


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

TOPOLOGY PROCEEDINGS



Volume 54, 2019

Pages 259–269

<http://topology.nipissingu.ca/tp/>

MAHAVIER PRODUCTS, IDEMPOTENT RELATIONS, AND CONDITION Γ

by

STEVEN CLONTZ AND SCOTT VARAGONA

Electronically published on April 11, 2019

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: (Online) 2331-1290, (Print) 0146-4124

COPYRIGHT © by Topology Proceedings. All rights reserved.

MAHAVIER PRODUCTS, IDEMPOTENT RELATIONS, AND CONDITION Γ

STEVEN CLONTZ AND SCOTT VARAGONA

ABSTRACT. Clearly, a generalized inverse limit of metrizable spaces indexed by $\mathbb{N}$ is metrizable, as it is a subspace of a countable product of metrizable spaces. The authors previously showed that all idempotent, upper semi-continuous, surjective, continuum-valued bonding functions on $[0, 1]$ (other than the identity) satisfy a certain Condition Γ ; it follows that only in trivial cases can a generalized inverse limit of copies of $[0, 1]$ indexed by an uncountable ordinal be metrizable. The authors show that Condition Γ is, in fact, guaranteed by much weaker criteria, proving a more general metrizability theorem for certain Mahavier products.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the spirit of the celebrated work by William S. Mahavier [9] and by W. T. Ingram and Mahavier [7], who first generalized traditional inverse limits to those with set-valued bonding functions, researchers have sought more ways to generalize inverse limits. One route proposed in [8] would be to index the factor spaces of an inverse limit not necessarily by the natural numbers, but rather by some other directed set. However, a poorly-behaved directed set can cause an inverse limit to be empty [8]; therefore, most research in this area has involved inverse limits with totally ordered index sets.

Various results in recent years have shown that investigating totally ordered index sets other than the natural numbers is fertile ground for new work. Ingram and Mahavier lay the foundation in [8] by proving some

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54B10 54C60 54D80 54F15.

Key words and phrases. idempotence, Mahavier product, relations, set valued, upper semi continuous.

©2019 Topology Proceedings.

basic connectedness theorems. Notably, Patrick Vernon in [11] studies inverse limits on $[0, 1]$ with set-valued functions indexed by the integers, and he shows that such an inverse limit with a single bonding function could be homeomorphic to a 2-cell—a striking result, considering Van Nall shows in [10] that this could never happen for an inverse limit indexed by the natural numbers. Later, the notion of a generalized inverse limit is further generalized to the notion of a Mahavier product, which only requires the index set to be a preordered set. Thus, the recent interest in Mahavier products (e.g., Sina Greenwood and Judy Kennedy [4] and Włodzimierz J. Charatonik and Robert P. Roe [2]) has helped bring “alternate” index sets further into the mainstream. In particular, in [2], Charatonik and Roe prove theorems about Mahavier products indexed by arbitrary totally ordered sets and, in the process, introduce some helpful terminology in the study of generalized inverse limits. Therefore, given this context, it is natural to consider generalized inverse limits (or Mahavier products) indexed by ordinals.

In [3], we study the special case of a generalized inverse limit of copies of $[0, 1]$ with a single continuum-valued upper semi-continuous idempotent bonding function. We prove that when f is a surjection other than the identity, the graph of f must contain two distinct points $\langle x, x \rangle$ and $\langle y, y \rangle$ on the diagonal, in addition to a third point $\langle x, y \rangle$. This Condition Γ is sufficient to guarantee that whenever the inverse limit is indexed by an ordinal α , the inverse limit contains a copy of $\alpha + 1$. It therefore follows that such an inverse limit is a metric continuum if and only if α is countable. When we authored [3], we suspected this to be merely a special case of a more general trend. To this end, it will be shown that to guarantee Condition Γ , $[0, 1]$ may be replaced with any weakly countably compact space, f need not be continuum-valued, and the surjectivity of f may be replaced with a weaker assumption to prevent trivialities. Applying this result, we also prove metrizability theorems for certain Mahavier products indexed by ordinals.

