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ABSTRACT

The main objective of this thesis is to give an up-to-date account of several dimension functions and relations that exist between them for various spaces.

Chapter 1 contains a brief history of the development of the subject as we know it today. In Chapter 2 we give definitions of the three basic dimension functions 'ind', 'dim', and 'Ind' and a detailed survey of the known properties of these functions. Included is a proof of the famous Čech Sum Theorem for dimension 'dim'.

In Chapter 3 we investigate relations between 'ind', 'dim', and 'Ind' and mention some of the latest examples that have been given to illustrate the gaps that exist between the various dimensions. Finally, Chapter 4 contains a brief account of a relatively new dimension function "Dim".
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Chapter One

Introduction

1. The Modern Concept of dimension.

In order to present the motivation behind the modern concepts of dimension theory we can hardly do better than quote from Hurewicz and Wallman [1]:

"... to divide spaces cuts that are called surfaces are necessary; to divide surfaces, cuts that are called lines are necessary; to divide lines, cuts that are called points are necessary; we can go no further and a point can not be divided, a point not being a continuum. Then lines, which can be divided by cuts which are not continua, will be continua of one dimension; surfaces which can be divided by continuous cuts of one dimension, will be continua of two dimensions; and finally space, which can be divided by continuous cuts of two dimensions, will be a continuum of three dimensions."

These words were written by Henri Poincaré in 1912. Writing in a philosophical journal [Revue de métaphysique et de morale], Poincaré was concerned only with putting forth an intuitive concept of dimension and not an exact mathematical formulation. Poincaré had, however, penetrated very deeply in stressing the inductive nature of the geometric meaning of dimension and the possibility of disconnecting a space by subsets of lower dimension. One year later Brouwer constructed on Poincaré's foundation a precise and topologically invariant definition of dimension which is essentially as follows:

(a) the empty set $\emptyset$ has dimension $-1$.

(b) the dimension of the topological space $X$ is the least integer $n$ such that for any pair of disjoint closed subsets $C_1$ and $C_2$, there
is a closed subset $K$ separating $C_1$ and $C_2$, where the dimension of $K$ is less than $n$.

Brouwer's paper remained practically unnoticed for almost a decade. Then in 1922, independently of Brouwer, and of each other, Urysohn and Menger recreated Brouwer's concept in the following formulation:

(a) the empty set $\emptyset$ has dimension $-1$,

(b) the dimension of a space is the least integer $n$ for which every point has arbitrarily small neighbourhoods whose boundaries have dimension less than $n$.

2. Previous concepts of dimension.

Before the advent of set theory mathematicians used dimension in only the vaguest sense. A configuration was said to be $n$-dimensional if the least number of real parameters required to describe its points, in some unspecified way, was $n$. The dangers and inconsistencies in this approach were vividly brought into view by two celebrated discoveries of the last part of the nineteenth century: Cantor's one-to-one correspondence between the points of a line and the points of a plane, and Peano's continuous mapping of an interval on the whole of a square. The first exploded the feeling that a plane is richer in points than a line, and showed that dimension can be raised by a one-valued continuous transformation.

An extremely important question was left open (and not answered until 1911, by Brouwer): Is it possible to establish a correspondence between Euclidean $n$-space (the ordinary space of $n$ real variables) and Euclidean $m$-space combining the features of both Cantor's and Peano's constructions, i.e. a correspondence which is both one-to-one and continuous? The question is crucial since the existence of a transformation of the stated type
between Euclidean n-space and Euclidean m-space would signify that dimension (in the natural sense that Euclidean n space has dimension n) has no topological meaning whatsoever! The class of topological transformations would in consequence be much too wide to be of any real geometric use.

3. Topological invariance of the dimension of Euclidean Spaces.

The first proof that Euclidean n-space and Euclidean m-space are not homeomorphic unless n equals m was given by Brouwer in his famous paper: Beweis der Invarianz der Dimensionenzahl (Math. Ann. (1911) pp. 161-165). However, this proof did not explicitly reveal any simple topological property of Euclidean n-space distinguishing it from Euclidean m-space and responsible for the non-existence of a homeomorphism between the two. More penetrating, therefore, was Brouwer's procedure in 1913 when he introduced his "Dimensionsgrad" and integer-valued function of a space which was topologically invariant by its very definition. Brouwer showed that the "Dimensionsgrad" of Euclidean n-space is precisely n (thereby justifying its name).

Meanwhile Lebesgue had approached in another way the proof that the dimension of a Euclidean space is topologically invariant. He had observed [1] that a square can be covered by arbitrarily small "bricks" in such a way that no point of the square is contained in more than three of these bricks; but that if the bricks are sufficiently small, at least three have a point in common. In a similar way a cube in Euclidean n-space can be decomposed into arbitrarily small bricks so that not more than n + 1 of these bricks meet. Lebesgue conjectured that this number n + 1 could not be reduced further, i.e. for any decomposition in sufficiently small
bricks there must be a point in common to at least \( n + 1 \) of the bricks. The first proof of this theorem was given by Brouwer in the paper already cited. Lebesgue's theorem also displays a topological property of Euclidean \( n \)-space distinguishing it from Euclidean \( m \)-space and therefore it also implies the topological invariance of the dimension of Euclidean spaces.

Lebesgue's covering theorem thus motivates the following definition of dimension:

(a) the empty set has dimension \(-1\).

(b) a topological space \( X \) has dimension \( \leq n \) if given any finite open covering \( U \) of \( X \) there exists a refinement \( V \) \([V \text{ is a refinement of the open covering } U \text{ of } X \text{ if}

(i) each member \( V_\alpha \subseteq V \) is an open subset of \( X \);
(ii) each member \( V_\alpha \subseteq V \) is contained in some member \( U_i \subseteq U \);
(iii) \( \bigcup_{\alpha} V_\alpha = X \)

such that at most \( n + 1 \) sets of this refinement have a non-empty intersection.

(c) the dimension of the space \( X \) is equal to \( n \) if (b) is true and it is false that the dimension is less than \( n \).

The formulation of Brouwer given above has the following equivalent form, introduced by Edward Čech [1]:

(a) the empty set \( \emptyset \) has dimension \(-1\);

(b) the dimension of the topological space \( X \) is the least integer \( n \) such that for any pair of a closed set \( F \) and an open set \( G \) such that \( F \subset G \subset X \) there exists an open set \( V \) with \( F \subset V \subset G \) where the dimension of the boundary \( \partial V = \overline{V} \setminus V \) of \( V \) is less than \( n \).
The definition of Urysohn-Menger, Brouwer-Cech, and Lebesgue are respectively termed the 'weak inductive dimension', 'the strong inductive dimension', and the 'covering dimension' and are denoted by 'ind', 'Ind', and 'dim' respectively.

Katetov [1], Morita [1], and Dowker and Hurewicz [2] have all published different proofs that for any metric space \( X \)
\[ \text{Ind} \ X = \text{dim} \ X. \]

The notion of weak inductive dimension (or Urysohn-Menger dimension) is no longer so important as the other two notions, because P. Roy [1] has recently constructed a complete metric space \( \Delta \) such that \( \text{ind} \ \Delta = 0 \) but \( \text{Ind} \ \Delta = \text{dim} \ \Delta = 1 \). However the weak inductive dimension still has its uses, and we consider it in some detail. The remainder of Chapter 1 involves a detailed treatment of the dimension functions of Brouwer-Cech and Lebesgue.

In Chapter 3 we examine relations that exist between the functions 'ind', 'dim', and 'Ind' for various classes of spaces. We mention several of the latest examples illustrating the gaps that exist between these functions, including Nagami's example of a normal space \( Z \) with \( \text{ind} \ Z = 0 \), \( \text{dim} \ Z = 1 \), \( \text{Ind} \ Z = 2 \).

Chapter 4 contains a brief account of the relatively new dimension function 'Dim'. Attempts were made without success to extend certain of the theorems given for perfectly normal spaces to more general spaces called totally normal. It appears that great difficulties are encountered in trying to extend the theory to more general spaces.
CHAPTER TWO

In this chapter the main results concerning the weak inductive dimension 'ind', the covering dimension 'dim', and the strong inductive dimension 'Ind' are presented together with relations between them for a given class of topological spaces. The discussion in sections (i) and (ii) on the weak inductive dimension 'ind' is similar to that given by Hurewicz and Wallman [1], and unless otherwise stated in these sections, all spaces referred to are separable metric.

(i) Weak inductive dimension 0

Definition 2.1. A space is connected if it is not the union of two non-empty disjoint open sets. Equivalently a space is connected if, except for the empty set and the whole space, there are no sets whose boundaries are empty.

In this section we are concerned with spaces which are disconnected in an exceedingly strong sense, i.e. have so many open sets whose boundaries are empty that every point may be enclosed in arbitrarily small set of this type.

Definition 2.2. A space $X$ has weak inductive dimension 0 at a point $p \in X$, $\text{ind}_p X = 0$, if $p$ has arbitrarily small (open) neighbourhoods with empty boundaries, i.e. if for any neighbourhood $U$ of $p$ there exists a neighbourhood $V$ of $p$ such that

$$p \in V \subseteq U, \quad b(V) = \emptyset.$$  

A non-empty space $X$ has weak inductive dimension 0, $\text{ind} X = 0$ if $\text{ind}_p X = 0$ for each $p \in X$. 


Clearly the property of being 0-dimensional at a point \( p \) is a topological invariant. Also, for any topological space \( X \), saying that \( \text{ind} \ X = 0 \) is equivalent to saying that \( X \neq \phi \) and that there is a basis for the open sets of \( X \) which consists of sets which are both open and closed.

**EXAMPLES**

**Example 2.1.** If \( X \) is any non-empty finite or countable metrizable space, then \( \text{ind} \ X = 0 \).

Provide \( X \) with the metric \( \rho \). For any given neighbourhood \( U \) of any point \( p \) let \( r \) be a positive real number such that the spherical neighbourhood of radius \( r \) about \( p \) is contained in \( U \). Let \( x_1, x_2, \ldots \) be an enumeration of the points of \( X \); then \( \rho(x_i, p) \) is the distance from \( x_i \) to \( p \). There exists a positive real number \( r' < r \) and different from all the \( \rho(x_i, p) \). The spherical neighbourhood of radius \( r' \) about \( p \) is contained in \( U \) and its boundary is empty. Hence \( \text{ind} \ X = 0 \).

In particular the space \( R \) of rational numbers has \( \text{ind} \ R = 0 \).

**Example 2.2.** If \( I \) is the space of irrational numbers, \( \text{ind} \ I = 0 \).

For any given neighbourhood \( U \) of an irrational point \( p \) there exist rational numbers \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \) such that \( \rho < p < \sigma \) and the set \( V \) of irrational numbers between \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \) is contained in \( U \). In the space of irrational numbers \( V \) is open and has an empty boundary because every irrational point which is an accumulation point of \( V \) is between \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \) and hence belongs to \( V \).
Example 2.3. The Cantor discontinuum $C$, the subspace of all real numbers expressible in the form

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{3^n},$$

where $a_n = 0$ or $2$ has $\text{ind } C = 0$.

Example 2.4. If $A$ is any subspace of the space of real numbers which contains no interval, then $\text{ind } A = 0$. (Example 2.3 above is a specific case of this.)

Example 2.5. If $I_2$ is the subspace of points in the plane both of whose coordinates are irrational, then $\text{ind } I_2 = 0$. Clearly any such point is contained in arbitrarily small rectangles bounded by lines having rational intercepts with the coordinate axes and intersecting them at right angles, and the boundaries of such rectangles contain no points of $I_2$.

Example 2.6. $\text{ind } R^1_2 = 0$, where $R^1_2$ is the subspace consisting of points of the plane exactly one of whose coordinates is rational. Clearly any such point is contained in arbitrarily small rectangles bounded by lines having rational intercepts with the coordinate axes and intersecting them at $45^\circ$, and the boundaries of such rectangles do not intersect $R^1_2$.

Example 2.7. The set $R_n$ of points of Euclidean n-space all of whose coordinates are rational and metrized by the usual Euclidean metric has $\text{ind } R_n = 0$ ($R_n$ is countable.)

