

SELECTIONS GENERATING NEW TOPOLOGIES

VALENTIN GUTEV AND ARTUR TOMITA

Abstract

Every (continuous) selection for the non-empty 2-point subsets of a space X naturally defines an interval-like topology on X . In the present paper, we demonstrate that, for a second-countable zero-dimensional space X , this topology may fail to be first-countable at some (or, even any) point of X . This settles some problems stated in [7].

1. Introduction

Let X be a topological space, and let $\mathcal{F}(X)$ be the set of all non-empty closed subsets of X . Also, let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{F}(X)$. A map $f: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow X$ is a *selection* for \mathcal{D} if $f(S) \in S$ for every $S \in \mathcal{D}$. A selection $f: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow X$ is *continuous* if it is continuous with respect to the relative Vietoris topology τ_V on \mathcal{D} . Let us recall that τ_V is generated by all collections of the form

$$\langle \mathcal{V} \rangle = \left\{ S \in \mathcal{F}(X) : S \subset \bigcup \mathcal{V} \text{ and } S \cap V \neq \emptyset, \text{ whenever } V \in \mathcal{V} \right\},$$

where \mathcal{V} runs over the finite families of open subsets of X .

In the sequel, all spaces are assumed to be at least Hausdorff and infinite. In the present paper, we are interested in continuous selections for \mathcal{D} , when \mathcal{D} is the family $\mathcal{F}_2(X) = \{S \in \mathcal{F}(X) : |S| \leq 2\}$. In this case, a selection $f: \mathcal{F}_2(X) \rightarrow X$ is usually called a *weak selection* for X .

Every weak selection f for X defines an order-like relation \preceq_f on X (see [10]) by letting that $x \preceq_f y$ iff $f(\{x, y\}) = x$. For convenience, we write that $x \prec_f y$ if $x \preceq_f y$ and $x \neq y$. We note that the relation “ \preceq_f ” may fail to be transitive (see, for instance, [4, Proposition 2.2]). Nevertheless, to every continuous weak selection f for X we may associate a

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54B20, 54C65.

Key words. Hyperspace topology, Vietoris topology, continuous selection.

The second author would like to thank UMALCA for the support to cover a part of the air fare expenses for his visit to UNAM, Campus Morelia, Mexico in December 2004, where the research was partially conducted.

topology \mathcal{T}_f on X generated by all “open f -intervals” $\{y \in X : y \prec_f x\}$ and $\{y \in X : x \prec_f y\}$, $x \in X$. According to [10, Lemma 7.2] (see, also, [4, Lemma 3.3]), these “ f -intervals” are always open in the original topology of X . Hence, \mathcal{T}_f is a coarser topology on X , and, consequently, it is the original topology on X provided X is compact. In fact, by [11, Theorem 1.1], for a compact space X the topology \mathcal{T}_f coincides with the open interval topology on X generated by a linear ordering on X (i.e., \mathcal{T}_f is an order topology on X). According to [10, Lemma 7.2], \mathcal{T}_f is also an order topology on X provided X is connected. Finally, by [12, Theorem 4 and Remark 16], \mathcal{T}_f coincides with the original topology on X provided X is connected and locally connected.

Some further properties of this topology were studied in [4], [7]. For instance, by [7, Corollary 2.3], \mathcal{T}_f is always a regular topology on X . On the other hand, by [7, Corollary 2.4], \mathcal{T}_f is the usual Euclidean topology on the rational numbers \mathbb{Q} , whenever f is a continuous weak selection for \mathbb{Q} . Hence, it become quite natural to study this topology on the irrational numbers \mathbb{P} which is an uncountable, second countable, zero-dimensional space.

We are now ready to state the main purpose of this paper. Namely, in this paper, we show that every uncountable, non-compact, second-countable, zero-dimensional space X has a continuous weak selection f such that \mathcal{T}_f is not first-countable at some point of X , see Theorem 4.1. In the same theorem, we also demonstrate that \mathcal{T}_f is not first-countable at any point of X provided X has an infinite pairwise disjoint cover consisting of uncountable open sets. Thus, in particular, there exists a continuous weak selection f for the irrational numbers \mathbb{P} such that \mathcal{T}_f is not first-countable at any point of \mathbb{P} (Corollary 4.2), which provides a negative answer to [7, Question 2], and a positive one to [7, Question 3]. Another interesting consequence is that an uncountable metrizable space X , with a covering dimension $\dim(X) = 0$, is compact if and only if \mathcal{T}_f is second-countable for every continuous weak selection f on X (see Corollary 4.4). For other applications, we refer the interested reader to Sections 4 and 5 of the paper.

