

## AN EMPTY CLASS OF NONMETRIC SPACES

ALAN DOW

(Communicated by Dennis Burke)

**ABSTRACT.** Let CSSM be the class of compact nonmetrizable spaces in which every subspace of cardinality at most  $\omega_1$  is metrizable. We show that CSSM is empty.

For the purposes of this article only let us call a space an SSM space (small subspaces metrizable) if it is not metrizable but it is regular and all of its subspaces of cardinality at most  $\omega_1$  are metrizable. A CSSM space is a compact SSM space. If  $X$  is a CSSM space, then  $X$  is first countable [HJ]. Therefore under the continuum hypothesis (CH) there are no CSSM spaces because, of course, a compact first countable space has cardinality at most  $c$ . This was first observed by Juhasz who then asked if the CH assumption could be removed [J]. It was shown in [D] that it is consistent with (and independent of)  $\neg\text{CH}$  that there are no Lindelöf, countably compact or even  $\omega_1$ -compact first countable SSM spaces. In this article we show that there simply are never any CSSM spaces.

There is however an easy example, under  $\text{MA} + \neg\text{CH}$ , of a Lindelöf first countable SSM space. I do not know if a Lindelof SSM space is necessarily first countable.

**EXAMPLE 1.** Recall that the Alexandroff double topology on  $I \times 2$  (where  $I$  is the unit interval) is obtained by declaring  $I \times \{1\}$  to be open and discrete while a basic open neighbourhood of a point  $(r, 0)$  is  $U \times 2 - \{(r, 1)\}$  where  $r \in U$  is open in  $I$ . If  $A \subset I$  is any uncountable set containing no uncountable closed set, then  $X = (I - A \times \{0\}) \cup (A \times \{1\})$  is a Lindelof non metrizable subspace of the Alexandroff double.

Furthermore, if  $\text{MA}(\omega_1)$  is assumed then  $X$  is an SSM space since  $A \times \{1\}$  will be an  $F_\sigma$ -set in any subspace of  $X$  of cardinality  $\omega_1$  (see [M]).

One might hope to modify the Alexandroff double somehow to obtain a CSSM space. In fact if  $X$  were a CSSM space then  $X$  would contain an uncountable discrete subset  $D$ ; hence  $\text{cl } D$  would itself be a CSSM space. (To see that  $X$  would contain such a  $D$  see 2(ii).)

### 2. PROPOSITION. *If $X$ is a SSM space then:*

- (i) *each separable subspace is metrizable and*
- (ii)  *$X$  contains an uncountable discrete subset and*
- (iii) *if  $X$  is, in addition, compact then  $X$  contains an uncountable discrete set  $D$  whose closure is a CSSM space.*

---

Received by the editors June 3, 1987 and, in revised form, October 5, 1987.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification* (1985 Revision). Primary 54E35, 54E45.

*Key words and phrases.* Compact, metrizable, reflection.

This research was supported by N.S.E.R.C. Grant No. U0310.

**PROOF.** (i) is essentially due to Hajnal and Juhasz [HJ]. They prove that a space has countable weight if all of its subspaces of cardinality at most  $\omega_1$  do. Now (i) follows since if  $K \subset X$  is separable, each subspace of size  $\omega_1$  is contained in a separable metrizable space (since  $X$  is SSM and  $K$  is separable).

Of course (ii) is obvious since, by (i),  $X$  is not separable and therefore  $X$  has a non separable subspace of cardinality  $\omega_1$ . This subspace is metrizable, hence not ccc. For (iii), let  $D$  be given by (ii) and note that  $\text{cl } D$  is not metrizable and is therefore a CSSM space.

**3. CSSM is empty.** Suppose that  $X$  is a compact space containing the discrete space  $\omega_1$  as a dense subspace. For each  $x \in X$  fix a countable neighbourhood base  $\{U(x, n) : n < \omega\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{\{U(x, n) : n < \omega\} : x \in X\}$ .

For each  $\lambda < \omega_1$  let  $\mathcal{C}\lambda = \bigcap\{\text{cl}(\lambda - \alpha) : \alpha < \lambda\}$ .

We shall define by induction on  $\gamma < \omega_1$  a continuous increasing sequence  $\{M(\gamma) : \gamma < \omega_1\}$  of countable elementary submodels of some sufficiently large  $H(\theta)$  and for each  $\lambda(\gamma) = M(\gamma) \cap \omega_1$  we will choose  $x(\gamma)$  in  $\mathcal{C}\lambda(\gamma)$  as follows.

Suppose  $\gamma < \omega_1$  and  $\{M(\rho) : \rho < \gamma\}$ ,  $\{x(\rho) : \rho < \gamma\}$  have been chosen so that  $\{X, \mathcal{U}\} \in M(\rho)$  and  $\{x(\rho), M(\rho)\} \in M(\rho + 1)$  for each  $\rho < \gamma$ .

In case  $\gamma$  is a limit, let  $M(\gamma) = \bigcup\{M(\rho) : \rho < \gamma\}$ . If  $\gamma = \rho + 1$  let  $M(\gamma)$  be any countable elementary submodel of  $H(\theta)$  containing  $\{M(\rho), x(\rho)\}$ .

The following fact is probably of some interest by itself and it provides the basis for the whole proof.

