

## Non-normality points and nice spaces

SERGEI LOGUNOV

*Abstract.* J. Terasawa in “ $\beta X - \{p\}$  are non-normal for non-discrete spaces  $X$ ” (2007) and the author in “On non-normality points and metrizable crowded spaces” (2007), independently showed for any metrizable crowded space  $X$  that each point  $p$  of its Čech–Stone remainder  $X^*$  is a non-normality point of  $\beta X$ . We introduce a new class of spaces, named nice spaces, which contains both of Sorgenfrey line and every metrizable crowded space. We obtain the result above for every nice space.

*Keywords:* non-normality point; butterfly-point; nice family; nice space; metrizable crowded space; Sorgenfrey line

*Classification:* 54D15, 54D35, 54D40, 54D80, 54E35, 54G20

### 1. Introduction

A point  $p$  of a normal space  $X$  is called a non-normality point, if  $X \setminus \{p\}$  is not normal. In a similar way,  $p$  is called a butterfly-point (b-point) of  $X$ , if  $\{p\} = [F] \cap [G]$  for some subsets  $F$  and  $G$  of  $X \setminus \{p\}$ , see [7]. We modify this notion for Čech–Stone compactification  $\beta X$  as follows: a point  $p$  of remainder  $X^* = \beta X \setminus X$  is called a butterfly-point (b-point) of  $\beta X$ , if  $\{p\} = [F]_{\beta X} \cap [G]_{\beta X}$  for some subsets  $F$  and  $G$  of  $X^* \setminus \{p\}$ , which are closed in  $\beta X \setminus \{p\}$ . It implies, obviously, that  $\beta X \setminus \{p\}$  is not normal.

Every point  $p$  of  $\omega^*$  is a non-normality point of  $\omega^*$  if [CH] holds, see [9]. But so far despite several efforts not much is known within ZFC (Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory). For example,  $p$  is called a Kunen point if there exists a discrete set  $D$  in  $\omega^*$  such that  $|D| = \omega_1$  and  $D \setminus O$  is countable for each neighbourhood  $O$  of  $p$ . If  $p$  is either an accumulation point of some countable discrete subset of  $\omega^*$ , see [1], or  $p$  is a Kunen point (E. K. van Douwen, unpublished), then  $p$  is a non-normality point of  $\omega^*$ .

As for crowded spaces, J. Terasawa and the author independently obtained the following result.

**Theorem 1** ([8], [5]). *Let  $X$  be a non-compact metrizable crowded space. Then any point  $p$  of  $X^*$  is a butterfly-point in  $\beta X$ . Hence  $\beta X \setminus \{p\}$  is not normal.*

Some facts for Tychonoff products were obtained by the author.

**Theorem 2** ([6]). *Let  $\tau$  be an arbitrary cardinal number and for every  $k < \tau$  let  $\mathcal{F}_k$  be a family of metrizable spaces with the following properties:  $\mathcal{F}_k$  contains a crowded space and  $\mathcal{F}_k$  contains at most one non-compact space. Let a space  $S$  be a free union  $\bigcup_{k < \tau} S_k$  of Tychonoff products  $S_k = \prod\{X : X \in \mathcal{F}_k\}$ . Then every point  $p$  of  $S^*$  is a butterfly-point in  $\beta S$ . Hence  $\beta S \setminus \{p\}$  is not normal.*

For instance, this is true if a space  $S$  is a free union of arbitrary powers of closed segments  $\bigcup_{k < \tau} I^k$  or, in particular,  $S = \omega \times I^c$ . Some other relevant facts may be seen in [2], [3] and [4].

Now we define a new class of spaces, nice spaces (see the definitions below) so that Sorgenfrey line and all metrizable crowded spaces belong to this class and prove the following

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $X$  be a non-compact nice space. Then every point  $p$  of  $X^*$  is a butterfly-point in  $\beta X$ . Hence  $\beta X \setminus \{p\}$  is not normal.*

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $S$  be a Sorgenfrey line. Then every point  $p$  of  $S^*$  is a butterfly-point in  $\beta S$ . Hence  $\beta S \setminus \{p\}$  is not normal.*

We obtain also the following more technical result.

**Theorem 4.** *Let a space  $X$  be  $p$ -nice for some point  $p$  of  $X^*$ . Then  $p$  is a butterfly-point in  $\beta X$ . Hence  $\beta X \setminus \{p\}$  is not normal.*

Theorems 3 and 4 follow from the last result of our paper, Theorem 5.

