

## A REGULAR LINDELÖF SEMIMETRIC SPACE WHICH HAS NO COUNTABLE NETWORK

E. S. BERNEY

ABSTRACT. A completely regular semimetric space  $M$  is constructed which has no  $\sigma$ -discrete network. The space  $M$  constructed has the property that every subset of  $M$  of cardinality  $2^{\aleph_0}$  contains a limit point of itself; thus, assuming  $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$ ,  $M$  is Lindelöf. It is also shown from the same space  $M$  that, assuming  $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$ , there exists a regular Lindelöf semimetric space  $X$  such that  $X \times X$  is not normal (hence not Lindelöf).

A. V. Arhangel'skiĭ asks the following question [1, p. 131]: Does every symmetric space have a  $\sigma$ -discrete network? R. W. Heath asks in [3]: Does every regular Lindelöf semimetric space have a countable network? In this paper Arhangel'skiĭ's question is answered negatively by the construction of a completely regular semimetric (hence symmetric) space  $M$  which has no  $\sigma$ -discrete network. In that same space  $M$ , every subset of cardinality  $2^{\aleph_0}$  contains a limit point of itself, so that, assuming the continuum hypothesis,  $M$  would be Lindelöf. Thus, subject to the continuum hypothesis, Heath's question is also answered negatively. Finally it is shown from the same space  $M$  that, assuming the continuum hypothesis, there exists a regular Lindelöf semimetric space  $X$  such that  $X \times X$  is not Lindelöf—in fact not even normal.

A collection of subsets  $\mathcal{Q}$  of a topological space  $X$  is said to be a *network* for  $X$  if, given an open set  $U$  containing a point  $x$ , there exists  $A \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $x \in A \subseteq U$ . A network  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a  $\sigma$ -discrete network if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is the countable union of discrete collections. A topological space  $X$  is said to be a *semimetric space* if there exists a real valued, nonnegative, symmetric function  $d$  on  $X \times X$  such that:

- a.  $d(x, y) = 0$  iff  $x = y$ ,
- b.  $x \in \overline{A}$  iff  $\text{glb} \{d(x, y) \mid y \in A\} = 0$ .

Let  $I$  denote the unit interval. Let  $\Delta = \{(x, x) \mid x \in I\}$ . If  $A$  is a set, let  $\text{card } A$  denote the cardinality of  $A$ . Let  $\Gamma$  denote the first ordinal such that  $\text{card} \{\alpha \mid \alpha \text{ an ordinal, } \alpha < \Gamma\} = 2^{\aleph_0}$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *There is a completely regular semimetric (hence symmetric) space  $M$  such that (i)  $M$  has no  $\sigma$ -discrete network, (ii) every*

---

Received by the editors August 29, 1969.

AMS 1968 subject classifications. Primary 5450, 5425.

Key words and phrases.  $\sigma$ -discrete, network, symmetric space, semimetric space.

subset of  $M$  of cardinality  $2^{\aleph_0}$  contains a limit point of itself so that, if  $\aleph_1 = 2^{\aleph_0}$ ,  $M$  is Lindelöf.

**THEOREM 2.** *If  $\aleph_1 = 2^{\aleph_0}$ , then there is a regular Lindelöf semimetric space  $X$  such that  $X \times X$  is not normal (hence not Lindelöf).*

**LEMMA.** *There exists a subset  $V$  of  $I$  such that:*

1. *If  $U$  is an open subset of  $I$ , then  $\text{card}(U \cap V) = 2^{\aleph_0}$ .*

2. *There exists no pair  $f$  and  $D$  such that:*

(i)  $D \subseteq V$  and  $\text{card } D = 2^{\aleph_0}$ ,

(ii)  $f: D \rightarrow V$ ,

(iii) *either  $f$  is strictly increasing and  $\{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in D\}$  is bounded away from  $\Delta$ , or  $f$  is strictly decreasing.*

