

Sergei Logunov

On non-normality points and metrizable crowded spaces

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 48 (2007), No. 3, 523--527

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/119676>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 2007

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>

On non-normality points and metrizable crowded spaces

SERGEI LOGUNOV

Abstract. $\beta X - \{p\}$ is non-normal for any metrizable crowded space X and an arbitrary point $p \in X^*$.

Keywords: nice family, p -filter, p -ultrafilter, projection, non-normality point, butterfly-point

Classification: 54D35

1. Introduction

We investigate non-normality points in Čech-Stone remainders $X^* = \beta X - X$ of metrizable spaces.

There are several simple proofs that, under CH, $\omega^* - \{p\}$ is not normal for any $p \in \omega^*$ [7], [8]. “Naively” it is known only for special points of ω^* . If p is an accumulation point of some countable discrete subset of ω^* , or if p is a *strong R -point*, or if p is a *Kunen’s point*, then $\omega^* - \{p\}$ is not normal (Blażczyk and Szymanski [1], Gryzlov [2], van Douwen respectively).

What about realcompact crowded spaces? Is $\beta X - \{p\}$ non-normal whenever X is realcompact and crowded and $p \in X^*$? Probably, but we are unaware of any counterexample. On the other hand, the answer is “yes” if X is a locally compact Lindelöf separable crowded space with $\pi w(X) \leq \omega_1$ and p is remote [5]. It is also “yes” if X is a second countable crowded space and either X is locally compact, or X is zero-dimensional, or p is remote [3], [4], [6]. Using the regular base of Arhangel’skiĭ J. Terasawa has omitted the separability condition in the last two cases. He has obtained the affirmative answer in case if X is a metrizable crowded space and either X is strongly zero-dimensional or p is remote [10]. Here, introducing p -filters into this construction, we answer affirmatively for all metrizable crowded spaces.

B. Shapirovskij [9] has defined a *butterfly-point* (or *b-point*) in a space X . We call $p \in X^*$ a *butterfly-point in βX* , if $\{p\} = \text{Cl } F \cap \text{Cl } G$ for some $F, G \subset X^* - \{p\}$ with $\text{Cl}(F \cup G) \subset X^*$.

Theorem. *Let X be a non-compact metrizable crowded space. Then any point $p \in X^*$ is a butterfly-point in βX . Hence $\beta X - \{p\}$ is not normal.*

2. Proofs

From now on a space X is non-compact, metrizable and crowded, i.e. X has no isolated points, and $p \in X^*$ is an arbitrary point. We denote by cl- and Cl- the closure operations in X and βX respectively, $3 = \{0, 1, 2\}$.

Let π and σ be an arbitrary families. A set $U \in \pi$ is called a *maximal member* of the family π if $U \subsetneq V$ for no $V \in \pi$. If members of π are mutually disjoint (with closure), then π is called (*strongly*) *cellular*. We write $\pi \prec \sigma$ if $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$ implies $U \supseteq V$ for any $U \in \pi$ and $V \in \sigma$. We denote by $\text{Exp } \pi$ the set of subfamilies $\{F : F \subset \pi\}$. We define a *projection* f_σ^π from $\text{Exp } \pi$ to $\text{Exp } \sigma$ by $f_\sigma^\pi F = \{V \in \sigma : \bigcup F \cap V \neq \emptyset\}$ for every $F \in \text{Exp } \pi$.

A maximal locally finite cellular family of open sets is called *nice*. The introduced in [6] *cellular refinement* $\text{Cel}(\pi) = \{\bigcap \phi - \text{cl } \bigcup (\pi - \phi) : \phi \subset \pi\}$ of π is nice, if π is an open locally finite cover of X .

