

203. On the Product of M -Spaces. I

By Tadashi ISHII, Mitsuru TSUDA, and Shin-ichi KUNUGI
Utsunomiya University

(Comm. by Kinjirô KUNUGI, M. J. A., Nov. 12, 1968)

1. Introduction. In the present paper all spaces are assumed to be Hausdorff. In his previous paper [2], K. Morita has introduced the notion of M -spaces. A space X is called an M -space if there exists a normal sequence $\{\mathfrak{U}_i \mid i=1, 2, \dots\}$ of open coverings of X satisfying the condition (M) below :

$$(M) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{If } \{K_i\} \text{ is a sequence of non-empty subsets of } X \text{ such that } K_{i+1} \\ \subset K_i, K_i \subset \text{St}(x_0, \mathfrak{U}_i) \text{ for each } i \text{ and for some fixed point } x_0 \text{ of } X, \\ \text{then } \bigcap K_i \neq \phi. \end{array} \right.$$

As is easily verified, Condition (M) is equivalent to the condition (M_0^*) below :

$$(M_0) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{If } \{x_i\} \text{ is a sequence of points of } X \text{ such that } x_i \in \text{St}(x_0, \mathfrak{U}_i) \text{ for} \\ \text{each } i \text{ and for some fixed point } x_0 \text{ of } X, \text{ then } \{x_i\} \text{ has an ac-} \\ \text{cumulation point.} \end{array} \right.$$

Hereafter we use Condition (M_0) in place of Condition (M).

As for the product $X \times Y$ of two M -spaces X and Y , it seems to be unknown whether $X \times Y$ is also an M -space or not. We can give an affirmative answer for this problem in the following cases :

- (a) X satisfies the first axiom of countability.
- (b) X is locally compact.
- (c) X is paracompact.

The purpose of our papers I and II is to introduce the notion of the spaces belonging to the class \mathfrak{C} and to prove a more general theorem (cf. Theorem 1.1 in II) as follows: If a space X belongs to the class \mathfrak{C} , then the product $X \times Y$ is also an M -space for any M -space Y . We denote by \mathfrak{C} the class of all spaces X such that there exists a normal sequence $\{\mathfrak{U}_i\}$ of open coverings of X satisfying the condition $(*)$ below :

$$(*) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{If } \{x_i\} \text{ is a sequence of points of } X \text{ such that } x_i \in \text{St}(x_0, \mathfrak{U}_i) \text{ for} \\ \text{each } i \text{ and for some fixed point } x_0 \text{ of } X, \text{ then there exist a sub-} \\ \text{sequence } \{x_{i(n)} \mid n=1, 2, \dots\} \text{ of } \{x_i\} \text{ which has the compact} \\ \text{closure.} \end{array} \right.$$

The class \mathfrak{C} contains all M -spaces satisfying one of conditions (a), (b), and (c), and further the spaces belonging to \mathfrak{C} have the following properties.

- (i) If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a quasi-perfect map (i.e., a continuous closed

surjective map such that $f^{-1}(y)$ is countably compact) of a space X belonging to \mathfrak{C} onto a normal space Y , then Y belongs to \mathfrak{C} (cf. Theorem 2.4).

(ii) If X_i , $i=1, 2, \dots$, belong to \mathfrak{C} , then the product $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i$ belongs to \mathfrak{C} (cf. Theorem 1.3 in II).

2. The spaces belonging to \mathfrak{C} .

Theorem 2.1. *If a space X belongs to \mathfrak{C} , then X is an M -space.*

Proof. Since X belongs to \mathfrak{C} , there exists a normal sequence $\{\mathfrak{U}_i\}$ of open coverings of X satisfying Condition (*). Let $\{x_i\}$ be a sequence of points of X such that $x_i \in \text{St}(x_0, \mathfrak{U}_i)$ for each i and for some fixed point x_0 of X . We shall prove that $\{x_i\}$ has an accumulation point. For this purpose we can assume without loss of generality that $\{x_i\}$ contains a subsequence $\{x_{i(n)}\}$ consisting of distinct points. Since $x_{i(n)} \in \text{St}(x_0, \mathfrak{U}_n)$ for every n , by Condition (*) there exists a subsequence $\{x'_n\}$ of $\{x_{i(n)}\}$ which has the compact closure. Consequently, $\{x'_n\}$ has an accumulation point. If otherwise, $\{x'_n\}$ must be discrete and closed. Since $\{x'_n\}$ consists of distinct points, it cannot be compact. Therefore $\{\mathfrak{U}_i\}$ satisfies Condition (M_0) . This completes the proof.