**PROOF OF LEMMA.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote the set of all closed subsets of  $I$ . If  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ , let  $\mathfrak{F}(A)$  denote the set of all monotone functions from  $A$  into  $I$  such that point-inverses are at most countable. Let

$$\mathfrak{F} = \cup \{ \mathfrak{F}(A) \mid A \in \mathcal{C} \}.$$

It is easily shown that  $\text{card}(\mathfrak{F}) = 2^{\aleph_0}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{U}$  denote the set of all open subsets of  $I$ . Let  $\mathfrak{u} = \{ \mathfrak{u}_\alpha : \alpha < \Gamma \}$  and  $\mathfrak{F} = \{ f_\alpha : \alpha < \Gamma \}$  be well-orderings of  $\mathfrak{U}$  and  $\mathfrak{F}$ , recalling that  $\Gamma$  is the first ordinal of cardinal  $2^{\aleph_0}$ . Define a set  $V$  as follows. Select a point  $x_1$  from  $U_1$ . For each  $\beta$ ,  $1 < \beta < \Gamma$ , such that  $x_\alpha$  is defined for all  $\alpha < \beta$ , pick  $x_\beta$  to be some point of  $U_\beta$  such that

$$x_\beta \notin [ \cup \{ f_\alpha^{-1}(x_\tau) \mid \alpha \leq \beta, \tau < \beta \} \cup \{ x_\tau \mid \tau < \beta \} \cup \{ f_\alpha(x_\tau) \mid \alpha \leq \beta, \tau < \beta \} ].$$

Let  $V = \{ x_\alpha \mid \alpha < \Gamma \}$ . The proof that  $V$  satisfies condition 1 is obvious. To see that condition 2 is satisfied, suppose not; then there exists a pair  $f$  and  $D$  satisfying 2(i), 2(ii), and 2(iii). Assume  $f$  is strictly decreasing (the argument is similar if  $f$  is strictly increasing and  $\{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in D\}$  is bounded away from  $\Delta$ ). Extend  $f$  to  $\overline{D}$  (call the extension  $\hat{f}$ ) as follows: if  $t \in \overline{D}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(t) &= f(t) && \text{if } t \in D, \\ &= \text{lub}_{x > t; x \in D} f(x) && \text{if } t \text{ is a limit point of } D \text{ from above and } t \notin D, \\ &= \text{glb}_{x < t; x \in D} f(x) && \text{if } t \text{ is not a limit point of } D \text{ from above and } t \notin D. \end{aligned}$$

It is easily checked that  $\hat{f} \in \mathfrak{F}$ . Therefore, for some ordinal  $\alpha$ ,  $\hat{f} = f_\alpha$ . Now  $f_\alpha$  has the property that there exists at most one  $x_\theta$  in  $D$  such that  $f_\alpha(x_\theta) = x_\theta$  (in the case of  $f_\alpha$  strictly increasing etc.,  $\{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in D\}$  being bounded away from  $\Delta$  guarantees for every  $\theta$ ,  $\theta < \Gamma$ ,  $f_\alpha(x_\theta) \neq x_\theta$ ).

Now there exist  $x_\gamma, x_\beta \in D$  such that  $\gamma, \beta > \max\{\theta, \alpha\}$ ,  $\gamma \neq \beta$ , and  $f_\alpha(x_\gamma) = x_\beta$ . For if not, then  $f_\alpha$  is a one-to-one correspondence between  $\{x_\tau \mid \tau > \max(\theta, \alpha)\}$  and  $\{x_\tau \mid \tau \leq \max(\theta, \alpha)\}$ , which is a contradiction since  $\text{card}[\{x_\tau \mid \tau > \max(\theta, \alpha)\}] > \text{card}[\{x_\tau \mid \tau \leq \max(\theta, \alpha)\}]$ . Thus, let  $x_\gamma, x_\beta$  be two such points. If  $\gamma < \beta$ , then we have a contradiction to the definition of  $V$ . If  $\gamma > \beta$ , as  $x_\gamma \in f_\alpha^{-1}(x_\beta)$ , we also have a contradiction to the definition of  $V$ . Thus, the proof is complete.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. Let  $V$  be as in the Lemma. Choose  $M$  to be a subset of  $V \times V - \Delta$  such that: (1) if  $U$  is open in  $I \times I$ , then  $\text{card}(U \cap M)$  is  $2^{\aleph_0}$ , and (2) if  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  denote the two projection functions on  $V \times V$  into  $V$ , then for each  $m \in M$ ,  $\Pi_i(m) \notin \Pi_i(M - \{m\})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Let  $d$  denote the usual Euclidean metric of  $I \times I$ . Define  $d^*$  on  $M \times M$  as follows: if  $(a, b), (c, d) \in M$ , then

