

Scattered and paracompact order topologies

Gerald Kuba

1. Statement of main results

Write $|M|$ for the cardinal number (the *size*) of a set M . While an infinite set S carries $2^{2^{|S|}}$ (mutually non-homeomorphic) topologies, S cannot be equipped with more than $2^{|S|}$ *order topologies*. This is trivial in view of the definition that τ is an order topology on S when τ is generated by a linear ordering \preceq of S . (A subbasis of τ is formed by all rays $\{x \in S \mid x \prec y\}$ and $\{x \in S \mid x \succ y\}$ with $y \in S$.) In the following, a *linearly ordered* space is a space whose topology is an order topology. Note that every linearly ordered space is hereditarily normal. According to the title we consider only linearly ordered spaces which are *scattered*. (A Hausdorff space is scattered if and only if every nonempty subspace contains an isolated point.) If X is such a space then for the weight $w(X)$ of X we always have $w(X) = |X|$. (Because $w(Y) \leq |Y|$ trivially holds when the space Y is linearly ordered. And it is a nice exercise to verify $|Y| \leq w(Y)$ for all scattered Hausdorff spaces Y .)

In the following we focus on scattered linearly ordered spaces which are either *metrizable* or *compact*. Since size and weight coincide, a compact *and* metrizable scattered space must be countable. Of course, every countable compact Hausdorff space is completely metrizable. Furthermore, a scattered metrizable space must be completely metrizable. The following theorem implies that every infinite set S can be equipped with $2^{|S|}$ complete metrics which generate mutually non-homeomorphic scattered order topologies on S .

Theorem 1. *For every cardinal $\kappa \geq \aleph_0$ there exist 2^κ mutually non-homeomorphic scattered and (completely) metrizable, linearly ordered spaces of size κ .*

On the other hand, the following theorem implies that every *uncountable* set S can be equipped with $2^{|S|}$ mutually non-homeomorphic scattered and compact order topologies.

Theorem 2. *For every cardinal $\kappa > \aleph_0$ there exist 2^κ mutually non-homeomorphic compact, scattered, linearly ordered spaces of size κ .*

The statement in Theorem 2 is unprovable for $\kappa = \aleph_0$ because, due to Mazurkiewicz and Sierpiński [9], up to homeomorphism there exist precisely \aleph_1 compact, countable Hausdorff spaces. (They all are linearly ordered and scattered.) And not only $\aleph_1 < 2^{\aleph_0}$ is consistent with ZFC set theory. It is also consistent with ZFC that there exist 2^{\aleph_0} cardinal numbers κ with $\aleph_0 < \kappa < 2^{\aleph_0}$. The last statement is worth mentioning to put important consequences of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 in perspective. Under the restriction that either $\kappa = \aleph_0$ or $\kappa \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ the following consequence of Theorem 1 is well-known and has been proved for $\kappa \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ in the realm of pathwise connected spaces, see [2].

Corollary 1. *For every cardinal $\kappa \geq \aleph_0$ there exist 2^κ mutually non-homeomorphic complete metric spaces of size κ .*

Under the restriction $\kappa \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ the following consequence of Theorem 2 has already been proved in the realm of connected, linearly ordered spaces, see [4].

Corollary 2. *For every cardinal $\kappa > \aleph_0$ there exist 2^κ mutually non-homeomorphic compact Hausdorff spaces of size κ .*

Remark. Not only in Theorem 2, but also in Corollary 2 the amount 2^κ is maximal. (Because every compact Hausdorff space of size κ is homeomorphic to a closed subspace of Hilbert cube $[0, 1]^\kappa$.)

2. Ultrametrics and linear orderings

In proving Theorem 1 we will consider scattered, *ultrametric* spaces only. (A metric d on X is an ultrametric if and only if $d(x, z) \leq \max\{d(x, y), d(y, z)\}$ for all $x, y, z \in X$.) By considering complete ultrametric spaces in the proof of Theorem 1 we need not deal with linear orderings in view of the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *The topology of a space is an order topology if it is generated by a complete ultrametric.*

One way to verify Proposition 1 is to combine two well-known results. By [1] 6.3.2.f the topology of any *strongly zero-dimensional* metrizable space is an order topology. And by [1] 7.3.F a metrizable space is strongly zero-dimensional if and only if its topology is generated by some ultrametric. (As a noteworthy consequence, the property *strongly zero-dimensional* can be included in Theorem 1. In Theorem 2 the property *strongly zero-dimensional* is included automatically because, other than for metric spaces, the properties *strongly zero-dimensional* and *totally disconnected* are equivalent for compact Hausdorff spaces.)

In particular, by applying [1] 6.3.2.f and [1] 7.3.F, Proposition 1 is true even without assuming completeness. In order to keep this paper self-contained, in the following we write down an elementary and direct proof of Proposition 1.

Let us call a strict linear ordering of a set S a *DE-ordering* when there is a maximum and a minimum and when each point in $S \setminus \{\max S\}$ has an immediate successor and each point in $S \setminus \{\min S\}$ has an immediate predecessor. Then the corresponding order topology is discrete. (The abbreviation *DE* refers to **d**iscrete with **e**nd points.) First of all we verify the following statement.

(2.1) *Every nonempty set can be equipped with a DE-ordering.*

Proof. Of course, if $S \neq \emptyset$ is finite then every linear ordering of S is a DE-ordering. Assume that S is infinite and that S is equipped with any well-ordering such that S has a maximum. Then create a linearly ordered set \tilde{S} from the well-ordered set S by replacing each point in $S \setminus \{\min S, \max S\}$ with a copy of the naturally ordered set \mathbb{Z} . Furthermore, replace $\min S$ with a copy of the naturally ordered set \mathbb{N} and replace $\max S$ with a copy of the naturally ordered set $\mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{N}$. So we obtain a set \tilde{S} equipped with a linear ordering which clearly is a DE-ordering. This is enough to verify (2.1) since S and \tilde{S} are equipollent sets.

Now in order to prove Proposition 1 let X be a space whose topology is generated by an ultrametric d . For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ put

$$\mathcal{P}_n := \{ \{x \in X \mid d(x, a) < 2^{-n}\} \mid a \in X \}.$$

Since distinct ultrametrical balls with identical radii must be disjoint, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the family \mathcal{P}_n is a partition of the set X consisting of open-closed sets. Since $B_1 \subset B_2$ or $B_1 \supset B_2$ whenever B_1, B_2 are non-disjoint balls in X , if $n > m$ then the partition \mathcal{P}_n is finer than the partition \mathcal{P}_m . Clearly, $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_n$ is a basis of the space X .