A preparation for the proof of Theorem 4.1 is given in Sections 2 and 3, while its proof will be finally accomplished in Section 4. A part of this preparation is based on a criterion for the existence of continuous weak selections (see Theorem 5.1), which is analogous to a result of Eilenberg on orderability [1]. It has a list of interesting independent consequences (see Section 5).

In conclusion, the second author would like to express his best gratitude to Professor Salvador García-Ferreira for his support and hospitality, and for discussing some questions related to this research.

2. A relation generated by weak selections

Let X be a set, and let $E \subset X \times X$ be a *relation* on X . As usual, we write xEy to denote that $(x, y) \in E$. Let us recall that a relation E on X is *anti-symmetric* if xEy and yEx implies $x = y$. Following [7], we say that an anti-symmetric relation E on X is a *selection relation* if xEy or yEx for every $x, y \in X$. Let us emphasize that, in this terminology, a relation E on X is a *linear order* on X if E is a selection relation which is also transitive (i.e., xEy and yEz implies xEz).

It should be mentioned that the set of all possible weak selections for X corresponds precisely to all possible selection relations on X . Namely, any selection relation E on X defines a weak selection f_E by letting $f_E(\{x, y\}) = x$ iff xEy . On the other hand, if f is a weak selection for X , then the order-like relation \preceq_f generated by f is a selection relation. In the sequel, we will refer to \preceq_f as a selection relation.

In the present section, we are interested in a natural extension of such relations to the subsets of X . Following [3], for a selection relation “ \preceq ” and (not necessarily non-empty) subsets $B, C \subset X$, we shall write that $B \preceq C$ (respectively, $B \prec C$) if $y \preceq z$ (respectively, $y \prec z$) for every $y \in B$ and $z \in C$. Obviously, $B \prec C$ implies $B \cap C = \emptyset$.

In these terms, we have the following simple criterion for continuity in $\mathcal{F}_2(X)$ which is, in fact, [4, Theorem 3.1].

Proposition 2.1 ([4]). *Let X be a space, f be a weak selection for X , and let “ \preceq_f ” be the selection relation generated by f . Also, let $x, y \in X$ be such that $x \prec_f y$. Then, f is continuous at $\{x, y\}$ if and only if there are open sets U and V such that $x \in U$, $y \in V$, and $U \prec_f V$.*

On the other hand, we have the following property of weak selections. It was implicitly used in several papers and summarized in [6, Proposition 4.1].

Proposition 2.2. *Let X be a space, and let f be a weak selection. Then, f is continuous on the singletons of X .*

Motivated by Propositions 2.1 and 2.2, we may consider only the subset

$$[X]^2 = \{S \in \mathcal{F}_2(X) : |S| = 2\},$$

which will play a crucial role in this paper. In fact, we will make no difference between weak selections $f: \mathcal{F}_2(X) \rightarrow X$ and weak selections $f: [X]^2 \rightarrow X$.

The following simple observation about special weak selections will be also useful.

Proposition 2.3. *Let X be a space which has a continuous weak selection, and an infinite pairwise disjoint cover \mathcal{V} consisting of non-empty open subsets. Then, there exists a continuous weak selection $g: [X]^2 \rightarrow X$ such that \mathcal{V} is an unbounded well-ordered set with respect to the selection relation generated by g .*

Proof: Let $f: [X]^2 \rightarrow X$ be a continuous weak selection. Also, let $h: \delta \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ be a one-to-one map, where $\delta = |\mathcal{V}|$. Then, for every $x \in X$, let $\alpha(x) < \delta$ be such that $x \in h(\alpha(x))$. Finally, define $g: [X]^2 \rightarrow X$ by letting for distinct points $x, y \in X$ that $g(\{x, y\}) = x$ if $\alpha(x) < \alpha(y)$, and $g(\{x, y\}) = f(\{x, y\})$ if $\alpha(x) = \alpha(y)$. Clearly, g is continuous because so is f , and \mathcal{V} is a discrete open cover of X . On the other hand, by the definition of g , the selection relation \preceq_g defines the same order on \mathcal{V} as that one of the infinite cardinal δ . Hence, \mathcal{V} is unbounded and well-ordered with respect to \preceq_g . \square

We conclude this section with some properties of the topology generated by weak selections. Suppose that f is a weak selection for X , and \preceq_f is the selection relation generated by f . For every $x \in X$, we consider the corresponding ‘‘open f -intervals’’

$$\mathbb{I}_f(x, \infty) = \{y \in X : x \prec_f y\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{I}_f(\infty, x) = \{y \in X : y \prec_f x\}.$$

Also, for convenience, we let

$$\mathcal{I}_f(X) = \{\mathbb{I}_f(\infty, x), \mathbb{I}_f(x, \infty) : x \in X\}.$$

