

## On total paracompactness and total metacompactness

by

Ken-ichi Tamano (Tokyo) and Yukinobu Yajima (Ibaraki)

**Abstract.** We first generalize the countable sum theorem concerning totally paracompact spaces by two order locally finite covers. Secondly, we show that there exists a separable metric space with a base containing no weakly uniform base.

**0. Introduction.** The present paper is composed of two main results. One is concerned with total paracompactness. Many results on a space  $X$  which has two order locally finite covers  $\{F_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  and  $\{U_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  such that  $F_\xi$  is closed and has a topological property  $\mathfrak{P}$  and  $U_\xi$  is an open nbd of  $F_\xi$  for each  $\xi < \alpha$  have been studied by Y. Katuta [8] and R. Telgársky [10], [12]. We show that  $X$  is totally paracompact if  $X$  has the above two covers  $\{F_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  and  $\{U_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  and the above property  $\mathfrak{P}$  is total paracompactness relative to  $X$ . This is a generalization of the countable sum theorem concerning total paracompactness by D. W. Curtis [3].

The other result is concerned with total metacompactness. It is well-known that the space  $N^N$  of all irrational numbers with a usual topology is not totally metacompact [2], [4]. R. W. Heath and W. F. Lindgren raised the question of whether or not every base of a space with a weakly uniform base contains a weakly uniform base ([6] Question 4). We give a negative answer to this question. We shall show that the space  $N^N$  of irrational numbers is a desired counterexample for it.

When  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a collection of subsets of a space  $X$ , let  $\mathfrak{A}^\# = \bigcup \{A: A \in \mathfrak{A}\}$ . Unless otherwise stated, no separation axioms are assumed. However, compact, paracompact and totally paracompact spaces are always Hausdorff.  $N$  denotes the set of all natural numbers. Natural numbers are denoted by  $m, n, i, j, \dots$  and ordinal numbers are denoted by  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots, \xi, \eta, \zeta, \dots$

**1. Total paracompactness.** A Hausdorff space  $X$  is said to be *totally paracompact* [5] if every open base of  $X$  contains a locally finite cover of  $X$ . A closed set  $F$  of  $X$  is said to be *totally paracompact relative to  $X$*  [10] if every open base of  $X$  contains a locally finite (in  $X$ ) cover of  $F$ . Then  $F$  is clearly totally paracompact. Recall that a collection  $\{A_\lambda: \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  of subsets of a space  $X$  is said to be *order locally finite* [8] if we can introduce a well-ordering  $<$  in the index set  $\Lambda$  such that for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  the collection  $\{A_\mu: \mu < \lambda\}$  is locally finite at each point of  $A_\lambda$ . Since every well-ordered set is order-isomorphic to an initial segment of ordinal numbers, we use the notation

$\{A_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  instead of  $\{A_\lambda: \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ . Every countable collection of subsets of  $X$  is clearly order locally finite.

Our main theorem is as follows.

**THEOREM 1.** *If a regular  $T_1$ -space  $X$  has two order locally finite covers  $\{F_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  and  $\{U_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  such that  $F_\xi$  is closed and totally paracompact relative to  $X$  and  $U_\xi$  is an open nbd of  $F_\xi$  for each  $\xi < \alpha$ , then  $X$  is totally paracompact.*

We need the following two lemmas to prove Theorem 1.

**LEMMA 2** (Y. Katuta [8]). *Let  $\{A_\lambda: \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  be an order locally finite collection of subsets of a space  $X$ , and let  $\{B_\xi: \xi \in \Xi_\lambda\}$  be a collection of subsets of  $A_\lambda$  which is locally finite in  $X$  for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . Then the collection  $\{B_\xi: \xi \in \Xi\}$  is order locally finite, where  $\Xi$  is the disjoint union of  $\Xi_\lambda$ .*

**LEMMA 3** (Y. Katuta [8]). *A regular  $T_1$ -space  $X$  is paracompact if and only if any open cover of  $X$  has an order locally finite open refinement.*

**Proof of Theorem 1.** Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be an open base of  $X$ . We can choose a subcollection  $\mathfrak{B}'_\xi$  of  $\mathfrak{B}$  such that  $\mathfrak{B}'_\xi$  is locally finite in  $X$  and  $F_\xi \subset \mathfrak{B}'_\xi \subset U_\xi$  for each  $\xi < \alpha$ . Then it follows from Lemma 2 that the collection  $\bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} \mathfrak{B}'_\xi$  is an order locally finite open cover of  $X$ . So any open base of  $X$  contains an order locally finite cover of  $X$ . By Lemma 3,  $X$  is paracompact. We first construct transfinite sequences  $\{\mathfrak{B}_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  of subcollections of  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\{V_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  of open sets in  $X$  satisfying the following conditions: For each  $\xi < \alpha$ ,

