

# On Urysohn's Lemma for generalized topological spaces in **ZF**

Jacek Hejduk and Eliza Wajch

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science,  
Łódź University, Banacha 22, 90-238 Łódź, Poland.

jacek.hejduk@wmii.uni.lodz.pl.

Institute of Mathematics

Faculty of Exact and Natural Sciences

Siedlce University of Natural Sciences and Humanities

ul. 3 Maja 54, 08-110 Siedlce, Poland.

eliza.wajch@wp.pl

March 10, 2021

## Abstract

A strong generalized topological space is an ordered pair  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mathcal{T} \rangle$  such that  $X$  is a set and  $\mathcal{T}$  is a collection of subsets of  $X$  such that  $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  is stable under arbitrary unions. A necessary and sufficient condition for a strong generalized topological space  $\mathbf{X}$  to satisfy Urysohn's lemma or its appropriate variant is shown in **ZF**. Notions of a U-normal and an effectively normal generalized topological space are introduced. It is observed that, in **ZF + DC**, every U-normal generalized topological space satisfies Urysohn's lemma. It is shown that every effectively normal generalized topological space satisfies Császár's modification of Urysohn's Lemma. A **ZF**-example of a strong generalized topological normal space which satisfies the Tietze-Urysohn Extension Theorem and fails to satisfy Urysohn's Lemma is shown.

*Mathematics Subject Classification (2010):* 54A35, 03E35, 03E25, 54A05, 54C30, 54D15

*Keywords:* Generalized topology, Urysohn's Lemma, effectively normal space, **ZF**

## 1 Introduction

The set-theoretic framework for this paper is the Zermelo-Fraenkel system of axioms **ZF**, so no form of the Axiom of Choice (**AC**) is assumed. The system **ZF** + **AC** is denoted by **ZFC**. The set of all Dedekind-finite ordinal numbers of von Neumann is denoted by  $\omega$ . Then  $0 = \emptyset$  and, for every  $n \in \omega$ ,  $n + 1 = n \cup \{n\}$ . We put  $\mathbb{N} = \omega \setminus \{0\}$ . If  $X$  is a set, then  $[X]^{<\omega}$  stands for the set of all finite subsets of  $X$ . The power set of  $X$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . For sets  $X$  and  $Y$ , the set of all mappings from  $X$  to  $Y$  is denoted by  $Y^X$ .

Generalized topological spaces in the style of [2] have been studied by many mathematicians. As to our knowledge, generalizations of the classical concept of a topology, such that it is not assumed that finite intersections of open sets are open were considered already in [1]. It has been shown, for instance, in [6] and [7] recently that generalized topologies that are not topologies can appear in a very natural way in some mathematical problems. Needless to say, the set-theoretic strength of Urysohn's Lemma and the Tietze-Urysohn Extension Theorem for topological spaces is very important (see, e.g., [8, Forms 78 and 375], [9] and [11]). In [3], a modification of Urysohn's Lemma for normal generalized topological spaces was obtained. However, it has been done very little about possible modifications of Urysohn's Lemma and the Tietze-Urysohn Extension Theorem for generalized topological spaces in **ZF**. In this article, we introduce and investigate in the absence of the axiom of choice several new concepts relevant to normality, Urysohn's Lemma and the Tietze-Urysohn Extension Theorem for generalized topological spaces in the sense of [2].

Before we pass to the body of the paper, let us recall several basic definitions and establish notation concerning mainly generalized topologies in the sense of [2].

**Definition 1.1.** (Cf. [2].)

1. A *generalized topology* in a set  $X$  is a collection  $\mu$  of subsets of  $X$  such that, for every family  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mu$ ,  $\bigcup \mathcal{U} \in \mu$ . That  $\mu$  is a generalized topology in  $X$  is abbreviated to:  $\mu$  is a GT in  $X$ .
2. A generalized topology  $\mu$  in  $X$  is called *strong* if  $X \in \mu$ .

3. A (strong) generalized topological space (in abbreviation: a (strong) GT space) is an ordered pair  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  where  $X$  is a set and  $\mu$  is a (strong) generalized topology in  $X$ .

If  $\mu$  is a generalized topology in  $X$ , then  $\emptyset \in \mu$  because  $\emptyset$  is the union of an empty subfamily of  $\mu$ .

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be a GT space and let  $A \subseteq X$ .

1. The set  $A$  is called  $\mu$ -open (respectively,  $\mu$ -closed) if  $A \in \mu$  (respectively,  $X \setminus A \in \mu$ ).
2.  $\text{cl}_\mu(A)$  denotes the intersection of all  $\mu$ -closed sets containing  $A$ ; that is,  $\text{cl}_\mu(A)$  is the closure of  $A$  in  $\mathbf{X}$ . Sometimes, we denote  $\text{cl}_\mu(A)$  by  $\text{cl}_{\mathbf{X}}(A)$  or by  $\text{cl}_X(A)$ .
3. For  $\mu|_A = \{U \cap A : U \in \mu\}$ , the GT space  $\mathbf{A} = \langle A, \mu|_A \rangle$  is called the subspace of  $\mathbf{X}$  with the underlying set  $A$ .