In these terms, the topology \mathcal{T}_f is generated by all finite intersections of members of $\mathcal{I}_f(X)$. This is the place to recall that, in general, the relation \preceq_f is not transitive. Hence, we may have points $x, y, z \in X$ which generate an infinite ‘‘monotone’’ sequence

$$\cdots \prec_f x \prec_f y \prec_f z \prec_f x \prec_f \cdots$$

In particular, for such points, we also have that

$$\{t \in X : x \prec_f t \prec_f y\} \neq \emptyset \neq \{t \in X : y \prec_f t \prec_f x\}.$$

Motivated by this, for every $a, b \in X$ we will associate the set

$$\mathbb{I}_f(a, b) = \mathbb{I}_f(a, \infty) \cap \mathbb{I}_f(\infty, b) = \{x \in X : a \prec_f x \prec_f b\}.$$

However, we don't require that $a \prec_f b$. Hence, both f -intervals $\mathbb{I}_f(a, b)$ and $\mathbb{I}_f(b, a)$ make sense, and could be non-empty.

In what follows, we shall say that a point $x \in X$ is an f -cutting point if there are points $a, b \in X$, with $x \in \mathbb{I}_f(a, b)$. Otherwise, we shall say that x is an f -extreme point of X . Clearly, X may have at most two f -extreme points, which could be different for different selections f .

Proposition 2.4. *Let X be a space, f be a weak selection for X , and let $A, B \subset X$ be non-empty subsets such that*

$$\mathbb{I}_f(A, B) = \bigcap \{ \mathbb{I}_f(a, b) : (a, b) \in A \times B \} \neq \emptyset.$$

Then, $A \cap B = \emptyset$. In particular, if $x \in X$ is an f -cutting point and $U \in \mathcal{T}_f$, then $x \in U$ if and only if there are non-empty finite disjoint subsets $A, B \subset X$, with $x \in \mathbb{I}_f(A, B) \subset U$.

Proof: The first part of this statement follows from the fact that $\mathbb{I}_f(z, z) = \emptyset$ for every $z \in X$. As for the second part, by the definition of \mathcal{T}_f , $x \in U$ if and only if there is a finite set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{I}_f(X)$, with $x \in \bigcap \mathcal{K} \subset U$. On the other hand, $x \in \mathbb{I}_f(a, b)$ for some $a, b \in X$, because x is an f -cutting point. Let $A_0 = \{y \in X : \mathbb{I}_f(y, \infty) \in \mathcal{K}\}$ and $B_0 = \{z \in X : \mathbb{I}_f(\infty, z) \in \mathcal{K}\}$. Then, $A = A_0 \cup \{a\}$ and $B = B_0 \cup \{b\}$ are as required. \square

3. A condition for continuity of weak selections

Lemma 3.1. *Let X be a space, $f: [X]^2 \rightarrow X$ be a selection, and let \preceq_f be the selection relation generated by f . Then, f is continuous if and only if the set $\mathcal{L} = \{(x, y) \in X^2 : x \prec_f y\}$ is open in X^2 . In particular, if f is continuous, then the map $h: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow [X]^2$, defined by $h((x, y)) = \{x, y\}$, $(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}$, is a homeomorphism.*

Proof: Take distinct points $x, y \in X$ such that $(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}$, i.e. $x \prec_f y$. Then, by Proposition 2.1, f is continuous at $\{x, y\}$ if and only if there are open sets $U, V \subset X$ such that $x \in U$, $y \in V$, and $U \prec_f V$. According to the definition of \mathcal{L} , this implies that f is continuous at $\{x, y\}$ if and only if there are disjoint open subsets $U, V \subset X$ such that $(x, y) \in U \times V \subset \mathcal{L}$. In particular, if f is continuous, then the map h is a continuous open bijection which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.1 suggests a natural construction of continuous weak selections. To this end, for a subset $Z \subset X^2$, let us agree to say that $\pi: Z \rightarrow X$ is a *projection* if $\pi((x, y)) \in \{x, y\}$ for every $(x, y) \in Z$. Then, whenever $Z \subset X^2$, we have always two standard continuous projections $\pi_i: Z \rightarrow X$, $i = 0, 1$, defined by $\pi_0((x, y)) = x$ and $\pi_1((x, y)) = y$,

$(x, y) \in Z$. Here is another example of continuous projections, which will play an important role in the next section.

Example 3.2. Let X be a space, $Z \subset X^2$, \mathcal{U} be a discrete open cover of Z , and let $\xi: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow 2 = \{0, 1\}$ be an arbitrary map. Define a map $\pi: Z \rightarrow X$ by letting for $(x, y) \in Z$ that $\pi((x, y)) = \pi_{\xi(U)}((x, y))$ if $(x, y) \in U \in \mathcal{U}$. Then, π is a continuous projection such that $\pi \upharpoonright U = \pi_{\xi(U)} \upharpoonright U$, $U \in \mathcal{U}$.