$$d^*[(a, b), (c, d)] = d[(a, b), (c, d)] \quad \text{if } a \leq c \text{ and } b \leq d \text{ or } a \geq c \text{ and } b \geq d, \\ = 1 \quad \text{if } a < c \text{ and } b > d \text{ or } a > c \text{ and } b < d.$$

It is easily shown that  $d^*$  generates a completely regular semimetric topology on  $M$  (denoted by  $M(d^*)$ ) with semimetric  $d^*$  by defining:  $A$  is closed in  $M$  iff  $A \supseteq \{x \in M \mid d^*(x, A) = 0\}$ . We now show that  $M$  (with the  $M(d^*)$  topology) has the property that every subset  $A$  of cardinality  $2^{\aleph_0}$  has a limit point in  $A$ . Let  $A$  be a subset of  $M$  such that  $\text{card } A$  is  $2^{\aleph_0}$ . Suppose  $A$  is discrete in itself. Then there exists a subset  $A'$  of  $A$  such that  $\text{card } A' = 2^{\aleph_0}$  and a positive number  $\delta$  such that  $(c, d), (a, b) \in A'$  implies  $d^*[(a, b), (c, d)] > \delta$ . Let  $(p, q) \in A'$  such that for each Euclidean disk  $S$  about  $(p, q)$ ,  $\text{card}(S \cap A') = 2^{\aleph_0}$ . Let  $S$  be a Euclidean disk of radius less than  $\delta/2$  about  $(p, q)$ . If  $(a, b), (c, d) \in S \cap A'$  and  $a < c$ , then  $b > d$ . For if not, then  $a < c$  and  $b < d$  implies  $d^*[(a, b), (c, d)] = d[(a, b), (c, d)] < \delta$ , a contradiction. Note  $S \cap A'$  is a strictly decreasing function on  $\Pi_1(S \cap A')$  into  $V$  and  $\text{card}[\Pi_1(S \cap A')] = 2^{\aleph_0}$ , a contradiction to the definition of  $V$ . Hence part (ii) of Theorem 1 is true. We now show that  $M$  has no  $\sigma$ -discrete network. Suppose it does, say  $\mathcal{Q}$  where  $\mathcal{Q} = \cup \{B_i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots\}$ . By part (ii) of Theorem 1,  $\text{card } B_i < 2^{\aleph_0}$ , hence  $\text{card } \mathcal{Q} < 2^{\aleph_0}$ . Let  $N(x, y)$  denote the  $d^*$  sphere of radius  $\frac{1}{2}$  about  $(x, y)$ . There exist a subset  $M^1$  of  $M$  and an  $A$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$  such that  $\text{card}(M^1) = 2^{\aleph_0}$  and  $(a, b) \in M^1$  implies  $(a, b) \in A \subseteq N(a, b)$ . Let  $(p, q) \in M^1$  such that, if  $S$  is a Euclidean disk about  $(p, q)$ , then  $\text{card}(S \cap M^1) = 2^{\aleph_0}$ . Let  $S$  be a Euclidean disk of radius  $r$  about  $(p, q)$  such that  $0 < r < \min\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}d[(p, q), \Delta]\}$ . Let  $(a, b), (c, d) \in S \cap M^1$ . If  $a < c$ , then  $b < d$ . For if not, there exists points  $(a, b)$  and  $(c, d)$  in  $S \cap M^1$  such that  $a < c$  and  $b > d$ . Then  $(c, d) \notin N(a, b)$ , but  $(c, d) \in A \subseteq N(a, b)$  which is a contradiction. Thus

