \mathbb{N} , *Bull. Sci. Math.* (2) 92 (1968), 41–48.
- [47] G. Choquet, Deux classes remarquables d'ultrafiltres sur \mathbb{N} , *Bull. Sci. Math.* (2) 92 (1968), 147–153.
- [48] Comfort, W. W.; Negrepontis, S. The theory of ultrafilters. *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Band 211. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1974. x+482 pp.
- [49] Coplakova, Eva; Hart, Klaas Pieter Crowded rational ultrafilters. Special issue in honor of W. W. Comfort (Curacao, 1996).
- [50] M. Dagenet, Etude combinatoire et topologique des filtres sur \mathbb{N} , Thèse, Paris, 1976.
- [51] Dagenet, Maryvonne Rapport entre l'ensemble des ultrafiltres admettant un ultrafiltre donné pour image et l'ensemble des images de cet ultrafiltre. (French) *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae* 16 (1975), 99–113.
- [52] Dagenet, Maryvonne Emploi des filtres sur \mathbb{N} dans l'étude descriptive des fonctions. (French) *Fund. Math.* 95 (1977), no. 1, 11–33.

- [53] Maryvonne Dagenet, Ultrafiltres à la façon de Ramsey, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 250 (1979) 91–120.
- [54] R. Dedekind, Sur la théorie des nombres entiers algébriques, *Bulletin des sciences mathématiques et astronomiques*, tome 11 (1876), p. 278–288.
- [55] Devlin, Denis Campau SOME PARTITION THEOREMS AND ULTRAFILTERS ON OMEGA. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Dartmouth College. 1980. 153 pp
- [56] Mauro Di Nasso and Marco Forti, Hausdorff ultrafilters, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 134 (2006) 1809–1818.
- [57] Dobrinen, Natasha Survey on the Tukey theory of ultrafilters. *Zb. Rad. (Beogr.)* 17(25) (2015), Selected topics in combinatorial analysis, 53–80.
- [58] Dobrinen, Natasha High dimensional Ellentuck spaces and initial chains in the Tukey structure of non-p-points. *J. Symb. Log.* 81 (2016), no. 1, 237–263.
- [59] Dobrinen, Natasha; Todorčević, Stevo Tukey types of ultrafilters. *Illinois J. Math.* 55 (2011), no. 3, 907–951 (2013).
- [60] Dobrinen, Natasha; Todorčević, Stevo A new class of Ramsey-classification theorems and their application in the Tukey theory of ultrafilters, Part 1. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 366 (2014), no. 3, 1659–1684.
- [61] Dobrinen, Natasha; Todorčević, Stevo A new class of Ramsey-classification theorems and their applications in the Tukey theory of ultrafilters, Part 2. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 367 (2015), no. 7, 4627–4659.
- [62] E.K. van Douwen, Better closed ultrafilters on \mathbb{Q} , *Topology Appl.* 47 (1992) 173–177.
- [63] Dow, Alan $\beta\mathbb{N}$. The work of Mary Ellen Rudin (Madison, WI, 1991), 47–66, *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.*, 705, New York Acad. Sci., New York, 1993.
- [64] Eisworth, Todd Selective ultrafilters and $\rightarrow()$. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 127 (1999), no. 10, 3067–3071.
- [65] R. Engelking, *General Topology*. Translated from the Polish by the author. Second edition. Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics, 6. Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989. viii+529 pp.
- [66] Farah, Ilija. Semiselective coideals. *Mathematika* 45 (1998), no. 1, 79–103
- [67] I. Farah, N. C. Phillips and J. Steprans, The commutant of $L(H)$ in its ultrapower may or may not be trivial, *Mathematische Annalen* 347 (2010), 839–857.
- [68] Fernández-Bretón, David J.; Hrušák, Michael Michael Gruff ultrafilters. *Topology Appl.* 210 (2016), 355–365.
- [69] Filipów, Rafał; Kowitz, Krzysztof; Kwela, Adam Characterizing existence of certain ultrafilters. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 173 (2022), no. 9, Paper No. 103157, 31 pp.
