

Alessandro Fedeli
Special almost P-spaces

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 38 (1997), No. 2, 371--374

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/118935>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1997

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

Special almost P-spaces

ALESSANDRO FEDELI

Abstract. Motivated by some examples, we introduce the concept of special almost P-space and show, using the reflection principle, that for every space X of this kind the inequality “ $|X| \leq \psi_c(X)^{t(X)}$ ” holds.

Keywords: cardinal function, almost P-space

Classification: 54A25, 54G99

An almost P-space is a space in which every non-empty G_δ -set has non-empty interior (see e.g. [7]). A subset S of a space X is called d-closed if disjoint closed subsets of S have disjoint closures in X . Obviously every closed subset of a space is d-closed. Moreover observe that:

(i) Every d-closed subset S of a normal space X is C^* -embedded in X : let C_1, C_2 be two completely separated sets in S , then C_1 and C_2 have disjoint closures in S . Since S is d-closed in X it follows that $cl_X(C_1) \cap cl_X(C_2) = \emptyset$. By the normality of X it follows that C_1 and C_2 are completely separated in X . Therefore (by the Urysohn’s extension theorem) S is C^* -embedded in X .

(ii) A C^* -embedded subset in a normal space may fail to be d-closed. In fact every d-closed subset of a normal space is normal.

(iii) Every normal C^* -embedded subset S in a space X is d-closed: let C_1 and C_2 be two closed disjoint subsets of S , since S is normal it follows that C_1 and C_2 are completely separated in S . Take a continuous function $f : S \rightarrow I$ such that $f(C_1) \subset \{0\}$ and $f(C_2) \subset \{1\}$. S is C^* -embedded in X so there is a continuous extension $F : X \rightarrow I$ of f , therefore C_1 and C_2 have disjoint closures in X and S is d-closed in X .

The purpose of this paper is to show that a good behaviour of the d-closed subsets of an almost P-space X allows us to obtain a bound on the cardinality of X in terms of $t(X)$ and $\psi_c(X)$, where $t(X)$ and $\psi_c(X)$ denote respectively the tightness and the closed pseudocharacter of X (we refer the reader to [3], [5], [6] for notations and terminology not explicitly given).

To this aim let us consider the following examples.

- (1) The one-point compactification of an uncountable discrete space is an almost P-space in which every d-closed subset is compact.
- (2) The one-point Lindelöfization of an uncountable discrete space is an almost P-space (even a P-space) in which every d-closed subset is Lindelöf.

(3) It is well known that under CH a subspace S of $\beta\omega$ is C^* -embedded in $\beta\omega$ if and only if it is weakly Lindelöf (i.e. every open cover of S has a countable subfamily whose union is dense, see e.g. Theorem 1.5.3 in [8]). Therefore $\beta\omega \setminus \omega$ is an almost P-space such that, under CH, every d-closed subset is weakly Lindelöf.

These common aspects of the above examples led us to the following

Definition 1. A special almost P-space X is a Hausdorff almost P-space in which every d-closed subset S is a WL-set in X (i.e. for every open family \mathcal{U} in X such that $S \subset \bigcup \mathcal{U}$ there exists a countable family $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$ such that $S \subset \overline{\bigcup \mathcal{V}}$).

Remark 2. Obviously every weakly Lindelöf subspace of a space X is a WL-set in X . The converse is not true. Let us consider the Katětov H-closed extension $k\omega$ of the discrete space ω , then $k\omega \setminus \omega$ is a discrete WL-set in $k\omega$ of cardinality 2^c .

To show our result on the cardinality of special almost P-spaces we need to review some facts on “elementary submodels” (our approach is that of [10], see also [9], [4] and [1], [2]).