Example 2.8. If $I_n$ is the subspace of points of $E_n$ all of whose coordinates are irrational, $\text{ind } I_n = 0$. (A simple generalization of Ex. 2.5)
Remark. Suppose $0 < m < n$. Denote by $R^m_n$ the subspace of $E^n$ exactly $m$ of whose coordinates are rational. Then $\text{ind } R^m_n = 0$. Examples 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8 above are specific cases of this, but the proof of this more general result depends on the "Sum Theorem for ind = 0" (Theorem 2.3).

Example 2.9. $\text{ind } R'_\omega = 0$, where $R'_\omega$ is the subspace of points of the Hilbert cube $I^\omega$ all of whose coordinates are rational. (For the proof see Hurewicz and Wallman).

Example 2.10. $\text{ind } I'_\omega = 0$, where $I'_\omega$ is the subspace of points of the Hilbert cube $I^\omega$ all of whose coordinates are irrational.

Example 2.11. $\text{ind } R^1_\omega = 1$, where $R^1_\omega$ is the subspace of points of Hilbert space $E^\omega$ all of whose coordinates are rational. (For the proof see Hurewicz and Wallman [1] or P. Erdos [1].)

Theorem 2.1. A non empty subset $X'$ of a 0-dimensional space is 0-dimensional.

Proof: Let $p \in X'$ and $U'$ any neighbourhood of $p$ open in $X'$. Then there exists a neighbourhood $U$ in $X$ of $p$ such that

$$U' = U \cap X'.$$

Since $\text{ind } X = 0$, there exists $V$ open and closed in $X$ such that

$$p \in V \subseteq U.$$

Let $V' = V \cap X'$.

Then $V'$ is both open and closed in $X'$

and

$$p \in V' \subseteq U'.$$

so that

$$\text{ind } X' = 0.$$
Definition 2.3. If $A_1$, $A_2$, and $B$ are mutually disjoint subsets of a space $X$, we say that $A_1$ and $A_2$ are separated in $X$ by $B$ if $X \setminus B$ can be split into two disjoint sets, open in $X \setminus B$ and containing $A_1$ and $A_2$ respectively, i.e. if there exists $A_1'$ and $A_2'$ for which

$$X \setminus B = A_1' \cup A_2'$$

$$A_1 \subseteq A_1', \quad A_2 \subseteq A_2'$$

$$A_1' \cap A_2' = \emptyset$$

with $A_1'$ and $A_2'$ both open in $X \setminus B$ (or what is the same, both closed in $X \setminus B$).

If $A_1$ and $A_2$ are separated by the empty set we say they are separated in $X$.

$A_1$ and $A_2$ are separated if and only if there exists a set $A_1'$ such that

$$A_1 \subseteq A_1'$$

and

$$A_1' \cap A_2 = \emptyset$$

where $A_1'$ is both open and closed, i.e. $b(A_1') = \emptyset$.

Then $A_2' = X \setminus A_1'$.

Definition 2.2'. Let $X$ be a non-empty space. Then $\text{ind } X = 0$ if every point $p \in X$ and every closed subset $C$ of $X$ with $p \notin C$ can be separated.

It is trivial to show that Definition 2.2. and Definition 2.2' are equivalent.
Remarks

1) A connected space $X$ with $\text{ind } X = 0$ consists of only one point.
2) If $\text{ind } X = 0$ then $X$ is totally disconnected.
3) It is obvious from Definition 2.2' that if $X$ is a $T_1$-space and any two disjoint closed subsets can be separated then $\text{ind } X = 0$. We now prove conversely that if $X$ has a countable base and $\text{ind } X = 0$, then any two disjoint closed subsets can be separated.

Theorem 2.2. Let $X$ be a topological space with a countable basis and $\text{ind } X = 0$. Then any two disjoint closed subsets of $X$ can be separated.

Proof. Since $\text{ind } X = 0$, by Definition 2.2' any point $p \in X$ can be separated from any closed set not containing $p$. Let $C$ and $K$ be two disjoint closed subsets of $X$. We have to demonstrate a separation of $C$ and $K$ in $X$.

For each $p \in X$ either $p \notin C$ or $p \notin K$. Hence there exist neighbourhoods $U(p)$ for each point $p$ which are both open and closed and such that either $U(p) \cap C = \emptyset$ or $U(p) \cap K = \emptyset$. Since $X$ has a countable basis there exists a sequence $U_1, U_2, \ldots$ of these $U(p)$ whose union is $X$ (Lindelöf's theorem - see Kelley[1], p. 49). We now define a new sequence of sets $V_i$ as follows:

$$V_1 = U_1$$
$$V_i = U_i \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{i-1} U_k = U_i \cap (X \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{i-1} U_k)$$

Then we have

(1) $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} V_i$

(2) $V_i \cap V_j = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$. 
(3) $V_i$ is open

(4) either $V_i \cap C = \emptyset$ or $V_i \cap K = \emptyset$.

(1), (2), and (4) are obvious. To prove (3) we note that
\[
\bigcup_{k=1}^{i-1} U_k \text{ is closed, so that }
\]
\[
X \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{i-1} U_k \text{ is open;}
\]
hence $V_i = U_i \cap (X \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{i-1} U_k)$ is open.

Let $C' = \bigcup V_i$ such that $V_i \cap K = \emptyset$.

$K' = \text{union of remaining } V_i$.

Then $X = C' \cup K'$ by (1)

$C' \cap K' = \emptyset$ by (2)

$C'$ and $K'$ are open by (3)

and $(C' \cap K) \cup (C \cap K') = \emptyset$ by (4).

It follows that $C \subseteq C'$ and $K \subseteq K'$.

The desired separation is thus given by $C'$ and $K'$.

The sum or union of zero-dimensional sets need not be zero-dimensional as we see from the decomposition of the real line into the rational numbers and irrational numbers or into its distinct points. We have the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.3.** (Sum Theorem for zero-dimensional sets).

A separable metric space $X$ which is the countable union of zero-dimensional closed subsets is itself zero-dimensional,

i.e. if $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i$

where each $X_i$ is a closed subspace and $\text{ind } X_i = 0$, then $\text{ind } X = 0$. 
Proof: Let \( K \) and \( L \) be two disjoint closed subsets of \( X \). We show that \( K \) and \( L \) can be separated.

Clearly \( K \cap X_1 \) and \( L \cap X_1 \) are disjoint closed subsets of the space \( X_1 \), where \( \text{ind } X_1 = 0 \). Hence by Theorem 2.3, there exist subsets \( A_1 \) and \( B_1 \) of \( X_1 \), closed in \( X_1 \) and therefore in \( X \), such that

\[
K \cap X_1 \subseteq A_1 \quad \text{and} \quad L \cap X_1 \subseteq B_1
\]

\[
A_1 \cup B_1 = X_1 \quad \text{and} \quad A_1 \cap B_1 = \emptyset.
\]

The sets \( K \cup A_1 \) and \( L \cup B_1 \) are closed and disjoint in \( X \). By the normality of \( X \) there exist open sets \( G_1 \) and \( H_1 \) for which

\[
K \cup A_1 \subseteq G_1 \quad \text{and} \quad L \cup B_1 \subseteq H_1
\]

\[
\overline{G_1} \cap \overline{H_1} = \emptyset.
\]

Therefore

\[
G_1 \cup H_1 \supseteq X_1
\]

\[
K \subseteq G_1 \quad \text{and} \quad L \subseteq H_1
\]

\[
\overline{G_1} \cap \overline{H_1} = \emptyset.
\]

Now repeat this process replacing \( K \) and \( L \) by \( \overline{G_1} \) and \( \overline{H_1} \) and \( X_1 \) by \( X_2 \). This yields open sets \( G_2 \) and \( H_2 \) for which

\[
G_2 \cup H_2 \supseteq X_2
\]

\[
\overline{G_2} \subseteq G_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{H_2} \subseteq H_2
\]

\[
\overline{G_2} \cap \overline{H_2} = \emptyset.
\]

By induction we construct sequences \( \{G_i\} \) and \( \{H_i\} \) of sets open in \( X \) for which

\[
G_i \cup H_i \supseteq X_i
\]

\[
\overline{G_i} \subseteq G_i \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{H_i} \subseteq H_i
\]

\[
\overline{G_i} \cap \overline{H_i} = \emptyset.
\]
Let \( G = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} G_i \) and \( H = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_i \).

Then \( G \) and \( H \) are disjoint open sets,

\[
G \cup H \supseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i = X
\]

and \( K \subseteq G, \ L \subseteq H \);

this is the desired separation.

**Definition 2.4.** By an \( F_\sigma \) set in a space \( X \) we mean any countable union of closed subsets of \( X \). It can be shown that in a metric space any open set is \( F_\sigma \).

**Corollary 1 to Theorem 2.3.** A separable metric space which is the countable union of 0-dimensional \( F_\sigma \) sets is 0-dimensional.

**Corollary 2.** The union of two 0-dimensional subsets of a separable metric space \( X \), at least one of which is closed, is 0-dimensional.

**Proof.** Suppose \( \text{ind } A = \text{ind } B = 0 \) and \( B \) is closed.

Then \( A \cup B \backslash B \) is open in \( A \cup B \). As an open set in a metric space it is \( F_\sigma \) in \( A \cup B \). The result then follows from Corollary 1 and

\[
A \cup B = [A \cup B \backslash B] \cup B.
\]

**Corollary 3.** A 0-dimensional space remains 0-dimensional after the adjunction of a single point (assuming that the enlarged space is separable metric).

**Example 2.12.** Suppose \( 0 < m < n \). Denote by \( \mathbb{R}_n^m \) the subspace of points in Euclidean \( n \)-space \( E_n^m \) exactly \( m \) of whose coordinates are rational.

Then \( \text{ind } \mathbb{R}_n^m = 0 \).
For each selection of \( m \) induces \( i_1, \ldots, i_m \) out of the range 1, 2, \ldots, \( n \), and each selection of \( m \) rational numbers \( r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_m \) we have an \((n - m)\) - dimensional linear subspace \( E_{n-m}^{(i)} \) of \( E_n \) determined by the equations

\[
x_{i_1} = r_1, \quad x_{i_2} = r_2, \ldots, x_{i_m} = r_m
\]

The subspace of this space made up of points none of whose remaining coordinates is rational we denote by \( C_i \). Each \( C_i \) is congruent to \( I_{n-m} \) and is therefore 0-dimensional (Example 2.8). It is clear that each \( C_i \) is closed in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) since

\[
C_i = \mathbb{R}_n^m \cap E_{n-m}^{(i)} \quad \text{and each } E_{n-m}^{(i)} \text{ is closed in } E_n.
\]

The union of the \( C_i \) just fills out \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Since the collection of the \( C_i \) is countable the sum theorem implies that \( \text{ind } \mathbb{R}^n = 0 \).

**Example 2.13.** Suppose \( 0 < m \). Denote by \( R^m_\omega \) the set of points in the Hilbert cube exactly \( m \) of whose coordinates are rational. Then \( \text{ind } R^m_\omega = 0 \).

Let \( i = \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_m\} \) be a selection of \( m \) different integers chosen from the set \( \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, n, \ldots\} \). Such a selection can be made in

\[
\underbrace{\chi_0 \cdot \chi_0 \cdots \chi_0}_{\text{m factors}} = \chi_0 \quad \text{ways (1)}
\]

Again for a given \( i_k \) of this selection the number of different rationals \( r_{i_k} \) such that

\[
\frac{1}{i_k} < r_{i_k} < \frac{1}{i_k}
\]

is \( \chi_0 \). Thus for a given selection \( i \) we have
sets of rationals.

By (1) and (2) the number of different subsets \( C_i \) of \( R^m \) is \( x_0 \cdot x_0 \cdots x_0 = x_0 \). Thus the set of \( C_i \) is countable and just fills out \( R^m \). Moreover each \( C_i \) is congruent to a subspace \( X' \) of \( I'_\omega \) in which exactly \( m \) of the rational coordinates are fixed. Hence \( \text{ind} \ C_i = \text{ind} \ X' = 0 \) (because \( \phi \downarrow X' \subset I'_\omega \) and \( \text{ind} \ I'_\omega = 0 \) implies \( \text{ind} \ X' < 0 \) while \( X' \downarrow \phi \) implies \( \text{ind} \ X' \geq 0 \)).