**Definition 1.3.** (Cf. [2].) Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu_X \rangle$  and  $\mathbf{Y} = \langle Y, \mu_Y \rangle$  be GT spaces. A mapping  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is called:

1.  $\langle \mu_X, \mu_Y \rangle$ -continuous if, for every  $V \in \mu_Y$ ,  $f^{-1}[V] \in \mu_X$ ;
2.  $\langle \mu_X, \mu_Y \rangle$ -continuous at a point  $x \in X$  if, for every  $V \in \mu_Y$  with  $f(x) \in V$ , there is  $U \in \mu_X$  such that  $x \in U$  and  $f[U] \subseteq V$ .

Since definitions of  $T_0, T_1, T_2, T_3$  and normal GT spaces are known and the same as analogous definitions for topological spaces, let us not write them down here. We recommend [4] and [14] as basic textbooks on topological spaces.

**Definition 1.4.** 1.  $\tau_n$  denotes the natural topology in  $\mathbb{R}$  having the family of all open intervals with rational end-points as a base.

2. For the generalized topology  $g\tau_n = \{\emptyset, \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{(-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{(a, +\infty) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{(-\infty, a) \cup (b, +\infty) : a, b \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } a < b\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbf{R} = \langle \mathbb{R}, g\tau_n \rangle$ .

In [3], the space  $\mathbf{R}$  was used in a version of Urysohn's lemma for GT spaces.

Let us introduce the following new concepts for GT spaces:

**Definition 1.5.** Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be a GT space.

1. **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) is the statement: For every pair  $A, B$  of disjoint  $\mu$ -closed sets, there exists a  $\langle \mu, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $A \subseteq f^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B \subseteq f^{-1}[\{1\}]$ . If **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) is true, we say that  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfies Urysohn's Lemma.
2. **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) is the statement: For every pair  $A, B$  of disjoint  $\mu$ -closed sets, there exists a  $\langle \mu, g\tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $A \subseteq f^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B \subseteq f^{-1}[\{1\}]$ .
3. **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) is the statement: For any  $\mu$ -closed set  $A$  and any  $\langle \mu|_A, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a  $\langle \mu, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $\tilde{f} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that, for every  $x \in A$ ,  $\tilde{f}(x) = f(x)$ . If **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) is true, we say that  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfies the Tietze-Urysohn Extension Theorem.
4. **GTET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) is the statement: For any  $\mu$ -closed set  $A$  and any  $\langle \mu|_A, g\tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a  $\langle \mu, g\tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $\tilde{f} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that, for every  $x \in A$ ,  $\tilde{f}(x) = f(x)$ .

The following proposition is straightforward:

**Proposition 1.6.** [**ZF**] *Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be a GT space.*

1. **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) *implies* **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ).
2. *If  $\mathbf{X}$  is a topological space, then **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) and **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) are equivalent, **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) and **GTET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) are equivalent, and **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) implies **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ).*
3. (*Cf. [3, Theorem 3.4].*) *If **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds, then  $\mathbf{X}$  is normal.*

For a topological space  $\mathbf{X}$ , the notation **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) and **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) was established in [11, Remark 2,3].

In the following definition, we recall three known forms from [8] and introduce a new one.

**Definition 1.7.** 1. **DC** (the Principle of Dependent Choices, [8, Form 43]): For every non-empty set  $A$  and every binary relation  $S$  on  $A$ , the following implication holds:  $((\forall x \in A)(\exists y \in A)\langle x, y \rangle \in S) \rightarrow ((\exists a \in A^\omega)(\forall n \in \omega)\langle a(n), a(n+1) \rangle \in S)$ .

2. **UL** (Urysohn's Lemma, [8, Form 78]): For every normal topological space  $\mathbf{X}$ , **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds.
3. **GUL**: For every normal GT space  $\mathbf{X}$ , **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds.
4. **TET** (the Tietze-Urysohn Extension Theorem, [8, Form 375]): For every normal topological space  $\mathbf{X}$ , **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds.

In [3], Á. Csaszár proved in **ZFC** the following version of Urysohn's Lemma:

**Theorem 1.8.** (Cf. [3, Theorem 3.3].) [**ZFC**] *If  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  is a normal GT space, then **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds.*

In [12] (cf. also [5] and [9]), it was proved that it is consistent with **ZF** the existence of a normal topological space  $\mathbf{X}$  for which **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) is false. This implies that Theorem 1.8 is not a theorem of **ZF**. On the other hand, it is well known that, in **ZF**, **DC** implies **TET** and, in consequence, **UL** also follows from **DC** (cf. [8, entries (43, 78) and (43, 375), pages 339 and 386]). It was shown in [9] that there is a model of **ZF** in which a compact Tychonoff space  $\mathbf{X}$  fails to satisfy **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ). Therefore, in general, for a compact Hausdorff space  $\mathbf{X}$ , **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) need not imply **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) in a model of **ZF**.