- (1)  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$  is locally finite in  $X$ .
- (2)  $F_\xi - \bigcup_{\eta < \xi} \mathfrak{B}_\eta \subset \mathfrak{B}_\xi \subset U_\xi$ .
- (3)  $F_\xi \subset V_\xi \subset \text{Cl } V_\xi \subset \bigcup_{\eta < \xi} \mathfrak{B}_\eta \cap U_\xi$ .
- (4)  $\text{Cl}(\bigcup_{\eta < \xi} V_\eta) \cap \mathfrak{B}_\xi = \emptyset$ .

We can choose a subcollection  $\mathfrak{B}_0$  of  $\mathfrak{B}$  and an open set  $V_0$  such that  $\mathfrak{B}_0$  is locally finite in  $X$  and  $F_0 \subset V_0 \subset \text{Cl } V_0 \subset \mathfrak{B}_0 \subset U_0$ . Assume that  $\{\mathfrak{B}_\eta: \eta < \xi\}$  and  $\{V_\eta: \eta < \xi\}$  have already been constructed. We show that

$$\text{Cl}(\bigcup_{\eta < \xi} V_\eta) \subset \bigcup_{\eta < \xi} \mathfrak{B}_\eta.$$

Let  $x \in X - \bigcup_{\eta < \xi} \mathfrak{B}_\eta$ . We take some  $\zeta < \alpha$  such that  $x \in F_\zeta$ . By (3),

$$\bigcup_{\eta < \zeta} V_\eta \subset \bigcup_{\eta < \zeta} \text{Cl } V_\eta \subset \bigcup_{\eta < \zeta} \mathfrak{B}_\eta.$$

So we have  $\zeta \geq \xi$ . By order locally finiteness of  $\{U_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$ , we can choose an open nbd  $G'_x$  of  $x$  such that for some  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_m < \zeta$ ,  $G'_x \cap U_{\eta_i} = \emptyset$  if  $\eta_i \neq \eta_1, \dots, \eta_m$ . Let  $G_x = G'_x - \bigcup \{\text{Cl } V_{\eta_i}: i = 1, \dots, m, \eta_i < \zeta\}$ . Then  $G_x$  is an open nbd of  $x$  such that  $G_x \cap \bigcup_{\eta < \zeta} V_\eta = \emptyset$ . Hence we have  $x \in X - \text{Cl}(\bigcup_{\eta < \zeta} V_\eta)$ .  $F_\xi - \bigcup_{\eta < \xi} \mathfrak{B}_\eta$  is clearly totally paracompact relative to  $X$ . It is easy to show that there exists a subcollection  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$

of  $\mathfrak{B}$  such that  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$  is locally finite in  $X$ ,  $F_\xi - \bigcup_{\eta < \xi} \mathfrak{B}_\eta \subset \mathfrak{B}_\xi \subset U_\xi$  and  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi \cap \text{Cl}(\bigcup_{\eta < \xi} V_\eta) = \emptyset$ . Then  $F_\xi \subset \bigcup_{\eta < \xi} \mathfrak{B}_\eta \cap U_\xi$ . Since  $X$  is normal, we can take an open set  $V_\xi$  in  $X$  such that  $F_\xi \subset V_\xi \subset \text{Cl } V_\xi \subset \bigcup_{\eta < \xi} \mathfrak{B}_\eta \cap U_\xi$ . Thus we have constructed the desired transfinite sequences  $\{\mathfrak{B}_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  and  $\{V_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$ . Put  $\mathfrak{B} = \bigcup \mathfrak{B}_\xi$ . By (3),  $\mathfrak{B}$  is a subcover of  $\mathfrak{B}$ . Let  $x \in X$ . We take some  $\xi_0 < \alpha$  such that  $x \in F_{\xi_0}$ . By (4),  $V_{\xi_0} \cap \mathfrak{B}_\xi = \emptyset$  for any  $\xi > \xi_0$ . We can choose an open nbd  $H'_x$  of  $x$  such that for some  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n < \xi_0$ ,  $H'_x \cap U_{\xi_i} = \emptyset$  if any  $\xi \neq \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$ . By (1),  $\mathfrak{B}_{\xi_0} \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{B}_{\xi_i})$  is locally finite in  $X$ . Hence we can also choose an open nbd  $H_x$  of  $x$  which intersects at most finite members of  $\bigcup \mathfrak{B}_\xi$ . Then  $H_x \cap V_{\xi_0}$  is an open nbd of  $x$  which intersects at most finite members of  $\mathfrak{B}$ . We have shown that  $\mathfrak{B}$  is a locally finite subcover of  $\mathfrak{B}$ . The proof is complete.