We now prove that each \( C_i \) is closed in \( R^m \).

Let \( y \in C_i \), where

\[
y_{i_1} = r_1, \quad y_{i_2} = r_2, \ldots, y_{i_m} = r_m
\]

(the \( r \)'s being rational, the rest of the coordinates of \( y \) being irrational) define a \( C_i \) in the space of the Hilbert cube and let

\[
x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{i_1}, \ldots) \text{ be a point of } I'_\omega.
\]

Then if \( y \notin C_i \) we have

\[
\rho(x, y)^2 = (x_{i_1} - r_1)^2 + (x_{i_2} - r_2)^2 + \ldots + (x_{i_m} - r_m)^2 + \sum_{k \neq i} (x_k - y_k)^2
\]

where \( \sum_{k \neq i} \) denotes that \( k \) takes all values \( 1, 2, 3, \ldots \) except \( i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_m \).

We can always make \( \sum_{k \neq i} \) zero by choosing \( x_k = y_k \).

Choosing \( \varepsilon = \sqrt{(x_{i_1} - r_1)^2 + \ldots + (x_{i_m} - r_m)^2} \) we see that \( x \notin I'_\omega \) does not belong to \( \overline{C_i} \) unless \( x_{i_1} = r_1 \), i.e. \( x \notin C_i \) implies \( x \notin \overline{C_i} \).

\[
\therefore \ C_i \text{ is closed.}
\]
Consider the following four properties of a space $X$:

(0) $X$ is totally disconnected.

(1) Any two distinct points of $X$ can be separated.

(2) Any point can be separated from any closed set $C$ to which it does not belong, i.e. $\text{ind } X = 0$ (Definition 2.2').

(3) Any two disjoint closed sets can be separated.

For $T_q$-spaces (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2), (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1), (1) $\Rightarrow$ 0. Conversely, for separable metric spaces (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3); for spaces without countable basis (2) does not imply (3) as the 'Tychonov Plank' shows. (See Appendix). Properties (0), (1), and (2) however are not equivalent, even for separable metric spaces.

Example 2.14. Sierpinski [1] gives an example of a subset of the plane satisfying (0) but not (1).

Example 2.15. By example 2.11, $\text{ind } R_w = 1$, so that $R_w$ does not satisfy (2). On the other hand it does satisfy (1). For, let $p$ and $q$ be two points of $R_w$ and let $i$ be an index such that the $i$th coordinate $p_i$ of $p$ differs from the $i$th coordinate $q_i$ of $q$; $p_i$ and $q_i$ are, of course, rational. Let $\rho$ be any irrational number between $p_i$ and $q_i$. The decomposition of $R_w$ into the closed and disjoint subsets determined by $x_i \leq \rho$, $x_i \geq \rho$ gives the desired separation of $p$ and $q$.

For compact spaces the conditions (0) - (3) are equivalent (see Hurewicz and Wallman [1].)

Remark. It is not true, as is seen in the following two examples, that if a space has properties (0) or (1) it will retain that property upon the adjunction of a single point; compare with Corollary 3 to Theorem 2.3.
Hence the Sum Theorem would not be true for a theory of dimension in which dimension 0 were either defined by total-disconnectedness or the separation of pairs of points.

Example 2.16. Knaster and Kuratowski [1] give an example of a subset of the plane which is totally disconnected but becomes connected upon the adjunction of a single point.

Example 2.17. J.H. Roberts [1] gives another example of this phenomenon.

Example 2.18. Sierpinski [1] gives an example of a space which has property (1) but loses it upon the adjunction of a single point.

Denoting the spaces investigated by Erdos, Sierpinski, Knaster and Kuratowski, and Roberts by E, K, S, and R. T.H. Walton [1] has given the following summary of the relationships of these various spaces to one another:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>K \ {a}</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S \ {p}</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R \ {q}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A detailed analysis of these spaces shows that

\[\text{ind } E = \text{ind } K = \text{ind } (K \setminus \{a\}) = \text{ind } S = \text{ind } (S \cup \{p\}) = \text{ind } R = \text{ind } (R \cup \{q\}) = 1.\]

Thus \(E, K \setminus \{a\}, S, R\) all have weak inductive dimension equal to unity although they are totally disconnected.

Moreover, Mazurkiewicz [1] has shown that for each finite \(n\) there exists a space \(X\) for which \(\text{ind } X = n\) and \(X\) is totally disconnected.

Thus the fact that a space has positive weak inductive dimension implies very little about its connectedness.

Finally Mazurkiewicz [1] proves the existence of a plane connected set containing no bounded connected subset.

(ii) Weak Inductive Dimension \(n\).

Roughly speaking, we may say that a space has dimension \(\leq n\) if an arbitrarily small piece of the space surrounding each point may be delimited by subsets of dimension \(\leq n - 1\). This method of definition is inductive, and an elegant starting point for the induction is provided by prescribing the empty set \(\emptyset\) as the \((-1)\)-dimensional space.

**Definition 2.4.** (a) \(\text{ind } X = -1\) if and only if \(X = \emptyset\).

(b) A space \(X\) has weak inductive dimension \(\leq n\) \((n \geq 0)\) at a point \(p\) if \(p\) has arbitrarily small (open) neighbourhoods whose boundaries have weak inductive dimension \(\leq n - 1\), denoted by \(\text{ind}_p X \leq n\).

(c) \(X\) has weak inductive dimension \(\leq n\), \(\text{ind } X \leq n\) if \(\text{ind}_p X \leq n\) for each \(p \in X\).
(d) \( \text{ind}_p X = n \) if it is true that \( \text{ind}_p X < n \) and it is false that \( \text{ind}_p X < n - 1 \).

(e) \( \text{ind}_p X = n \) if it is true that \( \text{ind}_p X < n \) and it is false that \( \text{ind}_p X < n - 1 \).

(f) \( \text{ind}_p X = \infty \) if \( \text{ind}_p X \leq n \) is false for each \( n \).

It is obvious that the property of having weak inductive dimension \( n \) (or having dimension \( n \) at a point \( p \)) is topologically invariant. Dimension is not, however, an invariant of continuous transformations. Projection of a plane into a line is an illustration of a transformation which lowers dimension and Peano's mapping of an interval onto the whole of a square is an illustration of a continuous transformation which raises dimension.

Equivalent to the condition that \( \text{ind}_p X < n \) is the existence of a basis for the topology of \( X \) made up of open sets whose boundaries have dimension \( \leq n - 1 \).

It is clear that definitions 2.2 and 2.4 are equivalent for \( n = 0 \).

**Proposition 2.1.** If \( \text{ind}_p X = n \), then \( X \) contains an \( m \)-dimensional subset for every \( m \leq n \).

**Proof.** Since \( \text{ind}_p X > n - 1 \) there exists a point \( p_0 \in X \) and an open neighbourhood \( U_0 \) of \( p_0 \) with the property that if \( V \) is any open set satisfying

\[
p_0 \in V \subseteq U_0 \quad \text{then} \quad \text{ind}_p b(V) \geq n - 1.
\]

On the other hand, because \( \text{ind}_p X \leq n \), there exists an open set \( V_0 \) satisfying \( p_0 \in V_0 \subseteq U_0 \) for which
Hence \( b(V_o) \) is a subset of \( X \) of the precise dimension \( n - 1 \).

The rest of proposition 2.1 is now evident.

Remark. The statement of the above proposition cannot be extended to infinite dimensional spaces. Indeed, under the hypothesis of the continuum there even exist infinite dimensional spaces whose only finite dimensional subspaces are countable sets. See Hurewicz [1].

Example 2.19. \( \text{ind} E_1 = 1 \) and the dimension of any interval of the Euclidean line \( E_1 \) is 1.

Example 2.20. Any polygon has dimension 1.

Example 2.21. Any 2-manifold has dimension \( \leq 2 \).

Example 2.22. \( \text{ind} E_n \leq n \) (proof by induction).

The proof that the dimension of \( E_n \) is precisely \( n \) is given by Hurewicz and Wallman [1].

Theorem 2.4. A subspace of any topological space of dimension \( \leq n \) has dimension \( \leq n \).

Proof. Obvious for \( n = -1 \). Assume true for \( n - 1 \).

Let \( \text{ind} \ X \leq n \) and \( X' \) be a subspace of \( X \), \( p \) a point of \( X' \). Let \( U' \) be any open neighbourhood of \( p \) in \( X' \). Then

\[ U' = U \cap X' \text{, where } U \text{ is open in } X. \]

Since \( \text{ind} X \leq n \) there exists \( V \) open in \( X \) such that

\[ p \in V \subseteq U \]

\[ \text{ind} b(V) \leq n - 1. \]
Let \( V' = V \cap X' \). Then \( V' \) is open in \( X' \) and
\[ p \in V' \subseteq U' \]

Let \( b_x(V) = \text{boundary of } V \text{ in } X \)
and \( b_{x'}(V') = \text{boundary of } V' \text{ in } X' \).

Then
\[
b_{x'}(V') = \overline{V'} \setminus V' \quad \text{(where } \overline{V'} \text{ is the closure of } V' \text{ in } X')
\]
\[= (\overline{V'} \cap X') \setminus V' \quad (\overline{V'} \text{ is the closure of } V' \text{ in } X)
\]
\[= \overline{V} \cap X' \setminus V \cap X'
\]
\[\subseteq \overline{V} \cap X' \setminus V \cap X'
\]
\[= (\overline{V} \setminus V) \cap X'
\]
\[= b_x(V) \cap X'
\]

i.e. \( b_{x'}(V') \subseteq b_x(V) \cap X' \)

\[. . . b_{x'}(V') \subseteq b_x(V)\]

We are given that \( \text{ind } b_x(V) \leq n - 1 \).

By the hypothesis of the theorem, \( \text{ind } b_{x'}(V) \leq n - 1 \),
and the theorem is proved.

i.e. \( \text{ind } X' \leq n \).

Definition 2.4'. \( \text{ind } X \leq n \) if every point \( p \) can be separated by a
closed set of dimension \( \leq n - 1 \) from any closed set not containing \( p \).

Definitions 2.4 and 2.4' are equivalent.
(see Hurewicz and Wallman [1].)

Definition 2.5. A space \( X \) is hereditarily normal if every subspace of
\( X \) is normal.
Lemma. A space $X$ is hereditarily normal if and only if given any pair of disjoint subsets $X_1$ and $X_2$ satisfying

$X_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset = \overline{X_1} \cap X_2$

there exist open sets $W_1$ and $W_2$ such that

$X_1 \subseteq W_1$, $X_2 \subseteq W_2$ and $W_1 \cap W_2 = \emptyset$.

Moreover it is clear that $\overline{W_1} \cap W_2 = \emptyset = W_1 \cap \overline{W_2}$.

Proof. See Walton [1].

Theorem 2.5. A subspace $X'$ of an hereditarily normal space $X$ has dimension $\leq n$ if and only if every point of $X'$ has arbitrarily small neighbourhoods open in $X$ whose boundaries have intersections with $X'$ of dimension $\leq n - 1$.

Proof. (Sufficiency). Let $p \in X'$ and $U'(p) = U'$ be open in $X'$.
Then there exists $U(p) = U$ open in $X$ such that $U' = U \cap X'$. Hence there exists, by hypothesis, $V$ open in $X$ such that

$p \in V \subseteq U$

and $\text{ind } (X' \cap b(V)) \leq n - 1$.

Let $V' = V \cap X'$. Then $V'$ is open in $X'$, $p \in V' \subseteq U'$ and $b_{X'}(V') \subseteq b_X(V) \cap X'$. Hence $\text{ind } b_{X'}(V') \leq n - 1$, so that $\text{ind } X' \leq n$.