In this article, we show that, in general, for a normal GT space  $\mathbf{X}$ , **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) need not imply **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) in **ZF**. We observe that, in **ZF** + **DC**, every normal GT space  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfies **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ). We introduce a concept of an effectively normal GT space and prove that, for every effectively normal GT space  $\mathbf{X}$ , **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds in **ZF**. We show in **ZF** necessary and sufficient conditions for a normal GT space to satisfy **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ), as well as more complicated necessary and sufficient conditions for  $\mathbf{X}$  to satisfy **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ). Some of the sufficient conditions are shown to be also necessary. Furthermore, we discuss **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) and **GTET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ). We show that there is in **ZF** a GT space  $\mathbf{X}$  which satisfies the conjunction **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ )  $\wedge$   $\neg$ **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ).

## 2 The GT space $\mathbf{R}$

In this section, we concentrate on the space GT space  $\mathbf{R} = \langle \mathbb{R}, g\tau_n \rangle$  (see Definition 1.4(2)). We show in **ZF** that **UL**( $\mathbf{R}$ ) is false but **GUL**( $\mathbf{R}$ ), **GTET**( $\mathbf{R}$ ) and **TET**( $\mathbf{R}$ ) are all true.

To begin, let us observe that  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}) = \{\emptyset, \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{(-\infty, a] : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{[a, +\infty) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{[a, b] : a, b \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } a \leq b\}$  is the collection of all  $g\tau_n$ -closed sets. If  $A, B$  is a pair of non-empty disjoint  $g\tau_n$ -closed sets, then there exists  $c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (A \cup B)$  such that  $A \subseteq (-\infty, c)$  and  $B \subseteq (c, +\infty)$  or  $B \subseteq (-\infty, c)$  and  $A \subseteq (c, +\infty)$ . This simple observation shows that the space  $\mathbf{R}$  is normal.

**Lemma 2.1.** [ZF] *Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $\langle g\tau_n, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function. Then the set  $f[\mathbb{R}]$  is  $\tau_n$ -connected.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}) \cap g\tau_n = \{\emptyset, \mathbb{R}\}$ , the GT space  $\mathbf{R}$  is connected. Thus, the set  $f[\mathbb{R}]$  is connected in  $\langle \mathbb{R}, \tau_n \rangle$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.2.** [ZF]  $\mathbf{UL}(\mathbf{R})$  is false.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathbf{UL}(\mathbf{R})$  is true. Since the sets  $A = [0, 1]$  and  $B = [2, 3]$  are both  $g\tau_n$ -closed and  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ , by  $\mathbf{UL}(\mathbf{R})$ , there exists a  $\langle g\tau_n, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $A \subseteq f^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B \subseteq f^{-1}[\{1\}]$ . It follows from Lemma 2.1 that  $[0, 1] \subseteq f[\mathbb{R}]$ . Let  $U = f^{-1}[(-1, \frac{1}{4})]$ ,  $V = f^{-1}[(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})]$  and  $W = f^{-1}[(\frac{3}{4}, +\infty)]$ . The sets  $U, V, W$  are pairwise disjoint, non-empty and  $g\tau_n$ -open. This is impossible. Hence  $\mathbf{UL}(\mathbf{R})$  is false.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.3.** [ZF]  $\mathbf{GUL}(\mathbf{R})$  is true.

*Proof.* Consider an arbitrary pair  $A, B$  of non-empty disjoint  $g\tau_n$ -closed sets. There exist real numbers  $c, d$  such that  $c < d$  and either  $A \subseteq (-\infty, c]$  and  $B \subseteq [d, +\infty)$  or  $B \subseteq (-\infty, c]$  and  $A \subseteq [d, +\infty)$ . We may assume that  $A \subseteq (-\infty, c]$  and  $B \subseteq [d, +\infty)$ . Then we define a function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in (-\infty, c); \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in [d, +\infty); \\ \frac{x-c}{d-c} & \text{if } x \in (c, d). \end{cases}$$

The function  $f$  is  $\langle g\tau_n, g\tau_n \rangle$ -continuous,  $A \subseteq f^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B \subseteq f^{-1}[\{1\}]$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.4.** [ZF] *Both  $\mathbf{GTET}(\mathbf{R})$  and  $\mathbf{TET}(\mathbf{R})$  are true.*

*Proof.* Let us show that  $\mathbf{TET}(\mathbf{R})$  is true.

Let  $P$  be a non-empty  $g\tau_n$ -closed set such that  $P \neq \mathbb{R}$  and  $P$  is not a singleton. Let  $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $\langle g\tau_n|_P, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function.