Let π and σ be nice families. A collection $\mathcal{F} = \{F\}$ of subfamilies $F \subseteq \pi$ is called a *p-filter on π* , if $p \in \text{Cl } \bigcup \bigcap_{k=0}^n F_k$ for any finite subcollection $\{F_0, \dots, F_n\} \subset \mathcal{F}$. Obviously, the union of any increasing family of *p-filters* is also a *p-filter*. So by Zorn's lemma there are maximal *p-filters* or *p-ultrafilters* \mathcal{F}' on π , that is $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{G}$ for any *p-filter* \mathcal{G} with $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Adding step-by-step new subfamilies from $\text{Exp } \pi - \mathcal{F}$ to \mathcal{F} , while possible, we can embed any *p-filter* \mathcal{F} into some *p-ultrafilter* \mathcal{F}' . If p is not a remote point, distinct *p-ultrafilters* \mathcal{F}' may exist. But each of them contains $\pi(O) = \{V \in \pi : V \cap O \neq \emptyset\}$ for any neighborhood O of p and its image $f_\sigma^\pi \mathcal{F} = \{f_\sigma^\pi F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is a *p-filter* on σ . We write $\pi \prec_{\mathcal{F}} \sigma$, if there is $F \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F \prec \sigma$. We denote $\bigcap \mathcal{F}^* = \bigcap \{\text{Cl } \bigcup F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we fix an open locally finite cover \mathcal{P}_i of X so that $\text{diam } U \leq \frac{1}{i}$ for any $U \in \mathcal{P}_i$ and $\{V \in \mathcal{P}_j : V \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite for each $j < i$. Then it is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{P}_i$$

is a regular base of Arhangel'skiĭ, i.e. for any point $x \in X$ and for any its neighborhood $O \subset X$ there is another neighborhood $O' \subset X$ of x with the following properties: $O' \subset O$ and at most finitely many members of \mathcal{P} meet booth O' and $X - O$ simultaneously. Moreover, for any cover $\pi \subset \mathcal{P}$ the family of its maximal members is a locally finite subcover of X .

By induction (see, also, [6]) we define the families of non-empty open sets \mathcal{D}_k and $\mathcal{W}_k \subset \mathcal{P}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \text{Cel}(\mathcal{P}_1).$$

If a nice family $\mathcal{D}_k = \{U\}$ has been constructed, then

$$\mathcal{W}_k = \{U(\nu) : U \in \mathcal{D}_k \text{ and } \nu \in 3\}$$

is strongly cellular with $\text{cl } U(\nu) \subset U$ for any its member and

$$\mathcal{D}_{k+1} = \text{Cel}(\mathcal{D}_k \cup \mathcal{W}_k \cup \mathcal{P}_{k+1}).$$

By our construction, if $U, V \in \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{D}_k$ are not disjoint, then either $U \subseteq V$ or $U \supseteq V$. For any $U \in \mathcal{P}_k$ the family $\hat{U} = \{V \in \mathcal{D}_k : V \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$ is locally finite and nice in U . For any locally finite cover $\pi \subset \mathcal{P}$ we denote $\sigma(\pi)$ all maximal members of the family $\bigcup\{\hat{U} : U \in \pi\}$. Then $\sigma(\pi)$ is nice. Define

$$\Sigma = \{\sigma(\pi) : \pi \subset \mathcal{P} \text{ is a locally finite cover of } X\}$$

and put $\sigma(\nu) = \{U(\nu) : U \in \sigma\}$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and $\nu \in 3$.

Lemma 1. *If π is an open locally finite cover of X , then $\text{Cel}(\pi)$ is nice.*

PROOF: Let $\phi \subset \pi$. If $\bigcap \phi \neq \emptyset$, then ϕ is finite. So $\bigcap \phi$ and, hence, $\bigcap \phi - \text{cl}(\pi - \phi)$ is open.

Let $\phi, \phi' \subset \pi$ be different and $U \in \phi - \phi'$. Then $\bigcap \phi \subset U$ and $\bigcap \phi' \cap U = \emptyset$, because $U \in \pi - \phi'$.

Let a neighborhood O of $x \in X$ meet finitely many members of π , say U_1, \dots, U_k . If $\phi \subset \pi$ contains some $U \in \pi - \{U_1, \dots, U_k\}$, then $\bigcap \phi \subseteq U \subseteq X - O$. So O meets at most 2^k members of $\text{Cel}(\pi)$.

As π is a locally finite family of open sets, $K = \bigcup\{\text{cl } U - U : U \in \pi\}$ is nowhere dense. Let $x \notin K$ and $\phi = \{U \in \pi : x \in U\}$. Then $U \notin \phi$ implies $x \notin \text{cl } U$. So $x \in \bigcap \phi - \text{cl} \bigcup(\pi - \phi)$, because π is conservative, and $\text{Cel}(\pi)$ is maximal. Our proof is complete. \square

Lemma 2. *There is a well-ordered chain $\{\sigma_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \subset \Sigma$ and p -ultrafilters \mathcal{F}_α on σ_α with the following properties for all $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$ and $f_\beta^\alpha = f_{\sigma_\beta}^{\sigma_\alpha}$:*

- (1) $p \notin \text{Cl } U$ for each $U \in \sigma_0$;
- (2) $f_\beta^\alpha \mathcal{F}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{F}_\beta$;
- (3) $\sigma_\alpha \prec_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha} \sigma_\beta$;
- (4) for any $\sigma \in \Sigma - \{\sigma_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ there is $\alpha < \lambda$ with $\neg(\sigma_\alpha \prec_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha} \sigma)$.

