Kenneth Kunen Locally compact linearly Lindelöf spaces

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 43 (2002), No. 1, 155--158

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/119307

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 2002

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

Locally compact linearly Lindelöf spaces

KENNETH KUNEN

Abstract. There is a locally compact Hausdorff space which is linearly Lindelöf and not Lindelöf. This answers a question of Arhangel'skii and Buzyakova.

Keywords: linearly Lindelöf, weak P-point

Classification: Primary 54D20, 54D80; Secondary 03C20

This note is devoted to the proof of:

Theorem 1. There is a compact Hausdorff space X and a point p in X such that:

- (1) $\chi(p,X) > \omega;$
- (2) for all regular $\kappa > \omega$, no κ -sequence of points distinct from p converges to p.

As usual, $\chi(p, X)$, the *character* of p in X, is the least size of a local base at p. Regarding (2), if $\vec{q} = \langle q_{\alpha} : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is a κ -sequence, we say $\vec{q} \to p$ iff whenever U is a neighborhood of p, $\exists \alpha \forall \beta > \alpha [q_{\beta} \in U]$. Then, (2) asserts that $\vec{q} \neq p$ whenever $\kappa > \omega$ is regular and all the $q_{\alpha} \neq p$. Observe that if $\chi(p, X) = \omega$, then (2) holds trivially.

Theorem 1 answers Question 1 of Arhangel'skii and Buzyakova [1]. They point out that given such an X, p, the space $X \setminus \{p\}$ is linearly Lindelöf (by (2)), not Lindelöf (by (1)), and locally compact.

Note that in any compact Hausdorff space X, if the point x is not isolated, then there is a sequence of type $\operatorname{cf}(\chi(x, X))$ converging to x. Thus, the X, p in Theorem 1 must satisfy $\operatorname{cf}(\chi(p, X)) = \omega$. In our example, $\chi(p, X)$ will be \beth_{ω} .

Our X will be constructed as an inverse limit. We begin by reviewing some basic terminology:

Definition 2. An inverse system is a sequence $\langle X_n, \pi_n^{n+1} : n \in \omega \rangle$, where each X_n is a compact Hausdorff space, and each π_n^{n+1} is a continuous map from X_{n+1} onto X_n .

Such an inverse systems yields a compact Hausdorff space,

$$X_{\omega} = \lim_{n \to \infty} X_n = \{ x \in \prod_{n \to \infty} X_n : \forall n \ [x_n = \pi_n^{n+1}(x_{n+1})] \}.$$

Author partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-0097881.

K. Kunen

It also yields the obvious maps $\pi_m^{\omega} : X_{\omega} \twoheadrightarrow X_m$ for $m < \omega$ and $\pi_m^n : X_n \twoheadrightarrow X_m$ for $m \le n < \omega$.

Lemma 3. Suppose that $\langle X_n, \pi_n^{n+1} : n \in \omega \rangle$, is an inverse system and $p = \langle p_n : n \in \omega \rangle \in X = X_\omega$ satisfies:

- (A) each p_n is a weak P_{\square_n} -point in X_n ;
- (B) each $\chi(p_n, X_n) \leq \beth_{n+1}$;
- (C) each $(\pi_0^n)^{-1}{p_0}$ is nowhere dense in X_n .

Then X, p satisfies Theorem 1 with $\chi(p, X) = \beth_{\omega}$.

As usual, $y \in Y$ is a weak P_{κ} -point iff y is not in the closure of any subset of $Y \setminus \{y\}$ of size less than κ , and y is a P_{κ} -point iff the intersection of fewer than κ neighborhoods of y is always a neighborhood of y. In a Hausdorff space, every P_{κ} -point is a weak P_{κ} -point, but note that in (A), the p_n cannot all be P_{\Box_n} -points, as that would contradict (C). Note that (C) cannot be omitted; it is easy to construct an example satisfying (A) and (B) where each X_n is a LOTS and each π_n^{n+1} collapses an interval around p_{n+1} to the point p_n ; then $\chi(p, X) = \omega$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 3: First, note that one local base at any $x \in X$ consists of all the $(\pi_n^{\omega})^{-1}(U)$ such that $n \in \omega$ and U is an open neighborhood of x_n in X_n . It follows that:

- (a) $\chi(p, X_{\omega}) \leq \sup_{n} \chi(p_n, X_n) = \beth_{\omega};$
- (β) $(\pi_0^{\omega})^{-1}\{p_0\}$ is nowhere dense in X_{ω} .