Suppose that  $P = [a, b]$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $a < b$ . We define a function  $f_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$f_1(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in P; \\ f(a) & \text{if } x \in (-\infty, a); \\ f(b) & \text{if } x \in (b, +\infty). \end{cases}$$

To show that  $f_1$  is  $\langle g\tau_n, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous, we consider any set  $V \in \tau_n$  and put  $U = f^{-1}[V]$ . Then  $U \in g\tau_n|_P$ . If  $U = [a, c)$  for some  $c \in (a, b]$ , then  $f_1^{-1}[V] = (-\infty, c) \in \tau_n$ . If  $U = (d, b]$  for some  $d \in [a, b)$ , then  $f_1^{-1}[V] = (d, +\infty) \in g\tau_n$ . If  $U = [a, c) \cup (d, b]$  for some  $c, d \in [a, b]$  such that  $a < c \leq d < b$ , then  $f_1^{-1}[V] = (-\infty, c) \cup (d, +\infty) \in g\tau_n$ . If  $U = \emptyset$ , then  $f_1^{-1}[V] = \emptyset \in g\tau_n$ . If  $U = P$ , then  $f_1^{-1}[V] = \mathbb{R} \in g\tau_n$ . Hence  $f_1$  is  $\langle g\tau_n, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous. Of course,  $f_1(x) = f(x)$  for every  $x \in P$ .

Suppose that  $P = (-\infty, a]$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . In this case, we define a  $\langle g\tau_n, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$f_2(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in P; \\ f(a) & \text{if } x \in (a, +\infty). \end{cases}$$

Suppose that  $P = [b, +\infty)$  for some  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . In this case, we define a  $\langle g\tau_n, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f_3 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$f_3(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in P; \\ f(b) & \text{if } x \in (-\infty, b). \end{cases}$$

All this taken together shows that **TET**( $\mathbb{R}$ ) is true. Using similar arguments, one can check that **GTET**( $\mathbb{R}$ ) is also true.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.5.** *In **ZF**, for a GT space  $\mathbf{X}$ , **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) need not imply **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ), and **TET**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) need not imply **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ).*

### 3 Conditions under which **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds

Since, for every GT space  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  such that  $X \notin \mu$ , **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds because there does not exist a pair  $A, B$  of disjoint  $\mu$ -closed sets (see [3, Proposition 2.1]), we are concerned mainly with strong GT spaces.

**Proposition 3.1.** [ZF] Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be a strong GT space. Then  $\mathbf{GUL}(\mathbf{X})$  holds if and only if, for every pair  $A, B$  of non-empty disjoint  $\mu$ -closed sets there exists a collection  $\{U_r : r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)\}$  of  $\mu$ -open sets such that:

- (i) for all  $r, s \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$ , if  $r < s$ , then  $\text{cl}_\mu(U_r) \subseteq U_s$ ;
- (ii) for every  $r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$ ,  $A \subseteq U_r$ ;
- (iii) for every  $r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$ ,  $\text{cl}_\mu(U_r) \subseteq X \setminus B$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $A, B$  is a pair of non-empty disjoint  $\mu$ -closed sets.

*Sufficiency.* Suppose that  $\{U_r : r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)\}$  is a family of  $\mu$ -open sets satisfying conditions (i)–(iii). For every  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $r \leq 0$ , we put  $U_r = \emptyset$ . For every  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $r > 1$ , we put  $U_r = X$ . We also put  $U_1 = X \setminus B$ . Then, as in the standard proof of Urysohn’s lemma, we define a function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by putting  $f(x) = \inf\{r \in \mathbb{Q} : x \in U_r\}$ . Arguing in much the same way, as in the proof to Theorem 3.3 in [3], one can check that the function  $f$  is  $\langle \mu, g\tau_n \rangle$ -continuous,  $A \subseteq f^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B \subseteq f^{-1}[\{1\}]$ .

*Necessity.* Suppose that  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $\langle \mu, g\tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function such that  $A \subseteq g^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B \subseteq g^{-1}[\{1\}]$ . Then, for every  $r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$ , we define  $U_r = g^{-1}[(-\infty, r)]$ .  $\square$

That it holds in  $\mathbf{ZF} + \mathbf{DC}$  that every normal topological space satisfies Urysohn’s Lemma is shown in [10, Problem 2.26] (see also [8, p. 339]) but without any detailed proof. Therefore, let us sketch a proof to the following more general theorem for completeness.

**Theorem 3.2.** [ZF]  $\mathbf{DC}$  implies that, for every normal GT space  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{GUL}(\mathbf{X})$  holds.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be a strong normal GT space. Suppose that  $A, B$  is a pair of non-empty disjoint  $\mu$ -closed sets. Fix a bijection  $\psi : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$ . For every  $n \in \omega$ , let  $\mathcal{U}_n$  be a family of all finite sequences  $(U_{\psi(i)})_{i \in n+1}$  of  $\mu$ -open sets such that:

- (i) for all  $i, j \in n + 1$ , if  $\psi(i) < \psi(j)$ , then  $\text{cl}_\mu(U_{\psi(i)}) \subseteq U_{\psi(j)}$ ;
- (ii) for every  $i \in n + 1$ ,  $A \subseteq U_{\psi(i)}$ ;
- (iii) for every  $i \in n + 1$ ,  $\text{cl}_\mu(U_{\psi(i)}) \subseteq X \setminus B$ .