Proof: Follows from the fact that \mathcal{U} is a discrete open cover of Z . \square

According to Lemma 3.1, we now have the following immediate consequence. It provides a possible way to construct continuous weak selections from given ones.

Corollary 3.3. *Let X be a space, $f: [X]^2 \rightarrow X$ be a continuous selection, and let \mathcal{L} and $h: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow [X]^2$ be as in Lemma 3.1. Also, let $\pi: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow X$ be a continuous projection. Then, $g = \pi \circ h^{-1}: [X]^2 \rightarrow X$ is a continuous selection.*

4. A construction of continuous weak selections

Theorem 4.1. *Let X be an uncountable, non-compact, second-countable, zero-dimensional space. Then, X has a continuous weak selection f such that \mathcal{T}_f is not first-countable at some point of X . If, moreover, X has an infinite pairwise disjoint open cover consisting of uncountable sets, then X has a continuous weak selection f such that \mathcal{T}_f is not first-countable at any point of X .*

Proof: First of all, let us observe that X is regular because it has a base of clopen sets. Hence, by the Urysohn's metrization theorem [13] (see, also, [2]), X is metrizable. Also, $\dim(X) = 0$ [14] (see, also, [2]) because X is a Lindelöf space being regular and second-countable.

In case X has an infinite cover consisting of pairwise disjoint uncountable open sets, we let this cover to be \mathcal{V} . Otherwise, let us observe that X has an infinite cover \mathcal{V} consisting of non-empty pairwise disjoint open sets such that at least three members of \mathcal{V} are uncountable. To this end, let Z be the set of all points $x \in X$ such that x has a local base consisting of uncountable open sets. Then, Z must be closed because every neighbourhood of a point $z \in \overline{Z}$ will contain a point of Z . In this case, $X \setminus Z$ must be countable. Namely, take a countable base \mathcal{O} for the topology of X , and then observe that $X \setminus Z = \bigcup \{O \in \mathcal{O} : |O| \leq \omega\}$. Since X is uncountable, Z must be also uncountable and, in particular,

infinite. Thus, using that $\dim(X) = 0$, we can take \mathcal{V} to be an infinite cover of X consisting of non-empty pairwise disjoint open sets, with $|\{V \in \mathcal{V} : V \cap Z \neq \emptyset\}| \geq 3$.

Having already constructed the cover \mathcal{V} , let \mathcal{B} be a countable base for the topology of X consisting of non-empty clopen subsets such that \mathcal{B} is a refinement of \mathcal{V} . In what follows, we will use $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})$ to denote the set of all non-empty subsets $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{B}$ which are finite and pairwise disjoint. Next, for every $\mathcal{W} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})$, let $2^{\mathcal{W}}$ be the set of all maps $\mu: \mathcal{W} \rightarrow 2 = \{0, 1\}$. Also, we let

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \bigcup \{2^{\mathcal{W}} : \mathcal{W} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})\}.$$

Finally, for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0$, we let $\text{Dom}(\mu)$ to be the domain of μ , which is clearly a non-empty finite and pairwise disjoint subset of \mathcal{B} .

Note that X has a continuous weak selection, because it is a subset of the Cantor set [14] (see, also, [2]) being a regular space with a countable clopen base. Hence, by Proposition 2.3, X has a continuous weak selection g such that \mathcal{V} is an unbounded well-ordered set with respect to the selection relation “ \preceq_g ” generated by g . Now, let $\mathcal{V}^* = \{V \in \mathcal{V} : |V| > \omega\}$, which, by construction, has the property that $|\mathcal{V}^*| \geq 3$. Next, let $V^* = \min_{\preceq_g} \mathcal{V}^*$, and then take $x^* \in V^*$ and $W^* \in \mathcal{B}$ to be such that $x^* \in W^* \subset V^*$. Finally, define

$$(4.1) \quad \mu_i^*: \{W^*\} \rightarrow 2, i = 0, 1, \quad \text{by } \mu_i^*(W^*) = 1 - i.$$

Thus, we get two different elements $\mu_0^*, \mu_1^* \in \mathcal{M}_0$, so we let

$$\alpha(\mu_0^*) = \min_{\preceq_g} (\mathcal{V}^* \setminus \{V^*\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(\mu_1^*) = \min_{\preceq_g} (\mathcal{V}^* \setminus \{V^* \cup \alpha(\mu_0^*)\}).$$

For later use, let us observe that

$$(4.2) \quad W^* \prec_g \alpha(\mu_0^*) \prec_g \alpha(\mu_1^*),$$

while both $\alpha(\mu_0^*)$ and $\alpha(\mu_1^*)$ are uncountable.