## 2. Preliminaries

In our article every space  $X$  is normal and crowded, i.e.  $X$  has no isolated points. By a neighbourhood of a point or a set we always mean an open neighbourhood. The closure of an open set is called a canonically closed set. By  $X^* = \beta X \setminus X$  we denote a remainder of Čech–Stone compactification  $\beta X$  of  $X$ , by  $[]$  and  $[]_{\beta X}$  – the closure operators in  $X$  and  $\beta X$ , respectively,  $\mathfrak{3} = \{0, 1, 2\}$  and  $\omega = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ . By  $O^\varepsilon$  we denote the biggest open in  $\beta X$  set, which trace on  $X$  equals open set  $O \subset X$ . A family of nonempty open sets  $\mathcal{B}$  is called a  $\pi$ -base of  $X$ , if every nonempty open subset of  $X$  contains some member of  $\mathcal{B}$ . A  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\sigma$ -locally finite, if it can be represented as  $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{B}_i$ , where every  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is locally finite. A base  $\mathcal{B}$  is called a regular base of Arhangel'skii, if for every neighbourhood  $O$  of any point  $x$  in  $X$  there is another or the same neighbourhood  $O'$  of  $x$  with the following properties:  $O' \subset O$  and at most finitely many members of  $\mathcal{B}$  meet both  $O'$  and  $X \setminus O$  simultaneously.

Let  $\pi$  and  $\sigma$  be arbitrary families of sets. For any set  $A$  we put  $\pi(A) = \{U \in \pi : U \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$ . By  $\text{Exp}(\pi)$  we denote all subfamilies of  $\pi$ , i.e.  $\text{Exp}(\pi) = \{F : F \subset \pi\}$ . We define a map  $f_\sigma^\pi : \text{Exp}(\pi) \rightarrow \text{Exp}(\sigma)$  in every  $F \in \text{Exp}(\pi)$  as follows:  $f_\sigma^\pi(F) = \{V \in \sigma : \bigcup F \cap V \neq \emptyset\}$ . If members of  $\pi$  are mutually disjoint (with closure), then  $\pi$  is called (strongly) cellular. A set  $U$  is a proper subset of a set  $V$ , denoted  $U \subsetneq V$ , if both  $U \subset V$  and  $U \neq V$ . A set  $U$  of  $\pi$  is a maximal member of  $\pi$ , if  $U \subsetneq V$  for no  $V \in \pi$ . We say, that  $\pi$  (strongly) refines  $\sigma$ , denoted  $(\pi \succ \sigma)$   $\pi \succeq \sigma$ , if  $U \in \pi$  is a (proper) subset of  $V \in \sigma$  whenever they are not disjoint. The family

$$\text{Cell}(\pi) = \left\{ U_\varphi = \bigcap \varphi \left[ \bigcup (\pi \setminus \varphi) \right] : \varphi \subset \pi \text{ is nonempty} \right\}$$

is a cellular refinement of  $\pi$ .

Let  $\pi$  and  $\sigma$  be nice families, i.e. maximal locally finite cellular families of open in  $X$  sets and  $p \in X^*$ . A collection  $\mathcal{F} \subset \text{Exp}(\pi)$  is called a  $p$ -filter on  $\pi$ , see [5], if  $p \in \left[ \bigcup \bigcap_{i \leq n} F_i \right]_{\beta X}$  for any finite subcollection  $\{F_1, \dots, F_n\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ . We write  $\pi \succeq_{\mathcal{F}} \sigma$  ( $\pi \succ_{\mathcal{F}} \sigma$ ), if there is  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $F \succeq \sigma$  ( $F \succ \sigma$ ). Obviously, the union of any increasing family of  $p$ -filters is also a  $p$ -filter. So by Kuratowski–Zorn lemma there are maximal  $p$ -filters or  $p$ -ultrafilters  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $\pi$ , that is  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$  whenever  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $p$ -filter and  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$ . Enriching any  $p$ -filter with new subfamilies of  $\pi$ , while possible, we can embed it into some  $p$ -ultrafilter. It may be not unique one, if a point  $p$  is not remote. But every  $p$ -ultrafilter contains  $\pi(O)$  for any neighborhood  $O$  of  $p$ . We denote

$$\bigcap^{\mathcal{F}^*} = \bigcap \left\{ \left[ \bigcup F \right]_{\beta X} : F \in \mathcal{F} \right\}.$$

### 3. Nice spaces

**Definition 1.** A  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $X$  is called a *nice  $\pi$ -base*, if  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\sigma$ -locally finite and for every neighbourhood  $O$  of any closed set  $F$  there is a nice subfamily  $\pi$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\bigcup \pi(F) \subset O$ .

**Definition 2.** A normal crowded space  $X$  is called *nice*, if for any point  $p$  of  $X^*$  there is a nice  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $X$  with the following property:  $p \notin [U]_{\beta X}$  for every  $U \in \mathcal{B}$ .

**Definition 3.** Let  $p$  be any point of  $\beta X$ . A  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $X$  is called a  *$p$ -nice  $\pi$ -base*, if  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\sigma$ -locally finite and for any neighbourhood  $O$  of  $p$  in  $\beta X$  there is a neighbourhood  $O'$  of  $p$  and a nice subfamily  $\pi$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\bigcup \pi(O') \subset O$ .