- [70] Jana Flašková, More than a 0-point, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.* 47 (2006), no. 4, 617–621.
- [71] J. Flašková, Description of some ultrafilters via I-ultrafilters, in: *Combinatorial and Descriptive Set Theory*, in: *RIMS Kōkyūroku*, vol. 1619, 2008, pp. 20–31.
- [72] Jana Flašková, Ultrafilters and small sets, Ph.D. thesis, Charles University in Prague, 2006.
- [73] Jana Flašková, The relation of rapid ultrafilters and \mathbb{Q} -points to van der Waerden ideal, *Acta Univ. Carol., Math. Phys.* 51 (suppl.) (2010) 19–27.
- [74] Jana Flašková, Rapid ultrafilters and summable ideals, *arXiv*, August 2012.
- [75] Fremlin, D. H. Measure-centering ultrafilters. *Ultrafilters across mathematics*, 73–120, *Contemp. Math.*, 530, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [76] Frolík, Zdeněk Sums of ultrafilters. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 73 (1967), 87–91.
- [77] García-Ferreira, Salvador Various orderings on the space of ultrafilters. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Wesleyan University. 1990. 196 pp
- [78] Goldberg, Gabriel The Ultrapower Axiom. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Harvard University. 2019. 423 pp.
- [79] Goldberg, Gabriel The ultrapower axiom. *De Gruyter Series in Logic and its Applications*, 10. De Gruyter, Berlin, [2022], ©2022. x+323 pp.
- [80] Goldbring, Isaac, Ultrafilters throughout mathematics *American Mathematical Society’s Graduate Studies in Mathematics series*, Volume 220 (2022).
- [81] Goldstern, M.; Shelah, S. Ramsey ultrafilters and the reaping number - $\text{Con}(\mathfrak{r} < \mathfrak{u})$. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 49 (1990), no. 2, 121–142.

- [82] Grebík, Jan; Vidnyánszky, Zoltán Tall F_σ subideals of tall analytic ideals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 151 (2023), no. 9, 4043–4046.
- [83] Gryzlov A.A., On theory of the space $\beta\mathbb{N}$, *General Topology (Russian)*, 166, Moskov. Gos. Univ., Moscow, 1986, pp. 20–34.
- [84] Guzmán, Osvaldo The ultrafilter number and \mathfrak{hm} . *Canad. J. Math.* 75 (2023), no. 2, 494–530.
- [85] Guzmán, Osvaldo; Hrušák, Michael On Pospíšil ideals. *Topology Appl.* 259 (2019), 242–250.
- [86] Guzmán, Osvaldo; Kalajdziejewski, Damjan The ultrafilter and almost disjointness numbers. *Adv. Math.* 386 (2021), Paper No. 107805, 41 pp.
- [87] K. P. Hart, J. van Mill, Problems on $\beta\mathbb{N}$, *Top. Appl.* (2024), to appear.
- [88] E. Hewitt, Rings of real-valued continuous functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 64 (1948), 45–99.
- [89] Hernández-Hernández, Fernando; Hrušák, Michael. Cardinal invariants of analytic P -ideals. *Canad. J. Math.* 59 (2007), no. 3, 575–595.
- [90] Hong, Jianyong; Zhang, Shuguo. Cardinal invariants related to the I -ultrafilters. *Scientia Sinica Mathematica.* (2013) 43. 1. 10.1360/012011-656.
- [91] Hindman, Neil Finite sums from sequences within cells of a partition of \mathbb{N} . *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A* 17 (1974), 1–11.
- [92] Hindman, Neil . Is there a point of ω^* that sees all others? *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 104 (1988), no. 4, 1235–1238.
- [93] Hindman, Neil; Strauss, Dona, *Algebra in the Stone-Čech compactification. Theory and applications.* De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, 27. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1998. xiv+485 pp.
- [94] Hong, Jianyong; Zhang, Shuguo. Cardinal invariants related to the I -ultrafilters. *Scientia Sinica Mathematica.* (2013) 43. 1. 10.1360/012011-656.