2. DEFINITIONS AND CONVENTIONS

Except when otherwise stated, we assume that all topological spaces are Hausdorff. By convention, all natural numbers are ordinals, e.g., $4 = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. Let B^A denote the set of functions from A to B ; in particular, X^2 is the usual square of ordered pairs $\{\langle x, y \rangle : x, y \in X\}$ (each pair is a function from $\{0, 1\}$ to X) and 2^X is the Cantor set of functions from X to $\{0, 1\}$. Let $F(X)$ denote the non-empty closed subsets of X .

Given a relation $R \subseteq X \times Y$, let $R(x) = \{y : xRy\} = \{y : \langle x, y \rangle \in R\}$; we often will use letters f and g to define relations and treat them as set-valued functions in this way. Given relations or set-valued functions f

and g and a set A , let $f(A) = \{f(x) : x \in A\}$ and $(f \circ g)(x) = f(g(x)) = \bigcup_{y \in g(x)} f(y) = \{z : \exists y(z \in f(y), y \in g(x))\}$. If $f : X \rightarrow F(X)$ or $f \subseteq X^2$, let $f^2 = f \circ f$.

Definition 2.1. Suppose $\langle P, \leq \rangle$ is a directed set ($\leq$ is transitive and reflexive, and each pair of points shares a common upper bound) and for each $p \in P$, X_p is a space. Let $\Pi = \prod_{p \in P} X_p$; we will use boldface letters to denote sequences in Π , e.g., $\mathbf{x} \in \Pi$. Suppose further that for each $p \leq q \in P$, there is a set-valued *bonding function* $f_{p,q} : X_q \rightarrow F(X_p)$ such that for $p \leq q \leq r$, $f_{p,r} = f_{p,q} \circ f_{q,r}$ with $f_{p,p} : X_p \rightarrow F(X_p)$ defined by $f_{p,p}(x) = \{x\}$. Then the *generalized inverse limit* $\varprojlim \langle X_p, f_{p,q}, P \rangle \subseteq \Pi$ is given by

$$\varprojlim \langle X_p, f_{p,q}, P \rangle = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi : p \leq q \Rightarrow \mathbf{x}(p) \in f_{p,q}(\mathbf{x}(q))\}.$$

The preceding definition is based upon the one given in [8, Ch. 2]. Much of the literature assumes that P is a total order, often simply $\omega = \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, but allowing for other orders, such as $\mathbb{Z}$, enables the construction of many interesting examples unattainable with simply ω [11].

The study of generalized inverse limits typically focuses on upper semi-continuous bonding functions $f_{p,q} : X_q \rightarrow F(X_p)$, which for compact spaces may be characterized as those that map points to non-empty sets and whose graphs are closed in $X_q \times X_p$. In fact, it will be convenient to simply consider this graph itself as a relation. This is exactly the approach taken with Mahavier products in [2] and [4].

Definition 2.2. Take the assumptions of the previous definition, but let $\langle P, \leq \rangle$ be a preordered set ($\leq$ is transitive and reflexive) and let $f_{p,q} \subseteq X_q \times X_p$ such that $f_{p,r} \subseteq f_{p,q} \circ f_{q,r}$. Then the *Mahavier product* $\mathbf{M} \langle X_p, f_{p,q}, P \rangle \subseteq \Pi$ is given by

$$\mathbf{M} \langle X_p, f_{p,q}, P \rangle = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi : p \leq q \Rightarrow \mathbf{x}(p) \in f_{p,q}(\mathbf{x}(q))\}.$$

Note that the condition $f_{p,r} \subseteq f_{p,q} \circ f_{q,r}$ has been weakened from equality, $f_{p,q}$ is an arbitrary relation from X_q to X_p , and the directed set is now only preordered, as is done in [2].

Definition 2.3. A Mahavier product $\mathbf{M} \langle X_p, f_{p,q}, P \rangle$ is *exact* whenever $f_{p,r} = f_{p,q} \circ f_{q,r}$ for all $p \leq q \leq r$.