If the ultrametric d is complete then, of course, $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \neq \emptyset$ for every chain $B_1 \supset B_2 \supset B_3 \supset \dots$ of balls $B_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$.

For every $x \in X$ and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $B_n(x)$ denote the unique open-closed set B with $x \in B \in \mathcal{P}_n$. Then $B_n(x) \supset B_m(x)$ whenever $n \leq m$.

We define by induction for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a DE-ordering \prec_n of the set \mathcal{P}_n in the following way. Firstly define a DE-ordering \prec_1 of the set \mathcal{P}_1 by virtue of (2.1).

If for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a DE-ordering \prec_n of the set \mathcal{P}_n is already defined then define a DE-ordering \prec_P of the set $\{A \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1} \mid A \subset P\}$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and for distinct $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}$ put $A \prec_{n+1} B$ either when $A, B \subset P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $A \prec_P B$ or when $A \subset P$ and $B \subset Q$ and $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P \prec_n Q$. Obviously, \prec_{n+1} is a DE-ordering of the set \mathcal{P}_{n+1} .

Now define $x \prec y$ for distinct $x, y \in X$ if and only if $B_n(x) \prec_n B_n(y)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $x \prec y$ for distinct $x, y \in X$ if and only if for some index n we have $B_m(x) \prec_m B_m(y)$ for every index $m \geq n$. Consequently, the relation \prec is a strict linear ordering of the set X . We claim that

(2.2) *the topology of X is finer than the order topology of \prec*

and that if the ultrametric d is complete then

(2.3) *the topology of X is coarser than the order topology of \prec .*

In order to verify (2.2) it is enough to show that the rays

$$\{x \in X \mid x \prec a\} \text{ and } \{x \in X \mid a \prec x\}$$

are open sets in the space X for every $a \in X$. Let $R_a = \{x \in X \mid x \prec a\}$ for $a \in X$ and let $y \in R_a$ and choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $B_n(y) \neq B_n(a)$. Then $B_n(y) \prec_n B_n(a)$ and hence $x \prec a$ for every $x \in B_n(y)$ (since $B_n(x) = B_n(y)$ for every $x \in B_n(y)$). Thus we have $B_n(y) \subset R_a$ if $y \in R_a$ and $B_n(y) \neq B_n(a)$. In other words, every point in R_a is an interior point of R_a . Hence R_a is open in the space X for every $a \in X$. Similarly, $\{x \in X \mid a \prec x\}$ is open in the space X for every $a \in X$.

In order to verify (2.3) under the completeness assumption it is enough to show that all sets in the basis $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_n$ are open with respect to the order topology of \prec . Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $V \in \mathcal{P}_m$. Assume firstly that V is neither the maximum nor the minimum of the DE-ordered set (\mathcal{P}_m, \prec_m) and let U resp. W be the immediate predecessor resp. successor of V in the linearly ordered set (\mathcal{P}_m, \prec_m) . For every $n \geq m$ define balls U_n, W_n such that $U_m = U$ and $W_m = W$ and that U_{n+1} is the \prec_{n+1} -maximum of $\{B \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1} \mid B \subset U_n\}$ and that W_{n+1} is the \prec_{n+1} -minimum of $\{B \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1} \mid B \subset W_n\}$. Then for $\bigcap_{n=m}^{\infty} U_n = \{u\}$ and $\bigcap_{n=m}^{\infty} W_n = \{w\}$ we obviously have $V = \{x \in X \mid u \prec x \prec w\}$. In a similar way we obtain $V = \{x \in X \mid x \prec a\}$ for some $a \in X$ if V is the \prec_m -minimum of \mathcal{P}_m and $V = \{x \in X \mid a \prec x\}$ for some $a \in X$ if V is the \prec_m -maximum of \mathcal{P}_m .

This concludes the proof of Proposition 1.

Remark. If the ultrametric d is not complete then (2.3) is not necessarily true. For one cannot rule out the situation that $\{x\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ for some $x \in X$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and that

x has neither an immediate \prec -predecessor nor an immediate \prec -successor, whence x is isolated in the space X but not isolated with respect to the order topology. However, by considering special DE-orderings it is not difficult to accomplish (2.3) without assuming that d is complete.

3. Signature sets for metrizable spaces

In general topology there are two natural ways to verify that spaces are not homeomorphic. The first way is to apply *connectedness* arguments. This way is out of the question when we deal with totally disconnected spaces. The second way is to use *Cantor derivatives*. Let Ω denote the class of all ordinals, whence $\{0\} \cup \mathbb{N} \subset \Omega$. If X is a Hausdorff space and $\xi \in \Omega$ and $A \subset X$ then $A^{(\xi)}$ is the ξ -th derivative of the point set A . ($A^{(0)} = A$ and A' is the set of all limit points of A and if $\alpha \in \Omega$ then $A^{(\alpha+1)} = A^{(\alpha)'}$ and if $\lambda > 0$ is a limit ordinal then $A^{(\lambda)} := \bigcap \{A^{(\alpha)} \mid 0 < \alpha < \lambda\}$.) Naturally, if $0 \neq \xi \in \Omega$ then $A^{(\xi)}$ is closed. Furthermore, X is scattered if and only if $X^{(\alpha)} = \emptyset$ for some $\alpha \in \Omega$.

Lemma 1. *Let Z be a Hausdorff space with $Z'' = \emptyset$ and let H be a Hausdorff space. Then for the product space $Z \times H$ we have $(Z \times H)^{(\xi+1)} = Z' \times H^{(\xi)} \cup Z \times H^{(\xi+1)}$ for every ordinal number ξ .*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{E}[\xi]$ denote the equation $(Z \times H)^{(\xi+1)} = Z' \times H^{(\xi)} \cup Z \times H^{(\xi+1)}$. Similarly as in calculus, the product formula $(X \times Y)' = X' \times Y \cup X \times Y'$ is true for arbitrary Hausdorff spaces X, Y . (For (x, y) is isolated in $X \times Y$ if and only if x is isolated in X and y is isolated in Y .) This has two consequences. Firstly, $\mathbf{E}[\xi]$ is true for $\xi = 0$. Secondly if $\mathbf{E}[\xi]$ holds for $\xi = \alpha$ then $\mathbf{E}[\xi]$ holds for $\xi = \alpha + 1$. The set $Z' \times H^{(\xi)} \cup Z \times H^{(\xi+1)}$ is the union of the disjoint sets $Z' \times H^{(\xi)}$ and $(Z \setminus Z') \times H^{(\xi+1)}$ since $H^{(\xi+1)} \subset H^{(\xi)}$. Therefore, if $\lambda > 0$ is a limit ordinal and $\mathbf{E}[\xi]$ is true for every $\xi < \lambda$ then $(Z \times H)^{(\lambda)} = \bigcap_{0 < \xi < \lambda} Z' \times H^{(\xi)} \cup \bigcap_{0 < \xi < \lambda} (Z \setminus Z') \times H^{(\xi+1)} = Z' \times H^{(\lambda)} \cup (Z \setminus Z') \times H^{(\lambda)} = Z \times H^{(\lambda)}$ and hence $(Z \times H)^{(\lambda+1)} = ((Z \times H)^{(\lambda)})' = (Z \times H^{(\lambda)})' = Z' \times H^{(\lambda)} \cup Z \times H^{(\lambda+1)}$ by applying the product formula, whence $\mathbf{E}[\xi]$ is true for $\xi = \lambda$, *q.e.d.*