$S \cap M^1$  is a strictly increasing function on  $\Pi_1(S \cap M^1)$  into  $V$  such that  $d[S \cap M^1, \Delta] > 0$  and  $\text{card } \Pi_1(S \cap M^1) = 2^{\aleph_0}$ , which is a contradiction to the definition of  $V$ . Hence  $M$  (with the  $M(d^*)$  topology) has no  $\sigma$ -discrete network.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. Define  $d'$  on  $M \times M$  by

$$\begin{aligned} d'[(a, b), (c, d)] &= d[(a, b), (c, d)] && \text{if } a \leq c \text{ and } b \geq d \text{ or } a \geq c \text{ and } b \leq d, \\ &= 1 && \text{if } a < c \text{ and } b > d \text{ or } a > c \text{ and } b < d. \end{aligned}$$

Then, again, we have a regular Lindelöf semimetric space (with semimetric  $d'$ ) which has no countable network (similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1). Denote the  $d'$  semimetric topology by  $M(d')$ . Let  $X_1$  (respectively  $X_2$ ) denote  $M$  with the  $M(d^*)$  (respectively  $M(d')$ ) topology. Let  $X$  be the free union [2] of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  (i.e.,  $X = \{(i, z) : z \in M, i = 1, 2\}$  with the topology generated by  $\{\{i\} \times U : U \text{ is open in } X_i, i = 1, 2\}$ ). Then  $X$  is a regular Lindelöf semimetric space which has no countable network and  $X \times X$  is not normal. To see  $X \times X$  is not normal (and hence not Lindelöf), consider the set  $R = \{((1, z), (2, z)) : z \in M\}$  which is a subset of  $X \times X$ . It is easily shown that  $R$  is closed in  $X \times X$ . We now show that  $R$  is discrete in itself. Let  $z \in M$ . Let  $((1, z), (2, z)) \in R$ . Let  $S_1$  denote the  $d^*$  semimetric sphere of radius  $\frac{1}{2}$  about  $z$ ,  $S_2$  denote the  $d'$  semimetric sphere of radius  $\frac{1}{2}$  about  $z$ ,  $S_1^1 = \{1\} \times S_1$ , and  $S_2^1 = \{2\} \times S_2$ . Let  $z = (x, y)$ . Suppose  $((1, c), (2, c)) \in R \cap (S_1^1 \times S_2^1)$ . If  $c = (a, b)$ , then  $a \leq x$  and  $b \leq y$  or  $a \geq x$  and  $b \geq y$  as  $(1, c) \in S_1^1$ . Similarly  $a \leq x$  and  $y \leq b$  or  $a \geq x$  and  $y \geq b$  as  $(1, c) \in S_2^1$ . Hence  $a = x$  and  $b = y$ . Therefore  $R \cap (S_1^1 \times S_2^1) = \{((1, z), (2, z))\}$  and  $R$  is discrete in itself. Note  $X \times X$  is separable. Thus, by Theorem 1 of [4],  $X \times X$  is not normal.

#### REFERENCES

1. A. V. Arhangel'skiĭ, *Mappings and spaces*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk 21 (1966), no. 4 (130), 133-184 = Russian Math. Surveys 21 (1966), no. 4, 115-162. MR 37 #3534.
2. J. Dugundji, *Topology*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, Mass., 1966. MR 33 #1824.
3. R. W. Heath, *On certain first-countable spaces*, Topology Seminar (Wisconsin, 1965), Ann. of Math. Studies, no. 60, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1966, pp. 103-113.
4. F. B. Jones, *Concerning normal and completely normal spaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 43 (1937), 671-679.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, TEMPE, ARIZONA 85281