Definition 2.4. A relation $f \subseteq X \times Y$ is said to be *left-total* (also called *full* [2]) if for all $x \in X$ there exists $y \in Y$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle \in f$; that is, $f(x) \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \in X$.

Note that we will refrain from using the term “full” to describe such relations, as “full” bonding functions are defined in another sense in [5].

Observation 2.5. *Exact Mahavier products bonded by closed-valued left-total relations indexed by a directed set are generalized inverse limits.*

Definition 2.6. A left-total relation that is a closed subset of $X \times Y$ is called *USC*.

Here USC stands for upper semi-continuous, as in the case that X and Y are compact; this property may be characterized as follows: For every $x \in X$ and open set $V \supseteq f(x)$, there exists an open neighborhood U of x such that $f(u) \subseteq V$ for all $u \in U$ [7]. Put another way, the set-valued function $f : X \rightarrow F(Y)$ is continuous where $F(Y)$ is given the upper Vietoris topology.

Definition 2.7. A relation $f \subseteq X \times Y$ is *surjective* if, for all $y \in Y$, there exists $x \in X$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle \in f$.

Definition 2.8. An *idempotent* relation on $f \subseteq X^2$ is one that satisfies $f^2 = f$.

Note that transitivity may be characterized by $f^2 \subseteq f$, so all idempotent relations are transitive. Put another way, an idempotent relation $R \subseteq X^2$ satisfies xRz if and only if $xRyRz$ for some $y \in X$; transitivity is the backwards implication. Assuming reflexivity, idempotence and transitivity are equivalent: Let $y = z$, so $xRz \Leftrightarrow xRzRz \Leftrightarrow xRyRz$. Note also that the inverse of an idempotent relation is idempotent.

The usual strict linear order $<$ on $\mathbb{Z}$ is an example of a transitive yet non-idempotent relation. Likewise, the strict linear order on any dense subset of $\mathbb{R}$ is a non-reflexive idempotent relation.


Idempotent relations are of significant interest when studying exact Mahavier products of many copies of the same topological space.

Observation 2.9. *If $X_p = X$ and $f_{p,q} = f$ for all $p < q$, and there exist $p, q, r \in P$ such that $p < q < r$, then the bonding relation f in an exact Mahavier product $\mathbf{M}\langle X, f, P \rangle$ must be idempotent.*

Note that $f_{p,p} \neq f$ unless f is the identity, but for simplicity we still simply write $\mathbf{M}\langle X, f, P \rangle$.

Definition 2.10. For convenience, we call a USC idempotent surjective relation $f \subseteq X^2$ a *V-relation*.

Examples of V-relations are given in Figure 1 (the designated points illustrate the definition of Condition Γ , given in §4). The next section will outline how to construct and identify V-relations.


FIGURE 1. Illustrating Condition Γ for V-relations on $[0, 1]$

3. CONSTRUCTING V-RELATIONS

The following propositions not only give necessary and/or sufficient conditions for a relation f to be a V-relation, but also give the reader a few tools for constructing simple V-relations from scratch. The first proposition is a useful recharacterization of idempotence.

Proposition 3.1. *Let X be a space and let $f \subseteq X^2$ be USC and surjective. Then f is a V-relation if and only if whenever A is the image of some $x \in X$, then $f(A) = A$.*

As an obvious consequence of Proposition 3.1, if $f \subseteq X^2$ is a V-relation and for some $x \in X$, $f(x) = \{y\}$, then $f(y) = \{y\}$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $f \subseteq [0, 1]^2$ be USC. If f satisfies at least one of the following conditions, then f is a V-relation.*

- (1) For each $x \in [0, 1]$, $f(x) = \{x, 1 - x\}$.
- (2) The relation f is surjective, and for each $x \in [0, 1]$, $f(x) = [0, x]$ or $f(x) \subseteq \{0, x\}$.
- (3) The relation f is surjective, and for each $x \in [0, 1]$, $f(x) = [x, 1]$ or $f(x) \subseteq \{x, 1\}$.
- (4) For some non-empty $A, B \subseteq [0, 1]$ with $A \cap B = \emptyset$, we have $f(a) = [0, 1]$ for each $a \in A$ and $f(x) = B$ for each $x \in [0, 1] \setminus A$.
- (5) The relation f is surjective, and there exists $b \in [0, 1]$ with $b \in f(b) = B$ so that for all $x \in [0, 1]$, either $f(x) = \{x\}$, $f(x) = B$, or $f(x) = \{y\}$ for some $y \in B$ satisfying $f(y) = \{y\}$.

