Comment.Math.Univ.Carolin. 39,3 (1998)581–585

On the cardinality of Hausdorff spaces

Alessandro Fedeli

Abstract. The aim of this paper is to show, using the reflection principle, three new cardinal inequalities. These results improve some well-known bounds on the cardinality of Hausdorff spaces.

Keywords: cardinal inequality, Hausdorff space

Classification: 54A25

Two of the most known inequalities in the theory of cardinal functions are the Hajnal-Juhàsz's inequality [7]: "For $X \in T_2$, $|X| \leq 2^{c(X)\chi(X)}$" and the Arhangel'skii's inequality [5]: "For $X \in T_2$, $|X| \leq 2^{L(X)t(X)\psi(X)}$".

In this paper we will use the language of elementary submodels (see [4], [10], [1] and [2]) to establish three new cardinal inequalities which generalize the results mentioned above. We refer the reader to [3], [5], [7] for notations and terminology not explicitly given. χ, c, ψ, t, L and π_χ denote character, cellularity, pseudocharacter, tightness, Lindelöf degree and π-character respectively.

Definitions. (i) Let X be a Hausdorff space.

The closed pseudocharacter of X, denoted $\psi_c(X)$, is the smallest infinite cardinal κ such that for every $x \in X$ there is a collection $\mathcal{U}_x$ of open neighbourhoods of x such that $\bigcap\{\overline{U} : U \in \mathcal{U}_x\} = \{x\}$ and $|\mathcal{U}_x| \leq \kappa$ ([7]).

The Hausdorff pseudocharacter of X, denoted $H\psi(X)$, is the smallest infinite cardinal κ such that for every $x \in X$ there is a collection $\mathcal{U}_x$ of open neighbourhoods of x with $|\mathcal{U}_x| \leq \kappa$ such that if $x \neq y$, there exist $U \in \mathcal{U}_x$, $V \in \mathcal{U}_y$ with $U \cap V = \emptyset$ ([6]).

Clearly $\psi_c(X) \leq H\psi(X) \leq \chi(X)$ for every Hausdorff space X.

(ii) Let X be a topological space, $ac(X)$ is the smallest infinite cardinal κ such that there is a subset S of X such that $|S| \leq 2^\kappa$ and for every open collection $\mathcal{U}$ in X there is a $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\leq\kappa}$ with $\bigcup\mathcal{U} \subset \overline{S \cup \bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}\}}$.

Observe that $ac(X) \leq c(X)$ for every space X.

Theorem 1. *If X is a T_2-space then $|X| \leq 2^{ac(X)H\psi(X)}$.*

Proof: Let $\lambda = ac(X)H\psi(X)$, $\kappa = 2^\lambda$, let τ be the topology on X and let S be an element of $[X]^{\leq\kappa}$ witnessing that $ac(X) \leq \lambda$. For every $x \in X$ let $\mathcal{B}_x$ be a collection of open neighbourhoods of x with $|\mathcal{B}_x| \leq \lambda$ such that if $x \neq y$ then there exist $U \in \mathcal{B}_x$, $V \in \mathcal{B}_y$ such that $U \cap V = \emptyset$, and let $f : X \to \mathcal{P}(\tau)$ be the map defined by $f(x) = \mathcal{B}_x$ for every $x \in X$.

Let $A = \kappa \cup \{S, X, \tau, \kappa, f\}$ and take a set $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \supset A$, $|\mathcal{M}| = \kappa$ and which reflects enough formulas to carry out our argument. To be more precise we ask that $\mathcal{M}$ reflects enough formulas so that the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) $C \in \mathcal{M}$ for every $C \in [\mathcal{M}]^{\leq\kappa}$;
(ii) $\mathcal{B}_x \in \mathcal{M}$ for every $x \in X \cap \mathcal{M}$;
(iii) if $B \subset X$ and $B \in \mathcal{M}$ then $\overline{B} \in \mathcal{M}$;
(iv) if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{M}$ then $\bigcup \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{M}$;
(v) if B is a subset of X such that $X \cap \mathcal{M} \subset B$ and $B \in \mathcal{M}$ then $X = B$;
(vi) if $E \in \mathcal{M}$ and $|E| \leq \kappa$ then $E \subset \mathcal{M}$.

Observe that by (ii) and (vi) $\mathcal{B}_y \subset \mathcal{M}$ for every $y \in X \cap \mathcal{M}$.

