

## On the Prüfer manifold and a problem of Alexandroff and Hopf.

By TUDOR GANEA in Bucharest (Roumania).

1. Let  $L$  denote the real line, taken with discrete topology, and let  $P$  be the upper half-plane  $y > 0$  of the  $(x, y)$ -plane, with its usual topology. Let  $M$  be the topological product  $L \times P$ , and let  $W$  denote the nontriangulable manifold of PRÜFER [2; 3, p.71].

*Theorem.*  $M$  is a nonseparable metrizable space.  $W$  is a connected, nonnormal, regular, locally Euclidean space.  $W$  is a decomposition space of  $M$ , and the corresponding identification map  $\varphi: M \rightarrow W$  is a continuous, open, local homeomorphism.

*Remarks.* i) The nonnormality of  $W$  is a stronger result than the known fact [2] that the 2nd countability axiom fails to hold on  $W$ . For, had  $W$  a countable base of open sets, so would its regularity imply, by a well known theorem of TYCHONOFF [4], that  $W$  be normal.

ii) P. ALEXANDROFF and H. HOPF have raised the question [1, p. 70] whether there exists or not a regular, nonnormal decomposition space of a normal space. Since the space  $M$  is obviously normal, their problem is answered in the affirmative. Moreover, the space  $M$  is not only normal, but even metrizable, while the decomposition space  $W$  is not only regular, but even completely regular. The identification map  $\varphi: M \rightarrow W$  is not only strongly continuous (stark stetig [1, p. 65]); it is even an open local homeomorphism.

iii) It is known that, if  $X$  is normal and  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous and closed, then  $Y$  is also normal. Our result shows that this need not hold any longer when closed is replaced by open.

2. It is obvious that  $M = L \times P$  is a nonseparable metrizable space.

We shall use the complex number notation for points in  $P$ , i. e.  $z = x + iy$ , with  $i = \sqrt{-1}$ .

For each  $t \in L$ , let  $f_t: P \rightarrow P$  be defined by

$$f_t(z) = z + \frac{z-t}{|z-t|}.$$

This is a homeomorphism mapping  $P$  on the open set  $P(t)$  consisting of the points  $z \in P$  which satisfy  $|z-t| > 1$ . By means of the formula

$$f_i^{-1}(A) = f_i^{-1}[A \cap P(t)],$$

valid for any  $A \subset P$ , we shall frequently simplify the notations in the sequel.

For any  $(t_0, z_0) \in M$ , define

$$C(t_0, z_0) = \{(t_0, z_0)\} \cup \{(t, f_t f_{t_0}^{-1}(z_0)) \mid t \in L\}.$$

If  $|z_0 - t_0| \leq 1$ , then  $f_{t_0}^{-1}(z_0)$  is empty, hence

$$C(t_0, z_0) = \{(t_0, z_0)\};$$

if  $|z_0 - t_0| > 1$ , then any  $(t, z)$  in  $C(t_0, z_0)$  satisfies  $|z-t| > 1$  and

$$C(t_0, z_0) = \{(t, z) \mid f_t^{-1}(z) = f_{t_0}^{-1}(z_0)\}.$$

Any  $(t_0, z_0) \in M$  belongs to  $C(t_0, z_0)$  and it is readily seen that any two  $C(t_j, z_j)$ ,  $j=1, 2$ , are either disjoint or identical. Thus we have a decomposition of the space  $M$  into disjoint closed subsets. We define<sup>1)</sup> the PRÜFER manifold  $W$  as the associated decomposition space and denote the corresponding identification map by

$$\varphi: M \rightarrow W.$$

Any  $C(t_0, z_0)$  meets each  $t \times P \subset M$  in at most one point. For any  $A \subset P$  we have

$$(1) \quad (t \times P) \cap \varphi^{-1}\varphi(t_0 \times A) = \begin{cases} t_0 \times A & \text{if } t = t_0 \\ t \times f_t f_{t_0}^{-1}(A) & \text{if } t \neq t_0, \end{cases}$$

hence

$$(2) \quad \varphi^{-1}\varphi(t_0 \times A) = (t_0 \times A) \cup \bigcup_{t \in L} (t \times f_t f_{t_0}^{-1}(A)).$$

1) According to T. RADÓ [2, p. 107–110], the PRÜFER manifold  $R$  consists of real points, having three real coordinates  $(x, y, a)$  subject to the conditions  $y > 0$ ,  $(x-a)^2 + y^2 \leq 1$ , and imaginary points  $(x, y, i)$  where  $x, y$  are reals with  $y > 0$ , while  $i = \sqrt{-1}$ . For each real  $a$ , let  $B(a)$  be the set of all the points of  $R$ , having  $a$  or  $i$  as their third coordinate; let also  $T_a$  be the one-one transformation of  $B(a)$  onto the upper half-plane  $P$ , defined by  $T_a(x, y, a) = z$  and  $T_a(x, y, i) = f_a(z)$ , where  $z = x + iy$  and  $f_a$  is the same as above. A topology is introduced in  $R$ , according to which each  $B(a)$  is open in  $R$ , while  $T_a$  is a homeomorphism of  $B(a)$  with  $P$  [2, p. 110].