Proof. Each of the five conditions implies that f is surjective, so it remains to verify that each condition implies that f is idempotent. In [6, p. 49], Ingram observes that (1) implies f is idempotent. For (2), let $x \in [0, 1]$. We note that $f(y) \subseteq [0, x]$ for every $y \leq x$. Therefore, if $f(x) = [0, x]$, then, clearly, $f^2(x) = [0, x] = f(x)$. On the other hand, if $f(x) = \{0, x\}$, then $f^2(x) = f(0) \cup f(x) = \{0\} \cup \{0, x\} = f(x)$; the remaining cases are obvious. The details for (3) are similarly straightforward and are left to the reader.

For (4), we note that when $x \in A$, $f(x) = [0, 1]$ (so, of course, $f^2(x) = [0, 1]$), whereas if $x \in [0, 1] \setminus A$, then $f(x) = B$, so that $f^2(x) = f(B)$. However, when $b \in B$, since $b \notin A$, it follows that $f(b) = B$; thus, $f^2(x) = B$, and we conclude that f is idempotent.

To prove that (5) implies f is idempotent, let $x \in [0, 1]$. If $f(x) = \{x\}$, then, clearly, $f^2(x) = f(x)$. If $f(x) = \{y\}$ for some $y \in B$ with $f(y) = \{y\}$, then $f^2(x) = f(y) = \{y\} = f(x)$. Finally, if $f(x) = B$, then $f^2(x) = f(B)$; since $f(b) \subseteq B$ for each $b \in B$, and there is some $b \in B$ that satisfies $f(b) = B$, it follows that $f(B) = B$. Thus, $f^2(x) = f(x)$ in each case. $\square$

Note that Proposition 3.2 implies that each of the relations pictured in Figure 1 is a V-relation. (Of course, the sufficient conditions given in Proposition 3.2 are by no means exhaustive.)

4. CONDITION Γ

Definition 4.1. A relation $f \subseteq X^2$ satisfies *Condition Γ* if distinct $x, y \in X$ exist such that $\langle x, x \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle y, y \rangle \in f$.

Note that in Figure 1, every example given other than the identity satisfies Condition Γ . In fact, this section will show that every V-relation other than the identity on a weakly countably compact space satisfies Condition Γ .

Definition 4.2. Let $\iota \subseteq X^2$ be the diagonal $\iota = \{\langle x, x \rangle : x \in X\}$, i.e., the *identity relation*.

Definition 4.3. For $f \subseteq X \times Y$ and $A \subseteq X$, let $f \upharpoonright A = f \cap (A \times Y)$.

Proposition 4.4. For f transitive, $f \upharpoonright f(x) = f \cap (f(x))^2$.

Definition 4.5. A relation is said to be *trivial* if for all $x \in X$, $f \upharpoonright f(x) = \iota \upharpoonright f(x)$.

Any trivial relation is idempotent, and, of course, ι is trivial, but other trivial idempotent relations exist other than the identity. For example, let $t \subseteq 3^2 = \{0, 1, 2\}^2$ be defined by

$$t = \{\langle 0, 0 \rangle, \langle 1, 1 \rangle, \langle 2, 0 \rangle, \langle 2, 1 \rangle\}.$$

It follows that $t \upharpoonright f(0) = t \upharpoonright \{0\} = \iota \upharpoonright \{0\}$, $t \upharpoonright f(1) = t \upharpoonright \{1\} = \iota \upharpoonright \{1\}$, and $t \upharpoonright f(2) = t \upharpoonright \{0, 1\} = \iota \upharpoonright \{0, 1\}$. Figure 2 shows examples of trivial relations defined on $[0, 1]$; these do not satisfy Condition Γ .