If X is a Hausdorff space and κ an uncountable cardinal then let $C_\kappa(X)$ denote the set of all points $x \in X$ such that $|U| \geq \kappa$ for every neighborhood of x and $|U| = \kappa$ for some neighborhood of x . (One may call the members of $C_\kappa(X)$ the κ -condensation points of X .) Define a signature set $\Sigma[\kappa; X]$ by

$$\Sigma[\kappa; X] := \{ \alpha \in \Omega \setminus \{0\} \mid (X^{(\alpha)} \setminus X^{(\alpha+1)}) \cap C_\kappa(X) \neq \emptyset \}.$$

Of course, the class $\Sigma[\kappa, X]$ is always a set and two spaces X_1 and X_2 cannot be homeomorphic if $\Sigma[\kappa; X_1] \neq \Sigma[\kappa; X_2]$ for some cardinal $\kappa > \aleph_0$.

For the proof of Theorem 1 we also need another signature set. For any Hausdorff space X let $\Gamma(X)$ be the set of all points $x \in X$ such that no neighborhood of x is compact (or, equivalently, the closure of an open neighborhood of x is never compact). Furthermore, define

$$\Sigma(X) := \{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid (X^{(k)} \setminus X^{(k+1)}) \cap \Gamma(X) \neq \emptyset \}$$

Note that we regard \mathbb{N} to be defined in the classical way, i.e. \mathbb{N} does not contain 0. Clearly, two spaces X_1 and X_2 cannot be homeomorphic if $\Sigma(X_1) \neq \Sigma(X_2)$.

4. Countable Polish spaces

Let $c = 2^{\aleph_0}$ denote the cardinality of the continuum. The size of a perfect completely metrizable space cannot be smaller than c (cf. [1] 4.5.5). Consequently, all completely metrizable spaces of size smaller than c are scattered. Furthermore, a Polish space is scattered if and only if it is countable. In view of this fact and by virtue of Proposition 1 the special case $\kappa = \aleph_0$ in Theorem 1 is settled by the following observation.

(4.1) *There exist c mutually non-homeomorphic closed and countable subspaces of the Polish space $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$.*

Notice that Proposition 1 can be applied because the topology of every space provided by (4.1) can be generated by a complete ultrametric. This is a consequence of the observation that the topology of the Baire space $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ is generated by a very natural complete ultrametric. (Declare 2^{-n} as the distance of distinct irrationals a and b when n is the smallest index of distinct quotients in the continued fractions of a and b .)

Remark. While for both $X = \mathbb{R}$ and $X = \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ the order topology on X generated by the natural ordering of the elements of X coincides with the Euclidean topology on X , such a coincidence is not true for subsets of X . Even worse, while such a coincidence holds for *closed* subsets of the connected space \mathbb{R} , it does not necessarily hold for closed subsets of the totally disconnected Baire space $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. (For example, $\{-e\} \cup \{e^{-n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an infinite, closed, discrete subspace of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ whose order topology is compact. See also Proposition 2 below.) Therefore, Proposition 1 is essential for deriving the case $\kappa = \aleph_0$ in Theorem 1 from (4.1).

The statement (4.1) equals the classic solution of the enumeration problem concerning *countable Polish spaces* due to Mazurkiewicz and Sierpiński (see [2] Lemma 4.10). In order to keep this paper self-contained we will prove (4.1) and hence Theorem 1 for $\kappa = \aleph_0$ in this section. And by proving a bit more we will gain a deeper insight in connection with the following observation.

(4.2) *It is unprovable that \mathbb{R} contains c mutually non-homeomorphic closed and countable subspaces.*

The observation (4.2) is true because by [9] there exist precisely \aleph_1 compact and countable subspaces of \mathbb{R} up to homeomorphism and therefore (see [5] Theorem 8.1) the real line \mathbb{R} has precisely \aleph_1 closed and countable subspaces up to homeomorphism. Motivated by comparing (4.1) and (4.2) we are now going to prove the following proposition which implies (4.1) and hence settles the case $\kappa = \aleph_0$ in Theorem 1. Throughout this section, if $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ then \overline{X} denotes the space which equals the closure of X in the real line \mathbb{R} equipped with the Euclidean topology, and \hat{X} denotes the space which equals the set X equipped with the order topology generated by the natural ordering of the reals in X .

Proposition 2. *There exists a family \mathcal{Y} of mutually non-homeomorphic countable subspaces of \mathbb{R} such that $|\mathcal{Y}| = c$ and $\overline{Y} \setminus \mathbb{Q} = Y$ for every $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and all spaces in the family $\{\overline{Y} \mid Y \in \mathcal{Y}\} \cup \{\hat{Y} \mid Y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ are homeomorphic.*

Proof. In the following put $\mathbb{N}^* = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$, whence $\mathbb{N}^* = \{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid k \geq 2\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let K_n be a compact, countable, well-ordered subset of $[\pi + 2n, \pi + 2n + 1] \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ such that $K_n^{(n)} = \{\max K_n\} = \{\pi + 2n + 1\}$. (The set K_n may be defined as an appropriate order-isomorphic copy of the canonically ordered set of all ordinals $\alpha \leq \omega^n$. It is also straightforward to construct K_1, K_2, K_3, \dots recursively without using ordinal numbers.)