Now, we are going to extend the map $\alpha: \{\mu_0^*, \mu_1^*\} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ to an injective map $\alpha: \mathcal{M}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ such that, for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0$,

$$(4.3) \quad W \prec_g \alpha(\mu), \quad \text{whenever } W \in \text{Dom}(\mu).$$

This can be done by transfinite induction because \mathcal{M}_0 is countable, while \mathcal{V} is infinite, hence $|\mathcal{M}_0| \leq |\mathcal{V}|$. Namely, take a well-ordering \ll on \mathcal{M}_0 as that of the first infinite ordinal ω such that $\mu_0^* = \min_{\ll} \mathcal{M}_0$ and $\mu_1^* = \min_{\ll} (\mathcal{M}_0 \setminus \{\mu_0^*\})$. Next, suppose that $\alpha(\nu)$ has been already defined for every $\nu \ll \mu$ and some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0$, with $\mu \gg \mu_1^*$. Then,

$$\mathcal{V}_\mu = \{\alpha(\nu) : \nu \ll \mu\} \cup \{V \in \mathcal{V} : W \subset V \text{ for some } W \in \text{Dom}(\mu)\},$$

is a non-empty finite subset of \mathcal{V} , while \mathcal{V} is unbounded. Hence the set

$$\mathcal{V}^\mu = \{V \in \mathcal{V} : \max_{\preceq_g} \mathcal{V}_\mu \prec_g V\}$$

is also non-empty. So, we may define $\alpha(\mu) = \min_{\preceq_g} \mathcal{V}^\mu$, which completes the construction.

Now, for convenience, we let $\vartheta: \{X\} \rightarrow 2 = \{0, 1\}$ to be the map $\vartheta(X) = 0$, and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_0 \cup \{\vartheta\}$. Also, we let $A_0 = \bigcup(\mathcal{V} \setminus \alpha(\mathcal{M}_0))$, $\alpha(\vartheta) = A_0$, and $\mathcal{A} = \alpha(\mathcal{M}_0) \cup \{A_0\}$. Thus, we get a discrete partition \mathcal{A} of X and a one-to-one map $\alpha: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that (4.3) holds for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0$. Keeping in mind this, we are going to construct a discrete open partition $\mathcal{U} = \{U_{\alpha(\mu)}^i : \mu \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } i = 0, 1\}$ of the set $\mathcal{L} = \{(x, y) \in X^2 : x \prec_g y\}$. To this end, to every subset $F \subset X$ and every $k \in 2$, we associate another subset $\mathcal{S}(k, F)$ defined by

$$(4.4) \quad \mathcal{S}(k, F) = \begin{cases} X \setminus F & \text{if } k = 0 \\ F & \text{if } k = 1. \end{cases}$$

Then, for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, we define

$$(4.5) \quad U_{\alpha(\mu)}^0 = \mathcal{L} \cap \left(\bigcup \{ \mathcal{S}(1 - \mu(W), W) \times \alpha(\mu) : W \in \text{Dom}(\mu) \} \right),$$

and

$$(4.6) \quad U_{\alpha(\mu)}^1 = \mathcal{L} \cap \left(\bigcup \{ \mathcal{S}(\mu(W), W) \times \alpha(\mu) : W \in \text{Dom}(\mu) \} \right).$$

It is easy to observe that $U_{\alpha(\mu)}^0 \cup U_{\alpha(\mu)}^1 = \mathcal{L} \cap (X \times \alpha(\mu))$, hence \mathcal{U} is a partition of \mathcal{L} . Also, \mathcal{U} is defined only by products of clopen sets, hence it is clopen as well.

Finally, we define a map $\xi: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow 2$ by letting $\xi(U) = i$ if $U = U_{\alpha(\mu)}^i$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$. Thus, by Example 3.2, we get a continuous projection $\pi: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow X$, with $\pi \upharpoonright U_{\alpha(\mu)}^i = \pi_i \upharpoonright U_{\alpha(\mu)}^i$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ and $i = 0, 1$. Hence, by Corollary 3.3, $f = \pi \circ h^{-1}$ is a continuous selection for $[X]^2$. In what follows, let “ \preceq_f ” be the selection relation generated by f .