Proposition 3 (The reflection principle). *Let $\phi(x, v_0, \dots, v_n)$ be a formula of set-theory with free variables x and the v_i 's. If A is any set, then there is a set $\mathcal{M} \supset A$ such that $|\mathcal{M}| \leq |A| + \omega$ and, whenever there are $m_0, \dots, m_n \in \mathcal{M}$ such that there is some x such that $\phi(x, m_0, \dots, m_n)$, then there is some $x \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\phi(x, m_0, \dots, m_n)$ (we say that \mathcal{M} reflects the formula $\exists x \phi$). We can also find a single \mathcal{M} which works for finitely many formulas simultaneously.*

Proposition 4. *Let κ, λ be infinite cardinal numbers. If A is a set such that $|A| \leq \lambda^\kappa$ and ϕ is a formula of set-theory, then there is a set \mathcal{M} such that $A \subset \mathcal{M}$, $|\mathcal{M}| \leq \lambda^\kappa$, \mathcal{M} reflects $\exists x \phi$ and moreover \mathcal{M} is closed under κ -sequences (i.e. $[\mathcal{M}]^{\leq \kappa} \subset \mathcal{M}$).*

Proposition 5. *Let κ be an infinite cardinal number. Then there are two formulas so that, if \mathcal{M} satisfies Proposition 3 for these two formulas and a set A and if $\kappa \subset A$, $\kappa \in A$, $E \in \mathcal{M}$ and $|E| \leq \kappa$, then $E \subset \mathcal{M}$.*

Theorem 6. *If X is a special almost P-space, then $|X| \leq \psi_c(X)^{t(X)}$.*

PROOF: Let $\kappa = t(X)$, $\lambda = \psi_c(X)$ and let τ be the topology on X . For every $x \in X$ let \mathcal{B}_x be a collection of open neighbourhoods of x with $|\mathcal{B}_x| \leq \lambda$ such that $\bigcap \{\overline{B} : B \in \mathcal{B}_x\} = \{x\}$, and let $f : X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\tau)$ be the map defined by $f(x) = \mathcal{B}_x$ for every $x \in X$.

Let $A = \lambda^\kappa \cup \{X, \tau, \lambda^\kappa, f\}$ and apply Propositions 3–5 to obtain a set \mathcal{M} such that $\mathcal{M} \supset A$, $|\mathcal{M}| = \lambda^\kappa$ and which reflects enough formulas to carry out the argument at hand. More precisely we ask that \mathcal{M} reflects enough formulas so that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) \mathcal{M} is closed under κ -sequences;
- (ii) $\mathcal{B}_x \in \mathcal{M}$ for every $x \in X \cap \mathcal{M}$;
- (iii) if $B \subset X$ and $B \in \mathcal{M}$, then $\overline{B} \in \mathcal{M}$;

- (iv) if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{M}$, then $\bigcup \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{M}$;
- (v) if B is a subset of X such that $X \cap \mathcal{M} \subset B$ and $B \in \mathcal{M}$, then $X = B$;
- (vi) if $E \in \mathcal{M}$ and $|E| \leq \lambda^\kappa$, then $E \subset \mathcal{M}$;
- (vii) if $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$, then $A \cap B \in \mathcal{M}$;
- (viii) if A is non-empty and $A \in \mathcal{M}$, then $A \cap \mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$.

For example if $\phi(x, v_0, v_1)$ is the formula $(x \in v_0 \wedge x \notin v_1)$ and \mathcal{M} reflects the formula $\exists x \phi$, then (v) is satisfied. In fact let B be a subset of X such that $B \in \mathcal{M}$. Set $m_0 = X$ and $m_1 = B$, if $B \neq X$ (i.e. if there is some x such that $\phi(x, m_0, m_1)$), then there is some $x \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\phi(x, m_0, m_1)$, i.e. $X \cap \mathcal{M} \not\subset B$.

Observe that by (ii) and (vi) $\mathcal{B}_y \subset \mathcal{M}$ for every $y \in X \cap \mathcal{M}$.