In order to prove Proposition 2, let r_0, r_1, r_2, \dots be a strictly decreasing sequence of *rational* numbers in $[\pi, \pi + 1]$ with $\inf \{ r_m \mid m \in \mathbb{N} \} = \pi$. For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\xi_m(1), \xi_m(2), \xi_m(3), \dots$ be a strictly decreasing sequence of *irrational* numbers in $[r_m, r_{m-1}]$ with $\inf \{ \xi_m(k) \mid k \in \mathbb{N} \} = r_m$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define a *discrete* subset E_n of $]\pi + 2n + 1, \pi + 2n + 2[\setminus \mathbb{Q}$ via $E_n := \{ 2n + 1 + \xi_m(k) \mid m, k \in \mathbb{N} \}$.

For every infinite subset S of \mathbb{N}^* put

$$G_S := \bigcup_{n \in S} (K_n \cup E_n).$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\overline{E_n} \setminus E_n = \{ 2n + 1 + r_m \mid m \in \mathbb{N} \} \cup \{ \pi + 2n + 1 \}$ and hence the only irrational limit point of E_n is $\pi + 2n + 1 = \max K_n$. So for every infinite subset S of \mathbb{N}^* we have $G_S = \overline{G_S} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ since $\overline{G_S} = G_S \cup \bigcup_{n \in S} \overline{E_n}$. We claim that the family

$$\mathcal{Y} := \{ G_S \mid S \subset \mathbb{N} \wedge |S| = \aleph_0 \}$$

is as desired. Obviously, we always have $\Gamma(G_S) = \{ \max K_n \mid n \in S \}$. Therefore, since the point $\max K_n$ lies in $(K_n \setminus \{ \max K_n \})^{(m)}$ but not in $(K_n \setminus \{ \max K_n \})^{(m+1)}$ if and only if $m = n$, we must always have $\Sigma(G_S) = S$. Hence two spaces G_S and G_T are never homeomorphic for distinct infinite sets $S, T \subset \mathbb{N}^*$.

We conclude the proof by showing that for some space W both spaces \overline{Y} and \hat{Y} are homeomorphic to W for each $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Let S be an arbitrary infinite subset of \mathbb{N}^* . The order-type of the naturally ordered set $\{-x \mid x \in \overline{E_n}\}$ is $\omega^2 + 1$ while the order type of K_n is $\omega^n + 1$. Hence by a *zipper* argument (in a Hilbert's hotel kind of way) it is plain to find a homeomorphism from the compact space $K_n \cup \overline{E_n}$ onto the compact space K_n for every $n \geq 2$. Consequently, since each compact building block $K_n \cup \overline{E_n}$ ($n \in S$) is open in the space $\overline{G_S} = \bigcup_{n \in S} (K_n \cup \overline{E_n})$, the space $\overline{G_S}$ is homeomorphic to $V_S := \bigcup_{n \in S} K_n$. The naturally ordered set V_S is well-ordered without a maximum and $V_S^{(k)} \neq \emptyset$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ but $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} V_S^{(k)} = \emptyset$. Hence V_S is order-isomorphic to the well-ordered set W of all ordinal numbers smaller than ω^ω . Therefore, since for every closed subset A of \mathbb{R} the linearly ordered space \hat{A} is identical with the subspace A of the real line, the space $\overline{G_S}$ is homeomorphic to the space W equipped with the canonical order topology. Finally it is evident that the linearly ordered space $\hat{G_S}$ is homeomorphic to the subspace $\overline{G_S}$ of \mathbb{R} and hence to the space W , *q.e.d.*

5. Ultrametric hedgehogs

Let us call a space *completely ultrametrizable* if and only if its topology is generated by some complete ultrametric. (It is worth mentioning that a space must be completely ultrametrizable if its topology is generated by some ultrametric and also by some complete metric, see [7] Lemma 3. Therefore, since every scattered metrizable space is completely metrizable, in view of Proposition 1 it would be enough to consider ultrametries instead of complete ultrametric. But the ultrametries we will consider in the proof of Theorem 1 are very natural and immediately recognized as complete metrics.)

Clearly, if X_1 and X_2 are completely ultrametrizable spaces then the product space $X_1 \times X_2$ and the topological sum of the two spaces are completely ultrametrizable as well. (Note that if d_i is an ultrametric on X_i then the standard *maximum metric* on $X_1 \times X_2$ with respect to d_1, d_2 is an ultrametric.)

For an index set $I \neq \emptyset$ let X_i be an infinite metric space and b_i a point in X_i for every $i \in I$. The metric of X_i is denoted by d_i and we assume that d_i is an ultrametric. Fix o such that $o \notin \bigcup_{i \in I} I \times X_i$ and put

$$\mathcal{H}[(X_i, b_i)_{i \in I}] = \{o\} \cup \bigcup_{i \in I} \{i\} \times (X_i \setminus \{b_i\}).$$

Define a function d from $\mathcal{H}[(X_i, b_i)_{i \in I}]^2$ into \mathbb{R} as follows:

Put $d(o, o) = 0$, and for each $i \in I$ put

$$\begin{aligned} d((i, x), o) &= d(o, (i, x)) = d_i(b_i, x) \text{ whenever } b_i \neq x \in X_i, \text{ and for each } i \in I \text{ put} \\ d((i, x), (i, y)) &= d_i(x, y) \text{ whenever } x, y \in X_i \setminus \{b_i\}, \text{ and for distinct } i, j \in I \text{ put} \\ d((i, x), (j, y)) &= \max\{d_i(b_i, x), d_j(b_j, y)\} \text{ whenever } b_i \neq x \in X_i \text{ and } b_j \neq y \in X_j. \end{aligned}$$

After having thoroughly checked that in all possible scenarios any triangle is isosceles and any non-equilateral triangle has one side shorter than the other sides, we see that d is an ultrametric on the set $\mathcal{H}[(X_i, b_i)_{i \in I}]$. Trivially, the subspace $\{o\} \cup (X_i \setminus \{b_i\})$ of $\mathcal{H}[(X_i, b_i)_{i \in I}]$ is an isometric copy of X_i for every $i \in I$. (So if the sets X_i are mutually disjoint then every basic space X_i can be identified with the space $\{o\} \cup (X_i \setminus \{b_i\})$ in order to achieve $\mathcal{H}[(X_i, b_i)_{i \in I}] = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ and $X_i \cap X_j = \{o\}$ for all distinct $i, j \in I$.) By analogy to the classical hedgehog of spininess $|I|$ (see [1] or [10]) we call $\mathcal{H}[(X_i, b_i)_{i \in I}]$ an *ultrametric hedgehog* and we call the basic spaces X_i ($i \in I$) the *spines* and the point o the *body* of the hedgehog.