The following two corollaries are immediate consequences of Theorem 1.

**COROLLARY 4** (D. W. Curtis [3]). *Every paracompact space  $X$  which is the countable union of closed subspaces totally paracompact relative to  $X$  is totally paracompact.*

**COROLLARY 5** (R. Telgársky [12]). *If a regular  $T_1$ -space  $X$  has two order locally finite covers  $\{C_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  and  $\{U_\xi: \xi < \alpha\}$  such that  $C_\xi$  is compact and  $U_\xi$  is an open nbd of  $C_\xi$  for each  $\xi < \alpha$ , then  $X$  is totally paracompact.*

R. Telgársky showed in [12] that the space  $X$  described in Corollary 5 has a closure-preserving cover by compact sets. So the following theorem is another generalization of Corollary 5.

**THEOREM 6** (Y. Yajima [14]). *If a paracompact space  $X$  has a  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving cover by compact sets, then  $X$  is totally paracompact.*

A regular  $T_1$ -space  $X$  is said to be a *Hurewicz space* [7] if for every sequence  $\mathfrak{U}_1, \mathfrak{U}_2, \dots$  of open covers of  $X$  there exists a cover  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $X$  such that  $\mathfrak{B} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{B}_i$ , where  $\mathfrak{B}_i$  is a finite subcollection of  $\mathfrak{U}_i$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{H}$  be the class of all Hurewicz spaces.  $\mathbf{H}$ -like space is defined as in [13] (p. 195).

**THEOREM 7** <sup>(1)</sup>. *The following are equivalent for a space  $X$ .*

- (a)  $X$  is a Hurewicz space.
- (b)  $X$  is  $\mathbf{H}$ -like.

**Proof.** (a)  $\rightarrow$  (b): It is obvious.

(b)  $\rightarrow$  (a): Let  $s$  be a winning strategy of player  $I$  in  $G(\mathbf{H}, X)$  and let  $\{\mathfrak{U}_n: n \geq 1\}$  be a sequence of open covers of  $X$ . We set  $E_0 = X$  and  $E_1 = s(E_0)$ . Since  $E_1 \in \mathbf{H}$ ,

<sup>(1)</sup> Theorem 7 and its proof have been pointed out to the authors by the referee. This theorem has a better form than the original one. The authors would like to thank the referee for several helpful comments.

there exists a sequence  $\{\mathcal{U}_{n1} : n \geq 1\}$  such that  $\mathcal{U}_{n1}$  is a finite subcollection of  $\mathcal{U}_n$  for each  $n \geq 1$ , and  $E_1 \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_{n1}^{\#}$ . We set  $E_2 = X - \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_{n1}^{\#}$  and  $E_3 = s(E_0, E_1, E_2)$ . Since  $E_3 \in \mathbf{H}$ , there exists a sequence  $\{\mathcal{U}_{n2} : n \geq 2\}$  such that  $\mathcal{U}_{n2}$  is a finite subcollection of  $\mathcal{U}_n$  for each  $n \geq 2$ , and  $E_3 \subset \bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_{n2}^{\#}$ . We set

$$E_4 = E_2 - \bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_{n2}^{\#} \quad \text{and} \quad E_5 = s(E_0, E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4).$$

Continuing in that matter, we get a play  $(E_0, E_1, E_2, \dots)$  of  $G(\mathbf{H}, X)$ . Since  $s$  is a winning strategy, we have  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_{2n} = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\{\bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_{nk}^{\#} : k \geq 1\}$  is an open cover of  $X$ . So, we set  $\mathfrak{B}_n = \bigcup_{m=1}^n \mathcal{U}_{nm}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . Then  $\mathfrak{B}_n$  is a finite subcollection of  $\mathcal{U}_n$  for each  $n \geq 1$  and  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{B}_n$  is an open cover of  $X$ . The proof is complete.

**Remark 8.** Theorem 7 is a generalization of 5.5 in [13]. Moreover, since each  $\sigma$ -compact space is a Hurewicz space, it is easy to see from Theorem 7 and 10.2 of [13] that each Lindelöf regular  $T_1$ -space with  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving cover by compact sets is a Hurewicz space.