PROOF: Let π be all maximal members of the cover $\{U \in \mathcal{P} : p \notin \text{Cl } U\}$ and let \mathcal{F}_0 be any p -ultrafilter on $\sigma_0 = \sigma(\pi)$.

For any ordinal β assume p -ultrafilters \mathcal{F}_α on $\sigma_\alpha \in \Sigma$ have been constructed for all $\alpha < \beta$. If some $\sigma \in \Sigma - \{\sigma_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\}$ satisfies the condition $\sigma_\alpha \prec_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha} \sigma$ for all $\alpha < \beta$, then we put $\sigma_\beta = \sigma$ and embed the p -filter $\bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} f_\beta^\alpha \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ into some p -ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_β on σ_β . Otherwise our construction is complete. \square

Lemma 3. $\bigcap \mathcal{F}_0^* \subset X^*$.

PROOF: Let $x \in X$ be an arbitrary point. Then $F = \{U \in \sigma_0 : x \notin \text{cl } U\}$ satisfies, obviously, $x \notin \text{Cl } \bigcup F$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}_0$. \square

Lemma 4. *If $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$, then $\bigcap \mathcal{F}_\beta^* \subset \bigcap \mathcal{F}_\alpha^*$.*

PROOF: There is $F \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ with $F \prec \sigma_\beta$ by (3). For any $G \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ we have $G \cap F \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ and $G \cap F \prec \sigma_\beta$. But then

$$\bigcap \mathcal{F}_\beta^* \subset \text{Cl } f_\beta^\alpha(G \cap F) \subset \text{Cl}(G \cap F) \subset \text{Cl } G.$$

□

Lemma 5. *For any neighbourhood O of p in βX there is $\alpha < \lambda$ with $\bigcap \mathcal{F}_\alpha^* \subset O$.*

PROOF: Let $\text{Cl } O' \subset O$ for a neighbourhood O' of p and let π be all maximal members of the cover $\{U \in \mathcal{P} : U \cap O' \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow U \subset O\}$. For $\sigma = \sigma(\pi)$ there is $\alpha < \lambda$ with $\neg(\sigma_\alpha \prec_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha} \sigma)$ by (3) or (4). As $\sigma_\alpha(O') \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ then $F = \{V \in \sigma_\alpha(O') : V \subseteq U \text{ for some } U \in \sigma\}$ also belongs \mathcal{F}_α . So $\bigcap \mathcal{F}_\alpha^* \subset \text{Cl } \bigcup F \subset \text{Cl } \bigcup \sigma(O') \subset \text{Cl } O$.

□

Proposition 6. *For any $\alpha < \lambda$ and $\nu \in 3$ there is a point $p_\alpha(\nu) \in \bigcap \mathcal{F}_\alpha^*$ such that $p_\alpha(\nu) \in \text{Cl } \bigcup \sigma_\beta(\nu)$ for all $\beta \in \lambda - \alpha$.*

PROOF: Let $\alpha < \beta_0 < \dots < \beta_n < \lambda$ be any finite sequence and $F \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$. Our idea is to find non-empty $W \in \bigcup_{i \leq n} \sigma_{\beta_i}$ so that

$$W(\nu) \subseteq \bigcap_{i \leq n} \bigcup \sigma_{\beta_i}(\nu) \cap \bigcup F.$$

At the first step of induction we put $\Delta_0 = \{\sigma_{\beta_i} : i \leq n\}$, $\Theta_0 = \emptyset$ and choose $W_0 \in \bigcup \Delta_0$ as follows: We may assume $F \prec \sigma_{\beta_0}$. For any $i < n$ there is $G_i \in \mathcal{F}_{\beta_i}$ with $G_i \prec \sigma_{\beta_{i+1}}$. We denote $F_0 = f_{\beta_0}^\alpha F \cap G_0$ and $F_{i+1} = f_{\beta_{i+1}}^{\beta_i} F_i \cap G_{i+1}$. Then $F_{i+1} \succ F_i$ and $\bigcup F_{i+1} \subseteq \bigcup F_i$. Any pairwise intersecting $U_i \in F_i$ make up an embedded sequence $U_n \subseteq \dots \subseteq U_0 \subseteq \bigcup F$. We define $W_0 = U_0$.

