

PRODUCTS OF PAIRWISE COMPACT SPACES

By Carroll V. Riecke

1. Introduction

Several definitions of pairwise compactness for the bitopological spaces of Kelly [2] have appeared in the literature. Of these definitions, this paper will concern those of Kim [3] (K -pairwise compactness) and Fletcher, Hoyle and Patty [1] (FHP -pairwise compactness) showing their equivalence for pairwise Hausdorff spaces.

Pahk and Choi [4] gave a characterization of FHP -pairwise compact spaces in terms of convergence of pairwise filter bases. A modified form of a theorem of Pahk and Choi will be used to establish necessary and sufficient conditions for FHP -pairwise compactness of products of bitopological spaces. The reader is referred to the above sources for the appropriate definitions.

2. Products of bitopological spaces

In a bitopological space $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ a filterbase on X is termed a pairwise filterbase by Pahk and Choi if \mathcal{F} contains a proper subset of X which is not dense in X with respect to either \mathcal{P} or \mathcal{Q} . If it is noted that any filterbase on X that is not a pairwise filterbase must accumulate at every point with respect to one of the topologies, theorem 2.1 of Pahk and Choi can be restated in a slightly different form.

THEOREM 2.1. *The following statements about a bitopological space are equivalent.*

- (a) $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is FHP -pairwise compact
- (b) Each pairwise closed family of subsets of X satisfying the finite intersection property has nonvoid intersection.
- (c) For each filterbase on X there exists at least one point which is both a \mathcal{P} -accumulation and a \mathcal{Q} -accumulation point or the filterbase accumulates at no point with respect to one topology and at every point with respect to the other topology.
- (d) For each maximal filterbase on X there exists at least one point which is both a \mathcal{P} -limit point and a \mathcal{Q} -limit point or the filterbase converges to no point with respect to one topology and to every point with respect to the other topology.

THEOREM 2.2. *If a bitopological space $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is K -pairwise compact, each ultrafilter has a limit point with respect to each topology or converges to no point with respect to one topology and to every point with respect to other topology.*

PROOF. Assume some ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on X has no \mathcal{P} -limit point. If there exists some y in X which is not a \mathcal{Q} -limit point of \mathcal{F} , then some \mathcal{Q} -open neighborhood V of y is not in \mathcal{F} . Consider the adjoint topology $\mathcal{P}(V) = \{\phi, X\} \cup \{U \cup V \mid U \in \mathcal{P}\}$. Each point x of X has a \mathcal{P} -open neighborhood U_x such that U_x is not in \mathcal{F} . But then $\{U_x \cup V\}$ is a cover of X by members of $\mathcal{P}(V)$ having no finite subcover and $\mathcal{P}(V)$ can not be compact, hence $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is not K -pairwise compact.

COROLLARY 2.1. *K -pairwise compactness is equivalent to FHP -pairwise compactness in the category of pairwise Hausdorff bitopological spaces.*

PROOF. Swart [5] proved that FHP -pairwise compactness implies K -pairwise compactness. The reverse implication follows from theorems 2.1 and 2.2 and a result of Park and Choi that a bitopological space is pairwise Hausdorff if and only if no filter has distinct \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} -limit points.

An immediate result of theorems 2.1 and 2.2 is that for noncompact topologies, pairwise compactness implies very strong connectivity properties.

COROLLARY 2.1. *If $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is K -(FHP -) pairwise compact and (X, \mathcal{P}) is not compact, then \mathcal{Q} is hyperconnected.*

PROOF. If (X, \mathcal{P}) is not compact, then some ultrafilter \mathcal{F} is not \mathcal{P} -convergent so must \mathcal{Q} converge to each point and $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{F}$ is hyperconnected.

THEOREM 2.3. *If (X, \mathcal{P}) is a compact Hausdorff space and \mathcal{Q} is any topology on X for which $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is pairwise Hausdorff and FHP -pairwise compact, then $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q}$.*

PROOF. If \mathcal{F} is an ultrafilter which \mathcal{P} -converges to x , (X, \mathcal{P}) Hausdorff and FHP -pairwise compactness of $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ implies \mathcal{F} must \mathcal{Q} -converge to x . Conversely, if \mathcal{F} \mathcal{Q} -converges to x , compactness of (X, \mathcal{P}) implies \mathcal{P} -convergence of \mathcal{F} and $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ pairwise Hausdorff implies \mathcal{F} \mathcal{P} -converges to x .

If $\{(X_i, \mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{Q}_i)\}$ is a family of bitopological spaces, let \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} represent the product topologies on $\prod X_i$ determined by $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}$ and $\{\mathcal{Q}_i\}$. Swart [5] has shown that $(\prod X_i, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ being FHP -pairwise compact implies FHP -pairwise com-

pactness of each bitopological space $(X_i, \mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{Q}_i)$. A somewhat more general result is presented here.