(Necessity). Suppose $\text{ind } X' \leq n$. Let $p \in X'$ and $U(p) = U$ open in $X$.

Then $U' = U \cap X'$ is a neighbourhood of $p$ open in $X'$.

Hence there exists $V'$ open in $X'$ such that

$p \in V' \subseteq U'$ and

$\text{ind } b_{X'}(V') \leq n - 1$. 
Neither of the disjoint sets \( V' \) and \( X' \setminus V' \) contains an accumulation point of the other, so by the hereditary normality of \( X \) there exists an open set \( W \) satisfying \( V' \subseteq W \) and \( W \cap (X' \setminus V') = \emptyset \).

Replacing \( W \) if necessary by \( W \cap U \) we may assume that \( W \subseteq U \).

The set \( \overline{W} \setminus W = b(W) \) contains no point of \( X' \setminus V' \) and no point of \( V' \). It follows that
\[
b(W) \cap X' \subseteq b_x(V').
\]

Hence by theorem 2.4,
\[
\text{ind} (b(W) \cap X') \leq n - 1 \text{ as required.}
\]

**Theorem 2.6.** For any two subspaces \( A \) and \( B \) of an hereditary normal space \( X \)
\[
\text{ind}(A \cup B) \leq \text{ind} A + \text{ind} B + 1.
\]

**Proof.** The theorem is true for
\[
\text{ind} A = \text{ind} B = -1.
\]

Suppose \( \text{ind} A = m, \text{ind} B = n \), and assume true for the cases

(i) \( \text{ind} A \leq m, \text{ind} B \leq n - 1 \)

(ii) \( \text{ind} A \leq m - 1, \text{ind} B \leq n \)

Let \( p \in A \cup B \). As a matter of notation take \( p \in A \).

Let \( U \) be a neighbourhood of \( p \) open in \( X \).

By Theorem 2.5 there exists an open set \( V \) such that
\[
p \in V \subseteq U \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ind} (b(V) \cap A) \leq m - 1.
\]

But \( b(V) \cap B \subseteq B \)
\[
\therefore \quad \text{ind} (b(V) \cap B) \leq n
\]
Hence by hypotheses (i) and (ii) of the induction
\[ \text{ind}[b(V) \cap (A \cup B)] \leq m + n. \]

Hence by Theorem 5
\[ \text{ind}(A \cup B) \leq m + n + 1, \] as required

**Corollary.** Let \( X = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} X_i \) where \( \text{ind} X_i < 0, \ i = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \)

Then \( \text{ind} X \leq n. \)

**Example 2.23.** Suppose \( 0 \leq m \leq n. \) Denote by \( M^m_n \) the set of points of \( E_n \) at most \( m \) of whose coordinates are rational and by \( L^m_n \) the set of points of \( E_n \) at least \( m \) of whose coordinates are rational.

Then \( \text{ind} M^m_n \leq m \), and
\[ \text{ind} L^m_n < n - m. \]

Evidently \( M^m_n = R^0_n \cup R^1_n \cup \ldots \cup R^m_n \)
and \( L^m_n = R^m_n \cup R^{m+1}_n \cup \ldots \cup R^n_n. \)

The assertion then follows from the Corollary to Theorem 2.6 and the fact that each summand is 0-dimensional. (Example 2.12).

**Example 2.24.** Suppose \( 0 < m. \) Denote by \( M^m_\omega \) the set of points in the Hilbert cube \( I_\omega \) at most \( m \) of whose coordinates are rational.

Then
\[ \text{ind} M^m_\omega \leq m. \]

For \( M^m_\omega = R^0_\omega \cup R^1_\omega \cup \ldots \cup R^m_\omega. \)

The assertion then follows from the Corollary to Theorem 2.6 and the fact that each summand is 0-dimensional. (Example 13).
The Sum and Decomposition Theorems for n-dimensional Sets.

**Theorem 2.7.** (Sum Theorem for Dimension n).

A separable metric space which is the countable union of closed subsets of dimension ≤ n has dimension ≤ n, i.e.

\[ X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i \]

where each \( X_i \) is a closed subset of \( X \) and \( \text{ind} X_i \leq n \), then

\[ \text{ind} X \leq n. \]

**Proof.** (by induction). Denote the sum theorem for dimension \( n \) by \( \sum_n \).

Clearly \( \sum_n \) is equivalent to the statement that for any space which is the countable union of \( F \) sets of dimension ≤ n has dimension ≤ n.

\( \sum_{n-1} \) is trivial. We now deduce \( \sum_n \) from \( \sum_{n-1} \) by making use of \( \sum_0 \), which is Theorem 2.3.

We first prove that \( \sum_{n-1} \) implies the following proposition \( \Delta_n \):

Any space of dimension ≤ n is the union of a subspace of dimension ≤ n - 1 and a subspace of dimension ≤ 0.

**Proof of \( \Delta_n \):** Let \( X \) be a separable metric space of dimension ≤ n. Then by a condition equivalent to \( \text{ind} X \leq n \) there exists a basis for the open sets of \( X \) made up of sets whose boundaries have dimension ≤ n - 1. Since \( X \) is separable metric there exists a countable basis \( \{U_i\} \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots \) made up of sets whose boundaries \( \{B_i\} \) have dimension ≤ n - 1. From \( \sum_{n-1} \) it follows that

\[ B = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i \]

has dimension ≤ n - 1,

i.e. \( \text{ind} B \leq n - 1 \).

We assert that (1) \( \text{ind} (X \setminus B) \leq 0 \).
For obviously the boundaries of the sets $U_i$ do not meet $X \setminus B$ and hence the condition of Theorem 2.5 (with $n = 0$ and $X'$ replaced by $X \setminus B$) is satisfied.

Then follows from the equation

$$X = B \cup (X \setminus B).$$

We now combine $\sum_{n-1}$ and $\sum_n$ to prove $\sum_n$.

Suppose $X = X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \ldots \cup X_i \cup \ldots = \bigcup_{1}^{\infty} X_i$

$$\text{ind } X_i < n \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$$

and each $X_i$ is closed.

We wish to prove that $\text{ind } X < n$.

Let $K_1 = X_1$

$$K_i = X_i \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} X_j = X_i \cap (X \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} X_j) \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$$

Then (2) $X = \bigcup_{1}^{\infty} K_i$.

(3) $K_i \cap K_j = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$.

(4) $K_i$ is an $F_\sigma$ in $X$.

(5) $\text{ind } K_i < n$

(2) and (3) are obvious. To prove (4) note that

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} X_j$$

is closed.

Hence $X \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} X_j$ is open, and any open set in a metric space is $F_\sigma$.

$K_i$, as the intersection of this $F_\sigma$ with the closed set $X_i$ is thus also $F_\sigma$. 
(5) holds because \( K_i \) is a subset of \( X_i \) (Theorem 2.4).

(5) enables us to apply \( \Delta_n \) to each \( K_i \); we have

\[
K_i = M_i \cup N_i
\]

where \( \text{ind } M_i \leq n - 1 \) and \( N_i \leq 0 \).

Denote \( \bigcup M_i \) by \( M \) and \( \bigcup N_i \) by \( N \).

From (2) \( X = M \cup N \).

Each \( M_i \) is an \( F_\sigma \) set in \( M \), since

\[
M_i = M_i \cap K_i = (M_1 \cup M_2 \cup \ldots \cup M_i \cup \ldots) \cap K_i = M \cap K_i
\]

(since \( M_i \subseteq K_i \) and \( K_i \cap K_j = \emptyset \) for \( i \neq j \) by (3)).

Hence \( M_i \), as the intersection of \( M \) with \( K_i \), which is an \( F_\sigma \) set by (4), is itself \( F_\sigma \) in \( M \). Therefore we may apply \( \sum_{n-1} \) to conclude that

\[
\text{ind } M \leq n - 1.
\]

By a similar argument each \( N_i \) is an \( F_\sigma \) set in \( N \) and therefore

\[
\text{ind } N \leq 0 \quad \text{by } \sum_0.
\]

Thus we have

\[
X = M \cup N \quad \text{with}
\]

\[
\text{ind } M \leq n - 1 \quad \text{and } \quad \text{ind } N \leq 0.
\]

From Theorem 2.6 we conclude that \( \text{ind } X \leq n \).

**Corollary 1.** The union of two subspaces each of which has dimension \( \leq n \) and one of which is closed has dimension \( \leq n \).
Proof. As in Corollary 2 to Theorem 2.3.

Corollary 2. The dimension of a non-empty space cannot be increased by the adjunction of a single point.

Proof. Obvious from Corollary 1.

Corollary 3. If a space $X'$ of dimension $\leq n$ is contained in an arbitrary space $X$, then every point of the containing space has arbitrarily small neighbourhoods (in $X$) whose boundaries have intersections with $X'$ of dimension $\leq n - 1$. (Compare with Theorem 5 and observe that Theorem 5 imposes a condition on the neighbourhoods of points of $X'$ only.)

Proof. For each point $p \in X, X' \cup \{p\}$ has dimension $\leq n$ by Corollary 2; the proof then follows from Theorem 5.

Corollary 4. If a space has dimension $\leq n$ it is the union of a subspace of dimension $\leq n - 1$ and a subspace of dimension $\leq 0$.

Proof. This is $\Delta_n$ which in the proof of Theorem 2.7 is shown to be a consequence of $\sum_{n-1}^n$.

Theorem 2.8. (The Decomposition Theorem for Dimension $n$). A space has dimension $\leq n$, $n$ finite if and only if it is the union of $n + 1$ subspaces of dimension $\leq 0$.

i.e. $\text{ind } X \leq n \iff X = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} X_i$

where $\text{ind } X_i \leq 0$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$.

Proof. Follows from repeated application of Corollary 4 above and the Corollary to Theorem 2.6.
Corollary. If $\text{ind } X = n$ and $p, q$ are two integers $\geq -1$ such that $p + q + 1 = n$, then

$$X = P \cup Q$$

where $\text{ind } P = p$ and $\text{ind } Q = q$.

Proof. Directly from Theorem 2.8.

Theorem 2.9. (Dimension of a topological product)

If $A \times B$ denotes the topological product of two spaces $A$ and $B$, at least one of which is non-empty, then

$$\text{ind } (A \times B) \leq \text{ind } A + \text{ind } B.$$  

Proof. (by induction). The proposition is obvious if either $\text{ind } A = -1$ or $\text{ind } B = -1$.

Let $\text{ind } A = m$, $\text{ind } B = n$ and assume the proposition for the cases

(1) $\text{ind } A \leq m$, $\text{ind } B \leq n - 1$ and

(2) $\text{ind } A < m - 1$, $\text{ind } B < n$.

Each point $p = (a, b)$ in $A \times B$ has arbitrarily small neighbourhoods of the form $U \times V$, $U$ being a neighbourhood of $a$ in $A$ and $V$ a neighbourhood of $b$ in $B$ and we may assume that

$$\text{ind } b(U) \leq m - 1, \text{ ind } b(V) \leq n - 1.$$  

Now $b(U \times V) = (U \times b(V)) \cup (b(U) \times V)$

(Kelly [1], p. 103)

Each summand is closed and by hypotheses (1) and (2) of the induction has dimension $\leq m + n - 1$.

Hence by the Sum Theorem,
\[ \text{ind } b(U \times V) \leq m + n - 1 \]
whence \[ \text{ind } (A \times B) \leq m + n = \text{ind } A + \text{ind } B \]

**Corollary.** If \( \text{ind } B = 0 \) then
\[ \text{ind } (A \times B) = \text{ind } A + \text{ind } B \]

**Proof.** Since \( B \supseteq \emptyset \); \( A \times B \) contains homeomorphs of \( A \).

Therefore \[ \text{ind } (A \times B) \geq \text{ind } A = \text{ind } A + \text{ind } B. \]

Combining this with Theorem 2.9 gives the Corollary.