- [95] Hong, Jianyong; Zhang, Shuguo Relations between the I -ultrafilters. *Arch. Math. Logic* 56 (2017), no. 1-2, 161–173.
- [96] Hrušák, Michael Combinatorics of filters and ideals. *Set theory and its applications*, 29–69, *Contemp. Math.*, 533, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.
- [97] Hrušák, Michael Katětov order on Borel ideals. *Arch. Math. Logic* 56 (2017), no. 7-8, 831–847.
- [98] Michael Hrušák and David Meza-Alcántara, Katětov order, Fubini property and Hausdorff ultrafilters, *Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste* 44 (2012), 503–511.
- [99] Hrušák, Michael; Meza-Alcántara, David; Minami, Hiroaki Pair-splitting, pair-reaping and cardinal invariants of F_σ -ideals. *J. Symbolic Logic* 75 (2010), no. 2, 661–677.
- [100] Hrušák, Michael; Minami, Hiroaki Mathias-Prikry and Laver-Prikry type forcing. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 165 (2014), no. 3, 880–894.
- [101] Hrušák, Michael; Saenz, Luis David. Some applications of Q -points and Lebesgue filters to Banach spaces. To appear in *Extracta Mathematicae* (2024), 11pp.
- [102] Hrušák, M.; Sanchis, M.; Tamariz-Mascarúa, Á. Ultrafilters, monotone functions and pseudocompactness. *Arch. Math. Logic* 44 (2005), no. 2, 131–157.
- [103] Hrušák, Michael ; Verner, Jonathan L. Adding ultrafilters by definable quotients. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* (2) 60 (2011), no. 3, 445–454.
- [104] Hrušák, Michael; Zapletal, Jindřich Forcing with quotients. *Arch. Math. Logic* 47 (2008), no. 7-8, 719–739.
- [105] Isbell, J. R. The category of cofinal types. II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 116 (1965), 394–416.
- [106] Isbell, J. R. The category of cofinal types. II, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 116 (1965), 394–416
- [107] Katětov, M., A theorem on mappings. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae* 8 (1967), 431–433.
- [108] Katětov, Miroslav, Products of filters. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae* 9 (1968), 173–189.
- [109] Keisler, H. Jerome, Ultraproducts and elementary classes. *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A* 64. *Indag. Math.* 23 (1961), 477–495.
- [110] H. J. Keisler, Mimeographed Lecture Notes, U.C.L.A. 1967

- [111] Keisler, H. Jerome, The Ultraproduct Construction. In "Ultrafilters Across Mathematics", ed. by V. Bergelson et. al., Contemporary Mathematics 530 (2010), pp. 163–179, Amer. Math. Soc.
- [112] Ketonen, Jussi Antero EVERYTHING YOU WANTED TO KNOW ABOUT ULTRAFILTERS—BUT WERE AFRAID TO ASK. Thesis (Ph.D.)—The University of Wisconsin - Madison. 1971. 61 pp
- [113] Jussi Ketonen, "On the existence of P-points," *Fund. Math.* 92 (1976) 91–94.
- [114] Kowitz, Krzysztof The relationship between D_{fin} -ultrafilter and Q-point. *Topology Appl.* 335 (2023), Paper No. 108597, 8 pp.
- [115] Krautzberger, Peter, Flat ultrafilters follow-up (2011), <https://www.peterkrautzberger.org/0083/>.
- [116] Krautzberger, Peter, Flat Ultrafilters (Michigan Logic Seminar Sept 21, 2011), <https://www.peterkrautzberger.org/0082/>.
- [117] E.E. Kummer, Über die Zerlegung der aus Wurzeln der Einheit gebildeten complexen Zahlen in ihre Primfactoren, *Jour. für Math. (Crelle)* 35 (1847) 327–367.
- [118] Kunen, Kenneth, Ultrafilters and independent sets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 172 (1972), 299–306.