THEOREM 2.4. *If $\{(X_i, \mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{Q}_i) \mid i \in I\}$ is a family of bitopological spaces with $|I| > 1$, $(\prod X_i, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is FHP-pairwise compact if and only if each $(X_i, \mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{Q}_i)$ is FHP-pairwise compact and if some (X_j, \mathcal{P}_j) ((X_j, \mathcal{Q}_j)) is not compact ((X_i, \mathcal{Q}_i) ((X_i, \mathcal{P}_i)) is indiscrete for each $i \neq j$).*

PROOF. As noted above, FHP-pairwise compactness of $(\prod X_i, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ implying FHP-pairwise compactness of each $(X_i, \mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{Q}_i)$ was established by Swart [5].

Suppose some (X_j, \mathcal{P}_j) is not compact. Then some ultrafilter \mathcal{F}_j on X_j has no \mathcal{P}_j -limit points. Then if $k \neq j$ and \mathcal{F}_k is any ultrafilter on X_k , consider an ultrafilter \mathcal{G} on $\prod X_i$ containing the filterbase $\prod \mathcal{G}_i = \{\prod A_i \mid A_i \in \mathcal{G}_i\}$ where $\mathcal{G}_j = \mathcal{F}_j$, $\mathcal{G}_k = \mathcal{F}_k$ and \mathcal{G}_i is any ultrafilter on X_i for $i \neq j, k$. Given any projection map $\mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{P}_i(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{G}_i$. Since $\mathcal{P}_j(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{F}_j$ does not \mathcal{P}_j -converge, \mathcal{G} does not \mathcal{P} -converge and must \mathcal{Q} -converge to every point of $\prod X_i$. Therefore, \mathcal{F}_k must \mathcal{Q}_k -converge to each point of X_k . since \mathcal{F}_k was an arbitrary ultrafilter on X_k , X_k must be indiscrete.

If the conditions hold, assume \mathcal{F} is an ultrafilter on $\prod X_i$. If \mathcal{F} has no \mathcal{P} -limit points, then some $\mathcal{P}_i(\mathcal{F})$ does not \mathcal{P}_i -converge and (X, \mathcal{P}_i) is not compact. Then FHP-pairwise compactness of $(X_i, \mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{Q}_i)$ and (X_j, \mathcal{Q}_j) indiscrete for $i \neq j$ implies \mathcal{F} \mathcal{Q} -converges to each point of $\prod X_i$. If \mathcal{F} both \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} -converges, since each $(X_i, \mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{Q}_i)$ is FHP-pairwise compact, each $P_i(\mathcal{F})$ has a common \mathcal{P}_i and \mathcal{Q}_i limit point and \mathcal{F} has a common \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} limit point so $(\prod X_i, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is FHP-pairwise compact.

COROLLARY 2.3. *In the category of pairwise Hausdorff spaces, if $|I| > 1$, $(\prod X_i, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is FHP-pairwise compact if and only if each $\mathcal{P}_i = \mathcal{Q}_i$ and \mathcal{P}_i is compact.*

PROOF. If the product space is FHP-pairwise compact and some \mathcal{P}_i is not compact, then each \mathcal{Q}_j is indiscrete for $j \neq i$ and $(X_j, \mathcal{P}_j, \mathcal{Q}_j)$ cannot be pairwise Hausdorff. Since each (X_i, \mathcal{P}_i) and (X_i, \mathcal{Q}_i) are compact and $(X_i, \mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{Q}_i)$ is pairwise Hausdorff, $\mathcal{P}_i = \mathcal{Q}_i$ by theorem 10 of Fletcher, Hoyle and Patty [1].

It may be easily observed that for any topological space (X, \mathcal{P}) , if \mathcal{Q} is the finite complement topology on X , then $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is FHP-pairwise compact.

Therefore, for any topology \mathcal{P} on a set X there exists at least T_1 topology \mathcal{Q} for which $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is *FHP*-pairwise compact. Since there exist maximal T_1 -compact topologies on any set, a corresponding question arises for bitopological spaces: Given a topological space (X, \mathcal{P}) , what conditions on \mathcal{P} are necessary and sufficient to assure the existence of a maximal topology \mathcal{Q} on X such that $(X, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ is *FHP*-pairwise compact? Such a topology would of necessity be T_1 .

Cameron College
Lawton, Oklahoma

REFERENCES

- [1] Fletcher, P., Hoyle, H.B. III and Patty, C.W., *The comparison of topologies*, Duke Math. J., 36 (1969), 325-31.
- [2] Kelly, J.C. *Bitopological spaces*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 13 (1963), 71-89.
- [3] Kim, Y.W., *Pairwise compactness*, Publicationes Math., 15 (1968), 87-90.
- [4] Park, D.H. and Choi, B.D. *Notes on pairwise compactness*, Kyungpook Math. J. 11 (1971), 45-52.
- [5] Swart, J.. *Total disconnectedness in bitopological spaces and product bitopological spaces*. Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 74. Indagationes Math. 33 (1971), 135-45.