**Remark.** One might expect that the logarithmic law in the above Corollary be true in general. Unfortunately, this is not so, for \( R_\omega \), the set of points in Hilbert space all of whose coordinates are rational, is homeomorphic to \( R_\omega \times R_\omega \), while Example 2.11 shows that \( \text{ind } R_\omega = 1 \). The result of the Corollary does not even hold if both \( A \) and \( B \) are compact. This is shown by Pontryagin's example of two compact 2-dimensional spaces whose product is 3-dimensional. It can be shown that the result does hold if \( B \) is one-dimensional provided \( A \) is compact. It is an open problem to characterize the spaces \( B \) for which the result holds for arbitrary \( A \).

(iii) The Lebesque Covering dimension 'dim'.

**Definition 2.6.** A covering of a space \( X \) is a collection \( U \) of subsets of \( X \) satisfying the condition
\[ \bigcup \{ U | U \in U \} = X \]

**Definition 2.7.** A collection \( V \) is a refinement of a collection \( U \) if for each \( V \in U \) there exists \( U \in U \) for which \( V \subseteq U \), and
\[ \bigcup \{ V | V \in U \} = X. \]
Definition 2.8. A covering $U$ has order $\leq n$ if and only if at most $n+1$ members of $V$ have a non-empty intersection.

Definition 2.9. A space $X$ has covering dimension $\leq n$, denoted by $\dim X \leq n$, if given any finite open covering $U$ of $X$ there exists an open refinement $V$ whose order is $\leq n$. If $\dim X \leq n$ and the statement $\dim X \leq n-1$ is false, we say that $\dim X = n$. For the empty set, $\dim \emptyset = -1$. If the statement $\dim X \leq n$ is false for all $n$, then $\dim X = \infty$.

Clearly if $Y$ is a topological space homeomorphic to $X$, then $\dim Y = \dim X$.

Theorem 2.10. For any space $X$, $\dim X \leq n$ if and only if for each finite open covering $U = \{U_1, U_2, U_3, \ldots, U_k\}$ there exists an open refinement $V = \{V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_k\}$ of order $\leq n$ satisfying $V_i \subseteq U_i$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$.

Proof. The condition is clearly sufficient.

Conversely, suppose $\dim X \leq n$ and $U = \{U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_k\}$ is any finite open covering of $X$. Then there exists an open refinement $W = \{W_a\}$ of order $\leq n$ such that $W_a \subseteq U_i$ for some $i$, $1 \leq i \leq k$.

One obtains the desired finite refinement $V$ of $U$ by defining $V_j = \bigcup\{W_a | W_a \subseteq U_j \text{ and } W_a \notin U_i \text{ for } i < j\}$.

It is easy to show that the order of $V$ is $\leq n$. 
Theorem 2.11. If \( \dim X < n \) and \( X' \) is a closed subspace of \( X \) then \( \dim X' < n \).

**Proof.** Let \( U' \) be a finite open covering of \( X' \). For each \( U' \subseteq U' \) we have

\[
U' = U \cap X'
\]

for some \( U \) open in \( X \).

These open sets \( U_i \), together with \( X \setminus X' \) form an open covering of \( X \). Since \( \dim X < n \), there exists a system \( V \) of sets open in \( X \) satisfying the conditions in Definition 2.9.

Let \( V' = V \cap X' \) where \( V \subseteq U \), giving the desired refinement \( V' \) of the open covering \( U' \) of \( X' \).

Hence \( \dim X' < n \).

**Note:** The above theorem is not true if \( X' \) is not closed; see Tychonov Plank (Appendix).

The following theorems (Theorem 2.12 - 2.19) are stated without proof. For proofs, the reader is referred to Walton [1].

**Theorem 2.12.** Let \( X \) be a normal space and \( F_1, F_2, ..., F_m \) be closed subsets of \( X \), finite in number. Then each \( F_i \) \((1 \leq i \leq m)\) can be associated with \( U_i \supseteq F_i \), \( U_i \) open in \( X \) such that for any arbitrary combination \((i_1, ..., i_k)\), where \( 1 \leq k \leq m \), of indices \( 1, 2, ..., m \) if

\[
\bigcap_{r=1}^{k} U_{i_r} \neq \emptyset
\]

then

\[
\bigcap_{r=1}^{k} F_{i_r} \neq \emptyset .
\]
Theorem 2.13. Let $X$ be a normal space. Let $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_m$ be finite in number, open in $X$, and cover $X$. Then for each $U_i \ (1 \leq i \leq m)$ we can find a $V_i$ open in $X$ such that

1. $V_i \subseteq U_i \quad$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. 
2. $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_m$ cover $X$.

Theorem 2.14. Let the topological space $X$ have the following property: Each finite open cover $U$ of $X$ can be associated with a finite closed cover $F$ such that each $F \in F$ is a subset of some $U \in U$. Then $X$ is normal.

Theorem 2.15. Let $X$ be a normal space and $A, B$ be $F_\sigma$ sets in $X$ satisfying

$$A \cap \bar{B} = \bar{A} \cap B = \emptyset$$

Then there exist $U, V$ open in $X$ such that

$$A \subseteq U, \ B \subseteq V, \ U \cap V = \emptyset.$$ 

Theorem 2.16. Let $X$ be a normal space and $Y$ a subspace of $X$, where $Y$ is an $F_\sigma$-set in $X$. Then $Y$ is normal.

Theorem 2.17. Let $X$ be a normal space and $\dim X \leq n$. Let $\{U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_n\}$ be a finite open cover of $X$. Then there exists another finite open cover $\{V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_n\}$ of $X$ such that

1. $\overline{V_i} \subseteq U_i \quad$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$
2. order of $\{\overline{V_1}, \overline{V_2}, \ldots, \overline{V_n}\}$ is $\leq n$. 
Theorem 2.18. Let \( n = -1, 0, 1, 2, \ldots \) and let the topological space \( X \) have the following property: For each finite open cover \( U \) of \( X \) there exists a finite closed cover \( F \) of \( X \) such that

1. each \( F \in F \) is a subset of some \( U \in U \)
2. \( F \) has order \( \leq n \).

Then \( X \) is normal and \( \dim X \leq n \).

Theorem 2.19. Let \( X \) be a normal space, \( A \) a closed subset of \( X \) and \( \dim A \leq n \). Let \( U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_m \) be finite in number, open in \( X \), and cover \( A \). Then there exist \( V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_m \) open in \( X \) such that

1. \( \overline{V}_i \subseteq U_i \)
2. \( V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_m \) cover \( A \)
3. order of \( \{\overline{V}_1, \overline{V}_2, \ldots\} \leq n \).

The following theorem was first proved by E. Čech in 1933. The theorem is not true if the space \( X \) is not normal; see 'Tychanov plank (Appendix).

Theorem 2.20. Let \( X \) be a normal space and

\[ X = \bigcup_{\nu=1}^{\infty} A_{\nu} \]

where \( A_{\nu} \) is closed in \( X \) and \( \dim A_{\nu} \leq n \) for \( \nu = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \).

Then \( \dim X \leq n \).

Proof. Let \( U_{ij} (1 \leq j \leq m) \) be a finite open cover of \( X \). We construct \( V_{ij} (1 \leq i \leq m) \) open in \( X \) such that

1. the system \( U = \{V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_m\} \) covers \( X \) and has order \( \leq n \).
(ii) \( V_i \subseteq U_i \) \( (1 \leq i \leq m) \).

By Theorem 2.19 there exists a system \( V' \) of \( V_i \) \( (1 \leq i \leq m) \) open in \( X \) such that

(i) \( \overline{V_i} \subseteq U_i \)

(ii) the system \( V' \) covers \( A \)

(iii) the system \( V' \) of sets \( V_i \) has order \( \leq n \).

Assume now that the system \( V' \) of \( V_i \) \( (1 \leq i \leq m) \) open in \( X \) has been constructed such that

(i) \( V_i \subseteq U_i \)

(ii) the system \( V' \) covers \( \bigcup_{\lambda=1}^{v} A_{\lambda} \)

(iii) the system \( V' \) of \( V_i \) has order \( \leq n \).

We now show that the system \( V^{v+1} \) can be constructed.

Since \( V' \) is a finite system of order \( \leq n \) of sets closed in \( X \); then by Theorem 2.12 there exist \( S_i \) \( (1 \leq i \leq m) \) open in \( X \) such that

(i) \( \overline{V_i} \subseteq S_i \)

(ii) the system \( S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_m \) has order \( \leq n \).

Since \( \overline{V_i} \subseteq U_i \), by the normality of \( X \) there exist \( T_i \) \( (1 \leq i \leq m) \) open in \( X \) such that

\[
\overline{V_i} \subseteq T_i \subseteq \overline{T_i} \subseteq U_i.
\]

Let \( W_i = S_i \cap T_i \)

Then the system \( W \) of sets \( W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_m \) is a finite system of order \( \leq n \) of open sets of \( X \) and

\[
\overline{V_i} \subseteq W_i \subseteq \overline{W_i} \subseteq U_i.
\]
By normality there exists $P_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$) open in $X$ such that

$$\overline{V_i} \subseteq P_i \subseteq \overline{P_i} \subseteq W_i$$

For $1 \leq i \leq m$ let:

1) $M_i$ mean the system of binary open coverings

$$\{P_i, X \setminus \overline{V_i}\}.$$

2) $N_i$ the system of binary open coverings

$$\{W_i, X \setminus \overline{P_i}\}.$$

Clearly each of the $2m$ systems $M_i, N_i$ cover $X$. Let $H$ denote the system of $m.4^m$ open sets of $X$ formed by

$$U_i \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^{m} M_j \cap \bigcap_{k=1}^{m} N_k \quad (1 \leq i, j, k \leq m)$$

$$M_j \in M_j; N_k \in M_k$$

Then $H$ is a finite system of open sets covering $X$. Since $A_{v+1}$ is closed in $X$ and since $\dim A_{v+1} \leq n$, by Theorem 19 there exists a finite system $Z$ of open sets $Z_r$ ($1 \leq r \leq t = m.4^m$) of $X$ such that

(i) each $Z_r \subset$ some element of $H$;

(ii) $Z$ covers $A_{v+1}$;

(iii) $Z$ has order $\leq n$.

From (i) it follows by definition of the systems $M_i, N_i, H$ that

(iv) $\overline{V_i} \bigcap \overline{V_i} \neq \phi$ implies $\overline{V_i} \subseteq P_i$;

(v) $\overline{V_i} \bigcap \overline{P_i} \neq \phi$ implies $\overline{V_i} \subseteq W_i$.

We divide the sets $Z_r$ ($1 \leq r \leq t$) into three kinds, $A, B, C$;

$Z_r \in A$ if there exists $i$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$) such that $\overline{V_i} \bigcap \overline{V_i} \neq \phi$.

$Z_r \in B$ if $Z_r \notin A$ and if there exists $i$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$) such that $\overline{V_i} \bigcap \overline{P_i} \neq \phi$. 

From (i) it follows by definition of the systems $M_i, N_i, H$ that
With each \( Z \in C \) we associate a single index \( i \) so chosen that
\[ Z \cap \overline{V}_i = \emptyset. \]

With each \( Z \in B \) we associate a single index \( i \) so chosen that
\[ Z \cap \overline{P}_i = \emptyset. \]

With each \( Z \in C \) we associate a single index \( i \) so chosen that
\[ Z \subset U_i. \] (This is possible by definition of \( H \) and condition (1) for the system \( Z \).)

For \( 1 \leq i \leq m \) let \( W_i = V_i \cup Z \) summed over all \( Z \in A \cup B \) associated with index \( i \).

Clearly \( V_i \subset W_i \) and by (5), \( \overline{W}_i \subset W_i \). Further let \( V_i^{+1} = W_i \cup Z \) summed over all \( Z \in C \) associated with the index \( i \).

Clearly \( V_i^{+1} \) is open in \( X \) and
\[ V_i \subset V_i^{+1} \subset V_i^{+1} \subset U_i. \]

Since \( V_i \) covers \( \bigcup A_{\lambda} \) and since \( Z \) covers \( A_{v+1} \), it is clear that the system \( V_i^{+1} \) of sets \( V_i^{+1} \), \( V_i^{+1} \), \ldots, \( V_i^{+1} \) covers \( \bigcup A_{\lambda} \).