- [119] Kenneth Kunen, Some points in $\beta\mathbb{N}$, *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.* 78 (1980) 385–398.
- [120] Kenneth Kunen, Weak P-points on \mathbb{N}^* , *Topology*, Vol. II (Proc. Fourth Colloq. Budapest, 1978), ed. Á. Császár, North-Holland, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai 23, (1980) 741–749.
- [121] Kuzeljevic, Borisa; Raghavan, Dilip A long chain of P-points. *J. Math. Log.* 18 (2018), no. 1, 1850004, 38 pp.
- [122] Laflamme, Claude COMPLETE COMBINATORICS FOR ULTRAFILTERS AND THE RUDIN-KEISLER ORDERING. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Michigan. 1987. 88 pp
- [123] Laflamme, Claude . Forcing with filters and complete combinatorics. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 42 (1989), no. 2, 125–163.
- [124] Laflamme, Claude . Upward directedness of the Rudin-Keisler ordering of P-points. *J. Symbolic Logic* 55 (1990), no. 2, 449–456.
- [125] Laflamme, Claude . A few special ordinal ultrafilters. *J. Symbolic Logic* 61 (1996), no. 3, 920–927.
- [126] Laflamme, Claude ; Zhu, Jian-Ping . The Rudin-Blass ordering of ultrafilters. *J. Symbolic Logic* 63 (1998), no. 2, 584–592.
- [127] Chris Lambie-Hanson, Ultrafilters II: Origin Story, Point at Infinity blog, <https://pointatinfinityblog.wordpress.com/2016/05/12/ultrafilters-ii-origin-story/> (2016).
- [128] H. Lebesgue, Leçons sur l'intégration et la recherche des fonctions primitives, Gauthier-Villars, 1904.
- [129] J. Łoś, Quelques remarques, théorèmes et problèmes sur les classes définissables d'algèbres. (1955) 98–113. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam.
- [130] Louveau, Alain, Ultrafiltres absolus. Séminaire Choquet, 10e année (1970/71), Initiation à l'analyse, Fasc. 1, Exp. No. 11, 11 pp., Secrétariat Math., Paris, 1971.
- [131] Machura, Michał ; Starosolski, Andrzej . How high can Baumgartner's I-ultrafilters lie in the P-hierarchy? *Arch. Math. Logic* 54 (2015), no. 5-6, 555–569.
- [132] Mazur, Krzysztof. F_σ -ideals and $\omega_1\omega_1^*$ -gaps in the Boolean algebras $P(\omega)/I$. *Fund. Math.* 138 (1991), no. 2, 103–111.
- [133] Mathias, A. R. D. Solution of problems of Choquet and Puritz. Conference in Mathematical Logic—London '70 (Proc. Conf., Bedford Coll., London, 1970), pp. 204–210, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 255, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1972.
- [134] Adrian Mathias, Happy families, *Ann. Math. Logic* 12 (1977) 59–111.
- [135] Medini, Andrea The topology of ultrafilters as subspaces of the Cantor set and other topics. Thesis (Ph.D.)—The University of Wisconsin - Madison. 2013.
- [136] Moore, Justin Tatch; Hrušák, Michael; Dzamonja, Mirna. Parametrized diamondsuit-principles. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 356 (2004), no. 6, 2281–2306.
- [137] Mildenberger, Heike On Milliken-Taylor ultrafilters. *Notre Dame J. Form. Log.* 52 (2011), no. 4, 381–394.

- [138] van Mill, Jan A remark on the Rudin-Keisler order of ultrafilters. *Houston J. Math.* 9 (1983), no. 1, 125–129.
- [139] van Mill, Jan, An introduction to $\beta\omega$. *Handbook of set-theoretic topology*, 503–567, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [140] Arnold W. Miller. Rational perfect set forcing. In *Axiomatic set theory* (Boulder, Colo., 1983), volume 31 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 143–159. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1984.
- [141] Arnold Miller, There are no Q-points in Laver’s model for the Borel conjecture, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 78 (1980) 103–106.
