

## 102. On Compactness of Weak Topologies

By Hidegorô NAKANO

(Comm. by K. KUNUGI, M.J.A., Oct. 12, 1959)

Let  $R$  be a space and  $a_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) a system of mappings of  $R$  into topological spaces  $S_\lambda$  with neighbourhood systems  $\mathfrak{N}_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ). Concerning the weak topology of  $R$  by  $a_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ), i.e. the weakest topology of  $R$  for which all  $a_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) are continuous, we have (H. Nakano: *Topology and Linear Topological Spaces*, Tokyo (1951), §19, Theorem 4. This book will be denoted by TLTS):

**Theorem 1.** *If all  $S_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) are compact Hausdorff spaces, then, in order that the weak topology of  $R$  be compact, it is necessary and sufficient that for any system of points  $a_\lambda \in S_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) subject to the condition*

$$(F) \quad \bigcap_{\nu=1}^n a_{\lambda_\nu}^{-1}(U_{\lambda_\nu}) \neq \phi$$

for every finite number of open sets  $a_{\lambda_\nu} \in U_{\lambda_\nu} \in \mathfrak{N}_{\lambda_\nu}$ ,  $\lambda_\nu \in A$  ( $\nu=1, 2, \dots, n$ ), we can find a point  $x \in R$  for which  $a_\lambda(x) = a_\lambda$  for every  $\lambda \in A$ .

In the sequel, we consider generalization of this theorem in the case where  $S_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) are merely compact.

**Theorem 2.** *If all  $S_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) are compact and for any system of points  $a_\lambda \in S_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) subject to the condition (F), we can find a point  $x \in R$  for which  $a_\lambda(x) \in \{a_\lambda\}^-$  for every  $\lambda \in A$ , then the weak topology of  $R$  is compact.*

**Proof.** Let  $K$  be a maximal system of sets of  $R$  subject to the condition (I)  $\bigcap_{\nu=1}^n K_\nu \neq \phi$  for every finite number of sets  $K_\nu \in \mathfrak{K}$  ( $\nu=1, 2, \dots, n$ ). We see easily then that  $A \cap K \neq \phi$  for all  $K \in \mathfrak{K}$  implies  $A \in \mathfrak{K}$ , and  $L, K \in \mathfrak{K}$  implies  $L \cap K \in \mathfrak{K}$ . For any  $\lambda \in A$ , we have obviously  $\bigcap_{\nu=1}^n a_\lambda(K_\nu) \neq \phi$  for every finite number of sets  $K_\nu \in \mathfrak{K}$  ( $\nu=1, 2, \dots, n$ ), and hence  $\bigcap_{K \in \mathfrak{K}} a_\lambda(K) \neq \phi$ , because  $S_\lambda$  is compact by assumption. For a point  $a_\lambda \in \bigcap_{K \in \mathfrak{K}} a_\lambda(K)^-$ , we have

$$a_\lambda^{-1}(U) \in \mathfrak{K} \quad \text{for } a_\lambda \in U \in \mathfrak{N}_\lambda,$$

because for  $a_\lambda \in U \in \mathfrak{N}_\lambda$ ,  $K \in \mathfrak{K}$  we have obviously

$$a_\lambda(K \cap a_\lambda^{-1}(U)) = a_\lambda(K) \cap U \neq \phi$$

which yields  $K \cap a_\lambda^{-1}(U) \neq \phi$ . Therefore the system of points  $a_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) satisfies the condition (F), and hence we can find a point  $x \in R$  by assumption such that  $a_\lambda(x) \in \{a_\lambda\}^-$  for every  $\lambda \in A$ . For such a point  $x \in R$ , we have obviously  $a_\lambda(x) \in \bigcap_{K \in \mathfrak{K}} a_\lambda(K)^-$ , and consequently  $a_\lambda^{-1}(U) \in \mathfrak{K}$  for  $a_\lambda(x) \in U \in \mathfrak{N}_\lambda$ , as proved just above. Therefore we have

$$\bigcap_{\nu=1}^n a_{\lambda_\nu}^{-1}(U_{\lambda_\nu}) \in \mathfrak{R} \quad \text{for } a_{\lambda_\nu}(x) \in U_{\lambda_\nu} \in \mathfrak{N}_{\lambda_\nu} \quad (\nu=1, 2, \dots, n).$$

