

A REMARK ON \mathcal{L}^* -SPACES

by Edwin E. Moise

An \mathcal{L}^* -space is one in which the notion of a convergent sequence is defined, such that (1) every subsequence of a convergent sequence converges to the same limit, (2) if $p_n \equiv p$, then $\text{Lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n = p$, and (3) if it is false that $\text{Lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n = p$, then the sequence p_1, p_2, \dots contains a subsequence no subsequence of which converges to p . [1, pp. 76-77.] The definition of convergent sequences induces a topology in such a space in a natural manner; and if the space is then a Hausdorff space, there are two possible ways of defining the topology of a Cartesian product $X \times Y$: (I) We can first define the topology in X and Y , and then define the product topology in the usual manner, or (II) we can say that $\text{Lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x_i, y_i) = (x, y)$ if and only if $\text{Lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_i = x$ and $\text{Lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_i = y$, and then define the topology in $X \times Y$ by means of the convergent sequences in $X \times Y$. The latter definition is the one adopted in [2]. The following simple example shows that if the first axiom of countability is not imposed, (I) and (II) may give different results, even if it is true that (II) makes $X \times Y$ a Hausdorff space. We shall call a Hausdorff space a convergence space if its topology can be induced by a definition of convergent sequences satisfying (1), and (2), and (3). Our example, the n , is of two convergence spaces whose product (in sense (II)) is a Hausdorff space and whose product (in sense (I)) is not a convergence space.

(1) Let $A = (a_{i,j})$ be an infinite matrix ($i=1, 2, \dots; j=1, 2, \dots$); let P be an ideal point; and let X be $A+P$. Let the neighborhoods in S_1 be the elements of