It is still to be shown that \( V_i^{+1} \) has order \( n \), i.e. that each point \( a \in X \) belongs to at most \( n + 1 \) elements of the system \( V_i^{+1} \). We distinguish two cases.

(a) Suppose there exists an index \( j \) \( (1 \leq j \leq m) \) such that \( a \in \overline{P}_j \). Then \( a \in Z \Rightarrow Z \cap \overline{P}_j = \emptyset \), i.e. \( Z \notin C \). Hence \( a \in V_i^{+1} \Rightarrow a \in W_i \subset W_i \).

Since \( \psi \) is of order \( n \), the point \( a \) belongs to at most \( n + 1 \) of the \( V_i^{+1} \).

(b) Suppose \( a \in \overline{P}_i \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \).

By (4) \( a \in Z \Rightarrow Z \cap \overline{V}_i = \emptyset \).
Hence on the one hand a \( \notin \) any \( V_i^\nu \) and on the other hand a \( \notin \) any \( Z_r \in A \). Hence a \( \in W_i^\nu \Rightarrow a \in Z_r \) where \( Z_r \in B \) and is associated with the index \( i \).

Since each \( Z_r \in B \) is associated with a single index \( i \), the point \( a \) is in at most as many \( W_i^\nu \) as in \( Z_r \in B \). Similarly \( a \) is in at most as many \( V_{i+1}^\nu \setminus W_i^\nu \) as in \( Z_r \in C \). Hence the point \( a \) is in at most as many \( V_{i+1}^\nu \) as \( Z_r \); since \( Z \) is of order \( < n \) the point \( a \) belongs to at most \( n+1 \) of the sets \( V_{i+1}^\nu \).

Thus it is shown by recurrence that we can construct systems \( V^\nu \) \((\nu = 1, 2, 3, \ldots)\) of open sets \( V_i^\nu \) \((1 \leq i \leq m)\) in \( X \) such that

1. \( V_i^\nu \subseteq V_{i+1}^\nu \)
2. \( V_i^\nu \subseteq U_i \)
3. \( V^\nu \) covers \( A \).
4. \( V^\nu \) has order \( \leq n \).

Let \( V_i = \bigcup_{\nu=1}^{\infty} U_i^\nu \) \((1 \leq i \leq m)\)

Then the \( V_i \) are open sets of \( X \). By (2) \( V_i \subseteq U_i \). Since \( X = \bigcup_{\nu=1}^{\infty} A_\nu \), by (3) the system \( V \) of sets \( V_1,V_2,\ldots,V_m \) covers \( X \).

Suppose, on the contrary, that there were \( n+2 \) different induces \( i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{n+2} \) and a point \( a \in X \) such that

\[ a \in V_i^s \quad (1 \leq s \leq n+2) \]

But this contradicts (4).

Corollary. Let \( X \) be a normal space. Let \( A_\nu = (\nu = 1,2,3,\ldots) \) be \( F_\sigma \)-sets in \( X \) and let \( \dim A_\nu \leq n \). Then \( \dim A_\nu \leq n \).
Definition 2.10. A topological space $X$ is perfectly normal if

(i) $X$ is normal,

(ii) each open set of $X$ is an $F_\sigma$-set in $X$, or equivalently, each closed set of $X$ is a $G_\delta$-set in $X$ (i.e. the countable intersection of open sets).

Theorem 2.21. (Čech's Subset Theorem). Let $X$ be a perfectly normal space and let $\dim X < n$. Then if $Y$ is any subspace of $X$, $\dim Y < n$.

C.H. Dowker has extended Čech's subset theorem to a class of spaces called totally normal.

Definition 2.11. A family $\mathcal{U}$ of subsets of a topological space is locally finite if each point of the space has a neighbourhood which intersects only finitely many members of $\mathcal{U}$.

Definition 2.12. A normal space $X$ is totally normal if each open set $G$ of $X$ has a locally finite covering by subsets each of which is an open $F_\sigma$-set of $X$. Totally normal spaces include hereditarily paracompact Hausdorff as well as perfectly normal spaces.

Theorem 2.22. (Dowker). If $Y$ is a subspace of a totally normal space $X$, then $\dim Y \leq \dim X$.

Definition 2.13. A collection $\mathcal{U}$ of subsets of a space $X$ is called star-finite if every element of $\mathcal{U}$ intersects at most a finite number of other elements of $\mathcal{U}$. (A star-finite open covering is of course locally finite).
Definition 2.14. A space is said to have the star-finite property if every open covering can be refined by a star-finite open covering.

Definition 2.15. A topological space is paracompact if each open cover of the space has an open locally finite refinement.

Definition 2.16. If $U$ is a family of subsets of a set $X$ and $x \in X$, then the star of $U$ is the union of the members of $U$ to which $x$ belongs. A cover $B$ is a star-refinement of $U$ (or $\Delta$-refinement) if the family of stars of $U$ at points of $X$ is a refinement of $U$. A topological space is fully normal if each open cover has an open star refinement.

A.H. Stone [1] has proved the following important result:

Theorem 2.23. A Hausdorff space is fully normal if and only if it is paracompact.

Corollary. Every metric space is paracompact.

We now state without proof several results about the covering dimension of a topological product.

In 1946 Hemmingsen showed that if $X$ and $Y$ are both compact Hausdorff spaces then

$$\dim(X \times Y) \leq \dim X + \dim Y.$$  

This result was sharpened by Miyazaki in 1951.

Theorem 2.24. If $X$ is compact normal and $Y$ is paracompact normal, then

$$\dim(X \times Y) \leq \dim X + \dim Y.$$  

Morita [2] proved the following three theorems:
Theorem 2.25. Let $X$ and $Y$ be Hausdorff spaces such that $X \times Y$ has the star-finite property (S-space) then
\[ \dim(X \times Y) \leq \dim X + \dim Y. \]

Theorem 2.26. If $X$ is a fully normal space and $Y$ is a locally compact fully normal space, then
\[ \dim(X \times Y) \leq \dim X + \dim Y. \]

Theorem 2.27. If $X$ is a countably paracompact normal space and $Y$ is a locally compact metric space, then
\[ \dim(X \times Y) \leq \dim X + \dim Y. \]

In the same paper Morita proves the following stronger relation between the covering dimension of $X \times Y$ and those of $X$ and $Y$.

Theorem 2.28. The relation
\[ \dim(X \times Y) = \dim X + \dim Y \]
holds for the following cases:

(i) $X$ is locally compact fully normal space of dimension $\geq 0$ and $Y$ is a fully normal space of dimension 1.

(ii) $X$ is a fully normal space of dimension $\geq 0$ and $Y$ is a locally finite polytype of dimension $\geq 0$.

We end this section on the covering dimension by quoting the following theorem, analogous to Theorem 2.6.

Theorem 2.29. If $X = Y \cup Z$ is a normal space and $\dim Y \leq m$, $\dim Z \leq n$, then $\dim X \leq m + n + 1$. 

(iv) The Čech strong inductive dimension 'Ind'.

Definition 2.17. If \( X = \emptyset \), \( \text{Ind} \ X = -1 \). For \( n = 0,1,2, \ldots \), a space \( X \) has strong inductive dimension \( \text{Ind} \ X \leq n \) if for every pair of a closed set \( F \) and an open set \( G \) with \( \overline{F} \subseteq G \), there exists an open set \( U \) such that

\[ F \subseteq U \subseteq G \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ind} \ b(U) < n - 1. \]

\( \text{Ind} \ X = n \) if it is true that \( \text{Ind} \ X < n \) and false that \( \text{Ind} \ X < n - 1 \).

If \( \text{Ind} \ X < n \) is false for \( n = -1,0,1,2, \ldots \), then we say that \( \text{Ind} \ X = \infty \).

Clearly if \( X^* \) is any homeomorphic image of \( X \), then \( \text{Ind} \ X^* = \text{Ind} \ X \).

C.H. Dowker [1] has established the following results:

Theorem 2.30. If \( X' \) is a closed subset of any space \( X \), \( \text{Ind} \ X' < \text{Ind} \ X \).

Note: The theorem is not true if \( X' \) is not closed; see the 'Tychonov plank' (Appendix).

Theorem 2.31. \( \text{Ind} \ X \leq n \) is equivalent to the following condition on \( X \):

If \( F \subseteq G \subseteq X \) with \( F \) closed and \( G \) open, then \( X \) is the union of three disjoint sets \( U, V, C \) with \( U, V \) open, \( F \subseteq U \subseteq G \) and \( \text{Ind} \ C \leq n - 1 \).

Theorem 2.32. If \( X \) is normal, \( \text{Ind} \ X \leq n \) is equivalent to the following condition: If \( E \) and \( F \) are disjoint closed subsets of \( X \), then \( X \) is the union of disjoint sets \( U, V, \) and \( C \) with \( U \) and \( V \) open, \( E \subseteq U \), \( F \subseteq V \), and \( \text{Ind} \ C \leq n - 1 \).

Theorem 2.33. Let \( Y_i \) (\( i = 1,2, \ldots \)) be open sets in a hereditarily normal space \( Y \) such that
\[ Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2 \cup \ldots, \quad \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} Y_i = \emptyset. \]

and, for each \( i \), \( \text{Ind} (Y_i \setminus Y_{i+1}) \leq n \). Then \( \text{Ind} Y \leq n \).

A particular case of the above theorem is obtained by putting \( Y_1 = Y, Y_2 = Y \setminus A, Y_3 = Y_4 = \ldots = \emptyset \). If \( A \) is a closed subset of a hereditarily normal space \( Y \) and if \( \text{Ind} A \leq n \) and \( \text{Ind} (Y \setminus A) \leq n \), then \( \text{Ind} Y \leq n \). Lokucievskii has produced an example to show that this special case of the theorem does not hold for arbitrary normal spaces.

We consider the following conditions which a space \( X \) may satisfy:

(a.) If \( B \subseteq A \subseteq X \) and \( \text{Ind} A \leq n \), then \( \text{Ind} B \leq n \).

(b.) If \( G \subseteq A \subseteq X \) with \( G \) open in \( A \) and \( \text{Ind} A \leq n \), then \( \text{Ind} G \leq n \).

(c.) If \( A = B \cup C \subseteq X \) with \( B \) closed in \( A \), \( \text{Ind} B \leq n \) and \( \text{Ind} C \leq n \), then \( \text{Ind} A \leq n \).

(d.) If \( A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \subseteq X \) with each \( A_i \) closed in \( A \) and \( \text{Ind} A_i \leq n \), then \( \text{Ind} A \leq n \).

Dowker [1] has proved the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.34.** If \( X \) is a hereditarily normal space satisfying condition (b.) for all \( n \), then \( X \) also satisfies (a.), (c.), (d.) for all \( n \).

Dowker concludes the paper with proofs of the following theorems:

**Theorem 2.35.** Let \( A \subseteq X \) with \( X \) totally normal and \( \text{Ind} X \leq n \). Then \( \text{Ind} A \leq n \).
Theorem 2.36. Let a totally normal space $X$ be the union of two sets $A$ and $B$ with $A$ closed and $\text{Ind} A < n$ and $\text{Ind} B < n$. Then $\text{Ind} X < n$.

Theorem 2.37. Let $\{A_i\}$ be a sequence of closed sets in a totally normal space and let $\text{Ind} A_i < n$. Then
$$\text{Ind} \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i < n.$$ 

These last two theorems are extensions of theorems given earlier by Čech for the case of perfectly normal spaces.

Product Theorems.

Katetov [2] and Morita [1] gave different proofs of the following theorem:

Theorem 2.38. If $X$ and $Y$ are metric spaces, at least one of which is nonempty, then
$$\text{Ind} (X \times Y) \leq \text{Ind} X + \text{Ind} Y.$$ 

Nagami [1] extended the result as follows:

Theorem 2.39. Let $X$ be a perfectly normal space and $Y$ a metric space. If at least one of $X$ and $Y$ is nonempty, then
$$\text{Ind} (X \times Y) \leq \text{Ind} X + \text{Ind} Y.$$ 

We now state a Theorem analogous to Theorems 2.6 and 2.29.