It is evident that the hedgehog-metric d is complete if and only if all spine-metrics d_i are complete. The weight of $\mathcal{H}[(X_i, b_i)_{i \in I}]$ is not smaller than $\max\{|I|, \aleph_0\}$ because each spine contains an open set disjoint from $\{o\}$. If $w(X_i) = \kappa \geq \aleph_0$ for every $i \in I$ then $w(\mathcal{H}[(X_i, b_i)_{i \in I}]) = \max\{|I|, \kappa\}$ because each spine contains a dense set of size κ .

6. Proof of Theorem 1

Proposition 3. *For every cardinal $\kappa > \aleph_0$ there exists a complete ultrametric space Y_κ of size κ such that $Y'_\kappa = C_\kappa(Y_\kappa)$ and $|C_\kappa(Y_\kappa)| = 1$ and hence $Y_\kappa \setminus C(Y_\kappa)$ is a discrete subspace of Y_κ .*

Proof. Consider the set $Z := \{0\} \cup \{2^{-n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and declare $\max\{x, y\}$ as the distance between distinct points $x, y \in Z$. It is evident that this distance defines a complete ultrametric on Z which generates the Euclidean topology restricted to Z . Thus $Z' = \{0\}$. Let I be an index set of size $\kappa > \aleph_0$ and for every $i \in I$ let A_i be identical with the complete ultrametric space Z . Put $Y_\kappa := \mathcal{H}[(A_i, 0)_{i \in I}]$ and let o be the body of this ultrametric hedgehog. We observe that $Y'_\kappa = C_\kappa(Y_\kappa) = \{o\}$, *q.e.d.*

Proposition 4. *For every ordinal $\alpha > 0$ there exists a complete ultrametric space Z_α of size $\max\{\aleph_0, |\alpha|\}$ such that $Z_\alpha^{(\alpha)}$ is a singleton. (In particular, Z_α is scattered.)*

Proof. Of course, we construct the desired spaces by transfinite induction. Put $Z_1 = Z$ where $Z = \{0\} \cup \{2^{-n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is the complete ultrametric space as in the proof of Proposition 3. Suppose firstly that for an ordinal $\alpha > 0$ a complete ultrametric space Z_α with $Z_\alpha^{(\alpha)} = \{z_\alpha\}$ and $|Z_\alpha| = \max\{\aleph_0, |\alpha|\}$ is already defined. (This is true for $\alpha = 1$.) Then we define $Z_{\alpha+1}$ as the product space $Z \times Z_\alpha$ and consider it equipped with

the maximum metric which is a complete ultrametric. Clearly, $|Z_{\alpha+1}| = \max\{\aleph_0, |\alpha|\} = \max\{\aleph_0, |\alpha+1|\}$. By virtue of Lemma 1 we have $Z_{\alpha+1}^{(\alpha+1)} = \{(0, z_\alpha)\}$.

Secondly, let $\lambda > 0$ be a limit ordinal and assume that for every ordinal α with $1 \leq \alpha < \lambda$ a complete ultrametric space Z_α with $Z_\alpha^{(\alpha)} = \{z_\alpha\}$ and $|Z_\alpha| = \max\{\aleph_0, |\alpha|\}$ is already defined. Then let Z_λ be the complete ultrametric hedgehog $\mathcal{H}[(Z_\alpha, z_\alpha)_{1 \leq \alpha < \lambda}]$. Obviously, the body o of the hedgehog Z_λ lies in $Z_\lambda^{(\beta)}$ whenever $1 \leq \beta < \lambda$. Furthermore, $Z_\alpha^{(\beta)} = \emptyset$ whenever $1 \leq \alpha < \beta < \lambda$. Consequently, $Z_\lambda^{(\lambda)} = \bigcap_{1 \leq \beta < \lambda} Z_\lambda^{(\beta)} = \{o\}$. Of course, $|Z_\lambda| = |\lambda| = \max\{\aleph_0, |\lambda|\}$. This concludes the proof of Proposition 4.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1. The special case $\kappa = \aleph_0$ is settled by Propositions 1 and 2. Therefore we assume $\kappa > \aleph_0$. Let $K := \{\alpha \in \Omega \mid \omega \leq \alpha < \kappa\}$. Then $|K| = \kappa$ and hence K has precisely 2^κ nonempty subsets. Let Y_κ be an ultrametric space with $|C_\kappa(Y_\kappa)| = 1$ as in the proof of Proposition 3 and for each $\alpha \in K$ let Z_α be an ultrametric space as in Proposition 4 with $Z_\alpha^{(\alpha)} = \{z_\alpha\}$. Since $0 \notin K$ we may unambiguously write Z_0 for the space Y_κ and z_0 for the unique condensation point in Y_κ . For every $\alpha \in K$ put $H_\alpha := \mathcal{H}[(Z_\beta, z_\beta)_{\beta \in \{0, \alpha\}}]$. So H_α is a complete ultrametric hedgehog with the two spines Y_κ and Z_α . Clearly, $|H_\alpha| = \kappa$ and if o is the body of the hedgehog H_α then $H_\alpha^{(\alpha)} = C_\kappa(H_\alpha) = \{o\}$. (Note that $|Z_\alpha| < \kappa$ for every $\alpha \in K$.) In view of the proofs of Propositions 3 and 4 we may assume that the distance between points in H_α is always smaller than 1. (Alternatively, if (X, d) is a complete ultrametric space then it is evident that $\min\{\frac{8}{9}, d(\cdot, \cdot)\}$ is a complete ultrametric which generates the topology of (X, d) .)

Finally, for each nonempty $L \subset K$ define $\mathcal{S}[L]$ as the *standard metrical sum* of the complete ultrametric spaces H_α ($\alpha \in L$). (The distance between any two points in a common summand remains unchanged and the distance between two points in distinct summands always equals 1.) Clearly, $\mathcal{S}[L]$ is a scattered and complete ultrametric space of size κ . The 2^κ spaces $\mathcal{S}[L]$ ($\emptyset \neq L \subset K$) are mutually non-homeomorphic because we obviously have $\Sigma[\kappa; \mathcal{S}[L]] = L$ whenever $\emptyset \neq L \subset K$.