As all  $\bigcap_{\nu=1}^n a_{\lambda_\nu}^{-1}(U_{\lambda_\nu})$  for every finite number of sets  $U_{\lambda_\nu} \in \mathfrak{N}_{\lambda_\nu}$  ( $\nu=1, 2, \dots, n$ ) constitute a neighbourhood system of the weak topology of  $R$ , we conclude that  $x \in K^-$  for all  $K \in \mathfrak{R}$ . For any system of closed sets  $\mathfrak{F}$  subject to the condition (I), we can find by the maximal theorem a maximal system  $\mathfrak{R}$  subject to the condition (I) such that  $\mathfrak{R} \supset \mathfrak{F}$ , and for such  $\mathfrak{R}$  we have

$$\bigcap_{K \in \mathfrak{F}} K \supset \bigcap_{K \in \mathfrak{R}} K^- \neq \phi,$$

as proved just above. Thus the weak topology of  $R$  is compact.

Let  $S$  be a topological space with topology  $\mathfrak{I}$ . For every point  $a \in S$ , we define a closed set  $a^*$  as

$$a^* = \bigcap_{a \in U \in \mathfrak{I}} U^-.$$

With this definition we have obviously:  $\{a\}^- \subset a^*$ , and  $b \in a^*$  implies  $a \in b^*$ .

**Theorem 3.** *If the weak topology of  $R$  by  $a_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) is compact, then for any system of points  $a_\lambda \in S_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) subject to the condition (F) we can find a point  $x \in R$  for which  $a_\lambda(x) \in a_\lambda^*$  for all  $\lambda \in A$ .*

**Proof.** For a system of points  $a_\lambda \in S_\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in A$ ) subject to the condition (F), we have

$$\bigcap_{\lambda \in A} \bigcap_{a_\lambda \in U \in \mathfrak{N}_\lambda} a_\lambda^{-1}(U)^- \neq \phi,$$

because  $R$  is compact by assumption. For a point  $x \in R$  such that

$$x \in a_\lambda^{-1}(U)^- \quad \text{for all } a_\lambda \in U \in \mathfrak{N}_\lambda, \lambda \in A,$$

as  $a_\lambda^{-1}(U)^- \subset a_\lambda^{-1}(U^-)$  (cf. TLTS §16, Theorem 3), we have  $a_\lambda(x) \in U^-$  for all  $a_\lambda \in U \in \mathfrak{N}_\lambda$ , and hence  $a_\lambda(x) \in a_\lambda^*$  for all  $\lambda \in A$ .

Finally we consider the topologies of  $S$  for which  $\{a\}^- = a^*$  for every point  $a \in S$ . We can prove easily:

**Lemma.**  *$\{a\}^- \ni b$  implies always  $\{b\}^- \ni a$ , if and only if  $a \in U \in \mathfrak{I}$  implies  $\{a\}^- \subset U$ .*

If  $\{a\}^- = a^*$  for every point  $a \in S$ , then for any point  $b \in \{a\}^-$  we can find  $U \in \mathfrak{I}$  such that  $a \in U$  and  $b \in U^-$ , and hence by Lemma  $\{a\}^- \subset U$  and  $\{b\}^- \subset U^-$ . Thus we have

**Theorem 4.** *We have  $\{a\}^- = a^*$  for every point  $a \in S$ , if and only if the partition space of  $S$  by the partition  $\{a\}^-$  ( $a \in S$ ) is a Hausdorff space.*

**Remark 1.** The condition about point system in Theorem 2 is not necessary. Because, let  $\{a, b\}$  be a topological space with the topology:  $\{a, b\}, \{a\}, \phi$ . The point set  $\{a\}$  is obviously compact by the relative topology, but  $a \notin \{b\}^- = \{b\}$ .

**Remark 2.** The condition in Theorem 3 is not sufficient. Because, let  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  be a topological space with a neighbourhood system:  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}, \{n\}$  ( $n=1, 2, \dots$ ). This space is obviously compact. It is clear that a point set  $\{1, 2, \dots\}$  is not compact by the relative topology but we have  $n \in 0^* = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  for every  $n=1, 2, \dots$ .