Claim: $X \subset \mathcal{M}$ (and hence $|X| \leq 2^{ac(X)H\psi(X)}$). Suppose not and take $p \in X \setminus \mathcal{M}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_p = \{B_\alpha\}_{\alpha<\lambda}$, clearly $\bigcap\{\overline{B}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} = \{p\}$. Now for every $\alpha < \lambda$ let $(X \cap \mathcal{M})_\alpha = \{y \in X \cap \mathcal{M} : \exists B \in \mathcal{B}_y \text{ for which } B \cap B_\alpha = \emptyset\}$. For every $y \in (X \cap \mathcal{M})_\alpha$ choose a $B_{y,\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_y$ such that $B_{y,\alpha} \cap B_\alpha = \emptyset$, clearly $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = \{B_{y,\alpha} : y \in (X \cap \mathcal{M})_\alpha\}$ covers $(X \cap \mathcal{M})_\alpha$. Since $ac(X) \leq \lambda$ it follows that there is a $\mathcal{V}_\alpha \in [\mathcal{U}_\alpha]^{\leq\lambda}$ such that $(X \cap M)_\alpha \subset \overline{S \cup \bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}}$. Observe that $p \notin \overline{S \cup \bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}}$ ($S \in \mathcal{M}$ and $|S| \leq \kappa$ so by (vi) $S \subset \mathcal{M}$, moreover $\overline{\bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}} \subset X \setminus B_\alpha$). We have also $\overline{\bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}} \in \mathcal{M}$ ($V \in \mathcal{M}$ for every $V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha$, so by (iii) $\overline{V} \in \mathcal{M}$, therefore $\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{M}$ by (i), hence by (iv) $\bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{M}$, so $\overline{\bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}} \in \mathcal{M}$ by (iii)). Set $C_\alpha = \overline{S \cup \bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}}$ for every $\alpha < \lambda$ and observe that $C_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ (recall that $S, \overline{\bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}} \in \mathcal{M}$). Now $X \cap \mathcal{M} \subset \bigcup\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$, since $\bigcup\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \in \mathcal{M}$ ($\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \subset \mathcal{M}$, so by (i) $\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \in \mathcal{M}$, hence by (iv) $\bigcup\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \in \mathcal{M}$) it follows by (v) that $\bigcup\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} = X$. This is a contradiction ($p \notin \bigcup\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$). □

Corollary 2 ([7]). *If X is a T_2-space then $|X| \leq 2^{c(X)\chi(X)}$.*

Remark 3. The above result of Hajnal and Juhàsz has been improved also by Hodel, in fact in [6] it is shown that $|X| \leq 2^{c(X)H\psi(X)}$ for every Hausdorff space X. It is clear that Theorem 1 generalizes also this result of Hodel.

Now let X be the Michael line, i.e. let X be $\mathbb{R}$ topologized by isolating the points of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and leaving the points of $\mathbb{Q}$ with their usual neighbourhoods. Then X is a normal space such that $|X| = 2^{ac(X)H\psi(X)} < 2^{c(X)H\psi(X)}$.

Observe that in Theorem 1 $H\psi(X)$ cannot be replaced by $\psi_c(X)$, in fact for every infinite cardinal κ there is a T_3-space X with $|X| = \kappa$ and $\psi(X) = c(X) = ac(X) = \omega$ (see e.g. [5]).

Definition 4. Let X be a topological space, $lc(X)$ is the smallest infinite cardinal κ such that there is a closed subset F of X such that $|F| \leq 2^\kappa$ and for every open collection $\mathcal{U}$ in X there is a $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\leq\kappa}$ with $\bigcup\mathcal{U} \subset \overline{F \cup \bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}\}}$.

Clearly $ac(X) \le lc(X) \le c(X)$ for every space X.

Theorem 5. *If X is a Hausdorff space then $|X| \le 2^{lc(X)\pi_\chi(X)\psi_c(X)}$.*

PROOF: Let $\lambda = lc(X)\pi_\chi(X)\psi_c(X)$ and let $\kappa = 2^\lambda$, let τ be the topology on X and let F be a closed subset of X with $|F| \le \kappa$ and witnessing that $lc(X) \le \lambda$. For every $x \in X$ let $\mathcal{B}_x$ be a local π-base at x such that $|\mathcal{B}_x| \le \lambda$, and let $f : X \to \mathcal{P}(\tau)$ be the map defined by $f(x) = \mathcal{B}_x$ for every $x \in X$. Let $A = \kappa \cup \{F, X, \tau, \kappa, f\}$ and take a set $\mathcal{M} \supset A$ such that $|\mathcal{M}| = \kappa$ and which reflects enough formulas so that the conditions (i)-(vi) listed in Theorem 1 are satisfied.