**2. Total metacompactness.** A space  $X$  is said to be *totally metacompact* [12] if every open base of  $X$  contains a point-finite cover of  $X$ .

**THEOREM 9.** *If a metacompact  $T_1$ -space  $X$  has a  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving closed cover by compact sets, then  $X$  is totally metacompact.*

The proof is quite similar to that of our Theorem 6. So the detail of it is left to the reader.

A base  $\mathfrak{B}$  of a space  $X$  is said to be a *uniform base* [1], if for each  $x \in X$ , any infinite subcollection of  $\mathfrak{B}$ , each member of which contains  $x$ , is a local base at  $x$ . A base  $\mathfrak{B}$  of a space  $X$  is said to be a *weakly uniform base* [6] if for each  $x \in X$ , the intersection of any infinite subcollection of  $\mathfrak{B}$ , each member of which contains  $x$ , is  $\{x\}$ . A collection  $\mathfrak{A}$  of subsets of  $X$  is said to be *weakly uniform* [6] if no two points of  $X$  belong to infinitely many members of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Clearly, a uniform base of a  $T_1$ -space is a weakly uniform base and a weakly uniform base is a base being weakly uniform.

R. W. Heath and W. F. Lindgren [6] raised the question of whether or not every base of a space with a weakly uniform base contains such a base. First, we consider the following generalized form instead of the above.

Let  $\mathfrak{P}$  be a property of bases of a space  $X$ .

“Suppose that a space  $X$  has a base having property  $\mathfrak{P}$ . Does every base of  $X$  contain a base having property  $\mathfrak{P}$ ?”

In this section, we study the two cases that  $\mathfrak{P}$  is the property being a uniform base and being a weakly uniform base. They seem to be closely related to total metacompactness.

**THEOREM 10.** *The following are equivalent for a space  $X$  with a uniform base.*

(a)  $X$  is totally metacompact.

(b) Every base of  $X$  contains a uniform base.

**Proof.** (a)  $\rightarrow$  (b): Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be any base of  $X$ . It is well-known that a space with a uniform base is developable. So we can easily construct a development  $\{\mathfrak{B}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  such that  $\mathfrak{B} \supset \mathfrak{B}_1 \supset \mathfrak{B}_2 \supset \dots$  and each  $\mathfrak{B}_i$  is a base of  $X$ . By (a),  $\mathfrak{B}_i$  contains a point-finite subcover  $\mathfrak{A}_i$  of  $X$  for each  $i \in \mathbf{N}$ . Put  $\mathfrak{B} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_i$ . Every infinite subcollection

of  $\mathfrak{B}$ , each member of which contains a point  $x$  of  $X$ , can not be contained in  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{A}_i$  for each  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ . Since  $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a development of  $X$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}$  is a uniform base of  $X$ .

(b)  $\rightarrow$  (a): Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be any base of  $X$ . By (b),  $\mathfrak{B}$  contains a uniform base  $\mathfrak{B}'$  of  $X$ . It is sufficient to show that  $\mathfrak{B}'$  contains a point-finite subcover of  $X$ . Put

$$\mathfrak{A} = \{B \in \mathfrak{B}' : B \text{ is not properly contained in any set } B', B' \in \mathfrak{B}'\}.$$

It is known in [1] that  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a point-finite subcover of  $\mathfrak{B}'$ . The proof is complete.

Let  $N^{\mathbf{N}}$  be the space of all irrational numbers with the usual topology. It is known that  $N^{\mathbf{N}}$  is not totally metacompact ([2], [4]). By Theorem 10, we can see that  $N^{\mathbf{N}}$  has a base containing no uniform base. Moreover, we obtain the following result which is a negative answer for the question of R. W. Heath and W. F. Lindgren ([6], Question 4).