We are going to show that f is as required. To prepare for this, take $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0$, $W \in \text{Dom}(\mu)$ and $(x, y) \in W \times \alpha(\mu)$, and let us observe that

$$(4.7) \quad f(\{x, y\}) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } \mu(W) = 0, \\ y & \text{if } \mu(W) = 1. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, by (4.3), we have $W \times \alpha(\mu) \subset \mathcal{L}$. If $\mu(W) = 0$, then, by (4.4) and (4.5),

$$\mathcal{S}(1 - \mu(W), W) \times \alpha(\mu) = \mathcal{S}(1, W) \times \alpha(\mu) = W \times \alpha(\mu) \subset U_{\alpha(\mu)}^0.$$

So $(x, y) \in U_{\alpha(\mu)}^0$, which implies that $f(\{x, y\}) = \pi_0((x, y)) = x$. If $\mu(W) = 1$, then, in the same way, by (4.4) and (4.6),

$$\mathcal{S}(\mu(W), W) \times \alpha(\mu) = \mathcal{S}(1, W) \times \alpha(\mu) = W \times \alpha(\mu) \subset U_{\alpha(\mu)}^1,$$

and therefore $f(\{x, y\}) = \pi_1((x, y)) = y$.

Now, take $y, z \in X$ and non-empty finite disjoint subsets $A, B \subset X$. We have the following crucial property of the topology \mathcal{T}_f .

$$(4.8) \quad \{y, z\} \cap (A \cup B) = \emptyset \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathbb{I}_f(A, B) \setminus \mathbb{I}_f(y, z) \neq \emptyset.$$

Indeed, consider the finite set $K = A \cup B \cup \{y, z\}$, and then take a pairwise disjoint family $\mathcal{W} = \{W_x : x \in K\} \subset \mathcal{B}$ such that $x \in W_x$ for every $x \in K$. Next, define $\mu: \mathcal{W} \rightarrow 2$ by letting for $x \in K$ that $\mu(W_x) = 0$ if $x \in A$ or $x = z$, and $\mu(W_x) = 1$ otherwise. Thus, we get a particular element μ of \mathcal{M}_0 . Take a point $e \in \alpha(\mu)$, and let us observe that, by the definition of μ and (4.7), $x \prec_f e$ if $x \in A$ or $x = z$, and $e \prec_f x$ if $x \in B$ or $x = y$. That is, $e \in \mathbb{I}_f(A, B)$, but $e \notin \mathbb{I}_f(y, z)$.

We are finally ready to show that the selection f is as required by showing that each point of X is an f -cutting point. Take a point $x \in X$, and let $W \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $x \in W$. Just like in (4.1), define $\mu_i: \{W\} \rightarrow 2$, $i=0, 1$, by $\mu_i(W) = 1 - i$. Thus, we get two different elements $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_0$, so $\alpha(\mu_0) \neq \alpha(\mu_1)$. Then,

$$(4.9) \quad x \in \mathbb{I}_f(y_0, y_1), \quad \text{whenever} \quad (y_0, y_1) \in \alpha(\mu_0) \times \alpha(\mu_1).$$

Indeed, by (4.7), $\mu_0(W) = 1$ implies $f(\{x, y_0\}) = y_0$ because $(x, y_0) \in W \times \alpha(\mu_0)$, while $\mu_1(W) = 0$ implies $f(\{x, y_1\}) = x$ because $(x, y_1) \in W \times \alpha(\mu_1)$. This completes the verification of (4.9). In fact, it also implies that \mathcal{T}_f is not first-countable at $x \in X$ if both $\alpha(\mu_0)$ and $\alpha(\mu_1)$ are uncountable. Namely, suppose if possible that \mathcal{T}_f is first-countable at $x \in X$, but $\alpha(\mu_0)$ and $\alpha(\mu_1)$ are uncountable. Then, by Proposition 2.4, there is a countable set $E(x) \subset X$ such that for every \mathcal{T}_f -neighbourhood U of x there are non-empty finite disjoint subsets $A, B \subset E(x)$, with $x \in \mathbb{I}_f(A, B) \subset U$. On the other hand, there are points $y_i \in \alpha(\mu_i) \setminus E(x)$, $i = 0, 1$, because both $\alpha(\mu_0)$ and $\alpha(\mu_1)$ are uncountable. However, by (4.9), this implies that $x \in \mathbb{I}_f(y_0, y_1)$, while, by (4.8), it implies that $\mathbb{I}_f(A, B) \setminus \mathbb{I}_f(y_0, y_1) \neq \emptyset$ for every two non-empty finite disjoint subsets $A, B \subset E(x)$. The contradiction so obtained implies that \mathcal{T}_f is not first-countable at x . In particular, by (4.2), it now implies that \mathcal{T}_f is not first-countable at the point x^* selected at the beginning of this proof. Finally, if each element of \mathcal{V} is uncountable, then \mathcal{T}_f will be not first-countable at any point of X , which completes the proof. \square

The following is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.1 which provides a negative answer to [7, Question 2], and a positive one to [7, Question 3].