It follows from the normality of  $\mathbf{X}$  that, for every  $n \in \omega$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_n \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{U}_n$ . We define a binary relation  $R$  on  $\mathcal{U}$  as follows: if  $V_1 \in \mathcal{U}_n$  with  $V_1 = (U(1)_{\psi(i)})_{i \in n+1}$ , and  $V_2 \in \mathcal{U}_m$  with  $V_2 = (U(2)_{\psi(i)})_{i \in m+1}$ , then  $\langle V_1, V_2 \rangle \in R$  if and only if  $n < m$  and, for every  $i \in n+1$ ,  $U(1)_{\psi(i)} = U(2)_{\psi(i)}$ . It follows from the normality of  $\mathbf{X}$  that, for every  $n \in \omega$  and every  $V \in \mathcal{U}_n$ , there exists  $W \in \mathcal{U}_{n+1}$  such that  $\langle V, W \rangle \in R$ . Assuming **DC**, we may fix  $V \in \mathcal{U}^\omega$  such that, for every  $n \in \omega$ ,  $\langle V(n), V(n+1) \rangle \in R$ . Using  $V$ , one can easily define a family  $\{U_r : r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)\}$  of  $\mu$ -open sets satisfying conditions (i)–(iii) of Proposition 3.1. Hence **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds in **ZF** + **DC**.  $\square$

The notion of an effectively normal topological space was introduced in [13] (see also [8, Note 71] and [9] for a definition of an effectively normal space). It is known from [9] that every effectively normal topological space satisfies Urysohn's lemma in **ZF**. Let us adopt the concept of effective normality to generalized topological spaces.

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be a GT space and let

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X}) = \{ \langle A, B \rangle : A, B \text{ are } \mu\text{-closed and } A \cap B = \emptyset \},$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) = \{ \langle U, V \rangle : U, V \text{ are } \mu\text{-open and } U \cap V = \emptyset \}.$$

We say that  $\mathbf{X}$  is *effectively normal* if there exists a function  $F : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$  such that, for every  $\langle A, B \rangle \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X})$ , if  $F(\langle A, B \rangle) = \langle U, V \rangle$ , then  $A \subseteq U$  and  $B \subseteq V$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** [**ZF**] *For every effectively normal GT space  $\mathbf{X}$ , **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be an effectively normal GT space. Let  $F : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$  be a function such that, for every  $\langle A, B \rangle \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X})$ , if  $F(\langle A, B \rangle) = \langle U, V \rangle$ , then  $A \subseteq U$  and  $B \subseteq V$ . Let  $\psi : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$  be a bijection. Given a pair  $A, B$  of non-empty disjoint  $\mu$ -closed sets, we can mimic the standard **ZFC**-proof of Urysohn's Lemma and, by using  $F$ , we can inductively define in **ZF** a family  $\{U_r : r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)\}$  of  $\mu$ -open sets satisfying conditions (i)–(iii) of Proposition 3.1. Hence **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) is true in **ZF** by Proposition 3.1.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.5.** [**ZF**] *The space  $\mathbf{R}$  is effectively normal.*

*Proof.* Let  $\psi : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  be a bijection. For every  $i \in \omega$ , let  $U_i = (-\infty, \psi(i))$  and  $V_i = (\psi(i), +\infty)$ . To define a mapping  $F : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{R})$  showing the effective normality of  $\mathbf{R}$ , for a fixed pair  $A, B$  of non-empty disjoint  $g\tau_n$ -closed sets, we consider the set  $N(A, B) = \{i \in \omega : A \subseteq U_i \text{ and } B \subseteq V_i \text{ or } A \subseteq V_i \text{ and } B \subseteq U_i\}$ . Clearly,  $N(A, B) \neq \emptyset$ , so we may define  $n(A, B) = \min N(A, B)$  and

$$F(\langle A, B \rangle) = \begin{cases} \langle U_{n(A,B)}, V_{n(A,B)} \rangle & \text{if } A \subseteq U_{n(A,B)}; \\ \langle V_{n(A,B)}, U_{n(A,B)} \rangle & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If  $A, B$  is a pair of  $g\tau_n$ -closed sets such that either  $A$  or  $B$  is empty, we put

$$F(\langle A, B \rangle) = \begin{cases} \langle \emptyset, \mathbb{R} \rangle & \text{if } A = \emptyset; \\ \langle \mathbb{R}, \emptyset \rangle & \text{if } B = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

□

## 4 Conditions under which $\mathbf{UL}(\mathbf{X})$ holds

Reasonable necessary and sufficient conditions for a GT space to satisfy  $\mathbf{UL}(\mathbf{X})$  are more complicated than the ones to satisfy  $\mathbf{GUL}(\mathbf{X})$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *[ZF] Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be a GT space. Then, for every pair  $A, B$  of non-empty subsets of  $X$ , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) *there exists a  $\langle \mu, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $A \subseteq f^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B \subseteq f^{-1}[\{1\}]$ ;*
- (b) *there exists a family of ordered pairs  $\{\langle U_r, F_r \rangle : r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)\}$  which satisfies the following conditions:*
  - (i) *for every  $r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$ ,  $U_r$  is a  $\mu$ -open set,  $F_r$  is a  $\mu$ -closed set and  $A \subseteq U_r \subseteq F_r$ ;*
  - (ii) *for every pair  $s, r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$ , if  $s < r$ , then  $F_s \subseteq U_r$  and  $U_r \setminus F_s \in \mu$ ;*
  - (iii) *for every  $r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$ ,  $F_r \cap B = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* (a)  $\rightarrow$  (b) Given a  $\langle \mu, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $A \subseteq f^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B \subseteq f^{-1}[\{1\}]$ , for every  $r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$ , we can define  $U_r = f^{-1}[(-\infty, r)]$  and  $F_r = f^{-1}[(r, \infty)]$ .