Observing that none of the examples in Figure 2 are surjective, the following proposition will allow us to ignore such exceptional cases when considering V-relations other than the identity.




FIGURE 2. Trivial idempotent relations on $[0,1]$ other than ι

Proposition 4.6. *Let f be a transitive surjective relation on X . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) $f = \iota$;
- (b) $|f(x)| = 1$ for all $x \in X$;
- (c) f is trivial.

Proof. (a) implies (b) trivially, so assume (b). For an arbitrary $x \in X$, there exists some $y \in X$ such that $f(x) = \{y\}$. Thus, $f^2(x) = \{y\} = f(y)$ by transitivity, so it follows that $f \upharpoonright \{y\} = \{\langle y, y \rangle\} = \iota \upharpoonright \{y\}$, showing (c).

Finally, assuming (c), let $y \in X$ and, by surjectivity, choose $x \in X$ with $y \in f(x)$. By triviality, $f(y) = (f \upharpoonright f(x))(y) = (\iota \upharpoonright f(x))(y) = \iota(y)$, showing (a). $\square$

Corollary 4.7. *The only trivial V -relation is ι .*

We now aim to exploit the properties of non-trivial relations to produce Condition Γ in V -relations other than ι . To do this, we require the following lemmas.

Definition 4.8. A *weakly countably compact space* is a space such that every infinite subset has a limit point.

Assuming spaces are T_2 , this property is equivalent to countable compactness: every countable open cover has a finite subcover. But we will need only this weaker characterization, and the remainder of this section does not assume any separation axioms for the spaces under consideration.

Lemma 4.9. *Let X be weakly countably compact. Every USC idempotent relation $f \subseteq X^2$ other than ι contains two points $\langle y, y \rangle$ and $\langle x, y \rangle$ for some distinct $x, y \in X$.*

Proof. Note first that if $\iota \subseteq f$, then, since $\iota \neq f$, the lemma follows immediately. So let $x_0 \in X$ be a point where $\langle x_0, x_0 \rangle \notin f$.

Suppose x_i is defined for $i \leq n$ such that $\langle x_i, x_j \rangle \in f$ if and only if $i < j$. Since $\{x_0, \dots, x_n\} \cap f(x_n) = \emptyset$, we may choose $x_{n+1} \notin \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$

such that $\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle \in f$. Note that by idempotence, $\langle x_{n+1}, x_i \rangle \notin f$ for $i \leq n$ since $x_i \notin f(x_n) = f^2(x_n) \supseteq f(x_{n+1})$. Similarly, $\langle x_i, x_{n+1} \rangle \in f$ for $i < n$ since $\langle x_i, x_n \rangle \in f$ and $\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle \in f$. If $\langle x_{n+1}, x_{n+1} \rangle \in f$, then the lemma is satisfied by $x = x_n$ and $y = x_{n+1}$.

If not, we have recursively constructed an infinite set $\{x_n : n < \omega\}$. Since X is a weakly countably compact space, $\{x_n : n < \omega\}$ has a limit point x_ω . Since $\{\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle : n < \omega\} \subseteq f$, it follows that $\langle x_\omega, x_\omega \rangle$ is a limit point of f . Similarly, $\{\langle x_0, x_n \rangle : 0 < n < \omega\} \subseteq f$, so it follows that $\langle x_0, x_\omega \rangle$ is also a limit point of f . Since f is closed, these limit points belong to f . Therefore, the lemma is witnessed by $x = x_0$ and $y = x_\omega$. $\square$

Lemma 4.10. *Let $f \subseteq X^2$ be idempotent and left-total, and let $x_0 \in X$. Then $f \upharpoonright f(x_0)$ and its inverse are idempotent, left-total, surjective relations on $f(x_0)$.*

