
TOPOLOGY PROCEEDINGS



Volume 9, 1984

Pages 31–36

<http://topology.auburn.edu/tp/>

MORE ON CAUCHY CONDITIONS

by

S. W. DAVIS

Topology Proceedings

Web: <http://topology.auburn.edu/tp/>

Mail: Topology Proceedings
Department of Mathematics & Statistics
Auburn University, Alabama 36849, USA

E-mail: topolog@auburn.edu

ISSN: 0146-4124

COPYRIGHT © by Topology Proceedings. All rights reserved.

MORE ON CAUCHY CONDITIONS

S. W. Davis

0. Introduction

This note is a continuation of [D]. The question which prompts this work was asked by Arhangel'skii and relayed by M. E. Rudin, namely, "Is every Lindelöf symmetrizable space separable?" This question appears in print in [NC].

The approach which has been used on this problem by Kofner [K], Nedev [N] and this author has been to increase the strength of the symmetric involved by adding a Cauchy-like requirement for convergent sequences. These conditions are described in detail in [D], and we will not repeat them here with the exception of the condition which we will be using.

Definition 0.1 [A]. A space X is called *weakly first countable* iff there exists $B: \omega \times X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ such that (i) for all $x \in X$ we have $B(n+1, x) \subseteq B(n, x)$ for all $n \in \omega$, and $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} B(n, x) = \{x\}$ and (2) a set $U \subseteq X$ is open iff for each $x \in U$ there exists $n_x \in \omega$ such that $B(n_x, x) \subseteq U$.

The function B in 0.1 is called a *wfc-system* which is compatible with X .

Definition 0.2. If B is a *wfc-system* for a space X , then we say B is *wC* iff whenever $A \subseteq X$ and there exists $n \in \omega$ such that $B(n, x) \cap A = \{x\}$ for all $x \in A$, then A is relatively discrete.

The present paper concerns WC wfc-systems on symmetrizable spaces. We show that if a Lindelöf symmetrizable space has a WC wfc-system, then it is separable. We also present an example of a symmetrizable space with no WC wfc-system which answers a question raised in [D].

We use the notation $\omega = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$.

1. The Main Result

In this section, we give the (surprisingly easy) proof of our main theorem. First, we give a lemma which is quite useful in working on these properties.

Lemma 1.1. Suppose X is a T_2 -space, d is a symmetric compatible with X , and B is a wfc-system compatible with X . For each $x \in X$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $k \in \omega$ such that $B(k, x) \subseteq \{y: d(x, y) < \frac{1}{n}\}$.

Proof. If the theorem is false, then choose $x \in X$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ witnessing that fact. For each $k \in \omega$ choose $x_k \in B(k, x)$ with $d(x, x_k) \geq \frac{1}{n}$. Since B is compatible with X , the sequence $\langle x_k: k \in \omega \rangle$ converges to x . Consider the set $\{x_k: k \in \omega\}$. Suppose $y \notin \{x_k: k \in \omega\}$. If $y = x$, then $d(y, \{x_k: k \in \omega\}) \geq \frac{1}{n} > 0$. If $y \neq x$, then $\{x\} \cup \{x_k: k \in \omega\}$ is a closed set excluding y , thus $d(y, \{x_k: k \in \omega\}) \geq d(y, \{x\} \cup \{x_k: k \in \omega\}) > 0$. In either case then $d(y, \{x_k: k \in \omega\}) > 0$ for all $y \in X \setminus \{x_k: k \in \omega\}$. Since d is compatible with X , this says that $\{x_k: k \in \omega\}$ is closed which is clearly impossible since $x \in \overline{\{x_k: k \in \omega\}} \setminus \{x_k: k \in \omega\}$. Hence we have the result.

Remark. Although we shall not need it here, a somewhat stronger result can be obtained; namely, if X is T_2 and B, B' are wfc-systems compatible with X , then for each $x \in X$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $B(k,x) \subseteq B'(n,x)$.

Lemma 1.2 [Nedev]. Every regular Lindelöf symmetrizable space is hereditarily Lindelöf.

Besides being useful for the next result, 1.2 shows that a counterexample (if there is one) to the main question must be an L-space.

Theorem 1.3. If X is a regular Lindelöf symmetrizable space with a compatible wC wfc-system, then X is separable.

Proof. Let d be a symmetric compatible with X , and B a wC wfc-system compatible with X . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $D_n \subseteq X$ be maximal with respect to $d(x,y) \geq \frac{1}{n}$ for $x,y \in D_n, x \neq y$. Now $D = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n$ is dense in X , since if $x \in U$ with U open and $U \cap D = \emptyset$, then choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d(x, X \setminus U) \geq \frac{1}{k}$, and D_k is not maximal. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $x \in D_n$, by Lemma 1.1, we let $k(x,n)$ be an element of the set $\{k: B(k,x) \subseteq \{y: d(x,y) < \frac{1}{n}\}\}$. For each $k \in \omega$, let $E_k = \{x \in D_n: k(x,n) = k\}$. For each $x \in E_k, B(k,x) \cap E_k = \{x\}$. Since B is wC, E_k is then relatively discrete. By Lemma 1.2, X is hereditarily Lindelöf, so E_k is countable. Now since $D_n = \bigcup_{k \in \omega} E_k$, we have that D_n is countable. This is true for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, thus D is the desired countable dense subset.