It is now a simple matter to realize the equivalence between RADÓ's definition and the one given in the present paper.

Let  $S$  be the transformation of  $M = L \times P$  onto  $R$ , defined by

$$S(t, z) = \begin{cases} (x, y, t) & \text{with } z = x + iy, \text{ if } |z-t| \leq 1, \\ (x', y', i) & \text{with } f_{t'}^{-1}(z) = x' + iy', \text{ if } |z-t| > 1. \end{cases}$$

The transformation  $S_a$  of  $P$  onto  $B(a)$ , defined by  $S_a(z) = S(a, z)$ , is one-one; its inverse is RADÓ's  $T_{a^-}$ , i. e.  $S_a^{-1} = T_a$ . Since  $T_a$  is a homeomorphism, so is  $S_a$ ; since each  $B(a)$  is open in  $R$ , it follows that  $S$  is continuous and open. Setting now  $\psi = S\varphi^{-1}$ , we obtain the desired homeomorphism of  $W$  onto  $R$ .

3. Since  $W$  is obtained from  $M$  by topological identification,  $\varphi$  is a continuous map. It is also an open map; for, if  $U \subset P$  is open, since each  $f_t$  is continuous and open, (2) implies that the set  $\varphi^{-1}\varphi(t \times U)$  is open in  $M$ , hence  $\varphi(t \times U)$  is open in  $W$ .

Since each  $C(t_0, z_0)$  meets  $t \times P$  in at most one point,  $\varphi$  maps each open subset  $t \times P$  of  $M$  topologically onto the open subset  $\varphi(t \times P)$  of  $W$ . It follows that  $\varphi$  is a local homeomorphism.

4. Since each  $p \in W$  belongs to some  $\varphi(t \times P)$ , which is open in  $W$  and homeomorphic to a plane, the space  $W$  is locally Euclidean. Since, for example, the point  $\varphi(0, 2i)$  belongs to each  $\varphi(t \times P)$ , which is a connected subset, the space  $W$  is connected.

5.  $W$  is a Hausdorff space. For, let

$$p_1 = \varphi(t_1, z_1) \neq \varphi(t_2, z_2) = p_2.$$

If  $t_1 = t_2 = t$ , then  $z_1 \neq z_2$ ; let  $U_j \ni z_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) be open in  $P$ , satisfying  $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$ , where  $\emptyset$  is the empty set. It follows that  $p_j \in \varphi(t \times U_j)$ , which is open in  $W$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) and, since  $\varphi$  is univalent on  $t \times P$ ,

$$\varphi(t \times U_1) \cap \varphi(t \times U_2) = \emptyset.$$

Let us now assume that  $t_1 \neq t_2$ .

If, for example,  $|z_1 - t_1| > 1$  holds, then let

$$z'_2 = f_{t_2} f_{t_1}^{-1}(z_1),$$

hence

$$\varphi(t_2, z'_2) = \varphi(t_1, z_1) = p_1 \neq p_2 = \varphi(t_2, z_2)$$

and the distinct points  $p_1, p_2$  may be separated by open sets as above.

If, on the contrary, both  $|z_1 - t_1| \leq 1$  and  $|z_2 - t_2| \leq 1$  hold, then  $t_1 \neq t_2$  implies, for example,  $t_2 - t_1 = 2r > 0$  and the open subset  $U_j = \{z \mid |z - t_j| < 1 + r\}$  of  $P$  contains  $z_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ). As a consequence,  $p_j$  belongs to the open subset  $\varphi(t_j \times U_j)$  of  $W$  and

$$\varphi(t_1 \times U_1) \cap \varphi(t_2 \times U_2) = \emptyset$$

holds. For, the presence of a  $\zeta_j \in U_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) satisfying

$$\varphi(t_1, \zeta_1) = \varphi(t_2, \zeta_2)$$

implies, since  $t_1 \neq t_2$ ,

$$|\zeta_j - t_j| > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad f_{t_1}^{-1}(\zeta_2) = f_{t_2}^{-1}(\zeta_1).$$

It follows that

$$\zeta_1 - \frac{\zeta_1 - t_1}{|\zeta_1 - t_1|} = \zeta_2 - \frac{\zeta_2 - t_2}{|\zeta_2 - t_2|} = \alpha,$$

$$|\alpha - t_j| = |\zeta_j - t_j| - 1 < r,$$

hence

$$|t_2 - t_1| \leq |t_2 - \alpha| + |\alpha - t_1| < 2r,$$

which contradicts the definition of  $r$ .