7. Signature sets for non-metrizable spaces

In order to prove Theorem 2 we also work with Cantor derivatives. Again let Ω be the canonically well-ordered class of all ordinal numbers (with $\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \subset \Omega$). Furthermore let \mathcal{L} denote the class of all *limit ordinals* (with $0 \in \mathcal{L}$). Note that any nonempty subset of the class Ω has a well-defined *supremum*. Put $[\alpha, \beta] := \{\xi \in \Omega \mid \alpha \leq \xi \leq \beta\}$ and $[\alpha, \beta[:= [\alpha, \beta] \setminus \{\beta\}$ and $] \alpha, \beta[:= [\alpha, \beta] \setminus \{\alpha, \beta\}$ whenever $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega$. If we speak of the *space* $[\alpha, \beta]$ resp. $[\alpha, \beta[$ resp. $] \alpha, \beta[$ then we refer to the order topology of the canonical well-ordering. Note that all spaces $[\alpha, \beta]$ are compact and scattered and hereditarily normal.

If $\alpha \in \Omega$ then put $|\alpha| := |[0, \alpha[|$. (This definition is a tautology if ordinal numbers are defined in the standard way.) Put $o(\kappa) := \min\{\gamma \in \Omega \mid |\gamma| = \kappa\}$ for every cardinal number κ . (If cardinal numbers are defined as initial ordinal numbers then, of course, $o(\kappa) = \kappa$ for every κ .) For any cardinal number κ let (as usual) κ^+ denote the smallest cardinal number greater than κ . (For example, $\aleph_1 = \aleph_0^+$.) For cardinals κ and ordinals α we have $|\alpha| = \kappa$ if and only if $o(\kappa) \leq \alpha < o(\kappa^+)$. In particular, $\omega := o(\aleph_0)$ is the smallest infinite ordinal and $\omega_1 := o(\aleph_1)$ is the smallest uncountable ordinal.

For $\xi \in \Omega$ we write (as usual) ω^ξ for the *ordinal power* with basis ω and exponent ξ . So all spaces $[0, \omega^\xi]$ are compact and for $\xi > 0$ we have $|[0, \omega^\xi]| = \max\{\aleph_0, |\xi|\}$. In particular, $|[0, \omega^\xi]| = |\xi|$ for every ordinal $\xi \geq \omega$.

As above, if X is a Hausdorff space and $\xi \in \Omega$ and $A \subset X$ then $A^{(\xi)}$ is the ξ -th *derivative* of the point set A . Clearly, $A^{(\alpha)} \supset A^{(\beta)}$ whenever $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$ and for $A \subset B \subset X$ we have $A^{(\alpha)} \subset B^{(\alpha)}$ for every $\alpha \in \Omega$. The following lemma is evident. (Historically, Cantor's definition of the ordinal powers of ω is designed precisely so that the following is true.)

Lemma 2. *Let $0 \neq \xi \in \Omega$. With respect to the compact space $[0, \omega^\xi]$, for every ordinal $\alpha > 0$ the point sets $[0, \omega^\xi]^{(\alpha)}$ and $[0, \omega^\xi]^{(\alpha)}$ coincide and they contain the point ω^ξ if and only if $\alpha \leq \xi$. And $[0, \omega^\xi]^{(\xi)} = [0, \omega^\xi]^{(\xi)} = \{\omega^\xi\}$.*

In the following we distinguish between *regular* and *singular* cardinal numbers. Singular cardinals are the cardinals which are not regular. A cardinal number κ is *regular* if and only if $\sup A < o(\kappa)$ for every subset A of $\{\alpha \in \Omega \mid \alpha < o(\kappa)\}$ with $|A| < \kappa$. (Note that any subset of the class Ω has a well-defined supremum in Ω .) Topologically speaking, *an infinite cardinal number κ is regular if and only if in the compact linearly ordered space $[0, o(\kappa)]$ the first derivative of a point set A with $|A| < \kappa$ does not contain the point $o(\kappa)$.* (In the following it is essential that κ^+ is regular for every κ .)

If (X, \preceq) is a linearly ordered set then let $[a, b] = \{x \in X \mid a \preceq x \preceq b\}$ and $]a, b[= \{x \in X \mid a \prec x \prec b\}$ and $[a, b[= [a, b] \setminus \{b\}$ for $a, b \in X$. Furthermore let \preceq^* denote the *backwards linear ordering* defined by $x \prec^* y$ if and only if $y \prec x$. In the usual sloppy way, if X is a set of ordinal numbers, then X^* is the set X equipped with the backwards linear ordering of the canonical well-ordering of Ω . If (X, \preceq) and (Y, \preceq) are two linearly ordered sets then the *lexicographic ordering* of any nonempty subset Z of $X \times Y$ is defined so that (x_1, y_1) is smaller than (x_2, y_2) when either $x_1 \prec x_2$ or when $x_1 = x_2$ and $y_1 < y_2$.

In the following let X be a *scattered* Hausdorff space and $\kappa > \aleph_0$ be a regular cardinal number. As in Section 2 let $C_\kappa(X)$ denote the set of all κ -condensation points. (So a point $x \in X$ lies in $C_\kappa(X)$ if and only if $|U| \geq \kappa$ for every neighborhood U of x and $|U| = \kappa$ for some neighborhood U of x .) For example, $C_\kappa([0, o(\kappa)]) = \{o(\kappa)\}$ for every regular cardinal $\kappa > \aleph_0$. For $x \in X$ let $\Omega_\kappa(x)$ denote the class of all ordinals α such that $x \in A^{(\alpha)}$ for some point set $A \subset X$ with $|A| < \kappa$. The class $\Omega_\kappa(x)$ is never empty since, trivially, $0 \in \Omega_\kappa(x)$ for every $x \in X$. Since X is scattered, the class $\Omega_\kappa(x)$ is a nonempty set for each $x \in X$. Moreover, $\Omega_\kappa(x) \subset [0, o(\kappa)[$ because $A^{(o(\kappa))} = \emptyset$ whenever $A \subset X$ and $|A| < \kappa$.

So we may define a signature set with respect to the scattered space X and the regular cardinal κ by

$$\Psi[X, \kappa] := \{ \sup \Omega_\kappa(x) \mid x \in C_\kappa(X) \}.$$

Clearly, two scattered spaces X_1, X_2 cannot be homeomorphic if $\Psi[X_1, \kappa] \neq \Psi[X_2, \kappa]$ for some regular cardinal κ . For each regular cardinal $\kappa > \aleph_0$ we have $\Psi[[0, o(\kappa)], \kappa] = \{0\}$. More generally, in view of the following lemma, $\Psi[[0, \alpha], \kappa] \subset \{0, o(\kappa)\}$ for every $\alpha \in \Omega$.