Theorem 2.40. Let $X = Y \cup Z$ where $X$ is totally normal and $\text{Ind} Y \leq m$, $\text{Ind} Z \leq n$, then $\text{Ind} X \leq m + n + 1.$
CHAPTER 3

Relations between the dimension functions 'ind', 'Ind', and 'dim'

In this Chapter we summarize various relationships between the three dimension functions introduced in Chapter 2.

Hurewicz and Wallman [1] completed the theory for separable metric spaces and proved the equivalence of the three ideas for such spaces. P. Roy [1] in 1962 showed that the three dimension concepts are not equivalent for general metric spaces by producing a metric space $X$ for which $\text{ind } X = 0$ but $\text{Ind } X = \text{dim } X = 1$. Katětov [1], Morita [1] and Dowker and Hurewicz [2] have all published different proofs that for any metric space $X$, $\text{Ind } X = \text{dim } X$.

We now present several results on relationships between the dimension functions for spaces subject to various conditions.

**Theorem 3.1.** If $X$ is a $T_1$-space then $\text{ind } X \leq \text{Ind } X$, i.e. $\text{Ind } X \leq n = \Rightarrow \text{ind } X \leq \text{n}$.

**Proof.** The theorem follows immediately from the definitions of the two dimension functions and the fact that singleton sets are closed in $T_1$-spaces.

**Theorem 3.2.** If $X$ is a compact normal space,

$\text{ind } X \leq 0 \Rightarrow \text{Ind } X \leq 0$

**Proof.** Let $F$ and $G$ be closed and open subsets respectively in $X$ and let $F \subseteq G$. Since $\text{ind } X \leq 0$, for each point $p \in F$ there exists an open and closed set $V$ in $X$ such that

$p \in V \subseteq G$.

Since $F$ is a closed subset of a compact space $X$, it also is compact,
and a finite collection

\[ \{V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_k\} \]

covers \( F \).

Then \( F \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} V_i \subseteq G \), where \( \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} V_i \) is closed and open.

Hence \( \text{Ind } X < 0 \).

We have the following counter-example to show that the implication in Theorem 3.2 cannot be reversed.

**Counter-example.** Let \( X = \{a, b\} \) and the open sets be \( \{a\}, X, \phi \); then the closed sets are \( X, \{b\}, \phi \). \( X \) is trivially compact and normal but not \( T_1 \) and \( \text{Ind } X = 0 \), while \( \text{ind } X = 1 \).

Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 together imply

**Theorem 3.3.** If \( X \) is a compact Hausdorff space,

\[ \text{ind } X < 0 \iff \text{Ind } X < 0. \]

**Theorem 3.4.** \( \text{Ind } X < 0 \Rightarrow X \) is normal.

**Proof.** This follows immediately from Definition 2.17.

**Theorem 3.5.** For any space \( X \), \( \dim X < 0 \iff \text{Ind } X < 0. \)

The proof of Theorem 3.5 follows readily from the definitions of the two dimension functions.

**Theorem 3.6.** \( \dim X < 0 \iff \text{Ind } X < 0 \Rightarrow X \) is normal.

**Proof.** This is an immediate consequence of the previous two theorems.
However, $\dim X = n$ does not imply that $X$ is normal if $n < 1$, as is illustrated by the following example.

**Example.** Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$ with open sets $\emptyset, \{b\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}$, and $X$.

Given the open covering $\{\{a, b\}, \{b, c\}\}$, both $\{a, b\}$ and $\{b, c\}$ must occur in any refinement and they intersect in the point $b$; hence the order of this covering is 1. Every covering of $X$ by open sets has a refinement of order $< 1$. Hence $\dim X = 1$. However $X$ is not normal because $\{a\}, \{b\}$ are disjoint closed sets and every two open sets both contain the point $b$.

**Theorem 3.7.** If $X$ is a compact Hausdorff space, $\text{ind} X < 0 \iff \text{Ind} X < 0 \iff \dim X < 0$.

**Proof.** Combine Theorems 3.1, 3.2, and 3.5.

N. Vedenissoff [1] has proved the following theorems.

**Theorem 3.8.** If $X$ is a normal space, $\dim X \leq \text{Ind} X$.

**Theorem 3.9.** If $X$ is a compact normal space, then $\dim X \leq \text{ind} X$.

Lokucievskii [1] has given an example of a compact Hausdorff space $S$ with $\dim S = 1$, $\text{ind} S = \text{Ind} S = 2$.

This shows that strict inequality can occur in the above theorems 3.8 and 3.9.

**Theorem 3.10.** If $X$ is a compact totally normal space, then $\text{Ind} X \leq \text{ind} X$.

**Proof.** follows easily by induction.
We state without proof the following theorems on relations between the various dimension functions for metric spaces.

Theorem 3.11. If $X$ is a separable metric space, then $\text{ind } X = \text{Ind } X$.

Theorem 3.12. For any metric space $X$, $\text{dim } X = \text{Ind } X$.

As was mentioned earlier, Katetov, Morita, and Dowker gave independent proofs of this theorem.

Theorem 3.13. For any separable metric space $X$

$$\text{dim } X = \text{Ind } X = \text{ind } X.$$  

P. Roy [1] showed that Theorem 3.13 is not true for arbitrarily metric spaces by constructing a space complete metric space $S$ for which

$$\text{ind } S = 0, \text{ but } \text{dim } S = \text{Ind } S = 1.$$  

Dowker [2] has also given an example of a normal space $M$ with

$$\text{ind } M = 0 \text{ and } \text{dim } M = 1.$$  

In Chapter Two we proved that the sum theorem for $\text{dim}$ holds for normal spaces. Lokucievskii [1] constructs a compact space $R$ for which the sum theorems for $\text{ind}$ and $\text{Ind}$ are not true.

In the same book Nagami gives an example of a normal space with

$$\text{ind } = 0, \text{ dim } = 1, \text{ and } \text{Ind } = 2.$$
Thus, we see that basic gaps exist between the various dimension functions, and that normality and even compactness do not effect the equalities between the dimensions.
CHAPTER 4
The Dimension Dim

Definition 4.1. The dimension Dim X of a topological space X is the least integer \( n (n = -1, 0, 1, 2 \ldots) \) for which

\[
X = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} X_i
\]

where each subspace \( X_i \) of X has \( \dim X_i \leq 0 \).

\( \dim \emptyset = -1. \)

Theorem 4.1. If X is a topological space with \( \dim X \leq n \) and A is a closed subset of X, then \( \dim A \leq n \).

Proof. The theorem is clearly true if \( n = -1 \).

We consider two cases: (I) \( n = 0 \), (II) \( n > 0 \).

Case (i) \( n = 0 \). Let \( \{V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_k\} \) be any finite open covering of A. Then \( V_i = A \cap U_i \), where \( U_i \) is open in X. The sets \( U_1, \ldots, U_k \), together with \( X \setminus A \) form an open covering of X. Since \( \dim X \leq 0 \) there is a disjoint refinement \( \{W_1, \ldots, W_n\} \) where \( W_j \subseteq U_i \) for some i or \( W_j \subseteq X \setminus A \). The system \( \{W_j \cap A\} \) forms a disjoint open covering of A which is a refinement of \( \{V_i\} \). Hence \( \dim A \leq 0 \). Since \( \dim A \leq 0 \iff \dim A \leq 0 \), we have \( \dim A \leq 0 \).

Case (ii) \( n > 0 \). Let \( X = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} X_i \), where \( \dim X_i \leq 0 \).

Then \( A = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} A_i \), where \( A_i = A \cap X_i \) (\( i = 0, 1, \ldots, n \)).

(Some of the \( A_i \) may be empty).

Since A is a closed subset of X, each \( A_i \) is a closed subset of \( X_i \).

Therefore by Case (i) \( \dim A_i \leq 0 \).

Since \( A = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} A_i \) and \( \dim A_i \leq 0 \), \( \dim A \leq 0 \).
Note: Theorem 4.1 is not true if A is not closed; see Tychonov Plank (Appendix).

Theorem 4.2. If A and B are subspaces of a topological space X and
\( \text{Dim } A < m, \text{ Dim } B < n, \) then
\[ \text{Dim}(A \cup B) \leq \text{Dim } A + \text{Dim } B + 1. \]

Proof. By definition
\[ A = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m} A_i \quad \text{and} \quad B = \bigcup_{j=0}^{n} B_j \]
where \( \text{dim } A_i < 0 \) and \( \text{dim } B_j < 0. \)

Define
\[ C_i = A_i \quad (i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, m) \]
\[ C_{m+1+j} = B_j \quad (j = 0, 1, \ldots, n) \]

Then \( A \cup B = \bigcup_{k=0}^{m+n+1} C_k, \) where \( \text{dim } C_k < 0. \)

Hence by definition
\[ \text{Dim } (A \cup B) \leq m + n + 1 \]
i.e., \( \text{Dim } (A \cup B) \leq \text{Dim } A + \text{Dim } B + 1. \)

Lemma. Let A be any subset of a topological space X where \( \text{dim } A < 0. \) Then
if \( \{U_1, \ldots, U_r\} \) is any finite open covering of A by open sets of X, there exists a system \( \{V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_r\} \) of open subsets of X such that
\[
\begin{align*}
(i) & \quad V_i \subseteq U_i \\
(ii) & \quad \{V_i\} \text{ covers A} \\
(iii) & \quad V_i \cap V_j \cap A^c = \emptyset \text{ if } i \neq j.
\end{align*}
\]

Proof. Since \( \text{dim } A < 0 \) the covering \( \{A \cap U_i\} \) of A has an open refinement
\( W_1 \subseteq A \cap U_1 \) with \( W_i \cap W_j = \emptyset \) if \( i \neq j \) where \( W_i = A \cap Z_i \) for some \( Z_i \)
open in $X$. Let $V_i = Z_i \cap U_i$. Then $V_i \subseteq U_i$ and $V_i \cap V_j \cap A = \emptyset$. Since $V_i \cap V_j$ is open, no point of it is an accumulation point of $A$; hence $V_i \cap V_j \cap A^* = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$.

**Theorem 4.3.** If $X$ is a normal space, $\dim X < \text{Dim } X$.

**Proof.** We show that if $X$ is normal then $\text{Dim } X < n$ implies $\dim X < n$. The result is true for $n = -1, 0$. Assume it true for $n = m - 1$. Let $U_1, \ldots, U_k$ be any finite open covering of $X_0^*$, where $X = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m} X_i$, $\dim X_i < 0$.

Since $\dim X_0 < 0$, by the lemma there exists a system \{${V_1, \ldots, V_k}$\} open in $X$ such that $V_i \subseteq U_i$ and \{${V_i}$\} covers $X_0$ and $V_i \cap V_j \cap X_0^* = \emptyset$ ($i \neq j$).

Let $V = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} V_i$. Put $S = X_0^* \setminus V$. Then $S$ is closed in $X$ and $S \subseteq X \setminus X_0$. Hence $\dim S < m - 1$ by the hypothesis of induction.

Since $X_0^*$ is closed in $X$, $X_0^*$ is normal, so that by Theorem 2.19 (Čech) there exists \{${W_1, \ldots, W_k}$\} open in $X_0^*$ with $W_i \subseteq U_i$, $W = \bigcup W_i \subseteq S$ and order of \{${W_i}$\} is $\leq m - 1$. Thus \{${V_i, W_i}$\} is an open covering of $X_0^*$ which forms a refinement of \{${U_i}$\} and is of order $\leq m$. Hence $\dim X_0^* < m$.

Similarly $\dim X_i^* \leq m$, where $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

Then $X = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m} X_i^*$, and by the Čech Sum Theorem,

$$\dim X \leq m.$$ 

**Theorem 4.4.** Let $X$ be an hereditarily normal space. Then if $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k$ are closed subsets of $X$ for which $\text{Dim } A_i \leq n$, then $\text{Dim } A \leq n$, where $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} A_i$.