(b)  $\rightarrow$  (a) Suppose that for a pair  $A, B$  of non-empty subsets of  $X$ , we are given a family  $\{\langle U_r, F_r \rangle : r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)\}$  which satisfies conditions (i)–(iii). For every non-negative rational number  $r$ , we define  $U_r = F_r = \emptyset$ . For every rational number  $r \geq 1$ , we define  $U_r = F_r = X$ . We define a function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by putting  $f(x) = \inf\{r \in \mathbb{Q} : x \in U_r\}$ . As in the standard proof of Urysohn's lemma, one can check that it follows from (ii) that  $f$  is  $\langle \mu, \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous. Clearly,  $A \subseteq f^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B \subseteq f^{-1}[\{1\}]$ .  $\square$

**Definition 4.2.** We say that a GT space  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  is *U-normal* if, for every pair  $A, B$  of non-empty disjoint  $\mu$ -closed sets and for every  $n \in \omega$ , there exists a family  $\{\langle U_i, F_i \rangle : i \in n + 1\}$  which satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) for every  $i \in n$ ,  $A \subseteq U_i \subseteq F_i \subseteq U_{i+1} \subseteq F_{i+1} \subseteq X \setminus B$ ;
- (ii) for every pair  $i, j \in n + 1$  such that  $i \in j$ ,  $U_j \setminus F_i \in \mu$ ;
- (iii) for every  $i \in n + 1$ , there exist a  $\mu$ -open set  $U$  and a  $\mu$ -closed set  $F$  such that  $U \subseteq F$  and if  $i = 0$ , that  $F \subseteq U_0$ , if  $i = n$ , then  $F_n \subseteq U$ , if  $0 \in i \in n$ , then  $F_i \subseteq U$  and  $F \subseteq U_{i+1}$  and, moreover, for every  $j \in n + 1$ , if  $F \subseteq U_j$ , then  $U_j \setminus F \in \mu$ , and if  $F_j \subseteq U$ , then  $U \setminus F_j \in \mu$ .

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be a U-normal GT-space. Assume that  $A, B$  is a pair of disjoint non-empty  $\mu$ -closed sets.

- (a) Let  $n \in \omega$  and let  $S$  be a set which has exactly  $n + 1$  elements. A family  $\mathcal{U} = \{\langle U_s, F_s \rangle : s \in S\}$  will be called a *U-family of length  $n + 1$*  for the pair  $\langle A, B \rangle$  if there is a bijection  $\psi : n + 1 \rightarrow S$  such that the family  $\{\langle U_{\psi(i)}, F_{\psi(i)} \rangle : i \in n + 1\}$  satisfies conditions (i)–(iii) of Definition 4.2.
- (b) Suppose that  $m, n \in \omega$ ,  $\mathcal{U} = \{\langle U_s, F_s \rangle : s \in S\}$  is a U-family of length  $n + 1$  for  $\langle A, B \rangle$ , and  $\mathcal{V} = \{\langle V_t, H_t \rangle : t \in T\}$  is a U-family of length  $m + 1$  for  $\langle A, B \rangle$ . Then we say that  $\mathcal{U}$  is an *extension* of  $\mathcal{V}$  if  $m \in n$ ,  $T \subseteq S$  and, for every  $t \in T$ ,  $U_t = V_t$  and  $F_t = H_t$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** *It holds in ZF that DC implies that every U-normal GT space  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfies  $\text{UL}(\mathbf{X})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be a U-normal GT space. Suppose that  $A, B$  is a pair of disjoint non-empty  $\mu$ -closed sets. Let  $\psi : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$  be a bijection. For every  $n \in \omega$ , let  $\mathcal{U}_n(\langle A, B \rangle)$  be a collection of all U-families  $\{\langle U_{\psi i}, F_{\psi(i)} \rangle : i \in n + 1\}$  of length  $n + 1$  for  $\langle A, B \rangle$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}(\langle A, B \rangle) = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{U}_n(\langle A, B \rangle)$ . We define a binary relation  $R$  on  $\mathcal{U}(\langle A, B \rangle)$  as follows. If  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{U}(\langle A, B \rangle)$ , then  $\langle \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \rangle \in R$  if and only if  $\mathcal{V}$  is an extension of  $\mathcal{U}$ . It follows from the U-normality of  $\mathbf{X}$  that, for every  $n \in \omega$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_n(\langle A, B \rangle) \neq \emptyset$  and, for every  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{U}(\langle A, B \rangle)$ , there exists  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{U}(\langle A, B \rangle)$  such that  $\langle \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \rangle \in R$ . Assuming **DC**, we can fix a function  $H \in \mathcal{U}(\langle A, B \rangle)^\omega$  such that, for every  $n \in \omega$ ,  $\langle H(n), H(n + 1) \rangle \in R$ . By using  $H$ , one can easily define a family  $\{\langle U_r, F_r \rangle : r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)\}$  satisfying conditions (i)-(iii) of Proposition 4.1(b). This, together with Proposition 4.1, completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5 On the topology generated by a generalized topology