Claim: $X \subset \mathcal{M}$ (and hence $|X| \le 2^{lc(X)\pi_\chi(X)\psi_c(X)}$). Suppose not and take $p \in X \setminus \mathcal{M}$. Let $\{G_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda\}$ be a family of open neighbourhoods of p such that $\bigcap\{\overline{G_\alpha} : \alpha \in \lambda\} = \{p\}$. Set $V_\alpha = X \setminus \overline{G_\alpha}$ and $S_\alpha = X \cap \mathcal{M} \cap V_\alpha$ for every $\alpha \in \lambda$. Now let $\mathcal{W}_\alpha = \{B : B \in \mathcal{B}_y, y \in S_\alpha \wedge B \subset V_\alpha\}$, since $lc(X) \le \lambda$ it follows that there is a $\mathcal{V}_\alpha \in [\mathcal{W}_\alpha]^{\le\lambda}$ such that $\bigcup \mathcal{W}_\alpha \subset \overline{F \cup \bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}}$. Since $S_\alpha \subset \overline{\bigcup \mathcal{W}_\alpha}$ (let $y \in S_\alpha$ and U be an open neighbourhood of y, $y \notin \overline{G_\alpha}$ so there is an open neighbourhood V of y such that $V \cap G_\alpha = \emptyset$, let $B \in \mathcal{B}_y$ such that $B \subset U \cap V$, $\emptyset \ne B \subset (\bigcup \mathcal{W}_\alpha) \cap U$ and $y \in \overline{\bigcup \mathcal{W}_\alpha}$) it follows that $S_\alpha \subset \overline{F \cup \bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}}$; moreover $\overline{\bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $p \notin \overline{F \cup \bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}}$. Set $C_\alpha = \overline{\bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha\}}$, since $X \cap \mathcal{M} \subset F \cup \bigcup\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ and $F \cup \bigcup\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \in \mathcal{M}$ it follows that $F \cup \bigcup\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} = X$, a contradiction. □

By Theorem 5 it follows again that $|X| \le 2^{c(X)\chi(X)}$ for every T_2-space X. Moreover we have the following

Corollary 6 ([6]). *If X is a T_3-space then $|X| \le 2^{c(X)\pi_\chi(X)\psi(X)}$.*

Remark 7. A generalization of the inequality in corollary 6 has also been obtained by Sun in [8]: "$|X| \le 2^{c(X)\pi_\chi(X)\psi_c(X)}$ for every Hausdorff space X". Note that even this result is a corollary of Theorem 5. Moreover if X is the Michael line then $|X| = 2^{lc(X)\pi_\chi(X)\psi_c(X)} < 2^{c(X)\pi_\chi(X)\psi_c(X)}$. Observe also that the π-character cannot be omitted in Theorem 5 (see the comment at the end of Remark 3).

Now let us turn our attention to the Arhangel'skii's inequality: "For $X \in T_2$, $|X| \le 2^{L(X)t(X)\psi(X)}$".

Definitions. Let X be a topological space.

(i) ([8]) A subset A of X with $|A| \le 2^\kappa$ is said to be κ-quasi-dense if for each open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of X there exist a $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\le\kappa}$ and a $B \in [A]^{\le\kappa}$ such that $(\bigcup \mathcal{V}) \cup \overline{B} = X$; $qL(X)$ is the smallest infinite cardinal κ such that X has a κ-quasi dense subset.

(ii) $aqL(X)$ is the smallest infinite cardinal κ such that there is a subset S of X with $|S| \le 2^\kappa$ such that for every open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of X there is a $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\le\kappa}$ with $X = S \cup (\bigcup \mathcal{V})$.

Clearly $aqL(X) \le L(X)$ for every space X.