For any $m < n$ let $\Delta_m, \Theta_m \subset \Delta_0$ and $W_m \in \bigcup \Delta_m$ has been constructed so that

- (1) $\Delta_m \cap \Theta_m = \emptyset$;
- (2) $\Delta_m \cup \Theta_m = \Delta_0$;
- (3) $W_m \subseteq \bigcup F$;
- (4) $W_m \subseteq \bigcup \sigma(\nu)$ for any $\sigma \in \Theta_m$;
- (5) for any $\sigma \in \Delta_m$ there is $U_\sigma \in \sigma$ with $U_\sigma \subseteq W_m$.

Let $\Omega_m = \{\sigma \in \Delta_m : U_\sigma = W_m\}$.

If $\Delta_m \neq \Omega_m$, then we put $\Delta_{m+1} = \Delta_m - \Omega_m$ and $\Theta_{m+1} = \Theta_m \cup \Omega_m$. As $\sigma \in \Delta_{m+1}$ are nice, we can choose $U'_\sigma \in \sigma$ so that $\bigcap \{U'_\sigma : \sigma \in \Delta_{m+1}\} \cap W_m(\nu) \neq \emptyset$. Then $U_\sigma \subsetneq W_m$ implies $U'_\sigma \subseteq W_m(\nu)$ by our construction. We define W_{m+1} to be the maximal member of embedded sequence $\{U'_\sigma : \sigma \in \Delta_{m+1}\}$.

If, finally, $\Delta_m = \Omega_m$, then W_m is as required. □

PROOF OF THEOREM: Define $F_\nu = \{p_\alpha(\nu) : \alpha < \lambda\}$ for all $\nu \in 3$. By our construction, $F_\nu \subset \bigcap \mathcal{F}_0^* \subset X^*$ and for any neighbourhood O of p there is $\alpha < \lambda$ with $\{p_\beta(\nu) : \beta \in \lambda - \alpha\} \subset \bigcap \mathcal{F}_\alpha^* \subset O$. Then the condition $\{p_\beta(\nu) : \beta < \alpha\} \subset \text{Cl} \bigcup \sigma_\alpha(\nu)$ implies that the sets $\text{Cl} F_\nu - \{p\}$ are pairwise disjoint and $p \in F_\nu$ for no more than one unique F_ν . The other two ensure that p is a b -point in βX .

Our proof is complete. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Blaszczyk A., Szymanski A., *Some nonnormal subspaces of the Čech-Stone compactifications of a discrete space*, in: Proc. 8-th Winter School on Abstract Analysis, Prague, 1980.
- [2] Gryzlov A.A., *On the question of hereditary normality of the space $\beta\omega \setminus \omega$* , Topology and Set Theory (Udmurt. Gos. Univ., Izhevsk) (1982), 61–64 (in Russian).
- [3] Logunov S., *On hereditary normality of compactifications*, Topology Appl. **73** (1996), 213–216.
- [4] Logunov S., *On hereditary normality of zero-dimensional spaces*, Topology Appl. **102** (2000), 53–58.
- [5] Logunov S., *On remote points, non-normality and π -weight ω_1* , Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **42** (2001), no. 2, 379–384.
- [6] Logunov S., *On remote points and butterfly-points*, Izvestia instituta matematiki i informatiki, Udmurt State University, Izhevsk (in Russian) **3** (26) (2002), 115–120.
- [7] van Mill J., *An easy proof that $\beta N \setminus N \setminus \{p\}$ is non-normal*, Ann. Math. Silesianea **2** (1984), 81–84.
- [8] Rajagopalan M., *$\beta N \setminus N \setminus \{p\}$ is not normal*, J. Indian Math. Soc. **36** (1972), 173–176.
- [9] Shapirovskij B., *On embedding extremely disconnected spaces in compact Hausdorff spaces, b -points and weight of pointwise normal spaces*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **223** (1975), 1083–1086.
- [10] Terasawa J., *On the non-normality of $\beta X - \{p\}$ for non-discrete spaces X* , Topology Proc. **27** (2003), 335–344.

DEPARTMENT FOR ALGEBRA AND TOPOLOGY, UDMURTIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
UNIVERSITetskAYA 1, IZHEVSK 426034, RUSSIA

E-mail: slogani@udm.net

(Received June 18, 2005, revised May 22, 2007)