8. Proof of Theorem 2

The following two lemmas are essential for the proof of Theorem 2.

Lemma 3. *Let $\kappa \geq \aleph_1$ be a regular cardinal. For $\theta \in \Omega$ consider the space $X = [0, \theta]$. If $\gamma \in C_\kappa(X)$ then either $\Omega_\kappa(\gamma) = [0, o(\kappa)[$ or $\Omega_\kappa(\gamma) = \{0\}$.*

Proof. Since $\gamma \in C_\kappa(X)$, if $\alpha_1 < \gamma$ and $\alpha_2 \in \Omega$ and $|\alpha_1, \alpha_2| < \kappa$ then $[\alpha_1, \alpha_2] \subset [0, \gamma[$. Clearly, if $\sup A \neq \gamma$ whenever $\emptyset \neq A \subset [0, \gamma[$ and $|A| < \kappa$ then $\Omega_\kappa(\gamma) = \{0\}$. So assume that there is a nonempty set $A \subset [0, \gamma[$ such that $|A| < \kappa$ and $\sup A = \gamma$. For $\xi \in \Omega$ put $U_\xi := \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} [\alpha, \alpha + \omega^\xi]$. If $\xi < o(\kappa)$ then $|\alpha, \alpha + \omega^\xi| = |[0, \omega^\xi]| < \kappa$ for every $\alpha \in A$ and hence $U_\xi \subset [0, \gamma[$ and hence $\sup U_\xi = \gamma$. Thus $|U_\xi| < \kappa$ and (by Lemma 2) $\gamma \in U_\xi^{(\xi)}$ for every $\xi < o(\kappa)$ and hence $\Omega_\kappa(\gamma) = [0, o(\kappa)[$, *q.e.d.*

Remark. In Lemma 3 the case $\Psi[[0, \theta], \kappa] = \{0, o(\kappa)\}$ may occur, for example if $\kappa = \aleph_1$ and $\theta = \omega_1 \cdot \omega$.

Lemma 4. *Let (X, \prec) be a linearly ordered set equipped with the order topology and assume that the space X is scattered. Let $0 \neq \xi \in \Omega$ and let κ be a regular cardinal number with $\kappa > |\omega^\xi|$. Let x, y, z be three points in X with $x \prec z \prec y$ so that $[x, z]_{\prec}$ is an order-isomorphic copy of $[0, \omega^\xi]$ and $[z, y]_{\prec}$ is an order-isomorphic copy of $[0, o(\kappa)]^*$. Then $C_\kappa(X) \cap]x, y[_{\prec} = \{z\}$ and $\sup \Omega_\kappa(z) = \xi$.*

Proof. Clearly, z is the only κ -condensation point of X strictly between x and y . Since κ is regular, there is no set $A \subset [z, y]_{\prec}$ with $|A| < \kappa$ and $z \in A'$. Therefore, if $0 \neq \alpha \in \Omega$ and $z \in A^{(\alpha)}$ for a point set A in the space X with $|A| < \kappa$ then we already have $z \in (A \cap [x, z]_{\prec})^{(\alpha)}$. On the other hand, $([x, z]_{\prec})^{(\xi)} = \{z\}$ by Lemma 2 and $|[x, z]| = |[0, \omega^\xi]| < \kappa$. Consequently, $\Omega_\kappa(z) = [0, \xi]$ and hence $\sup \Omega_\kappa(z) = \xi$, *q.e.d.*

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2. Let κ be a cardinal with $\kappa > \aleph_0$ and put $K = [\omega, o(\kappa)]$. Let \mathcal{G} be the family of all nonempty sets S of successor ordinals $\alpha + 1$ with $\alpha \in K \cap \mathcal{L} \setminus \{o(\kappa)\}$. So if $\xi \in S \in \mathcal{G}$ then $|\xi| = |[0, \omega^\xi]| < \kappa$. Clearly, $|\mathcal{G}| = 2^\kappa$. For every set $S \in \mathcal{G}$ let

$$H_S := K \times \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{\xi \in S} (\{\xi\} \times [0, \omega^\xi] \cup \{\xi + 1\} \times [0, o(\kappa)]^*)$$

and

$$G_S := K \times \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{\xi \in S} (\{\xi\} \times [0, \omega^\xi] \cup \{\xi + 1\} \times [0, o(|\xi|^+)]^*)$$

be equipped with the lexicographic ordering. Illustratively, the linearly ordered set H_S resp. G_S is constructed from the well-ordered set K by replacing ξ with a copy of $[0, \omega^\xi]$ and $\xi + 1$ with a copy of $[0, o(\kappa)]^*$ resp. $[0, o(|\xi|^+)]^*$ for each $\xi \in S$.

Then the corresponding linearly ordered spaces H_S and G_S are of size κ and it is evident that all these spaces are scattered. They are also compact since the ordering is complete with a maximum and a minimum (cf. [10] 39.7). We claim that the spaces H_S ($S \in \mathcal{G}$) are mutually non-homeomorphic if κ is regular and that the spaces G_S ($S \in \mathcal{G}$) are mutually non-homeomorphic if κ is singular.

Assume firstly that κ is regular and let $S \in \mathcal{G}$ and consider the space H_S . Clearly we have $(o(\kappa), 0) \in C_\kappa(H_S)$ and $\Omega_\kappa((o(\kappa), 0)) = \{0\}$. Obviously, $(\gamma, 0) \in C_\kappa(H_S)$ if and only if

$\gamma = o(\kappa)$ or $\gamma = \sup(S \cap [0, \gamma[)$ where $S \cap [0, \gamma[\neq \emptyset$. If $(o(\kappa), 0) \neq (\gamma, 0) \in C_\kappa(H_S)$ then $\Omega_\kappa((\gamma, 0)) = [0, o(\kappa)[$ and hence $\sup \Omega_\kappa((\gamma, 0)) = o(\kappa)$ because if $\xi \in S \cap [0, \gamma[$ then $\{\xi + 1\} \times [0, \omega^\alpha]^* \subset \{\xi + 1\} \times [0, o(\kappa)]^*$ and $|\bigcup\{\{\xi + 1\} \times [0, \omega^\alpha]^* \mid \xi \in S \cap [0, \gamma[\}| < \kappa$ for arbitrarily large exponents $\alpha < o(\kappa)$. In view of Lemma 4 we have $C_\kappa(H_S) \setminus K \times \{0\} = \{(\xi, \omega^\xi) \mid \xi \in S\}$ and $\sup \Omega_\kappa((\xi, \omega^\xi)) = \xi$ for every $\xi \in S$. Therefore,

$$S = \Psi[H_S, \kappa] \setminus \{0, o(\kappa)\}$$

for every $S \in \mathcal{G}$ and this settles Theorem 2 for *regular* $\kappa > \aleph_0$.