**Definition 4.** Let  $p \in X^*$ . A normal crowded space  $X$  is called  $p$ -nice, if there is a  $p$ -nice  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $X$  with the following property:  $p \notin [U]_{\beta X}$  for every  $U \in \mathcal{B}$ .

**Definition 5.** Let  $\pi$  be any subfamily of a  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{B}$ . Then a *cap* of  $\pi$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ , denoted  $\mathcal{B}'(\pi)$ , are all the sets  $U \in \mathcal{B}$  with the following property: if  $U$  meets some  $V \in \pi$ , then  $U$  is a proper subset of  $V$ , i.e.

$$\mathcal{B}'(\pi) = \{U \in \mathcal{B} : \forall V \in \pi (U \cap V = \emptyset \vee U \subsetneq V)\}.$$

**Definition 6.** Let  $\pi$  be any subfamily of a  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{B}$ . Then a *little cap* of  $\pi$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ , denoted  $\mathcal{B}(\pi)$ , are all maximal sets of a cap  $\mathcal{B}'(\pi)$ , i.e.

$$\mathcal{B}(\pi) = \{U \in \mathcal{B}'(\pi) : \forall V \in \mathcal{B}'(\pi) (\neg(U \subsetneq V))\}.$$

**Lemma 1.** Let  $\pi$  be any family of open sets,  $U_\varphi \in \text{Cell}(\pi)$  and  $x \in U_\varphi$ . Then for any  $V \in \pi$  the following hold:  $x \in V$  if and only if  $V \in \varphi$ .

PROOF: Let  $x \in V$  and  $V \notin \varphi$ . Then  $U_\varphi \cap [V] = \emptyset$  implies  $x \notin U_\varphi$ . Let  $x \notin V$  and  $V \in \varphi$ . Then  $U_\varphi \subset V$  implies  $x \notin U_\varphi$ . □

**Lemma 2.** Let  $\pi$  and  $\sigma$  be any families of open sets such that  $\pi \subset \sigma$ . Then  $\text{Cell}(\pi) \preceq \text{Cell}(\sigma)$ .

PROOF: Let  $U_\varphi \cap U_{\varphi'} \neq \emptyset$  for some  $\varphi \subset \pi$  and  $\varphi' \subset \sigma$ . For any point  $x \in U_\varphi \cap U_{\varphi'}$  we have  $\varphi = \{V \in \pi : x \in V\}$  and  $\varphi' = \{V \in \sigma : x \in V\}$ . Hence  $\varphi \subset \varphi'$  implies  $\bigcap \varphi' \subset \bigcap \varphi$ . Moreover,  $\pi \setminus \varphi = \{V \in \pi : x \notin V\}$  and  $\sigma \setminus \varphi' = \{V \in \sigma : x \notin V\}$ . Hence  $\pi \setminus \varphi \subset \sigma \setminus \varphi'$  and  $[\bigcup(\pi \setminus \varphi)] \subset [\bigcup(\sigma \setminus \varphi')]$ . Finally,  $U_{\varphi'} \subset U_\varphi$ . □

**Lemma 3.** Let a family  $\pi$  be open locally finite and everywhere dense in  $X$ . Then  $\text{Cell}(\pi)$  is a nice family, refining  $\pi$ .

PROOF: If  $U_\varphi \neq \emptyset$  for some  $\varphi \subset \pi$ , then  $\varphi$  is finite and  $U_\varphi$  is open.

If  $U \in \varphi \setminus \varphi'$ , then  $U_\varphi \subset U$  and  $U_{\varphi'} \cap U = \emptyset$ . So  $\text{Cell}(\pi)$  is cellular.

Let an open set  $O$  meet only finitely many sets of  $\pi$ , say  $U_0, \dots, U_k$ . Then  $O \cap U_\varphi \neq \emptyset$  implies  $\varphi \subset \{U_0, \dots, U_k\}$ . So  $O$  meets at most  $2^{k+1}$  members of  $\text{Cell}(\pi)$ , which is locally finite.

Let  $x$  not be a boundary point of any  $U \in \pi$ . Then  $x \in U_\varphi$  for  $\varphi = \{U \in \pi : x \in U\}$  and  $\text{Cell}(\pi)$  is everywhere dense.