Corollary 4.2. *Let \mathbb{P} be the set of the irrational numbers endowed with the usual Euclidean topology. Then, \mathbb{P} has a continuous weak selection f such that \mathcal{T}_f is not first-countable at any point of \mathbb{P} .*

Here is another interesting consequence.

Corollary 4.3. *Let \mathfrak{C} be the Cantor set, and let $p \in \mathfrak{C}$. Then, $X = \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{p\}$ has a continuous weak selection f such that \mathcal{T}_f is not first-countable at any point of X . In particular, f cannot be extended to a continuous weak selection for \mathfrak{C} .*

As it was mentioned in the Introduction, if (X, \mathcal{T}) is compact, then $\mathcal{T}_f = \mathcal{T}$ for every continuous weak selection f for X . The same is true if (X, \mathcal{T}) is connected and locally connected, but we don't know if this holds for other classes of spaces (see [7, Question 4]). Related to this, we have the following further consequence of Theorem 4.1.

Corollary 4.4. *Let X be an uncountable metrizable space X , with $\dim(X) = 0$. Then, X is compact if and only if \mathcal{T}_f is second-countable for every continuous weak selection f for X .*

Proof: If X is compact and \mathcal{T} is the topology of X , then $\mathcal{T}_f = \mathcal{T}$ for every continuous weak selection f for X . Note that, in this case, X has at least one continuous weak selection because it is a subset of the Cantor set. Suppose that X is not compact. We have the following two possibilities. If X is not separable, then it should have an uncountable discrete cover consisting of open sets because $\dim(X) = 0$. On the other hand, it has a continuous weak selection because, for instance, the topology of X is generated by some linear ordering on X , [8], [9] (see, also, [2]). Then, by Proposition 2.3, X has a continuous weak selection g such that \mathcal{T}_g is not second-countable. In case X is separable, by Theorem 4.1, we get again that X has a continuous weak selection f such that \mathcal{T}_f is not second-countable. Thus, if \mathcal{T}_f is second-countable for any continuous weak selection for X , then X must be compact. \square

5. A condition for the existence of continuous weak selections

In this section, we demonstrate some natural relations between the existence of continuous weak selections, and the Eilenberg's result [1, Theorem I] about ordered topological spaces. In fact, these relations

were naturally incorporated in Lemma 3.1. Now, we provide another reading of this lemma in terms of Eilenberg's condition of orderability in [1], and some possible further consequences. Following the terminology in [1], for a space X , we let $\Delta(X) = \{(x, x) : x \in X\}$, and $P(X) = X^2 \setminus \Delta(X)$. Also, we consider the map $\Lambda: P(X) \rightarrow P(X)$ defined by $\Lambda(x, y) = (y, x)$, whenever $(x, y) \in P(X)$.

Theorem 5.1. *A space X has a continuous weak selection if and only if there are non-empty open subsets \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} of $P(X)$ such that $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{R} = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{R} = P(X)$, and $\mathcal{R} = \Lambda(\mathcal{L})$.*

Proof: Let f be a continuous weak selection for X . Following Lemma 3.1, we let $\mathcal{L} = \{(x, y) \in P(X) : x \prec_f y\}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \Lambda(\mathcal{L})$, where \prec_f is the selection relation generated by f . Then, $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{R} = P(X)$. Also, \mathcal{L} is open in $P(X)$ if and only if $\mathcal{R} \subset P(X)$ is open. Hence, Lemma 3.1 completes the proof of this implication.

Suppose now that there are open subsets $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \subset P(X)$ such that $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{R} = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{R} = P(X)$, and $\mathcal{R} = \Lambda(\mathcal{L})$. Next, define a selection $f: [X]^2 \rightarrow X$ by letting $f(\{x, y\}) = x$ if $(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}$. Note that if $x \neq y$, then either $(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}$ or $(y, x) \in \mathcal{L}$, so our definition is correct. That f is continuous, it follows by Lemma 3.1. \square

Corollary 5.2. *Let X be a space which has a continuous weak selection. Then, $P(X)$ is not connected.*

Proof: According to Theorem 5.1, there are non-empty open subsets $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \subset P(X)$ such that $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{R} = P(X)$. In particular, both \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} are clopen in $P(X)$. \square

Corollary 5.3. *Let X be a connected space which has a continuous weak selection. Then, $P(X)$ consists of two components \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} such that $\mathcal{R} = \Lambda(\mathcal{L})$.*

Proof: By Corollary 5.2, $P(X)$ is not connected. The rest of the proof follows precisely that one in [1, (3.1)]. \square