**EXAMPLE 11.** The space  $N^{\mathbf{N}}$  of all irrational numbers has a base containing no weakly uniform base.

It is well-known that  $N^{\mathbf{N}}$  is considered as the product space of  $\{N_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ , where each  $N_i$  is a copy of  $N$ . Let  $B(k) = \{1, \dots, k\} \times \prod_{i=2}^{\infty} N_i$  and let  $B(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}; k) = \{x_1\} \times \dots \times \{x_{n-1}\} \times \{1, \dots, k\} \times \prod_{i=n+1}^{\infty} N_i$  for each  $x_i \in N_i$  and  $k \in N$ . Moreover, let  $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \{B(k) : k \in N\}$  and let  $\mathfrak{B}_n = \{B(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}; k) : x_i \in N_i, i = 1, \dots, n-1 \text{ and } k \in N\}$  for  $n \geq 2$ . Then  $\mathfrak{B} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{B}_n$  is an open base of  $N^{\mathbf{N}}$  (This base  $\mathfrak{B}$  was considered in [4] in order to prove non-total metacompactness of  $N^{\mathbf{N}}$ ). We show that the base  $\mathfrak{B}$  contains no weakly uniform base of  $N^{\mathbf{N}}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be any weakly uniform subcollection of  $\mathfrak{B}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{A}_n = \mathfrak{A} \cap \mathfrak{B}_n$ . For each  $B \in \mathfrak{A}_1$ ,  $(1, 1, 1, \dots) \in B$  and  $(1, 2, 1, 1, \dots) \in \mathfrak{B}$ . By the assumption of  $\mathfrak{A}$ ,  $\mathfrak{A}_1$  is a finite collection. Then we can take some  $y_1 \in N$  such that  $\{y_1\} \times \prod_{i=2}^{\infty} N_i \cap \mathfrak{A}_1^{\#} = \emptyset$ . By the same argument,

$$\{B(x_1; k) \in \mathfrak{A}_2 : x_1 = y_1, k \in N\}$$

is a finite subcollection of  $\mathfrak{A}_2$ . Then we can take some  $y_2 \in N$  such that

$$\{y_1\} \times \{y_2\} \times \prod_{i=3}^{\infty} N_i \cap (\bigcup \{B(x_1; k) \in \mathfrak{A}_2 : x_1 = y_1, k \in N\}) = \emptyset.$$

Since  $\{y_1\} \times \{y_2\} \times \prod_{i=3}^{\infty} N_i \cap B(x_1; k) = \emptyset$  if  $x_1 \neq y_1$ , we have

$$\{y_1\} \times \{y_2\} \times \prod_{i=3}^{\infty} N_i \cap \mathfrak{U}_2^{\#} = \emptyset.$$

By induction, we can choose a sequence  $\{y_1, y_2, \dots\} \subset N$  such that

$$\{y_1\} \times \dots \times \{y_n\} \times \prod_{i=n+1}^{\infty} N_i \cap \mathfrak{U}_n^{\#} = \emptyset \quad \text{for each } n \in N.$$

Then  $(y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots) \notin \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{U}_n^{\#} = \mathfrak{U}^{\#}$ . Hence we have shown that  $\mathfrak{U}$  is not a cover of  $N^N$ . Thus the base  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $N^N$  contains no weakly uniform cover.

#### References

- [1] P. S. Aleksandrov, *On the metrization of topological spaces*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. 8 (1960), pp. 135–140.
- [2] H. H. Corson, T. J. McMinin, E. A. Michael and J. Nagata, *Bases and local finiteness*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 6 (1959), p. 814.
- [3] D. W. Curtis, *Total and absolute paracompactness*, Fund. Math. 77 (1973), pp. 277–283.
- [4] B. Fitzpatrick Jr. and R. M. Ford, *On the equivalence of small and large inductive dimension in certain metric spaces*, Duke. Math. J. 34 (1967), pp. 33–37.
- [5] R. M. Ford, *Basis properties in dimension theory*, Doctoral Dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, Ala. (1963).
- [6] R. W. Heath and W. F. Lindgren, *Weakly uniform bases*, (to appear).
- [7] W. Hurewicz, *Über eine Verallgemeinerung des Borelschen Theorems*, Math. Z. 24 (1926), pp. 401–421.
- [8] Y. Katuta, *A theorem on paracompactness of product spaces*, Proc. Japan. Acad. 43 (1967), pp. 615–618.
- [9] R. Telgársky, *Total paracompactness and paracompact dispersed spaces*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. 16 (1968), pp. 567–572.
- [10] — *C-scattered and paracompact spaces*, Fund. Math. 73 (1971), pp. 59–74.
- [11] — and H. Kok, *The space of rationals is not absolutely paracompact*, Fund. Math. 73 (1971), pp. 75–78.
- [12] — *Closure-preserving covers*, Fund. Math. 85 (1974), pp. 165–175.
- [13] — *Spaces defined by topological games*, Fund. Math. 88 (1975), pp. 193–223.
- [14] Y. Yajima, *Solution of R. Telgársky's problem*, Proc. Japan. Acad. 52 (1976), pp. 348–350.

TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION  
Tokyo, Japan  
UNIVERSITY OF TSUKUBA  
Ibaraki, Japan