Let  $U_\varphi$  meet some  $V \in \pi$ . Then  $V \in \varphi$  by our definition. Hence  $U_\varphi \subset \bigcap \varphi$  implies  $U_\varphi \subset V$ , i.e.,  $\text{Cell}(\pi)$  refines  $\pi$ . □

**Lemma 4.** Sorgenfrey line  $S$  has a nice  $\pi$ -base.

PROOF: Every  $\mathcal{B}_n = \{[z + k/2^n, z + k + 1/2^n) : z \in Z \text{ and } k = 0, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$  is a nice family and  $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{B}_n$  is a nice  $\pi$ -base. Indeed, let  $O$  be any

neighbourhood of a closed set  $F$ . Define  $\sigma$  to be all maximal sets of the cover  $\mathcal{A} = \{U \in \mathcal{B} : U \cap F = \emptyset \vee U \subset O\}$  of  $X$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}$  is embedded,  $\sigma$  is cellular. Any  $x \in F$  belongs to some  $U \in \mathcal{A}$ . Let  $V$  be the maximal set of  $\mathcal{A}$ , containing  $U$ . Then  $V \in \sigma$  and  $\sigma$  is a cover. Hence  $\sigma$  is nice and  $\bigcup \sigma(F) \subset O$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *Every metrizable crowded space  $X$  has a nice  $\pi$ -base.*

PROOF: For every  $i \in \omega$  let  $\mathcal{P}_i$  be a locally finite open cover of  $X$ , consisting of sets with diameter at most  $1/(i + 1)$ . Obviously,  $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{P}_i$  is a regular base of Arhangelskii. Every  $\mathcal{B}_i = \text{Cell}(\bigcup_{j \leq i} \mathcal{P}_j)$  is nice and  $\mathcal{B}_i \succeq \mathcal{P}_i$  by Lemma 3,  $\mathcal{B}_{i+1} \succeq \mathcal{B}_i$  by Lemma 2. Then  $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{B}_i$  is a nice  $\pi$ -base. Indeed, let  $O$  be any neighbourhood of a closed set  $F$ . Assume  $\pi$  to be all maximal sets of the cover  $\{U \in \mathcal{P} : U \cap F = \emptyset \vee U \subset O\}$ . It is easy to see that  $\pi$  is a locally finite cover of  $X$  and  $\bigcup \pi(F) \subset O$ . For any  $U \in \pi$  we fix unique  $i_0 \in \omega$  so that  $U \in \mathcal{P}_{i_0}$ . If  $U$  meets some  $V \in \mathcal{B}_{i_0}$ , where the index  $i_0$  is one and the same, then  $V \subset U$ . Hence  $\mathcal{B}_U = \{V \in \mathcal{B}_{i_0} : V \subset U\}$  is nice in  $U$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}_\pi$  be all maximal members of  $\bigcup_{U \in \pi} \mathcal{B}_U$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}$  is embedded,  $\mathcal{B}_\pi$  is nice. Let  $V \in \mathcal{B}_\pi$  intersect  $F$ . Then  $V \in \mathcal{B}_U$  for some  $U \in \pi$  by our construction. It implies  $V \subset U$  and  $U \cap F \neq \emptyset$ . But then  $U \subset O$  implies  $V \subset O$  and  $\bigcup \mathcal{B}_\pi(F) \subset O$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a  $\sigma$ -locally finite  $\pi$ -base. Then  $\mathcal{B}$  is nice if and only if for any two closed disjoint subsets  $F$  and  $G$  of  $X$  there is a nice subfamily  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\bigcup \sigma(F) \cap (\bigcup \sigma(G)) = \emptyset$ .*

PROOF: Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be nice and let  $F$  and  $G$  be closed and disjoint. Then there is a nice subfamily  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\bigcup \sigma(F) \subset X \setminus G$ . Since  $\sigma$  is cellular,  $\sigma(F) \cap \sigma(G) = \emptyset$  implies  $\bigcup \sigma(F) \cap (\bigcup \sigma(G)) = \emptyset$ .

Vice versa. Let  $O$  and  $O'$  be any neighbourhoods of a closed set  $F$  such that  $[O'] \subset O$ . Then every nice subfamily  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  is everywhere dense in canonically closed  $G = [X \setminus [O']]$ . Hence  $\bigcup \sigma(F) \cap (\bigcup \sigma(G)) = \emptyset$  implies  $\bigcup \sigma(F) \subset O$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** *Let there be a nice  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{A}$  with the following properties:  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{A}_i$  and every  $\mathcal{A}_i$  is locally finite. Then there is a nice  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{B}_i$  and for every  $i \in \omega$  the following hold:*

- 1)  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is a nice family;
- 2)  $\mathcal{A}_i \prec \mathcal{B}_i$ ;
- 3)  $\mathcal{B}_i \prec \mathcal{B}_{i+1}$ ;
- 4) there is a strongly cellular family  $\{U(\nu) : U \in \mathcal{B}_i \text{ and } \nu \in 3\}$  of sets  $U(\nu) \in \mathcal{B}_{i+1}$  with  $[U(\nu)] \subset U$ .