Theorem 8. *If X is a Hausdorff space then $|X| \leq 2^{aqL(X)t(X)\psi_c(X)}$.*

Proof: Let $\lambda = aqL(X)t(X)\psi_c(X)$, $\kappa = 2^\lambda$, let τ be the topology on X and let S be an element of $[X]^{\leq\kappa}$ witnessing that $aqL(X) \leq \lambda$. For every $x \in X$ let $\mathcal{B}_x$ be a family of open neighbourhoods of x with $|\mathcal{B}_x| \leq \lambda$ and $\bigcap\{\overline{B} : B \in \mathcal{B}_x\} = \{x\}$, and let $f : X \to \mathcal{P}(\tau)$ be the map defined by $f(x) = \mathcal{B}_x$ for every $x \in X$. Let $A = \kappa \cup \{S, X, \tau, \kappa, f\}$ and take a set $\mathcal{M} \supset A$ such that $|\mathcal{M}| = \kappa$ and which reflects enough formulas so that the conditions (i)–(vi) listed in Theorem 1 are satisfied. First observe that $X \cap \mathcal{M}$ is a closed subset of X, although this fact follows from a general result which can be found in [4] we give a proof of it for the sake of completeness: let $x \in \overline{X \cap \mathcal{M}}$, since $t(X) \leq \lambda$ there is a $C \in [X \cap \mathcal{M}]^{\leq\lambda}$ such that $x \in \overline{C}$. Since $C \in \mathcal{M}$ (by (i)), it follows that $\overline{C} \in \mathcal{M}$ (by (iii)). Now it remains to observe that $|\overline{C}| \leq \kappa$ (recall that $t(X)\psi_c(X) \leq \lambda$) and hence by (vi) $x \in \overline{C} \subset X \cap \mathcal{M}$.

We have done if we show that $X \subset \mathcal{M}$. Suppose there is a $p \in X \setminus \mathcal{M}$, for every $y \in X \cap \mathcal{M}$ let $B_y \in \mathcal{B}_y$ such that $p \notin B_y$. Since $\mathcal{U} = \{B_y : y \in X \cap \mathcal{M}\} \cup \{X \setminus \mathcal{M}\}$ is an open cover of X and $aqL(X) \leq \lambda$ there is a $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\leq\lambda}$ such that $X = S \cup (\bigcup \mathcal{V})$. Let $\mathcal{W} = \{B_y : B_y \in \mathcal{V}\}$, since $X \cap \mathcal{M} \subset S \cup (\bigcup \mathcal{W})$ and $S \cup (\bigcup \mathcal{W}) \in \mathcal{M}$ it follows that $X = S \cup (\bigcup \mathcal{W})$, a contradiction ($p \notin S \cup (\bigcup \mathcal{W})$). □

A consequence of Theorem 8 is the following generalization of the Arhangel'skii's inequality.

Corollary 9 ([8]). *If X is a Hausdorff space then $|X| \leq 2^{qL(X)t(X)\psi_c(X)}$.*

Proof: It is enough to note that $aqL(X) \leq qL(X)t(X)\psi_c(X)$. □

Remark 10. Let κ be an infinite cardinal number and let X be the discrete space of cardinality 2^κ. This space shows that Theorem 8 can give a better estimation than the one in Corollary 9.

References

[1] Dow A., *An introduction to applications of elementary submodels to topology*, Topology Proc. **13** (1988), 17–72.

[2] Dow A., *More set-theory for topologists*, Topology Appl. **64** (1995), 243–300.

[3] Engelking R., *General Topology. Revised and completed edition*, Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics 6, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[4] Fedeli A., Watson S., *Elementary submodels and cardinal functions*, Topology Proc. **20** (1995), 91–110.

[5] Hodel R.E., *Cardinal Functions I*, Handbook of Set-theoretic Topology, (Kunen K. and Vaughan J.E., eds.), Elsevier Science Publishers, B.V., North Holland, 1984, pp. 1–61.

[6] Hodel R.E., *Combinatorial set theory and cardinal functions inequalities*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **111** (1991), 567–575.

[7] Juhàsz I., *Cardinal Functions in Topology – ten years later*, Mathematical Centre Tracts 123, Amsterdam, 1980.

[8] Sun S.H., *Two new topological cardinal inequalities*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **104** (1988), 313–316.

[9] Watson S., *The construction of topological spaces: Planks and Resolutions*, Recent Progress in General Topology, (Hušek M. and Van Mill J., eds.), Elsevier Science Publishers, B.V., North Holland, 1992, pp. 675–757.

[10] Watson S., *The Lindelöf number of a power; an introduction to the use of elementary submodels in general topology*, Topology Appl. **58** (1994), 25–34.

Department of Mathematics, University of L'Aquila, via Vetoio (Loc. Coppito), 67100 L'Aquila, Italy

E-mail: fedeli@axscaq.aquila.infn.it

(*Received* September 11, 1997)