Now, to verify (2) of Theorem 1, assume that $\vec{q} = \langle q_{\alpha} : \alpha < \kappa \rangle \to p$, where $\kappa > \omega$ is regular and all the $q_{\alpha} \neq p$. The definition of $\vec{q} \to p$ implies that $\kappa \leq \chi(p, X)$, so fix m with $\kappa < \beth_m$. Now, $q_{\alpha} \neq p$ implies that $\pi_n^{\omega}(q_{\alpha}) \neq p_n = \pi_n^{\omega}(p)$ for some n, so we can fix $n \geq m$ and an $S \subseteq \kappa$ with $|S| = \kappa$ and $\pi_n^{\omega}(q_{\alpha}) \neq p_n$ for all $\alpha \in S$. But then $p_n \in cl\{\pi_n^{\omega}(q_{\alpha}) : \alpha \in S\}$, contradicting (A).

In view of (α) , to prove that $\chi(p, X) = \beth_{\omega}$, it is sufficient to fix $m < \omega$ and prove that $\chi(p, X) \ge \beth_m$. Suppose that \mathcal{B} were a local base at p in Xwith $|\mathcal{B}| < \beth_m$. Let $F = (\pi_m^{\omega})^{-1} \{p_m\}$. By (β) , F is nowhere dense in X, so for each $U \in \mathcal{B}$, we can choose $y_U \in U \setminus F$. Then $p \in \operatorname{cl}\{y_U : U \in \mathcal{B}\}$, so $p_m = \pi_m^{\omega}(p) \in \operatorname{cl}\{\pi_m^{\omega}(y_U) : U \in \mathcal{B}\}$, contradicting (A).

We now need to find an inverse system satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 3. X_n will be $\beta \beth_n$. In general, $\beta \kappa$ denotes the Čech compactification of a discrete κ ; equivalently, $\beta \kappa$ is the space of ultrafilters on κ ; thus, the remainder, $\kappa^* = \beta \kappa \backslash \kappa$, is the space of non-principal ultrafilters on κ .

The p_n will be good ultrafilters. Following Keisler [5], an ultrafilter x on κ is good (i.e., κ^+ -good) iff given $A_s \in x$ for $s \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$, there are $B_\alpha \in x$ for $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $\bigcap_{\alpha \in s} B_\alpha \subseteq A_s$ for all non-empty $s \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$. For every infinite κ , there is a non-principal $x \in \beta \kappa$ such that x is a good ultrafilter (Keisler [5] under GCH and Kunen [7] in ZFC; see also Chang and Keisler [3, Theorem 6.1.4]). The following folklore result about such ultrafilters is proved in [2] and [4]:

Lemma 4. If x is a good ultrafilter on κ , then x is a weak P_{κ} -point in $\beta \kappa$.

Thus, fixing $p_n \in \beta \beth_n$ to be good will handle (A) of Lemma 3, but to get $p = \langle p_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ to really define a point in $X = X_\omega$, we need to choose the $\pi_n^{n+1} : \beta \beth_{n+1} \twoheadrightarrow \beta \beth_n$ such that each $p_n = \pi_n^{n+1}(p_{n+1})$. In fact, π_n^{n+1} will be $\beta(\Pi_n^{n+1})$, where $\Pi_n^{n+1} : \beth_{n+1} \twoheadrightarrow \beth_n$. Here, as usual, if $f : P \to Q$, where P, Q are Tychonov spaces, then $\beta f : \beta P \to \beta Q$ denotes its Čech extension. In the special case of discrete P, Q, where $x \in \beta P$ is an ultrafilter on P, $(\beta f)(x) \in \beta Q$ is the induced measure, $\{B \subseteq Q : f^{-1}(B) \in x\}$. Now, showing that appropriate $\Pi_n^{n+1} : \beth_{n+1} \twoheadrightarrow \beth_n$ can be chosen requires a digression:

Definition 5. An ultrafilter x on κ is regular iff there are $E_{\alpha} \in x$ for $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $\bigcap_{n} E_{\alpha_{n}} = \emptyset$ whenever the α_{n} (for $n \in \omega$) are distinct.

Clearly, such x are countably incomplete. Moreover,

Lemma 6. If x is a countably incomplete good ultrafilter on κ , then x is regular.

This is Exercise 6.1.3 of [3]; a proof is contained in the proof of Lemma 2.1 of Keisler [6]. The proof of universality of regular ultrapowers ([3, Theorem 4.3.12]) is easily modified to produce:

Lemma 7. Suppose that $\kappa \geq 2^{\lambda}$ and y is any ultrafilter on λ . Let x be a regular ultrafilter on κ . Then there is an $f : \kappa \to \lambda$ such that $(\beta f)(x) = y$.

PROOF: Since $\kappa \geq 2^{\lambda}$, we may list the elements of y (possibly with repetitions) as $\{B_{\alpha} : \alpha < \kappa\}$. Let the $E_{\alpha} \subseteq \kappa$ be as in Definition 5. Choose $g : \kappa \to \lambda$ such that $g(\xi)$ is some element of $\bigcap \{B_{\alpha} : \xi \in E_{\alpha}\}$ (observe that this is a finite intersection). Then $(\beta g)(x) = y$ because each $g^{-1}(B_{\alpha}) \supseteq E_{\alpha} \in x$. This g may fail to be onto, but we may now fix a set $A \in x$ with $|\kappa \setminus A| = \kappa$, and choose $f : \kappa \twoheadrightarrow \lambda$ such that $f \upharpoonright A = g \upharpoonright A$, so that $(\beta f)(x) = (\beta g)(x) = y$.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1: We obtain the situation of Lemma 3. Fix $X_n = \beta \beth_n$, and fix $p_n \in \beta \beth_n$ to be good and non-principal (and hence countably incomplete). Applying Lemmas 6 and 7, fix $\Pi_n^{n+1} : \beth_{n+1} \twoheadrightarrow \beth_n$ so that setting $\pi_n^{n+1} = \beta(\Pi_n^{n+1})$ yields $p_n = \pi_n^{n+1}(p_{n+1})$. Then (A) follows by Lemma 4, and (B) is clear, since there is a base for the space X_n of size $2^{\beth_n} = \beth_{n+1}$. Finally, (C) holds because $(\pi_0^n)^{-1} \{p_0\} \subseteq (\beth_n)^*$, which is nowhere dense in $\beta \beth_n$.

References

- Arhangel'skii A.V., Buzyakova R.Z., Convergence in compacta and linear Lindelöfness, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 39 (1998), 159–166.
- [2] Baker J., Kunen K., Limits in the uniform ultrafilters, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 353 (2001), 4083–4093.
- [3] Chang C.C., Keisler H.J., Model Theory, Third Edition, North-Holland, 1990.
- [4] Dow A., Good and OK ultrafilters, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 290 (1985), 145–160.

K. Kunen

- [5] Keisler H.J., Good ideals in fields of sets, Ann. of Math. 79 (1964), 338-359.
- [6] Keisler H.J., Ultraproducts of finite sets, J. Symbolic Logic 32 (1967), 47-57.
- [7] Kunen K., Ultrafilters and independent sets, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 172 (1972), 299-306.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, WI 53706, U.S.A.

E-mail:kunen@math.wisc.edu

(Received October 11, 2001)