- [142] Arnold W. Miller. Ultrafilters with property (s). *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 137(9):3115–3121, 2009.
- [143] Arnold W. Miller. Arnie Miller’s problem list. *Set theory of the reals* (Ramat Gan, 1991), 645–654, *Israel Math. Conf. Proc.*, 6, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1993.
- [144] Milovich, David. Tukey classes of ultrafilters on ω . *Spring Topology and Dynamics Conference. Topology Proc.* 32 (2008), Spring, 351–362.
- [145] Mokobodzki, Gabriel, Ultrafiltres rapides sur \mathbb{N} . *Construction d’une densité relative de deux potentiels comparables. Séminaire de Théorie du Potentiel*, dirigé par M. Brelot, G. Choquet et J. Deny, 12e année: 1967/68, Exp. 12, 22 pp., Secrétariat mathématique, Paris, 1969.
- [146] E. H. Moore, and H. L. Smith, A general theory of limits, *Am. Jour. of Math.* 44 (1922), 102–121.
- [147] Neeman, Itay Ultrafilters and large cardinals. *Ultrafilters across mathematics*, 181–200, *Contemp. Math.*, 530, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [148] Nyikos, Peter Special ultrafilters and cofinal subsets of $(\omega^\omega, <^*)$. *Arch. Math. Logic* 59 (2020), no. 7-8, 1009–1026.
- [149] R. A. Pitt, The classification of ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} , Ph.D. Thesis, University of Leicester, 1971
- [150] B. Pospíšil, Remark on bicomact spaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 38 (1937), no. 4, 845–846.
- [151] B. Pospíšil, On bicomact spaces. *Publ. Fac. Sci. Univ. Masaryk 1939* (1939), no. 270, 16 pp.
- [152] Raghavan, Dilip ; Shelah, Saharon . On embedding certain partial orders into the P-points under Rudin-Keisler and Tukey reducibility. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 369 (2017), no. 6, 4433–4455.
- [153] Raghavan, Dilip ; Todorcevic, Stevo . Cofinal types of ultrafilters. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 163 (2012), no. 3, 185–199.
- [154] F. Riesz, Stetigkeitsbegriff und abstrakte Mengenlehre, *Atti IV Congr. Internat. Mat. (Roma 1908)*, vol. 2, 18–24.
- [155] Rosen, Ned Ira WEAKLY RAMSEY ULTRAFILTERS AND P POINTS. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Michigan. 1980. 204 pp, ProQuest LLC Review PDF Clipboard Series Thesis
- [156] Rosen, Ned I. Weakly Ramsey P points. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 269 (1982), no. 2, 415–427.
- [157] Rosen, Ned I. A characterization of 2-square ultrafilters. *J. Symbolic Logic* 48 (1983), no. 2, 409–414.
- [158] Rosen, Ned I. P-points with countably many constellations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 290 (1985), no. 2, 585–596.
- [159] Mary Ellen Rudin, Types of ultrafilters, 1966 *Topology Seminar* (Wisconsin, 1965), Princeton Univ. Press, *Ann. of Math. Studies* 60, 147–151.
- [160] M. E. Rudin, Partial orders on the types in $\beta\mathbb{N}$, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 155 (1971), 353–362.
- [161] W. Rudin, Homogeneity problems in the theory of Čech compactifications, *Duke Math. J.* 23 (1956), 409–419.
- [162] Samuel, Pierre Ultrafilters and compactification of uniform spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 64 (1948), 100–132.
- [163] Sakai, Hiroshi, On Katětov and Katětov-Blass orders on analytic P-ideals and Borel ideals. *Arch. Math. Logic* 57 (2018), no. 3-4, 317–327.
- [164] Scott, Dana, Measurable cardinals and constructible sets. *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys.* 9 (1961), 521–524.

- [165] Shelah, Saharon Proper and improper forcing. Second edition. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. xlviii+1020 pp. ISBN: 3-540-51700-6
- [166] Shelah, Saharon $\text{CON}(u > i)$. Arch. Math. Logic 31 (1992), no. 6, 433–443.