Proof. Let $g = f \upharpoonright f(x_0)$. For each $x \in f(x_0)$, $f(x) \subseteq f^2(x_0) = f(x_0)$. Thus, $g(x) = f(x) \neq \emptyset$ and $g^2(x) = f^2(x) = f(x) = g(x)$, showing that g is idempotent and left-total. It is also surjective: For all $y \in f(x_0)$, it follows that $y \in f^2(x_0)$, so there exists some $x \in f(x_0)$ such that $g(x) = f(x) = y$. Since g is left-total, surjective, and idempotent, so is g^{-1} . $\square$

Lemma 4.11. *Let $f \subseteq X^2$ be idempotent and left-total, and let $x_0 \in X$ witness that f is non-trivial. Then $f \upharpoonright f(x_0)$ and its inverse are idempotent, left-total, surjective, non-trivial relations on $f(x_0)$.*

Proof. By the previous lemma, $g = f \upharpoonright f(x_0)$ and g^{-1} are idempotent, left-total, and surjective. By non-triviality, $g \neq \iota \upharpoonright f(x_0)$, so $g^{-1} \neq \iota \upharpoonright f(x_0)$ too. But since $\iota \upharpoonright f(x_0)$ is the only surjective idempotent trivial relation on $f(x_0)$, neither g nor g^{-1} is trivial. $\square$

Theorem 4.12. *Let X be weakly countably compact and let $f \subseteq X^2$ be an idempotent USC relation. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *f satisfies Condition Γ ;*
- (b) *f contains points $\langle x, x \rangle$ and $\langle x, y \rangle$ for some distinct $x, y \in X$;*
- (c) *f is non-trivial.*

Proof. (a) implies (b) trivially. Assuming (b), it follows that $f \upharpoonright f(x) \neq \iota \upharpoonright f(x)$ since $\langle x, y \rangle \in f \upharpoonright f(x)$, showing (c).

Assuming (c), we may apply Lemma 4.11 to choose x_0 such that $g = f \upharpoonright f(x_0)$ and g^{-1} are idempotent, USC, surjective, non-trivial relations. Then Lemma 4.9 allows us to conclude that g^{-1} contains points $\langle x, x \rangle$ and $\langle y, x \rangle$ for some distinct $x, y \in X$, so (b) is satisfied.

Assume (b) such that $\langle y, y \rangle \notin f$. Note then that $\langle y, x \rangle \notin f$ as otherwise $\langle y, x \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle \in f$ would imply $\langle y, y \rangle \in f$. Let $z_0 = x$ and $z_1 = y$.

Suppose z_i is defined for $i \leq n+1$ such that $\langle z_i, z_j \rangle \in f$ if and only if $i < j$ or $i = j = 0$. Since $\{z_0, \dots, z_{n+1}\} \cap f(z_{n+1}) = \emptyset$, we may choose z_{n+2} distinct from z_i for $i \leq n+1$ such that $\langle z_{n+1}, z_{n+2} \rangle \in f$. Note that by idempotence, $\langle z_{n+2}, z_i \rangle \notin f$ for $i \leq n+1$ since $z_i \notin f(z_{n+1}) = f^2(z_{n+1}) \supseteq f(z_{n+2})$. Similarly, $\langle z_i, z_{n+2} \rangle \in f$ for $i < n+1$ since $\langle z_i, z_{n+1} \rangle \in f$ and $\langle z_{n+1}, z_{n+2} \rangle \in f$. If $\langle z_{n+2}, z_{n+2} \rangle \in f$, then Condition Γ is witnessed by $\langle z_0, z_0 \rangle$, $\langle z_0, z_{n+2} \rangle$, and $\langle z_{n+2}, z_{n+2} \rangle$.