Corollary 5.4. *Let X be a connected space which has a continuous weak selection, and let $E(X) = \{x \in X : X \setminus \{x\} \text{ is connected}\}$. Then, $|E(X)| \leq 2$.*

Proof: By Corollary 5.3, $P(X)$ has exactly two components \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} such that $\mathcal{R} = \Lambda(\mathcal{L})$. Suppose that $x, y \in E(X)$ are distinct points, with $(X \setminus \{x\}) \times \{x\} \subset \mathcal{L}$ and $(X \setminus \{y\}) \times \{y\} \subset \mathcal{L}$. Then, we get that $(y, x) \in \mathcal{L}$ and $(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}$, which is impossible because $\Lambda(x, y) = (y, x)$. Thus, we get that there exists at most one point $x \in E(X)$, with

$(X \setminus \{x\}) \times \{x\} \subset \mathcal{L}$. In the same way, there exists at most one point $y \in E(X)$, with $(X \setminus \{y\}) \times \{y\} \subset \mathcal{R}$. Hence, $|E(X)| \leq 2$. \square

Now we get the following result, which, for instance, implies the well-known fact that the unit circle has no continuous weak selection. Let us recall that we consider only infinite spaces.

Corollary 5.5. *Let X be a connected space which has a continuous weak selection. Then, there exists a point $x \in X$ such that $X \setminus \{x\}$ is not connected.*

We complete this list of consequences with the following one related to continuous weak selections on product spaces.

Corollary 5.6. *Let X be a space such that X^2 has a continuous weak selection. Then, X must be totally disconnected.*

Proof: Let Z be a connected component of X , and let us show that $|Z| = 1$. Suppose if possible that $|Z| \geq 2$. Since Z^2 has a continuous weak selection being a subset of X^2 , by Corollary 5.5, there is a point $(y, z) \in Z^2$ such that $Z^2 \setminus \{(y, z)\}$ is not connected. However, this is not possible because $|Z| \geq 2$ and Z is connected, a contradiction. Thus, any connected component of X is a singleton. Now let us observe that X is naturally embedded in X^2 , hence X has also a continuous weak selection. According to [5, Theorem 4.1], this implies that the connected components of X coincide with the quasi-components of X . That is, X is totally disconnected. \square

References

- [1] S. EILENBERG, Ordered topological spaces, *Amer. J. Math.* **63** (1941), 39–45.
- [2] R. ENGELKING, “*General topology*”, Translated from the Polish by the author, Second edition, Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics **6**, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [3] S. GARCÍA-FERREIRA, V. GUTEV AND T. NOGURA, Extensions of 2-point selections, *New Zealand J. Math.* (2006), accepted for publication.
- [4] V. GUTEV AND T. NOGURA, Selections and order-like relations, *Appl. Gen. Topol.* **2(2)** (2001), 205–218.
- [5] V. GUTEV AND T. NOGURA, Vietoris continuous selections and disconnectedness-like properties, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **129(9)** (2001), 2809–2815.

- [6] V. GUTEV AND T. NOGURA, Some problems on selections for hyperspace topologies, *Appl. Gen. Topol.* **5(1)** (2004), 71–78.
- [7] V. GUTEV AND T. NOGURA, A topology generated by selections, *Topology Appl.* **153(5–6)** (2005), 900–911.
- [8] H. HERRLICH, Ordnungsfähigkeit total-diskontinuierlicher Räume, *Math. Ann.* **159** (1965), 77–80.
- [9] I. L. LYNN, Linearly orderable spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **13** (1962), 454–456.
- [10] E. MICHAEL, Topologies on spaces of subsets, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **71** (1951), 152–182.
- [11] J. VAN MILL AND E. WATTEL, Selections and orderability, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **83(3)** (1981), 601–605.
- [12] T. NOGURA AND D. SHAKHMATOV, Characterizations of intervals via continuous selections, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2)* **46(2)** (1997), 317–328.
- [13] P. URYSOHN, Zum Metrisationsproblem, *Math. Ann.* **94(1)** (1925), 309–315.
- [14] N. VEDENISSOFF, Remarques sur la dimension des espaces topologiques, (Russian), *Uchenye Zapiski Moskov. Gos. Univ. Matematika* **30** (1939), 131–140.

Valentin Gutev:
School of Mathematical Sciences
Faculty of Science
University of KwaZulu-Natal
King George V Avenue
Durban 4041
South Africa
E-mail address: gutev@ukzn.ac.za

Artur Tomita:
Departamento de Matemática
Instituto de Matemática e Estatística
Universidade de São Paulo
Caixa Postal 66281
CEP 05315-970 São Paulo
Brazil
E-mail address: tomita@ime.usp.br

Primera versió rebuda el 12 de maig de 2005,
darrera versió rebuda el 19 d'abril de 2006.