PROOF: Every

$$\mathcal{D}_i = \text{Cell} \left( \bigcup_{j \leq i} \mathcal{A}_j \cup \{X\} \right)$$

is nice and  $\mathcal{A}_i \preceq \mathcal{D}_i$  by Lemma 3,  $\mathcal{D}_i \preceq \mathcal{D}_{i+1}$  by Lemma 2. To provide (4) we put  $\mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{D}_0$  and assume  $\mathcal{B}_i$  to be constructed for some  $i \in \omega$ . There is a strongly cellular family of nonempty open sets

$$\mathcal{W}_i = \{U(\nu) : U \in \mathcal{B}_i \text{ and } \nu \in 3\}$$

with  $[U(\nu)] \subset U$ . If  $\mathcal{B}_{i+1} = \text{Cell}(\mathcal{B}_i \cup \mathcal{W}_i \cup \mathcal{D}_{i+1})$ , then  $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{B}_i$  is as required.

Indeed, leaving the conditions 1)–4) to the reader we will show only that  $\mathcal{B}$  is nice. Let  $O$  be any neighbourhood of a closed set  $F$  in  $X$ . There is nice  $\sigma \subset \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\bigcup \sigma(F) \subset O$ . For any  $U \in \sigma$  we choose unique  $i_0 \in \omega$  so that  $U \in \mathcal{A}_{i_0}$ . By our construction,  $\mathcal{A}_{i_0} \preceq \mathcal{D}_{i_0} \preceq \mathcal{B}_{i_0}$ , where the index  $i_0$  is one and the same. So  $V \cap U \neq \emptyset$  implies  $V \subset U$  for every  $V \in \mathcal{B}_{i_0}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{B}_U = \{V \in \mathcal{B}_{i_0} : V \subset U\}$  is nice in  $U$ . Since  $\sigma$  is nice,  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma = \bigcup_{U \in \sigma} \mathcal{B}_U$  is also nice. Let  $V \cap F \neq \emptyset$  for some  $V \in \mathcal{B}_\sigma$ . Then  $V \in \mathcal{B}_U$  implies  $V \subset U$  for unique  $U \in \sigma$  and  $U \cap F \neq \emptyset$  implies  $U \subset O$ . Hence  $V \subset O$  implies  $\bigcup \mathcal{B}_\sigma(F) \subset O$  and our proof is complete.  $\square$

From now on we may assume that every nice  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies the conditions 1)–4). Then  $\mathcal{B}$  is embedded and  $\mathcal{B}_i \cap \mathcal{B}_j = \emptyset$  if  $i \neq j$ . So for each  $U \in \mathcal{B}$  we can put  $n(U) = i$  if  $U \in \mathcal{B}_i$ .

**Lemma 8.** *If  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$  is locally finite, then “little cap”  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$  is nice.*

PROOF: Since  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{B}$ , it is a family of open sets.

Since  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$  is the family of maximal sets of  $\mathcal{B}'(\mathcal{A})$ , which is embedded, then  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$  is cellular.

Let an open  $O$  intersect at most finitely many sets of  $\mathcal{A}$  and let  $x \in O$  not be in the boundary of any of them. There is a neighbourhood  $O_0$  of  $x$  such that  $O_0 \subset O$  and for any  $U \in \mathcal{A}$  the following hold: either  $O_0 \cap U = \emptyset$  or  $O_0 \subsetneq U$ . If  $V \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $V \subset O_0$ , then  $V \in \mathcal{B}'(\mathcal{A})$ . Let  $W$  be the maximal set of  $\mathcal{B}'(\mathcal{A})$ , containing  $V$ . Then  $W \cap O \neq \emptyset$  and  $W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$ , which is maximal.

Now we have to show only that  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$  is locally finite. Let a neighbourhood  $O$  of a point  $x$  intersect at most finitely many sets of  $\mathcal{A}$ . We put either  $k_0 = \max\{n(U) : O \text{ meets } U \in \mathcal{A}\}$ , if the last set is not empty, or  $k_0 = 1$  otherwise. For any neighbourhood  $O_0$  of  $x$  with  $[O_0] \subset O$  there is a nice subfamily  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\bigcup \sigma(O_0) \subset O$ . Let a neighbourhood  $O_1$  of  $x$  satisfy both  $O_1 \subset O_0$  and  $O_1$  meets at most finitely many members of  $\sigma$ . We set  $k_1 = \max\{n(U) : O_1 \text{ meets } U \in \sigma\}$  and  $k = k_0 + k_1$ .

Let  $U \in \mathcal{B}$  intersect  $O_1$  and  $n(U) > k$ . Since  $\sigma$  is nice,  $U \cap O_1$  meets some  $V \in \sigma$ . Then  $k_1 \geq n(V)$  implies  $U \subset V \subset O_0$ . Let  $U$  intersect some  $V \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then  $k_0 \geq n(V)$  implies  $U \subsetneq V$  and  $U \in \mathcal{B}'(\mathcal{A})$ .

Let  $U \in \mathcal{B}$  intersect  $O_1$  and  $n(U) > k + 1$ . By our construction,  $U$  is a proper subset of unique  $V \in \mathcal{B}_{k+1}$ . Since  $V \in \mathcal{B}'(\mathcal{A})$ , then  $U \notin \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$ .