For a generalized topology  $\mu$  in a set  $X$ , let  $\tau(\mu)$  be the topology in  $X$  generated by  $\mu$ . If  $\mu$  is strong, then

$$\tau(\mu) = \{V \subseteq X : (\forall x \in V)(\exists \mathcal{U} \in [\mu]^{<\omega})(x \in \bigcap \mathcal{U} \subseteq V)\}.$$

The main aim of this section is to show in **ZF** an example of a Hausdorff strong GT space  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  such that **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) is true but **UL**( $\langle X, \tau(\mu) \rangle$ ) is false. The following theorem shows that, in such an example,  $\tau(\mu)$  cannot be compact.

**Theorem 5.1.** [**ZF**] *Let  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  be a strong GT space such that **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) is true and  $\tau(\mu)$  is compact. Then **UL**( $\langle X, \tau(\mu) \rangle$ ) is true.*

*Proof.* Consider any pair  $A_0, A_1$  of disjoint non-empty  $\tau(\mu)$ -closed sets. If  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , there exist a non-empty set  $S_i$  and a family  $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,s} : s \in S_i\}$  such that, for every  $s \in S_i$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{i,s}$  is a finite family of  $\mu$ -closed sets and  $A_i = \bigcap_{s \in S_i} (\bigcup \mathcal{F}_{i,s})$ . Since  $A_0 \cap A_1 = \emptyset$  and the sets  $A_0, A_1$  are both  $\tau(\mu)$ -compact, for every  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , there exists a finite subset  $K_i$  of  $S_i$  such that, for  $B_i = \bigcap_{s \in K_i} (\bigcup \mathcal{F}_{i,s})$ , the sets  $B_0, B_1$  are disjoint. Now, it is easily seen that, for every  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , we can choose a finite family  $\mathcal{C}_i$  of  $\mu$ -closed sets such that

$B_i = \bigcup \mathcal{C}_i$ . Since every  $\langle \mu, g\tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function is  $\langle \tau(\mu), \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous, it follows from **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) that there exists a  $\langle \tau(\mu), \tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that, for every  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\bigcup \mathcal{C}_i \in f^{-1}[\{i\}]$ . This shows that **UL**( $\langle X, \tau(\mu) \rangle$ ) is true.  $\square$

Let us establish the following general fact:

**Theorem 5.2.** [**ZF**] For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $\mathbf{X}_i = \langle X_i, \mu_i \rangle$  be a strong GT space. Let  $X = X_1 \times X_2$  and

$$\mu = \{(U \times X_2) \cup (X_1 \times V) : U \in \mu_1 \text{ and } V \in \mu_2\}.$$

Then  $\mathbf{X} = \langle X, \mu \rangle$  is a strong GT space. Moreover, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) if, for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}_i$ ) holds, then **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds;
- (ii) if, for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , **UL**( $\mathbf{X}_i$ ) holds, then **UL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds;
- (iii) if, for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_i$  is effectively normal, so is  $\mathbf{X}$ .

*Proof.* It is obvious that  $\mu$  is a strong generalized topology in  $X$ . To prove (i)–(iii), let us assume that  $A, B$  is a pair of disjoint  $\mu$ -closed sets. Then there exist  $\mu_1$ -closed sets  $A_1, B_1$  and  $\mu_2$ -closed sets  $A_2, B_2$  such that  $A = A_1 \times A_2$  and  $B = B_1 \times B_2$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $A_1 \cap B_1 = \emptyset$ .

To prove (i), assuming that, for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}_i$ ) holds, we can take a  $\langle \mu_1, g\tau_n \rangle$ -continuous function  $f : X_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $A_1 \subseteq f^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B_1 \subseteq f^{-1}[\{1\}]$ . We define a function  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by putting  $g(x, y) = f(x)$  for every point  $\langle x, y \rangle \in X$ . The function  $g$  is  $\langle \mu, g\tau_n \rangle$ -continuous,  $A \subseteq g^{-1}[\{0\}]$  and  $B \subseteq g^{-1}[\{1\}]$ . Hence **GUL**( $\mathbf{X}$ ) holds. The proof to (ii) is similar.