2. The Main Example

In this section, we describe an old example of Kofner [K], and show that it has no compatible wC wfc-system even though it is a separable symmetrizable space. This answers negatively Question 4.1 of [D].

Example 2.1 [Kofner]. Let \mathbf{R} denote the real numbers, I denote the irrational numbers, and \mathbf{Z} denote the integers. Let $D_0 = \emptyset$, and for $i \in \mathbf{N}$, let $D_i = \{\frac{k}{2^{i-1}}: k \in \mathbf{Z}\}$. Let $D = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} D_i$. Note that D is the set of dyadic rationals. Let $M = I \cup D$. For $x \in M$ and $j \in \mathbf{N}$, we let $T_j(x) = M \cap (x - \frac{1}{2^{j-1}}, x + \frac{1}{2^{j-1}})$. For $x \in I$, let $S_j(x) = T_j(x) \cap D_j$ for each $j \in \mathbf{N}$. Let $O_n(x) = \bigcup_{j \geq n} S_j(x) \cup \{x\}$ for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

For $x \in D$, choose i with $x \in D_i \setminus D_{i-1}$. For $n \in \mathbf{N}$, let $m = \max\{i, n\}$, let $U_n(x) = T_n(x) \cap D$, and let $O_n(x) = T_m(x) \cup U_n(x)$.

Define $B^*: \mathbf{N} \times M \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M)$ by $B^*(n, x) = O_n(x)$. Then using (2) of Definition 0.1 to define a topology on M , B^* is a wfc-system.

Let X be the space whose underlying set is M with the topology generated by B^* .

Lemma 2.2 [Kofner]. B^* is a symmetric wfc-system (i.e. $x \in B^*(n, y) \Rightarrow y \in B^*(n, x)$) for the topology on X which is finer than Euclidean. Hence X is T_2 and symmetrizable.

Lemma 2.3 [Kofner]. X is zero dimensional. Hence X is a Tychonoff space.

Theorem 2.4. *There is no wC wfc-system which is compatible with X.*

Proof. Suppose B is any wfc-system which is compatible with X. For $n \in \omega$, let $I_n = \{x \in I : B(n,x) \cap I = \{x\}\}$. Since for each $x \in I$, there exists $k \in \omega$ such that $B(k,x) \subseteq O_1(x)$ by Lemma 1.1, we have that $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} I_n = I$. Since I is second category in \mathbb{R} , choose $n \in \omega$ and an open interval (a,b) such that $a \notin M$, $b \notin M$, and $I_n \cap (a,b)$ is dense in the Euclidean topology on (a,b) . Now in the topology of X, each point of $I_n \cap (a,b)$ is a cluster point of I_n so that I_n can not be relatively discrete. Hence B is not wC.

3. Sequential Separability and Questions

The positive results on the question we've been considering all have a similarity in the way the countable dense subset is constructed. Indeed, the countable dense set D is such that each point in the space is the limit of a sequence drawn from D. In non-Fréchet spaces, this "sequential separability" seems too much to expect.

Question 3.1. Is every separable symmetrizable space "sequentially separable"?*

The main question could still be answered by an affirmative answer to the following:

Question 3.2. Does every Lindelöf symmetrizable space admit a wC wfc-system?

* See Note added in proof.

Related to wC and weak Cauchy conditions (see [D] for definitions), the following questions remain.

Question 3.3. If X has a symmetric and a wC wfc-system, must X have a wC symmetric?

Question 3.4. If X has a wC symmetric, must X have a weakly Cauchy symmetric?

Kofner [K] has shown that the answer is "yes" to 3.3 if "wC" is replaced by "weakly Cauchy." Example 2.5 of [D] shows that 3.4 does not trivially have a "yes" answer.

Note (added in proof). L. Foged has given an example answering 3.1 in the negative.

References

- [A] A. V. Arhangel'skiĭ, *Mappings and spaces*, Russian Math. Surveys 21 (1966), 115-162.
- [D] S. W. Davis, *Cauchy conditions on symmetric spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 86 (1982), 349-352.
- [K] J. A. Kofner, *Symmetrizable spaces and factor mappings*, translated from *Matematicheskie Zametki* 14 (1973), 713-722.
- [N] S. I. Nedev, *Symmetrizable spaces and final compactness*, Soviet Math. Dokl. 8 (1967), 890-892.
- [NC] _____ and M. M. Choban, *On the theory of α -metrizable spaces, II*, Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Matematika, 27 (2) (1972), 10-17.

Miami University
Oxford, Ohio 45056