Finally, let a neighbourhood  $O_2$  satisfy both  $O_2 \subset O_1$  and  $O_2$  intersects at most finitely many members of  $\bigcup_{i \leq k+1} \mathcal{B}_i$ . Then  $O_2$  intersects at most finitely many members of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.** *For any locally finite subfamily  $\pi$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  there is a nice subfamily  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\sigma \succ \pi$ .*

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a  $\sigma$ -locally finite  $\pi$ -base. Then  $\mathcal{B}$  is nice if and only if  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $p$ -nice for any point  $p$  of  $\beta X$ .*

PROOF: Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be nice and assume  $O$  and  $O'$  to be any neighbourhoods of  $p$  in  $\beta X$  with  $[O']_{\beta X} \subset O$ . Then  $U = O \cap X$  is an open neighbourhood of  $F = [O']_{\beta X} \cap X$ . There is a nice subfamily  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\bigcup \sigma(F) \subset U$ . But then  $O$  contains  $\bigcup \sigma(O') = \bigcup \sigma(F)$ .

Vice versa. Let  $O$  be any neighbourhood of a closed set  $F$  in  $X$ . Then  $O^\varepsilon$  is an open neighbourhood of  $G = [F]_{\beta X}$  in  $\beta X$ . For any point  $x$  of  $G$  there is a neighbourhood  $Ox$  in  $\beta X$  and a nice subfamily  $\sigma_x$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\sigma_x(Ox) \subset O^\varepsilon$ . The open cover  $\{Ox : x \in G\}$  of  $G$  contains a finite subcover  $\{Ox_1, \dots, Ox_n\}$ . The family  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{i \leq n} \sigma_i$ , where  $\sigma_i = \sigma_{x_i}$ , is locally finite in  $X$ . Hence  $\sigma = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$  is nice by Lemma 8 and  $\bigcup \sigma(F) \subset O$ . Indeed, every  $U \in \sigma(F)$  intersects some  $Ox_i$ . Since  $\sigma_i$  is nice,  $U$  meets some  $V \in \sigma_i$ . Then  $U \subset V$  by the definition of  $\sigma$  and  $V \cap Ox_i \neq \emptyset$ . Hence  $V \subset O^\varepsilon$  and our proof is complete.  $\square$

#### 4. Butterfly-point

From now on a space  $X$  has a nice  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{B}$ , satisfying the conditions 1)–4) of Lemma 7. By  $\Sigma = \Sigma(\mathcal{B})$  we denote all nice subfamilies of  $\mathcal{B}$ , i.e.  $\Sigma = \{\sigma \subset \mathcal{B} : \sigma \text{ is nice}\}$ . For any  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $\nu \in 3$  we put  $\sigma(\nu) = \{U(\nu) : U \in \sigma\}$ .

**Lemma 10.** *Let a paracompact space  $X$  has a nice  $\pi$ -base. Then  $X$  is nice.*

PROOF: For any point  $p$  of  $X^*$  there is an open locally finite cover  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $X$  with the following property:  $p \notin [U]_{\beta X}$  for every  $U \in \mathcal{P}$ . Let  $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{B}_i$  be a nice  $\pi$ -base, where every  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is locally finite. Then each

$$\mathcal{B}'_i = \{U \cap V : U \in \mathcal{B}_i \text{ and } V \in \text{Cell}(\mathcal{P})\}$$

is locally finite and  $\mathcal{B}' = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{B}'_i$  is as required. Indeed, for any open neighbourhood  $O$  of a closed set  $F$  there is a nice subfamily  $\sigma$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\bigcup \sigma(F) \subset O$ . But then  $\sigma' = \{U \cap V : U \in \sigma \text{ and } V \in \text{Cell}(\mathcal{P})\}$  is a nice subfamily of  $\mathcal{B}'$ , having the same property.  $\square$

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a nice  $\pi$ -base of  $X$  and  $p \in X^*$ . If there is a zero-set  $Z$  in  $\beta X$  with  $p \in Z \subset X^*$ , then there is  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  with the following property:  $p \notin [U]_{\beta X}$  for any  $U \in \sigma$ .*

PROOF: Let  $Z = \bigcap_{i \in \omega} O_i$ , where  $O_i$  is open in  $\beta X$  and  $[O_{i+1}]_{\beta X} \subset O_i$  for each  $i \in N$ . We put  $F_0 = [X \setminus [O_2]]$  and  $F_i = [O_i \setminus [O_{i+2}]]$ . We set  $W_0 = X \setminus [O_3]$  and  $W_i = O_{i-1} \setminus [O_{i+3}]$ . Then every  $F_i$  is a canonically closed subset of open  $W_i$  and  $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} F_i = X$ . If  $\sigma_i \subset \mathcal{B}$  is nice and  $\bigcup \sigma_i(F_i) \subset W_i$ , then  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \sigma_i(F_i)$  is locally finite. Hence “little cap”  $\sigma = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$  is nice by Lemma 8 and  $\sigma \succ \mathcal{A}$ . If  $U \in \sigma$  meets any  $F_i$ , then  $U$  meets some  $V \in \sigma_i(F_i)$ . It implies  $U \subset V \subset W_i$  and our proof is complete.  $\square$

We omit the proofs of Lemmas 12–15, since they coincide with the proofs of Lemmas 2–5 in [5].