If not, we have recursively constructed an infinite set $\{z_n : n < \omega\}$. Since X is a weakly countably compact space, $\{z_n : n < \omega\}$ has a limit point z_ω . Since $\{\langle z_n, z_{n+1} \rangle : n < \omega\} \subseteq f$, it follows that $\langle z_\omega, z_\omega \rangle$ is a limit point of f . Similarly, $\{\langle z_0, z_n \rangle : n < \omega\} \subseteq f$, so it follows that $\langle z_0, z_\omega \rangle$ is also a limit point of f . Since f is closed, these limit points belong to f . Therefore, Condition Γ is witnessed by $\langle z_0, z_0 \rangle$, $\langle z_0, z_\omega \rangle$, and $\langle z_\omega, z_\omega \rangle$, showing (a). $\square$

Corollary 4.13. *Let X be weakly countably compact and let $f \neq \iota$ be a V -relation on X . Then f satisfies Condition Γ .*

It is worth noting that the strict linear order $<$ on $\mathbb{Q}$ with the discrete topology is an example of a non-trivial idempotent USC relation on a space that is not weakly countably compact that does not satisfy Condition Γ . Likewise, the strict lexicographic order $<$ on the long ray $\omega_1 \times [0, 1]$ with the topology induced by this linear order is an example of a non-trivial idempotent left-total non-USC relation on a Hausdorff countably compact space that does not satisfy Condition Γ .

5. APPLICATIONS

Let $\alpha = \{\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ be an ordinal with its usual linear order. As noted in [3], it is well known and easy to see that $\alpha + 1$ as a totally ordered topological space is metrizable if and only if α is countable. If α is uncountable, then the first uncountable ordinal ω_1 is a point of non-first-countability in $\alpha + 1$; if α is countable, then $\alpha + 1$ is regular and second-countable.

Theorem 5.1. *Let X be a T_1 topological space, let α be an uncountable ordinal, and let f be a relation on X (with $f \subseteq f \circ f$) satisfying Condition Γ . Then the Mahavier product $\mathbf{M}\langle X, f, \alpha \rangle$ contains a copy of $\alpha + 1$; therefore, $\mathbf{M}\langle X, f, \alpha \rangle$ cannot be metrizable.*

Proof. Let $\langle x, x \rangle, \langle x, y \rangle, \langle y, y \rangle \in f$ for distinct $x, y \in X$. For $\gamma \leq \alpha$, define $\mathbf{x}_\gamma \in \mathbf{M}\langle X, f, \alpha \rangle$ by $\mathbf{x}_\gamma(\beta) = y$ for $\beta < \gamma$ and $\mathbf{x}_\gamma(\beta) = x$ for $\gamma \leq \beta < \alpha$. That is, $\mathbf{x}_\gamma$ is defined such that γ is the least ordinal such that $\mathbf{x}_\gamma(\gamma) = x$.

We will show that the map $\gamma \mapsto \mathbf{x}_\gamma$ is a homeomorphism from $\alpha + 1$ to $A = \{\mathbf{x}_\gamma : \gamma \leq \alpha\} \subseteq \mathbf{M}\langle X, f, \alpha \rangle$. This may be accomplished by

comparing subbases: For $\beta \leq \alpha$, the subbasic open set $[0, \beta) \subseteq \alpha + 1$ maps to the set $\{\mathbf{x} \in A : \mathbf{x}(\beta) = x\} \subseteq A$, which equals the open set $A \cap \prod_{\gamma < \alpha} U_\gamma$ where $U_\beta = X \setminus \{y\}$ and $U_\gamma = X$ otherwise. Similarly, the subbasic open set $(\beta, \alpha] \subseteq \alpha + 1$ maps to the set $\{\mathbf{x} \in A : \mathbf{x}(\beta) = y\} \subseteq A$, which equals the open set $A \cap \prod_{\gamma < \alpha} U_\gamma$ where $U_\beta = X \setminus \{x\}$ and $U_\gamma = X$ otherwise. And since $A \cap \prod_{\gamma < \alpha} U_\gamma$ describes every subbasic open subset of A for $U_\beta \in \{\emptyset, X \setminus \{x\}, X \setminus \{y\}, X\}$ and $U_\gamma = X$ otherwise, it follows that this map is indeed a homeomorphism. $\square$

Noting that in metrizable spaces, compactness is characterized by weak countable compactness, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.2. *Let X be any compact metrizable space, let α be an ordinal, and let $f \neq \iota$ be a V -relation on X . Then the exact Mahavier product $\mathbf{M}\langle X, f, \alpha \rangle$ contains a copy of $\alpha + 1$; therefore, $\mathbf{M}\langle X, f, \alpha \rangle$ is metrizable if and only if α is countable.*

As noted in [3], a bit more can be said.