Remark. In the proof of Theorem 2.1, it is sufficient to assume that the closure of the subsequence $\{x'_n\}$ of $\{x_{i(n)}\}$ is countably compact.

The converse of Theorem 2.1 is not valid in general, as is shown in Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 2.2. *If an M -space X satisfies one of the following conditions, then X belongs to \mathfrak{C} :*

- (a) X satisfies the first axiom of countability.
- (b) X is locally compact.
- (c) X is paracompact.

Proof. Since X is an M -space, there exists a normal sequence $\{\mathfrak{U}_i\}$ of open coverings of X satisfying Condition (M_0) . Let $\{x_i\}$ be a sequence of points of X such that $x_i \in \text{St}(x_0, \mathfrak{U}_i)$ for each i and for some fixed point x_0 of X . Then, by Condition (M_0) , $\{x_i\}$ has an accumulation point x' .

(i) If X satisfies the first axiom of countability, then $\{x_i\}$ contains a subsequence $\{x_{i(n)}\}$ which converges to x' . Clearly the closure of $\{x_{i(n)}\}$ is compact. Thus X belongs to \mathfrak{C} .

(ii) If X is locally compact, then there exists a neighborhood $U(x')$ of x' which has the compact closure. Since $U(x')$ contains infinite number of elements of $\{x_i\}$, we denote them by $\{x_{i(n)}\}$. Then $\{x_{i(n)}\}$ has clearly the compact closure. Thus X belongs to \mathfrak{C} .

(iii) If X is paracompact, any countably compact subset is compact. Since $\{x_i\}$ has accumulation points in $\bigcap \text{St}(x_0, \mathfrak{U}_i)$ and nowhere

else, the closure of $\{x_i\}$ is countably compact, and hence it is compact. Thus X belongs to \mathfrak{C} .

Remark. A space X belonging to \mathfrak{C} does not necessarily satisfy the first axiom of countability, because there is a compact space which does not satisfy the first axiom of countability. Further a space belonging to \mathfrak{C} is not necessarily locally compact, because there is a metric space which is not locally compact.

Theorem 2.3. *There exists an M -space which does not belong to \mathfrak{C} , and further there exists a space which belongs to \mathfrak{C} but is not a paracompact M -space.*

To prove Theorem 2.3, we mention two examples of the spaces satisfying the required properties.

Example 1. (*An M -space which does not belong to \mathfrak{C}*). We show that a countably compact space A_1 , which was constructed by J. Novák [4], satisfies the required conditions. Let $\beta(N)$ be the Čech-compactification of the set N of natural numbers. Then by [4] there exist two subsets P and Q of $\beta(N)$ such that $P \cup Q = \beta(N) - N$, $P \cap Q = \emptyset$ and that $\bar{S} \cap P \neq \emptyset$ and $\bar{S} \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ for any countable infinite subset S of $\beta(N)$. Let us put $A_1 = P \cup N$. Then the subspace A_1 of $\beta(N)$ is countably compact, and hence it is an M -space.

Now we shall prove that the space A_1 does not belong to \mathfrak{C} . Let S be any countable infinite subset of A_1 . Then the set S has no compact closure in A_1 . If otherwise, then the closure of S in A_1 is compact, and hence it is compact in $\beta(N)$, too. But, as the construction of the sets P and Q shows, the closure of S in $\beta(N)$ contains a point of the set $Q = \beta(N) - A_1$. This is a contradiction. Let $\{\mathfrak{U}_i\}$ be any normal sequence of open coverings of A_1 , and let $x_0 \in P$. Then $\text{St}(x_0, \mathfrak{U}_i)$ contains infinite points of N for each i , and hence we can choose a sequence $\{n_i\}$ of distinct points of N such that $n_i \in \text{St}(x_0, \mathfrak{U}_i)$. As is shown above, the closure of $\{n_i\}$ in A_1 is not compact. Thus the space A_1 does not belong to \mathfrak{C} .