**Lemma 12.** *Let for a point  $p$  of  $X^*$  there be  $\sigma_p \in \Sigma$  such that  $p \notin [U]_{\beta X}$  for any  $U \in \sigma$ . Then there is a well-ordered chain  $\{\sigma_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \subset \Sigma$  and a  $p$ -ultrafilter  $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$  on every  $\sigma_\alpha$ , with the following properties for all  $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$  and  $f_\beta^\alpha = f_{\sigma_\beta}^{\sigma_\alpha}$ :*

- 1)  $p \notin [U]_{\beta X}$  for every  $U \in \sigma_0$ ;
- 2)  $f_\beta^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_\alpha) \subset \mathcal{F}_\beta$ ;
- 3)  $\sigma_\alpha \prec_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha} \sigma_\beta$ ;
- 4) for any  $\sigma \in \Sigma \setminus \{\sigma_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$  there is  $\alpha < \lambda$  with  $\neg(\sigma_\alpha \prec_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha} \sigma)$ .

**Lemma 13.** *We have  $\bigcap \mathcal{F}_0^* \subset X^*$ .*

**Lemma 14.** *If  $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$ , then  $\bigcap \mathcal{F}_\beta^* \subset \bigcap \mathcal{F}_\alpha^*$ .*

**Lemma 15.** *For any neighbourhood  $O$  of  $p$  in  $\beta X$  there is  $\alpha < \lambda$  with  $\bigcap \mathcal{F}_\alpha^* \subset O$ .*

Lemma 16 coincides with Proposition 6 in [5]. Now we present a new proof, probably clearer and easier to understand.

**Lemma 16.** *The set*

$$B_\alpha(\nu) = \bigcap \mathcal{F}_\alpha^* \cap \left( \bigcap_{\beta \in \lambda \setminus \alpha} \left[ \bigcup \sigma_\beta(\nu) \right]_{\beta X} \right)$$

*is not empty for any  $\alpha < \lambda$  and  $\nu \in 3$ .*

PROOF: Let  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$  and let  $\alpha < \beta_0 < \dots < \beta_i < \dots < \beta_n < \lambda$  be any finite sequence of indexes. Our goal is to find by induction  $U \in \mathcal{B}$  so that  $U \subset \bigcup F$  and  $U \subset V(\nu)$  for any  $i \leq n$  and some  $V \in \sigma(\beta_i)$ . We can assume  $F \prec \sigma_{\beta_0}$  and choose  $G_i \in \mathcal{F}_{\beta_i}$  so that  $G_i \prec \sigma_{\beta_{i+1}}$  for any  $i < n$  and  $G_n = \sigma_{\beta_n}$ . For  $F_0 = f_{\beta_0}^\alpha F \cap G_0$  and  $F_{i+1} = f_{\beta_{i+1}}^{\beta_i} F_i \cap G_{i+1}$  we get  $F_i \in \mathcal{F}_{\beta_i}$ ,  $F_i \prec F_{i+1}$  and  $\bigcup F_{i+1} \subset \bigcup F_i$ . For



any  $U_n \in F_n$  and  $U_i \in F_i$  with  $U_n \subset U_i$  we obtain

$$(1) \quad U_n \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq U_i \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq U_1 \subsetneq U_0 \subsetneq \bigcup F.$$

Only in order to simplify the notation assume, that the order of the embedding does not change.

To insert the set  $U_0(\nu)$  into the sequence (1), we note the following points.

1) Since every  $\sigma_{\beta_i}$  is nice and unique,  $U_i$  of  $\sigma_{\beta_i}$  can be replaced with another or the same set  $U'_i$  of  $\sigma_{\beta_i}$  so that

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n U'_i \cap U_0(\nu) \neq \emptyset.$$

2) Since  $U_i \subsetneq U_0$ , then  $U'_i \subset U_0(\nu)$  by the definition of  $\mathcal{B}$ .