To prove (iii), we assume that the spaces  $\mathbf{X}_i$  are effectively normal. For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , choose a function  $F_i : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X}_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}_i)$  such that, for every  $\langle C, D \rangle \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X}_i)$ , if  $F_i(\langle C, D \rangle) = \langle U, V \rangle$ , then  $C \subseteq U$  and  $D \subseteq V$ . Now, we define a function  $F : \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$  as follows. If  $A_1 \cap B_1 = \emptyset$  and  $F_1(\langle A_1, B_1 \rangle) = \langle U, V \rangle$ , we define  $F(\langle A, B \rangle) = \langle U \times X_2, V \times X_2 \rangle$ . If  $A_2 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$  and  $F_2(\langle A_2, B_2 \rangle) = \langle U, V \rangle$ , we define  $F(\langle A, B \rangle) = \langle X_1 \times U, X_1 \times V \rangle$ . This shows that  $\mathbf{X}$  is effectively normal.  $\square$

**Example 5.3.** [**ZF**] Let us consider the following generalized topology  $g\tau_s$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ :

$$g\tau_s = g\tau_n \cup \{[a, +\infty) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{(-\infty, a) \cup [b, +\infty) : a, b \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } a < b\}.$$

Then  $\tau(g\tau_s)$  is the topology of the Sorgenfrey line. Let  $X = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  and

$$\mu = \{(U \times \mathbb{R}) \cup (\mathbb{R} \times V) : U, V \in g\tau_s\}.$$

Then  $\mu$  is a Hausdorff strong generalized topology in  $X$ . To check that the GT space  $\langle \mathbb{R}, g\tau_s \rangle$  is effectively normal, for every pair  $A, B$  of disjoint  $g\tau_s$ -closed sets such that either  $A$  is  $g\tau_s$ -open or  $B$  is  $g\tau_s$ -open, we put

$$F(\langle A, B \rangle) = \begin{cases} \langle A, \mathbb{R} \setminus A \rangle & \text{if } A \text{ is } g\tau_s\text{-open;} \\ \langle \mathbb{R} \setminus B, B \rangle & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If  $A, B$  is a pair of disjoint  $g\tau_s$ -closed sets such that neither  $A$  nor  $B$  is  $g\tau_s$ -open, we can define  $F(\langle A, B \rangle)$  in much the same way, as in the proof to Proposition 3.5. In this way, we define a mapping  $F : \mathcal{E}(\langle \mathbb{R}, g\tau_s \rangle) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\langle \mathbb{R}, g\tau_s \rangle)$  witnessing that  $\langle \mathbb{R}, g\tau_s \rangle$  is effectively normal. It follows from Theorem 3.4 that  $\mathbf{GUL}(\langle \mathbb{R}, g\tau_s \rangle)$  is true. One can also check that  $\mathbf{GUL}(\langle \mathbb{R}, g\tau_s \rangle)$  holds by a slight modification of the proof to Proposition 2.3. It follows from Theorem 5.2 that  $\mathbf{GUL}(\langle X, \mu \rangle)$  is true. That  $\mathbf{UL}(\langle X, \tau(\mu) \rangle)$  is not true follows from the well-known fact that the square of the Sorgenfrey line is not normal in  $\mathbf{ZF}$ .

## References

- [1] A. Appert and K. Fan, *Espaces Topologiques Intermédiaires*, Act. Sci. et Ind. 1121, Hermann, Paris, 1951.
- [2] Á. Csaszár, Generalized topology, generalized continuity, *Acta Math. Hungar.* 96 (4) (2002), 351–357.
- [3] Á. Csaszár, Normal generalized topologies, *Acta Math. Hung.* 115(4) (2007), 309–313.
- [4] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, Heldermann, Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics 6, Heldermann, Berlin, 1989.
- [5] C. Good and I. Tree, Continuing horrors of topology without choice, *Topology Appl.* 63 (1995) 79–90.

- [6] J. Hejduk and A. Loranty, On a strong generalized topology with respect to the outer Lebesgue measure, *Acta Math. Hungar.* 163 (1) (2021), 18–28.
- [7] J. Hejduk and A. Loranty, On functions continuous with respect to a density type strong generalized topology, *Georgian Math. J.*, accepted for publication, <https://doi.org/10.1515/gmj-2020-2081>
- [8] P. Howard and J. E. Rubin, Consequences of the axiom of choice, *Math. Surveys and Monographs* 59, A.M.S., Providence R.I., 1998.
- [9] P. Howard, K. Keremedis, H. Rubin and J. Rubin, Versions of normality and some weak forms of the axiom of choice. *Math. Logic Quart.*, 44 (1998), 367–382.
- [10] T. Jech, *The Axiom of Choice*, *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, vol. 75, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1973.
- [11] K. Keremedis and E. Wajch, Hausdorff compactifications in **ZF**, *Topology Appl.* 258 (2019), 79–99.
- [12] H. Läuchli, Auswahlaxiom in der algebra, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 37 (1963), 1–18.
- [13] M. Morillon, *Topologie, Analyse Nonstandard et Axiome du Choix*, Thesis, Université Blaise Pascal (1988).
- [14] S. Willard, *General Topology*, Addison-Wesley Series in Math., Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Massachusetts, 1970.