Definition 5.3. The Σ -product of reals $\Sigma\mathbb{R}^\kappa$ for a cardinal κ is given by

$$\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^\kappa : |\{\alpha < \kappa : \mathbf{x}(\alpha) \neq 0\}| \leq \aleph_0\}.$$

Note $\Sigma\mathbb{R}^\omega = \mathbb{R}^\omega$, and since every compact metrizable space embeds in $[0, 1]^\omega$, it follows that every compact metrizable space embeds in a Σ -product of reals.

Compact subspaces of $\Sigma\mathbb{R}^\kappa$ are known as Corson compacts; see, e.g., [1] for an investigation into the applications of Corson compacts in functional analysis.

Corollary 5.4. *Let X be a T_1 topological space, let α be an uncountable ordinal, and let f be a relation on X (with $f \subseteq f \circ f$) satisfying Condition Γ . Then the Mahavier product $\mathbf{M}\langle X, f, \alpha \rangle$ cannot be embedded in a Σ -product of reals.*

Proof. The Mahavier product $\mathbf{M}\langle X, f, \alpha \rangle$ contains a copy of $\alpha + 1$, which cannot be embedded into a Σ -product of reals. $\square$

Acknowledgments. The authors wish to thank Jonathan Meddaugh, Christopher Night, and the participants in the Spring 2016 Carolina Topology Seminar for their comments on various working versions of these results.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Argyros, S. Mercourakis, and S. Negrepontis, *Functional-analytic properties of Corson-compact spaces*, Studia Math. **89** (1988), no. 3, 197–229.
- [2] Włodzimierz J. Charatonik and Robert P. Roe, *On Mahavier products*, Topology Appl. **166** (2014), 92–97.
- [3] Steven Clontz and Scott Varagona, *Destruction of metrizability in generalized inverse limits*, Topology Proc. **48** (2016), 289–297.
- [4] Sina Greenwood and Judy Kennedy, *Connectedness and Ingram-Mahavier products*, Topology Appl. **166** (2014), 1–9.
- [5] Sina Greenwood, Judy Kennedy, and Michael Lockyer, *Connectedness and inverse limits with set-valued functions on intervals*, Topology Appl. **221** (2017), 69–90.
- [6] W. T. Ingram, *An Introduction to Inverse Limits with Set-Valued Functions*. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics. New York: Springer, 2012.
- [7] W. T. Ingram and William S. Mahavier, *Inverse limits of upper semi-continuous set valued functions*, Houston J. Math. **32** (2006), no. 1, 119–130.
- [8] W. T. Ingram and William S. Mahavier, *Inverse Limits: From Continua to Chaos*. Developments in Mathematics, 25. New York: Springer, 2012.
- [9] William S. Mahavier, *Inverse limits with subsets of $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$* , Topology Appl. **141** (2004), no. 1-3, 225–231.
- [10] Van Nall, *Inverse limits with set valued functions*, Houston J. Math. **37** (2011), no. 4, 1323–1332.
- [11] R. Patrick Vernon, *Inverse limits of set-valued functions indexed by the integers*, Topology Appl. **171** (2014), 35–40.

(Clontz) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS; UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA; 411 UNIVERSITY BOULEVARD NORTH, MSPB 314; MOBILE, AL 36688-0002

Email address: `sclontz@southalabama.edu`

(Varagona) DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY, CHEMISTRY & MATHEMATICS; UNIVERSITY OF MONTEVALLO; HARMAN HALL, STATION 6480; MONTEVALLO, AL 35115

Email address: `svaragona@montevallo.edu`