Assume now that κ is a singular cardinal number and let \mathcal{R} denote the set of all regular uncountable cardinals smaller than κ . We claim that for every $S \in \mathcal{G}$ we have

$$S = \left(\bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{R}} \Psi[G_S, \lambda] \right) \setminus \mathcal{L} = \left(\bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{R}} \Psi[G_S, \lambda] \right) \setminus (\{0\} \cup \{o(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{R}\}).$$

On the one hand, if $\xi \in S$ then $\xi \notin \mathcal{L}$ and $|\xi|^+ \in \mathcal{R}$ and (ξ, ω^ξ) is a $|\xi|^+$ -condensation point with $\sup \Omega_{|\xi|^+}((\xi, \omega^\xi)) = \xi$ in view of Lemma 4.

On the other hand, let y be a λ -condensation point in G_S where $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}$ and assume firstly that $y \notin K \times \{0\}$. Then y lies in $B_\xi := \{\xi\} \times [0, \omega^\xi] \cup \{\xi + 1\} \times [0, |\xi|^+[^*$ for some $\xi \in S$. Since the points $\min B_\xi = (\xi, 0)$ and $\max B_\xi = (\xi + 1, 0)$ are isolated in the space G_S , the point y must be a λ -condensation point in the space B_ξ , whence $\lambda \leq |B_\xi| = |\xi|^+$.

In the case that $\lambda = |\xi|^+$ we must have $y = (\xi, \omega^\xi)$ and hence $\sup \Omega_\lambda(y) = \xi \in S$ by Lemma 4. In the case that $\lambda < |\xi|^+$ the point y must be the maximum resp. minimum of an isomorphic copy of $[0, \gamma]$ resp. $[0, \gamma]^*$ within the linearly ordered set B_ξ where γ is a λ -condensation point in the space $[0, \gamma]$, whence $\sup \Omega_\lambda(y) \in \{0, o(\lambda)\}$ by Lemma 3.

Assume secondly that $y = (x, 0)$ for $x \in K$. If x is a λ -condensation point in the basic space K then it is clear that in the space G_S we also have $\sup \Omega_\lambda(y) \in \{0, o(\lambda)\}$. If $x \notin C_\lambda(K)$ then $y \in C_\lambda(G_S)$ forces x to be the supremum of a set

$$\tilde{S} \subset \{\xi \in S \mid \xi < x \wedge |\xi|^+ = \lambda\}$$

with $|\tilde{S}| < \lambda$ and therefore (by the same argument as for the space H_S) we must have $\Omega_\lambda(y) = [0, o(\lambda)[$ and hence $\sup \Omega_\lambda(y) = o(\lambda)$.

So in any case the ordinal number $\sup \Omega_\lambda(y)$ lies in $S \cup \{0, o(\lambda)\}$ if $y \in C_\lambda(G_S)$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

9. Completions and compactifications

In this short, final section we present two nice applications of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

If X is a scattered Hausdorff space then it is plain that the set $X \setminus X'$ of all isolated points is dense. Moreover, $X \setminus X'$ is the intersection of all dense subsets of X . In particular, $|X \setminus X'|$ is the *density* of the scattered space X . Consequently, if the scattered space X is metrizable then $|X \setminus X'| = |X|$ because *weight* and *density* of a metric space are always identical. Therefore, from Theorem 1 we derive the following enumeration result about completions of discrete metric spaces.

Corollary 3. *The topology of an infinite discrete space S can be generated by $2^{|S|}$ ultrametrics d such that the completions of the metric spaces (S, d) are mutually non-homeomorphic scattered, ultrametric (linearly ordered) spaces (of weight and size $|S|$).*

Remark. Size and weight of any scattered completion of a discrete metric space S must coincide with $|S|$ since size and density of a scattered metric space are always identical.

Similarly, from the proof of Theorem 2 we can derive an enumeration theorem about compactifications of discrete spaces. While $|X \setminus X'| < |X|$ is possible for compact and scattered Hausdorff spaces X (consider for example the one point compactification of space **65** in [10]), in the proof of Theorem 2 it is evident that $|X \setminus X'| = |X| = \kappa$ whenever $X \in \{H_S, G_S\}$ for $S \in \mathcal{G}$. This is clearly enough to settle the following enumeration result.

Corollary 4. *Every uncountable discrete space S has precisely $2^{|S|}$ scattered and linearly ordered compactifications of size (and weight) $|S|$ up to homeomorphism.*

Remark. As already pointed out, the statement in Corollary 4 would be unprovable for a countably infinite discrete space S . However, in view of [9] it is clear that any countably infinite discrete space S has precisely \aleph_1 countable compactifications up to homeomorphism, and they all are scattered and linearly ordered spaces. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that any countably infinite discrete space S has 2^{\aleph_0} mutually non-homeomorphic *uncountable* compactifications which all are also *linearly ordered* and *metrizable* spaces (see [8] Theorem 7).

References

- [1] Engelking, R., *General Topology*, revised and completed edition. Heldermann 1989.
- [2] Hodel, R.E., *The number of metrizable spaces*, Fund. Math. **115** (1983), 127-141.
- [3] Kechris, A., *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*, Springer 1995.
- [4] Kuba, G.: *Counting topologies*. Elemente d. Math. **66** (2011), 56-62.
- [5] Kuba, G., *Counting metric spaces*, Archiv d. Math. **97** (2011), 569-578.
- [6] Kuba, G., *Counting linearly ordered spaces*, Coll. Math. **135** (2014), 1-14.
- [7] Kuba, G., *Counting ultrametric spaces*, Coll. Math. **152** (2018), 217-234.
- [8] Kuba, G., *On the variety of Euclidean point sets*, arXiv:2004.11101v1 [math.GN] (2020).
- [9] Mazurkiewicz, S., and Sierpiński, W., *Contribution la topologie des ensembles dnombrables*, Fund. Math. **1** (1920), 17-27.
- [10] Steen, L.A., and Seebach Jr., J.A., *Counterexamples in Topology*, Dover 1995.

Author's address: Institute of Mathematics.

University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna, Austria.

E-mail: gerald.kuba@boku.ac.at

Theorem 1 and its proof is contained in the author's paper [7].

Theorem 2 and its proof is contained in the author's paper [6].