**Proof.** We first prove the theorem for the case when $k = 2$.

Let $L, M$ be closed subsets of the hereditarily normal space $X$, and
let
\[ \text{Dim } L \leq n, \quad \text{Dim } M \leq m. \]
i.e. \( L = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} L_i \), \( M = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} M_i \) where \( \text{dim } L_i \leq 0 \)
and \( \text{dim } M_i \leq 0. \)

Let \( P_0 = L_0 \cup (M_0 \setminus L) \).

Then \( P_0 \) is normal and \( L_0 = P_0 \cap L \), i.e. \( L_0 \) is closed in \( P_0 \).

Let \( F_0 \) be a closed subset of \( P_0 \) such that \( F_0 \cap L_0 = \emptyset \).

Then \( F_0 = F \cap M_0 \) where \( F \) is closed in \( X \), i.e. \( F_0 \) is a closed
subset of \( M_0 \), so that \( \text{dim } F_0 \leq 0. \)

By a lemma of Dowker ("If \( H \) is closed in the normal space \( S \) and if
\( \text{dim } H \leq n \) and \( \text{dim } F \leq n \) for each closed set \( F \) such that
\( F \cap H = \emptyset \),
then \( \text{dim } S \leq n' \)") for the case \( n = 0 \), we have \( \text{dim } P_0 \leq 0. \)

Let \( P_1 = L_1 \cup (M_1 \setminus L) \). Then, as before, \( \text{dim } P_1 \leq 0 \), etc.

Now \( L \cup M = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} P_i \) where \( \text{dim } P_i \leq 0. \) Hence \( \text{Dim } (L \cup M) \leq n. \)

The theorem now follows directly for the union of a finite number of
closed subsets of \( X. \)

**Theorem 4.5.** If \( X \) is an hereditarily normal space, then \( \text{Ind } X \leq \text{Dim } X. \)

**Proof.** We show that \( \text{Dim } X \leq n \) implies \( \text{Ind } X \leq n. \) The result is true for
\( n = -1, 0; \) assume true for \( n = m - 1. \) Let \( X = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m} X_i \), where \( X \) is
hereditarily normal and \( \text{dim } X_i \leq 0. \) By a theorem of Walton [1], p. 81,
given \( F \) closed in \( X \) and \( G \) open in \( X \) with \( F \subseteq G \) there exists a set
\( V \) open in \( X \) with \( F \subseteq V \subseteq G \) such that \( b(V) \) does not meet \( X_m \),
i.e. \( b(V) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} X_i. \)
Hence by the inductive hypothesis,
\[ \text{Ind } b(V) \leq m - 1, \quad \text{and } \text{Ind } X \leq m. \]

**Corollary.** For an hereditarily normal $T_1$ space $X$, $\text{ind } X \leq \text{Dim } X$.

However, if $X$ is hereditarily normal, but not $T_1$, the result is not true, by an example of Dowker [1].

**Theorem 4.6.** Let $X$ be a hereditarily normal space, $A$ a closed subset of $X$, and $\text{Dim } A \leq n$, $\text{Dim } (X \setminus A) \leq n$. Then $\text{Dim } X \leq n$.

**Proof.** If a normal space $X$ is the union of two sets $A$ and $B$ with $A$ closed and $\text{dim } A \leq n$ and $\text{dim } B \leq n$, then $\text{dim } X \leq n$. Hence the result is true for $n = -1, 0$. Assume it is true for the case $n = m - 1$. Let $A = A_0 \cup P_{m-1}$, $B = X \setminus A = B_0 \cup Q_{m-1}$ where $\text{dim } A_0 \leq 0$, $\text{dim } B_0 \leq 0$, and $P_{m-1} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} A_i$, $Q_{m-1} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} B_i$, where $\text{Dim } P_{m-1} \leq m - 1$.

Let $C_0 = A_0 \cup B_0$.

and $C_{m-1} = P_{m-1} \cup Q_{m-1}$.

Then $A_0 = A \cap (A_0 \cup B_0)$, i.e. $A_0$ is closed in $A_0 \cup B_0 = C_0$ and $C_0$ is normal so $\text{dim } C_0 \leq 0$.

Similarly $P_{m-1} = A \cap C_{m-1}$ is closed in $C_{m-1}$ and $C_{m-1}$ is hereditarily normal. Hence $\text{Dim } C_{m-1} \leq m - 1$. Therefore since $X = C_0 \cup C_{m-1}$, $X$ is the union of at most $m + 1$ subsets each of which has covering dimension $\leq 0$, i.e. $\text{Dim } X \leq m.$
Corollary. If $A$ is a closed subset of a hereditarily normal space $X$, then

$$\dim X \leq \max (\dim A, \dim X \setminus A).$$

Theorem 4.7. If $A$ is any subset of a totally normal space $X$, then

$$\dim A \leq \dim X.$$  

Proof. Let $\dim X \leq n$. Then

$$X = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} X_i, \text{ where } \dim X_i \leq 0.$$  

Now

$$A = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} A_i, \text{ where } A_i = A \cap X_i.$$  

Then by Theorem 2.22, $\dim A_i \leq 0$, since total normality is a hereditary property.

Hence $\dim A \leq n$.

Theorem 4.8. Let $X$ be a perfectly normal space and $Y = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$, where each $F_i$ is a closed subset of $X$ and $\dim F_i \leq n$. Then $\dim Y \leq n$.

Proof. Since $\dim F_i \leq n$

$$F_i = \bigcup_{j=0}^{n} F_{ij}, \text{ where } \dim F_{ij} \leq 0$$

for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ 

and where without loss of generality we can take $F_{ij} \cap F_{ik} = \emptyset$ for each $i$ if $j \neq k$.

Let $K_1 = F_1$, $K_2 = F_2 \setminus F_1$, $K_m = F_m \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} F_i$.

Then $K_m = F_m \cap F_1^c \cap \ldots \cap F_{m-1}^c$ is an $F_\sigma$-set in $X$ and $Y = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} K_i$.  


Thus $K_i = \bigcup_{j=0}^{n} K_{ij}$, where $K_{ij} \subseteq F_{ij}$.

Since $X$ is perfectly normal $\dim K_{ij} \leq 0$.

Hence $\dim K_i \leq n$.

Let $H_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} K_{10}$. Then $K_{10} = H_0 \cap F_1$.

Now $X \setminus F_1$ is an $F_0$-set.

Let $D_2 = (X \setminus F_1) \cap F_2$.

Then $D_2 \cap H_0 = K_{20}$.

Let $D_3 = (X \setminus F_1 \setminus F_2) \cap F_3$. Then $D_3 \cap H_0 = K_{30}$, etc.

Hence each $K_{10}$ is an $F_0$-set in $H_0$ and since $\dim K_{10} \leq 0$ we have by Theorem 2.20 (Čech) that

$$\dim H_0 \leq 0.$$ 

Similarly $\dim H_i \leq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

and since $Y = \bigcup_{i=0}^{h} H_i$

we have $\dim Y \leq n$ as required.

An interesting question is whether Theorem 4.8 holds for totally normal spaces as well.
The Tychonov Plank

Let \( \omega_0 \) be the first infinite ordinal and \( \omega_1 \) the first uncountable ordinal. Provide each of the sets

\[
N = \{ k | k \text{ is an ordinal, } 0 < k < \omega_0 \}
\]

\[
P = \{ \alpha | \alpha \text{ is an ordinal, } 0 < \alpha < \omega_1 \}
\]

with the order topology.

Then both \( N \) and \( P \) are compact Hausdorff spaces. Hence the topological product

\[
X = P \times N
\]

is a compact Hausdorff space and consequently a normal space, called the 'Tychonov Plank'. \( X \), however, is not hereditarily normal, since the subspace

\[
Y = X \setminus \{ (\omega_1, \omega_0) \}
\]

is not normal.

Let

\[
A = \{ (\alpha, \omega_0) | 0 < \alpha < \omega_1 \}
\]

\[
B = \{ (\omega_1, k) | 0 < k < \omega_0 \}
\]

Then \( A \) and \( B \) are disjoint closed subsets of \( Y \). Hence \( U = Y \setminus A \) is an open subset of \( Y \) containing the closed subset \( B \). Now let \( V \) be any open set in \( Y \) containing \( B \). Each point \( (\omega_1, k) \) of \( B \) has a neighbourhood contained in \( V \). This means that for each \( k \) there exists an ordinal \( \alpha_k < \omega_1 \) such that \( x > \alpha_k \) implies \( (x, k) \notin V \).

But a countable collection of ordinals each of which is less than \( \omega_1 \) has its supremum less than \( \omega_1 \), i.e. there exists an ordinal \( \beta < \omega_1 \) such that \( \alpha_k \leq \beta \) so that for each \( k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \) the point \( (\beta, k) \in V \); therefore \( V \) must contain the point \( (\beta, \omega_0) \). But \( (\beta, \omega_0) \in A \), proving there there exists no open set \( V \) satisfying...
\[ B \subseteq V \subseteq \overline{V} \subseteq U \]

i.e. \( Y \) is not normal (and not closed).

It can be shown that \( \text{ind} \ X = \text{Ind} \ X = \dim \ X = \text{Dim} \ X = 0 \).

Also \( Y = \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} Y_k \)

where \( Y_k = \{(a,k) \mid 0 \leq a \leq \omega_1\} \cap Y \).

Then each \( Y_k \) is closed in the completely regular non-normal Hausdorff space \( Y \), and \( \dim Y_k = 0 \), yet \( \dim Y > 0 \). This shows that the sum theorem is not true for 'dim' for all completely regular Hausdorff spaces.

Now \( \dim A = 0 \), where 
\( A = \{(a,\omega_1) \mid 0 \leq a < \omega_1\} \).

Let \( C = Y \setminus A \).

Then \( \dim C = 0 \), for every finite open cover of \( C \) has a disjoint refinement. Hence \( \text{Dim} \ Y \leq 1 \). But also \( \text{Dim} \ Y \geq 1 \). Hence \( \text{Dim} \ Y = 1 \).

It can also be shown that \( \dim Y = 1 \).

To show that \( \text{Ind} \ Y = 1 \), let \( F, G \) be closed and open subsets of \( Y \) respectively, with \( F \subseteq G \).

Consider the statements:

A : "there exists an ordinal \( \omega_0 < \omega_1 \) such that \( (\alpha,\omega_0) \notin F \) for \( \alpha \geq \omega_0 \)."

B : "there exists an ordinal \( \omega_0 < \omega_1 \) such that \( (k,\omega_1) \notin F \) for \( k \geq k_0 \)."

We now distinguish four cases:

(i) A, B both true.

(ii) A, B both false.

(iii) A false, B true.

(iv) A true, B false.
In cases (i), (ii) it is not difficult to see that there exists an open set \( U \) satisfying
\[
F \subseteq U \subseteq G, \quad b(U) = \emptyset.
\]

In case (iii) for every open set \( U \supseteq F \), \( b(u) \supseteq \{(k, \omega_1) \mid k_0 < k \leq \omega_0\} \) for some \( k_0 < \omega_0 \). Hence \( \text{Ind } b(u) \geq 0 \) in this case. However, we can build up \( U \) from basic open sets so that \( b(U) \subseteq \{(\omega_1, k) \mid 0 < k < \omega_0\} = B \).

Hence \( \text{Ind } b(U) = 0 \).

The analysis of the 'Tychonov Plank' to show that \( Y \) is not normal shows that in this case there exists an open set \( U \) such that \( F \subseteq U \subseteq G \) where
\[
\emptyset \neq b(U) \subseteq A = \{(\alpha, \omega_1) \mid 0 \leq \alpha < \omega_1\}.
\]

Thus again \( \text{Ind } b(U) = 0 \). Hence in all cases \( \text{Ind } b(U) \leq 0 \) and \( \text{Ind } Y \leq 1 \).

Since \( Y \) is not normal, Theorem 3.6 \( \Rightarrow \) \( \text{Ind } Y \geq 1 \).

Hence \( \text{Ind } Y = 1 \).

Then \( \text{ind } X = \text{ind } Y = \dim X = \text{Dim } X = \text{Ind } X = 0 \), but \( \dim Y = \text{Dim } Y = \text{Ind } Y = 1 \).
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