First we check that $X \cap \mathcal{M}$ is d-closed in X . Let F_1, F_2 be two closed disjoint subsets of $X \cap \mathcal{M}$, we claim that they have disjoint closures in X . Suppose there is a point $x \in \overline{F_1} \cap \overline{F_2}$, since $t(X) = \kappa$ it follows that there are $A \in [F_1]^{\leq \kappa}$ and $B \in [F_2]^{\leq \kappa}$ such that $x \in \overline{A} \cap \overline{B}$. Since $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ ($A, B \subset \mathcal{M}$ and \mathcal{M} is closed under κ -sequences) it follows that $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B} \in \mathcal{M}$ (by (iii) and (vii)). Therefore by (viii) there is some $x \in \overline{A} \cap \overline{B} \cap \mathcal{M}$, so $x \in cl_{X \cap \mathcal{M}}(A) \cap cl_{X \cap \mathcal{M}}(B) \subset F_1 \cap F_2$, which is a contradiction.

Now let us show that $X \subset \mathcal{M}$ (and hence $|X| \leq \psi_c(X)^{t(X)}$). Suppose not and take a point $x \in X \setminus \mathcal{M}$. For every $y \in X \cap \mathcal{M}$ let $B_y \in \mathcal{B}_y$ such that $x \notin \overline{B_y}$ and observe that $B_y \in \mathcal{M}$. Since $X \cap \mathcal{M} \subset \bigcup \{B_y : y \in X \cap \mathcal{M}\}$ and $X \cap \mathcal{M}$ is a WL-set in X there is some $S \in [X \cap \mathcal{M}]^{\leq \omega}$ such that $X \cap \mathcal{M} \subset \overline{\bigcup_{y \in S} B_y}$. Now set $G = Int(\bigcap \{X \setminus \overline{B_y} : y \in S\})$, since $\bigcap \{X \setminus \overline{B_y} : y \in S\}$ is a non-empty G_δ -set and X is an almost P-space it follows that $G \neq \emptyset$. Moreover $G \cap \overline{\bigcup_{y \in S} B_y} = \emptyset$.

Since $\{B_y : y \in S\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ and \mathcal{M} is closed under κ -sequences, it follows that $\{B_y : y \in S\} \in \mathcal{M}$. Hence, by (iv), $\bigcup \{B_y : y \in S\} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Now observe that, by (iii), $\overline{\bigcup_{y \in S} B_y} \in \mathcal{M}$ and therefore, by (v), $\overline{\bigcup_{y \in S} B_y} = X$, a contradiction. □

Remark 7. Obviously every special almost P-space is weakly Lindelöf. Moreover it is well-known that $|X| \leq 2^{\chi(X)}$ for every weakly Lindelöf T_4 -space X (see [5, Theorem 4.13]), so it is natural to compare this estimation with the one given in Theorem 6. To this end let us consider the one-point compactification X of the discrete space of cardinality 2^{\aleph_0} . It is easily seen that $|X| = \psi_c(X)^{t(X)} < 2^{\chi(X)}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dow A., *An introduction to applications of elementary submodels to topology*, Topology Proc. **13** (1988), 17–72.
- [2] Dow A., *More set-theory for topologists*, Topology Appl. **64** (1995), 243–300.
- [3] Engelking R., *General Topology*, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [4] Fedeli A., Watson S., *Elementary submodels and cardinal functions*, Topology Proc., to appear.
- [5] Hodel R.E., *Cardinal Functions I*, in: Handbook of Set-theoretic Topology, (Kunen K. and Vaughan J.E., eds.), North Holland, 1984, pp.1–61.

- [6] Juhász I., *Cardinal Functions in Topology—ten years later*, Mathematical Centre Tracts 123, Amsterdam, 1980.
- [7] Levy R., *Almost P-spaces*, Can. J. Math. **29** (1977), 284–288.
- [8] van Mill J., *An introduction to $\beta\omega$* , in: Handbook of Set-theoretic Topology, (Kunen K. and Vaughan J.E., eds.), North Holland, 1984, pp. 503–567.
- [9] Watson S., *The construction of topological spaces: Planks and Resolutions*, in: Recent Progress in General Topology (Hušek M. and Van Mill J., eds.), North Holland, 1992, pp. 675–757.
- [10] Watson S., *The Lindelöf number of a power; an introduction to the use of elementary submodels in general topology*, Topology Appl. **58** (1994), 25–342.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA PURA ED APPLICATA, UNIVERSITÀ, 67100 L'AQUILA, ITALY

(Received April 30, 1996)