Example 2. (*A space X which belongs to \mathfrak{C} but is not a paracompact M -space*). Let X be the space $\{\alpha \mid \alpha < \Omega\}$ of ordinals with the order topology, where Ω is the first uncountable ordinal. Since X is countably compact and satisfies the first axiom of countability, it belongs to \mathfrak{C} . But it is not paracompact.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a quasi-perfect map. If X belongs to \mathfrak{C} and if X or Y is normal, then Y belongs to \mathfrak{C} . If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is perfect and if Y belongs to \mathfrak{C} , then X belongs to \mathfrak{C} .*

The proof of Theorem 2.4 is performed by the similar way as in the proof of the first part of [3, Theorem 2.2]. For this purpose we introduce a class \mathfrak{C}^* of the spaces. We denote by \mathfrak{C}^* the class of

all spaces X such that there exists a sequence $\{\mathfrak{F}_i | i=1, 2, \dots\}$ of locally finite closed coverings of X satisfying Condition (*). As for the spaces belonging to \mathfrak{C}^* , the following lemmas are valid.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a quasi-perfect map. If X belongs to \mathfrak{C}^* , then Y also belongs to \mathfrak{C}^* .*

Lemma 2.6. *If X belongs to \mathfrak{C} , then X belongs to \mathfrak{C}^* and satisfies the property (C) below:*

(C) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{For any locally finite collection } \{F_\lambda\} \text{ of closed sets of } X \text{ there} \\ \text{exists a locally finite collection } \{G_\lambda\} \text{ of open sets of } X \text{ such that} \\ F_\lambda \subset G_\lambda \text{ for each } \lambda. \end{array} \right.$

In case X is normal, the converse is true.

Since Lemma 2.5 can be proved by the similar way as in the proof of [1, Theorem 2.3] and Lemma 2.6 can be proved by the similar way as in the proof of [3, Theorem 1.1], we omitt the proof.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. If X is normal, so is Y . Further by [3, Lemma 2.1], if X has Property (C), so has Y . Hence the first part follows from Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6. The second part follows from the fact that, if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is perfect, then $f^{-1}(C)$ is compact for every compact set C of Y . Thus the proof is completed.

By the same way as in the proof of [3, Theorem 3.1], it follows from Theorem 2.4 that, if $\{A_\lambda | \lambda \in A\}$ is a locally finite closed covering of a space X and if each A_λ is a normal space belonging to \mathfrak{C} , then X is a normal space belonging to \mathfrak{C} . In [3], K. Morita shows by an example that a space Y which is the union of closed subspaces C_i , $i=1, 2$, each of which is an M -space, is not an M -space in general. In this example, each C_i is a locally compact M -space, and hence belongs to \mathfrak{C} , while Y does not belong to \mathfrak{C} .

Finally we note that a space belonging to \mathfrak{C}^* does not belong to \mathfrak{C} in general. This is an immediate consequence of the following result obtained by K. Morita [3]: There is a perfect map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ such that X is a locally compact M -space but Y is not an M -space. In fact, Y belongs to \mathfrak{C}^* by Lemma 2.5 but does not belong to \mathfrak{C} .

References

- [1] T. Ishii: On closed mappings and M -spaces. I. Proc. Japan Acad., **43**, 752-756 (1967).
- [2] K. Morita: Products of normal spaces with metric spaces. Math. Ann., **154**, 365-382 (1964).
- [3] —: Some properties of M -spaces. Proc. Japan Acad., **43**, 869-872 (1967).
- [4] J. Novák: On the cartesian product of two compact spaces. Fund. Math., **40**, 106-112 (1953).