- [167] Shelah, Saharon There may be no nowhere dense ultrafilter. Logic Colloquium '95 (Haifa), 305–324, Lecture Notes Logic, 11, Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [168] Shelah, Saharon Nice \aleph_1 generated non-P-points, Part I. MLQ Math. Log. Q. 69 (2023), no. 1, 117–129.
- [169] Shelah, S. ; Rudin, M. E. Unordered types of ultrafilters. Topology Proc. 3 (1978), no. 1, 199–204 (1979).
- [170] Simon, P. Applications of independent linked families. Topology, theory and applications (Eger, 1983), 561–580, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, 41, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985.
- [171] T. Skolem, Über die Nicht-Charakterisierbarkeit der Zahlenreihe mittels endlich oder abzählbar unendlich vieler Aussagen mit ausschliesslich Zahlenvariablen, Fund. Math. 23 (1934), 150–161.
- [172] Solecki, Sławomir. Analytic ideals and their applications. Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 99 (1999), no. 1-3, 51–72.
- [173] Solecki, Sławomir, Todorcevic, Stevo. Cofinal types of topological directed orders. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 54 (2004), no. 6, 1877–1911 (2005).
- [174] R. C. Solomon, Ultrafilters and ultraproducts, Dissertation, Bedford College, London, 1972
- [175] Starosolski, Andrzej Cascades, order, and ultrafilters. Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 165 (2014), no. 10, 1626–1638.
- [176] Starosolski, Andrzej . Ordinal ultrafilters versus P-hierarchy. Cent. Eur. J. Math. 12 (2014), no. 1, 84–96.
- [177] Starosolski, Andrzej . The Rudin-Keisler ordering of P-points under $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$. J. Symb. Log. 86 (2021), no. 4, 1691–1705.
- [178] M. H. Stone, M. The theory of representations for Boolean algebras. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 40 (1936), no. 1, 37–111.
- [179] M. H. Stone, Applications of the theory of Boolean rings to general topology. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 41 (1937), no. 3, 375–481.
- [180] A. Tarski, Une contribution à la théorie de la mesure, Fundamenta Mathematicae (1930) Vol. 15, 42–50.
- [181] Talagrand, Michel, Compacts de fonctions mesurables et filtres non mesurables. Studia Math. 67 (1980), no. 1, 13–43.
- [182] J. W. Tukey, Convergence and uniformity in topology, Ann. of Math., Studies No. 2 (Princeton, 1940)
- [183] Todorčević, S. Walks on countable ordinals and selective ultrafilters. Bull. Cl. Sci. Math. Nat. Sci. Math. No. 35 (2010)
- [184] Tychonoff, A. Über einen Funktionenraum. (German) Math. Ann. 111 (1935), no. 1, 762–766.
- [185] S. Ulam, Concerning functions of sets, Fundamenta Mathematicae (1929) Vol. 14, 231–233.
- [186] S. Ulam, Zur Masstheorie in der allgemeinen Mengenlehre, Fundamenta Mathematicae (1930) Vol. 16, 140–150.
- [187] Vojtáš, Peter, On ω^* and absolutely divergent series. Topology Proc. 19 (1994), 335–348.
- [188] L. Vietoris, Stetige Mengen, Monatsh. Math. 31 (1921), 173–204.
- [189] Vitali, G., Sul problema della misura dei gruppi di punti di una retta, Bologna, (1905).
- [190] Verner, Jonathan L. Ultrafilters and independent systems. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Charles University. 2011.
- [191] Olga Yiparaki. On some tree partitions. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1994. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Michigan.
- [192] Edward Wimmers, The Shelah P-point independence theorem, Israel J. Math. 43 (1982) 28–48.
- [193] Zapletal, Jindřich Forcing idealized. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 174. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008. vi+314 pp. ISBN: 978-0-521-87426-7

- [194] Zapletal, Jindřich. Preserving P-points in definable forcing. *Fund. Math.* 204 (2009), no. 2, 145–154.