6. Since  $W$  is a Hausdorff locally Euclidean space, it is locally compact, regular and completely regular.

7. It remains to show that  $W$  is not normal. For this purpose, let  $L_1, L_2$  be the sets of rational, respectively irrational numbers of  $L$ . The set

$$A_j = \{(t, t+i) | t \in L_j\} \text{ is closed in } M \text{ and } A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset.$$

Let  $F_j = \varphi(A_j)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ ; from  $|t+i-t|=1$  it follows that  $\varphi^{-1}(F_j) = A_j$ , thus, for  $j = 1, 2$ ,

$$F_j \text{ is closed in } W \text{ and } F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset.$$

Let now  $V_j$  be any open subset of  $W$  containing  $F_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ); we shall prove that

$$(3) \quad V_1 \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset.$$

In fact, for each  $t \in L$  there exists an open disk  $D_t \subset P$ , centered in  $t+i$  and such that

$$t \times D_t \subset \varphi^{-1}(V_j),$$

hence

$$\varphi^{-1}\varphi(t \times D_t) \subset \varphi^{-1}(V_j) \quad \text{if } t \in L_j.$$

For any  $t \in L$ , let

$$H_t = \varphi^{-1}(D_t) \subset P \quad \text{and} \quad G_j = \bigcup_{t \in L_j} H_t.$$

Formula (1) implies that

$$0 \times f_0(G_j) \subset \varphi^{-1}\varphi\left(\bigcup_{t \in L_j} t \times D_t\right),$$

hence

$$0 \times f_0(G_1 \cap G_2) \subset \varphi^{-1}(V_1) \cap \varphi^{-1}(V_2).$$

Finally, (3) is a consequence of

$$\varphi^{-1}(V_1) \cap \varphi^{-1}(V_2) \neq \emptyset,$$

which follows from the inequality

$$G_1 \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset,$$

which we proceed now to prove.

For  $j = 1, 2$  and  $n, l = 1, 2, \dots$  let

$$M_j^n = \left\{ t \mid t + \frac{i}{n} \in G_j \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad N_j^l = \bigcup_{n \geq l} M_j^n.$$

It is obvious that, for each  $t \in L_j$ ,  $t + \frac{i}{n} \in G_j$ , hence  $t \in M_j^n$  holds for almost all the indices  $n$ ; as a consequence

$$(4) \quad L_j \subset \bigcap N_j^l.$$

Furthermore,  $t \in \bigcap N_j^l$  implies  $t + \frac{i}{n_l} \in G_j$ , where  $n_l \geq l$  for each  $l \geq 1$ .

Assuming now

$$(5) \quad G_1 \cap G_2 = \emptyset,$$

we obtain  $t \in L_j$ , hence

$$(6) \quad \bigcap N_j' \subset L_j,$$

since  $t \in L_{3-j}$  implies  $t + \frac{i}{n} \in G_{3-j}$  for almost all the indices  $n$ .

Since  $G_j$  is open in  $P$ ,  $M_j^n$  and  $N_j'$  are open subsets of the real line  $R$  in its usual topology. On account of (4) and (6), we see that (5) implies that  $L_1$ , the set of rational numbers, is a  $G_\delta$  in  $R$ , which is known to be impossible: the nonnormality of the space  $W$  is thereby completely proved.

(Added in proof:) The author realized recently that the nonnormality of the Prüfer manifold has already been proved by E. CALABI and M. ROSENBLICHT in their paper: Complex analytic manifolds without countable base, *Proceedings American Math. Soc.*, 4 (1953), 335—340.

### References.

- [1] P. ALEXANDROV—H. HOPF, *Topologie I* (Berlin, 1935).
- [2] T. RADÓ, Über den Begriff der Riemannschen Fläche, *these Acta*, 2 (1925), 101—121.
- [3] S. STOILOW, *Principes topologiques de la théorie des fonctions analytiques* (Paris, 1938).
- [4] A. TYCHONOFF, Über einen Metrisationssatz von P. Urysohn, *Math. Annalen*, 95 (1926), 139—142.

(Received April 13, 1954.)