**FACT 1.** If  $M$  is a countable elementary submodel of  $H(\theta)$  such that  $X, \mathcal{U}$  are in  $M$ ,  $\lambda = M \cap \omega_1$ , and if  $F \in [X \cap M]^{<\omega}$  and  $p : F \rightarrow \omega$  are such that  $\mathcal{C}\lambda \subset \bigcup\{U(x, p(x)) : x \in F\}$  then

$$\text{for some } \beta < \lambda \quad [\beta, \omega_1) \subset \bigcup\{U(x, p(x)) : x \in F\}.$$

**PROOF.** By definition of  $\mathcal{C}\lambda$ , each sequence cofinal in  $\lambda$  is eventually in  $\bigcup\{U(x, p(x)) : x \in F\}$ , hence there is some  $\beta < \lambda$  such that  $[\beta, \lambda) \subset \bigcup\{U(x, p(x)) : x \in F\}$ . But since  $F, p$  and  $\omega_1$  are all in  $M$ , we have that  $M$  is a model of  $[\beta, \omega_1) \subset \bigcup\{U(x, p(x)) : x \in F\}$ . Now the fact follows since  $M$  is an elementary submodel.

**NOTATION.** For  $\rho < \gamma$  let  $U(\rho, n) = U(x(\rho), n)$ .

**FACT 2.** There is an  $x(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}\lambda(\gamma)$  such that for any  $\rho < \gamma$  and  $n < \omega$ ,  $x(\gamma) \in U(\rho, n) \rightarrow \lambda(\gamma) \in U(\rho, n)$ .

**PROOF.** If not we could find for each  $x \in \mathcal{C}\lambda(\gamma)$  a pair  $t(x) \in \gamma \times \omega$  such that  $x \in U(t(x))$  and  $\lambda(\gamma) \notin U(t(x))$ . Since  $\mathcal{C}\lambda(\gamma)$  is compact we find  $F \in [\gamma]^{<\omega}$  such that  $\bigcup\{U(t(x)) : x \in F\} \supset \mathcal{C}\lambda(\gamma)$ . However, this contradicts Fact 1 since  $\lambda(\gamma) \notin U(t(x))$  for  $x \in F$ .

Therefore we have defined a cub  $\{\lambda(\gamma) : \gamma < \omega_1\}$ , a sequence  $\{x(\gamma) : \gamma < \omega_1\}$  with  $x(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}\lambda(\gamma)$  and a sequence of neighbourhood bases  $\{U(\gamma, n) : \gamma < \omega_1, n < \omega\}$  so that  $\rho < \gamma$  and  $x(\gamma) \in U(\rho, n) \rightarrow \lambda(\gamma) \in U(\rho, n)$ .

**FACT 3.**  $\omega_1 \cup \{x(\gamma) : \gamma < \omega_1\}$  is not metrizable.

**PROOF.** Assume that it is metrizable. Recall that each open subset of a metric space is an  $F_\sigma$ . Therefore there must be a stationary set  $S \subset \{\lambda(\gamma) : \gamma < \omega_1\}$  such that  $\text{cl } S \cap \{x(\gamma) : \gamma < \omega_1\} = \emptyset$  since  $\omega_1$  is open. For each  $\lambda(\gamma) \in S$  choose  $n(\gamma) < \omega$  so that  $U(x(\gamma), n(\gamma)) \cap S = \emptyset$ . It follows that if  $\lambda(\gamma) < \lambda(\rho)$  are both in  $S$  then  $x(\rho) \notin U(x(\gamma), n(\gamma))$  since  $\lambda(\rho) \notin U(x(\gamma), n(\gamma))$ . Let, for  $n \in \omega$ ,  $\mathcal{V}_n$  be a locally finite family of open subsets of  $\omega_1 \cup \{x(\gamma) : \gamma < \omega_1\}$  such that  $\bigcup\{\mathcal{V}_n : n \in \omega\}$  is a

base (recall that each metric space has a  $\sigma$ -locally finite base). For each  $\lambda(\gamma) \in S$ , there is an  $m_\gamma$  and a  $V_\gamma \in \mathcal{V}_{m_\gamma}$  such that  $x(\gamma) \in V_\gamma \subset U(x(\gamma), n(\gamma))$ . There is an  $m \in \omega$  such that  $S' = \{\lambda(\gamma) \in S : m_\gamma = m\}$  is stationary. Since  $\lambda(\gamma) < \lambda(\rho)$  both in  $S'$  implies  $x(\rho) \notin V_\gamma$ , these sets are all distinct (i.e.  $V_\gamma \neq V_\rho$ ). However, for each  $\lambda(\gamma) \in S'$ ,  $V_\gamma \cap [0, \lambda(\gamma)) \neq \emptyset$  since  $x(\gamma)$  is a limit point of  $[0, \lambda(\gamma))$ . Now a pressing down argument gives that the family  $\{V_\gamma : \lambda(\gamma) \in S'\}$  is not point-finite, contradicting that  $\mathcal{V}_m$  is locally finite.

FACT 4.  $X$  is not SSM.

#### REFERENCES

- [D] A. Dow, *Two applications of reflection and forcing to topology*, General Topology and its Relations to Modern Analysis and Algebra VI; Proc. Sixth Prague Topological Sympos. 1986, ed. Z. Frolík, Heldermann-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.
- [HJ] I. Juhasz, *Cardinal functions in topology—10 years later*, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam, 1980.
- [J] ———, *Cardinal functions II*, Handbook of Set Theoretic Topology, ed. K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 63–110.
- [M] A. Miller, *Special subsets of the real line*, Handbook of Set Theoretic Topology, ed. K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 201–234.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, YORK UNIVERSITY, TORONTO, CANADA, M3J 1P3