

Re: Separable Linear Order

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math.research/2005-08/msg00016.html>

- *From:* William Elliot <marsh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 1 Aug 2005 00:19:13 -0700
-

From: Fred Galvin <fred.galvin@xxxxxxxx>
Newsgroups: sci.math.research
Subject: Re: Separable Linear Order

fred.galvin@xxxxxxxx wrote:

- > William Elliot wrote:
- >> Given a linear order L with the usual interval topology,
- >> how does one show when L is separable, L is Lindelof?
- >
- > Let C be any open cover of L; we may assume that the members of C are
- > open intervals (a, b). Define an equivalence relation on L so that,
- > when $x < y$, the points x and y are equivalent just in case the closed
- > interval [x, y] is covered by countably many members of C. Each
- > equivalence class is open, since it is the union of some subcollection
- > of C. So the equivalence classes form a collection of disjoint nonempty
- > open subsets of L. Since L is separable, it follows that there are only
- > countably many equivalence classes. To finish the proof, we have to
- > show that each equivalence class is covered by countably many members
- > of C.
- >
- >>From the separability of L, it follows that L cannot have a subset of
- > order type ω_1 . Hence each equivalence class must have a countable
- > cofinal subset, and (dually) a countable cointial subset. Hence each
- > equivalence class is the union of countably many closed intervals. By
- > the definition of the equivalence relation, each closed interval
- > (contained in an equivalence class) is covered by countably many
- > members of C. That does it, I think.

- > PS. Note that, instead of assuming that L is separable, you can get
- > by with the weaker assumption that L satisfies the "countable chain
- > condition", i.e., every collection of disjoint open sets is
- > countable.

Yes

separable \implies ccc (countable chain condition)

and your assertion is correct because
linear order topologies are monotonically normal and
ccc, monotonically normal \implies (hereditarily) Lindelof

Re: Separable Linear Order

A space (S, τ) is monotonically normal (MN) when
for all x , open U nhood x , some open $\mu(x, U)$ nhood x
with for all x, y , open U, V ,
 $x \in U, y \in V, \text{nonnull } \mu(x, U) \wedge \mu(y, V) \implies x \in V \text{ or } y \in U$

The partial map $\mu: S \times \tau \rightarrow \tau$ is called a normality (for S).
Monotonically normal is hereditary and implies completely normal.
Metric spaces are MN.

I have tried to adapt your proof of
separable linear order topology \implies Lindelof
or
ccc, linear order topology \implies Lindelof
to
separable, monotonically normal \implies Lindelof
with an eye to
ccc, monotonically normal \implies Lindelof.

But I have netted a bankruptcy of ideas, unable to find any
remotely eligible equivalence relation for the first step.

Incidentally, a discrete subspace with cardinality κ of a
monotonically normal space will yield a collection of pairwise disjoint
open sets with cardinality κ . Thus for MN spaces, ccc and every
discrete subspace is countable, are equivalent.

.

• *References:*

◆ *Re: Separable Linear Order*

◇ *From:* Fred Galvin

- Prev by Date: *Re: Separable Linear Order*
- Next by Date: *This week in the mathematics arXiv (11 Jul – 15 Jul)*
- Previous by thread: *Re: Separable Linear Order*
- Next by thread: *Two papers published by Algebraic and Geometric Topology*
- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*