3) Perhaps  $U'_1 \neq U_0(\nu)$ :

$$(2) \quad U'_n \subset \cdots \subset U'_i \subset \cdots \subset U'_1 \subsetneq U_0(\nu) \subset U_0 \subset \bigcup F.$$

4) Perhaps some sets of  $U'_i$  are equal to  $U_0(\nu)$ :

$$(3) \quad U'_n \subset \cdots \subset U'_i \subset \cdots \subset U'_{i_0} \subsetneq U'_{i_0-1} = \cdots = U'_1 = U_0(\nu) \subset U_0 \subset \bigcup F.$$

To insert the set  $U'_1(\nu)$  in sequence (2) we can repeat points 1)–4) to get either

$$(4) \quad U''_n \subset \cdots \subset U''_i \subset \cdots \subset U''_2 \subsetneq U'_1(\nu) \subset U'_1 \subsetneq U_0(\nu) \subset U_0 \subset \bigcup F$$

or

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} U''_n \subset \cdots \subset U''_i \subset \cdots \subset U''_{i_1} \subsetneq U''_{i_1-1} = \cdots = U''_2 \\ = U'_1(\nu) \subset U'_1 \subsetneq U_0(\nu) \subset U_0 \subset \bigcup F. \end{aligned}$$

To insert the set  $U''_1(\nu)$  in sequence (3) we can repeat points 1)–4) to get either

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} U''_n \subset \cdots \subset U''_i \subset \cdots \subset U''_{i_0} \subsetneq U''_1(\nu) \\ \subset U'_{i_0-1} = \cdots = U'_1 = U_0(\nu) \subset U_0 \subset \bigcup F \end{aligned}$$

or

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} U''_n \subset \cdots \subset U''_i \subset \cdots \subset U''_{i_1} \subsetneq U''_{i_1-1} = \cdots = U''_{i_0} = U''_1(\nu) \\ \subset U'_{i_0-1} = \cdots = U'_1 = U_0(\nu) \subset U_0 \subset \bigcup F. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can insert  $U''_2(\nu)$  into the sequences (4) and (5). We can insert  $U''_{i_0}(\nu)$  into the sequences (6) and (7) and so on. After each “stroke by the tail in front of the set  $U_i(\nu)$ ” it becomes shorter by at least one set. So, after a finite number  $k \leq n$  of “strokes” it will be empty. Then  $U_k(\nu)$  is as required.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.** *Let for a point  $p$  of  $X^*$  there be  $\sigma_p \in \Sigma$  such that  $p \notin [U]_{\beta X}$  for any  $U \in \sigma$ . Then  $p$  is a butterfly-point of  $\beta X$ .*

PROOF: For any  $\nu \in 3$  denote  $F_\nu = \{p_\alpha(\nu) : \alpha < \lambda\}$ , where  $p_\alpha(\nu)$  is any point of the set  $B_\alpha(\nu)$  in the previous lemma. By Lemmas 13–15,  $F_\nu \subset B_0 \subset X^*$  and for any neighbourhood  $O$  of  $p$  there is  $\alpha < \lambda$  with  $\{p_\beta(\nu) : \beta \in \lambda \setminus \alpha\} \subset B_\alpha \subset O$ . Then the condition  $\{p_\beta(\nu) : \beta < \alpha\} \subset [\bigcup \sigma_\alpha(\nu)]_{\beta X}$  implies both that the sets  $[F_\nu]_{\beta X} \setminus \{p\}$  are pairwise disjoint and  $p \in F_\nu$  for no more than one unique  $F_\nu$ . The other two ensure that  $p$  is a b-point in  $\beta X$ . Our proof is complete.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Błaszczyk A., Szymański A., *Some non-normal subspaces of the Čech–Stone compactification of a discrete space*, in Abstracta, 8th Winter School on Abstract Analysis, Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Praha, 1980, pages 35–38.
- [2] Logunov S., *On hereditary normality of compactifications*, Topology Appl. **73** (1996), no. 3, 213–216.
- [3] Logunov S., *On hereditary normality of zero-dimensional spaces*, Topology Appl. **102** (2000), no. 1, 53–58.
- [4] Logunov S., *On remote points, non-normality and  $\pi$ -weight  $\omega_1$* , Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **42** (2001), no. 2, 379–384.
- [5] Logunov S., *On non-normality points and metrizable crowded spaces*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **48** (2007), no. 3, 523–527.
- [6] Logunov S., *Non-normality points and big products of metrizable spaces*, Topology Proc. **46** (2015), 73–85.
- [7] Šapirovskiĭ B. È., *The embedding of extremely disconnected spaces in bicompleta. b-points and weight of point-wise normal spaces*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **223** (1975), no. 5, 1083–1086 (Russian).
- [8] Terasawa J.,  *$\beta X - \{p\}$  are non-normal for non-discrete spaces  $X$* , Topology Proc. **31** (2007), no. 1, 309–317.
- [9] Warren N. M., *Properties of Stone–Čech compactifications of discrete spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **33** (1972), 599–606.

S. Logunov:

DEPARTMENT FOR ALGEBRA AND TOPOLOGY, UDMURT STATE UNIVERSITY,  
UNIVERSITETSKAYA 1, IZHEVSK 426034, RUSSIA

*E-mail:* olla209@yandex.ru

(Received October 27, 2019, revised September 7, 2020)