### Some notes about Hausdorff µ-space

## Chung, In Jae Dept. of Electrical Engineering

#### (Abstract)

In this paper we define a Hausdorff  $\mu$ -space and study its properties. In section 2, we consider some properties between the given topology and the  $\mu$ -extention topology. In section 3, we investigate the necessary condition and the sufficient condition for the Hausdorff  $\mu$ -space. In section 4, we prove that a locally  $\mu$ -space is a  $\mu$ -space and any closed subspace of  $\mu$ -spaces is a  $\mu$ -space,

### Hausdorff μ-space에 관한 연구

징 **인** 자 전기 공학과

〈요 약〉

본 논문에서는 Hausdorff  $\mu$ -space를 정의하여 이들이 갖는 몇가지 성질들을 안아 보았다. 제 2 절에서는 일반 Hausdorff인 위상궁간에서 이돌 보다 finer한  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$ -공간을 정의하여 본래 주어진 위상공간과의 관계를 비교하였고, 제 3 길에서는 Hausdorff  $\mu$ -space의 필요조건과 충분조건을 찾아 보았다. 제 4 절에서 국소  $\mu$ -space를 정의하여 국소  $\mu$ -space이던  $\mu$ -space임을 중명하였고 일의의  $\mu$ -space의 개부분 공간은  $\mu$ -space임을 증명하였다.

#### I. Introduction

In this paper we are concerned with a Hausd-orff  $\mu$ -space. By a  $\mu$ -space is meant a topological space which is coherent with its metacompact closed subsets, i.e. X is a  $\mu$ -space if open subsets of X are exactly those sets which intersect every metacompact closed subset M of X in an open subset of M. In section 2, we consider some properties between the given topology and the  $\mu$ -extention topology. In section 3, we investigate two topological properties which are closely related to  $\mu$ -space. One of them ensures a space to be a  $\mu$ -space, while the other proved to be a necessary condition to become a  $\mu$ -space. In section 4, we proved that locally

 $\mu$ -space is  $\mu$ -space and every closed subset of a  $\mu$ -space is a  $\mu$ -space. Unless otherwise mentioned, the word "space" is used to meant a Hausdorff space.

#### II. The $\mu$ -extention of a topology.

Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a Hausdorff space. The  $\mu$ -extention of  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined to be the family  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$  of all subsets U of X such that  $U \cap M$  is open in M for every metacompact closed subset M

Proposition 2.1. If M is a  $\mathcal{F}$ -metacompact closed subset of X, then the relativization of  $\mathcal{F}$  to M is identical with that of  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$ . Consequently a set is  $\mathcal{F}$ -metacompact closed subset iff it is  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$ -metacompact closed subset.

Proof. Suppose M is  $\mathcal{T}$ -metacompact closed

subset. Since M is  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$ -closed as  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$  is finer than  $\mathcal{F}$ , a subset A of M is  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$ -closed in the whole space whenever it is relatively  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$ -closed in M. Hence a subset A of M is closed in M with respect to  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$ , then its intersection with any metacompact closed subset must be  $\mathcal{F}$ -closed.  $A=A\cap M$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -closed, and  $\mathcal{F}$  is finer than  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$  on M.

Proposition 2.2. The space  $(X, \mathcal{T}_u)$  is a  $\mu$ -space.

Proposition 2.3. A function on X is  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$ -continuous iff it is  $\mathcal{F}$ -continuous on every metacom-pact closed subset of X.

Proof. If f is continuous on every metacompact closed subset, then  $(f|M)^{-1}(C)=f^{-1}(C)\cap M$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -closed for C closed in Y whenever M is a metacompact closed subset. Hence  $f^{-1}(C)$  is closed with respect to  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$ , i.e. f is  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$ -continuous. Since  $\mathcal{F}=\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$  on every metacompact closed subset, the converse is true.

Proposition 2.4. The topology  $\mathcal{F}_{\mu}$  is the largest topology which agrees with  $\mathcal{F}$  on metacompact closed subsets.

Proof. By proposition 2.3, the identity function of X is continuous of  $(X, \mathcal{F}_{\mu})$  to  $(X, \overline{\mathcal{F}})$  if  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$  agrees with  $\mathcal{F}$  on metacompact closed subsets.

# II. Necessary condition and sufficient condition for $\mu$ -space.

Proposition 3.1. A space is a  $\mu$ -space if for any subset A of X having  $p \in X$  as a limit point there is a metacompact closed subset M of X such that p is a limit point of  $A \cap M$ .

Proof. Let A be a nonclosed subset of X. We must show that for some metacompact closed subset M the intersection  $A \cap M$  is not closed. Suppose p is a limit point of A which does not belong to A. There is a metacompact closed subset M of X such that p is a limit point of  $A \cap M$ . But the point p cannot be contained in  $A \cap M$  as p is not contained in A. Hence  $A \cap M$  is not closed.

Proposition 3.2. If a space X is a  $\mu$ -space,

then for any closed subset C of X having p as a limit point there is a metacompact closed subset M of X with p as a limit point of  $C \cap M$ .

Proof. Suppose that the proposition is false, and let X be a  $\mu$ -space which does not satisfy the condition that there is a metacompact closed subset M of X with p as a limit point of  $C \cap M$  whenever C is a closed subset of X having  $p \in X$  as a limit point. Then there is a point p and a closed subset C of X having p as a limit point such that p is not a limit point of  $C \cap M$  whenever M is a metacompact closed subset of X. This implies that  $(C - \{p\}) \cap M = (C \cap M) - \{p\}$  is closed in X. Since X is a  $\mu$ -space,  $C - \{p\}$  is also a closed subset of X and X cannot be a limit point of X. This contradiction proves the proposition.

## V. Locally $\mu$ -space and free union of the spaces.

Let X be a Hausdorff space and p be a point of X. By a  $\mu$ -neighborhood of p, we mean a closed neighborhood of p which is a  $\mu$ -space as a subspace of X. We call a space is a locally  $\mu$ -space iff every point p of X has a  $\mu$ -neighborhood.

Proposition 4.1. A space is a  $\mu$ -space if and only if it is a locally  $\mu$ -space.

Proof. For sufficiency, let A be a non-closed subset of a  $\mu$ -space X. Then there is a point p of A which is not in A. Let N be a  $\mu$ -neighborhood of p. The intersection  $A \cap N$  has p as a limit point with  $p \in A \cap N$ . Thus  $A \cap N$  is not closed in the  $\mu$ -space and there is a metacompact closed subset M of N such that  $(A \cap N) \cap M$  is not closed in N. This means that  $A \cap M$  is not closed since  $A \cap N \cap M = A \cap M$ . Necessity is obvious.

Proposition 4.2. The free union of the  $\mu$ -spaces is also a  $\mu$ -space.

Proof. The proof is obvious from proposition 4.1.

Proposition 4.3. Every closed subset of  $\mu$ -space is a  $\mu$ -space.

Proof. Let C be a closed subspace of a  $\mu$ -space, and let S be a subset of C such that  $S \cap M$  is closed in M whenever M is a metacompact closed subset of C. Then, for any metacompact closed subset N of X,  $(S \cap C) \cap N = S \cap (N \cap C)$  is closed in  $N \cap C$  as  $N \cap C$  must be a metacompact closed subset of C. Since  $N \cap C$  is closed in N,  $(S \cap C) \cap N$  is closed in N. This means

that  $S \cap C$  is closed in X. Therefore S is closed in C.

#### Reference

- James Dugundji. Topology, Allyn and Bacon, INC., Boston (1966) p. 160~180.
- John L. Kelley. General Topology, D. Van Nostrand company, INC., (1955) p. 217~249