

ON COLLECTIONWISE SUBNORMAL SPACES

ZHU JUN (朱 俊)*

Abstract

Collectionwise subnormality is characterized by some covering properties. It follows that collectionwise subnormality is preserved under closed mappings.

In paper [1], J. C. Smith gave some characteristic properties of collectionwise normal spaces by covering properties. Naturally, we shall ask whether collectionwise subnormal spaces can be characterized by covering properties. In this paper, we give an affirmative answer. From this result we prove that collectionwise subnormality is preserved under closed mappings,

We denote the union of family \mathcal{U} by \mathcal{U}^* .

A space X is called weak $\bar{\theta}$ -refinable if every open cover of X has a refinement $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_n$ satisfying (1) \mathcal{G}_n is an open collection for each n , (2) each $x \in X$, has finite positive order with respect to some \mathcal{G}_n , (3) the open cover $\{\mathcal{G}_n^*\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is point finite. The open cover $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_n$ is called weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover.

A weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_n$ is called boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover^[3] if there exists an integer N such that

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{x \in X: 0 < \text{ord}(x, \mathcal{G}_n) \leq N\} = X.$$

Lemma 1. (Long Bing^[3]) For a space X , every boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover has a refinement $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_n$ such that $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset\}$, for each $n \geq 1$, \mathcal{F}_n is a discrete closed family in $X \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{F}_i^*$ and \mathcal{F} is a cover of X .

A space X is collectionwise subnormal (J. Chaber [4]) if for each discrete closed family \mathcal{F} of X , there exists a countable closed cover \mathcal{C} of X such that for each $E \in \mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{F}|_E$ has a pairwise disjoint open in E expansion.

J. Chaber proved in [4] that the above definition is equivalent to the statement that for each discrete closed family \mathcal{F} of X , there exists a countable family $\{\mathcal{V}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of open expansions of \mathcal{F} such that for each $x \in X$, there exists an n

Manuscript received December 18, 1985. Revised June 4, 1986.

* Department of Mathematics, Suzhou University, Suzhou, Jiangsu, China.

with $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_n) \leq 1$. In the following, we regard this characteristic property as the definition of collectionwise subnormal spaces.

Lemma 2. *Let X be a collectionwise subnormal space. If $\mathcal{F} = \{F_r: r \in I\}$ is a discrete closed family which refines open cover \mathcal{V} , then there exists a σ -discrete closed family \mathcal{F}' and G_δ -set A such that*

- (1) \mathcal{F}' refines \mathcal{V} ,
- (2) $\mathcal{F}^* \subset A \subset \mathcal{F}'^*$.

Proof Since \mathcal{F} refines \mathcal{V} , we see that for each $r \in I$ there exists a $V_r \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $F_r \subset V_r$. By the property of collectionwise subnormal spaces, there exists a countable family $\{\mathcal{V}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of open expansion of \mathcal{F} such that for each $x \in X$ there is an n with $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_n) \leq 1$. Clearly, we may assume that each \mathcal{V}_n refines \mathcal{V} , $\mathcal{V}_n = \{V_{nr}: r \in I\}$.

Let $S_n = X \setminus \mathcal{V}_n^*$. Then S_n and \mathcal{F}^* are disjoint closed subsets. Note that X is subnormal (i. e., each disjoint closed subset pair has a disjoint G_δ -expansion).

Hence, we have G_δ -sets $\bigcap_{i=1}^\infty Q_{ni}$ and $\bigcap_{i=1}^\infty W_{ni}$, where each Q_{ni} or W_{ni} is open in X , such that $\mathcal{F}^* \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^\infty Q_{ni}$, $S_n \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^\infty W_{ni}$, and $(\bigcap_{i=1}^\infty Q_{ni}) \cap (\bigcap_{i=1}^\infty W_{ni}) = \emptyset$. Let

$$\mathcal{G}_{ni} = \{W_{ni} \cap V: V \in \mathcal{V}\} \cup \{V_{nr}: r \in I\},$$

$$\mathcal{F}'_{ni} = \{X \setminus \bigcup \{\mathcal{G}_{ni} \setminus \{g\}\}: g \in \mathcal{G}_{ni}\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\mathcal{F}' = \bigcup_{n,i=1}^\infty \mathcal{F}'_{ni}.$$

Clearly, \mathcal{G}_{ni} is an open cover of X . It follows that each \mathcal{F}'_{ni} is a discrete closed family and \mathcal{F}' is a σ -discrete closed family.

Let $A = \bigcap_{n,i=1}^\infty Q_{ni}$. Then A is a G_δ -set and $\mathcal{F}^* \subset A$. We show that $A \subset \mathcal{F}'^*$. For each $x \in A$, by the property of $\{\mathcal{V}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, there exists an n such that $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_n) \leq 1$. Since $x \notin \bigcap_{i=1}^\infty W_{ni}$, there exists an i_0 such that $x \notin W_{ni_0}$. Since \mathcal{G}_{ni_0} is a cover and $x \notin W_{ni_0}$, x must be in some V_{nr} , but $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_n) \leq 1$. Hence, there is one and only one member V_{nr_0} of \mathcal{V}_n such that $x \in V_{nr_0}$. Therefore, $x \in X \setminus \bigcup \{\mathcal{G}_{ni_0} \setminus \{V_{nr_0}\}\} \subset \mathcal{F}'_{ni_0} \subset \mathcal{F}'^*$. This completes the proof.

The main result in this paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *For every space X , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) X is collectionwise subnormal.
- (2) Every boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover of X has a σ -discrete closed refinement.
- (3) Every boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover of X has a σ -locally finite closed refinement.
- (4) Every boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover of X has a σ -closure preserving closed refinement.

(5) Every boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover of X has a σ -cushioned refinement.

Proof It is clear that (2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4) \Rightarrow (5). We show that (1) \Rightarrow (2) and (5) \Rightarrow (1).

(1) \Rightarrow (2). Let \mathcal{G} be a boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover of X . By Lemma 1, there exists a refinement $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}_n$ such that $\mathcal{B}_0 = \{\emptyset\}$, for each $n \geq 1$, \mathcal{B}_n is a discrete closed family in $X \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{B}_i^*$ and \mathcal{B} is a cover. We denote the set of all positive integers by N . For any $i_0, i_1 \in N$, we set $\mathcal{F}_{i_0 i_1} = \{\emptyset\}$, G_δ -set $A_{i_0} = \emptyset$ and open set $G_{i_0 i_1} = \emptyset$. Suppose that there exist discrete closed families $\mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_k}$, $(i_0, \dots, i_k) \in N^{k+1}$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, and G_δ -sets $A_{i_0 \dots i_k} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} G_{i_0 \dots i_k j}$, $(i_0, \dots, i_k) \in N^{k+1}$, $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, $j \in N$, such that

- (i) each $\mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_k}$ refines \mathcal{G} ,
- (ii) for each tuple $(i_0, \dots, i_k) \in N^{k+1}$, $k < n$,

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_k j}^* \supset A_{i_0 \dots i_k} \supset \mathcal{B}_k^* \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^k G_{i_0 \dots i_j},$$

For $k = n+1$, we construct discrete closed families $\mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_{n+1}}$ and G_δ -sets

$$A_{i_0 \dots i_n} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} G_{i_0 \dots i_n j}.$$

At first, we note that for each tuple (i_1, \dots, i_m) with $m \leq n$ we have $\bigcup_{i=1}^m G_{i_0 \dots i_j} \supset \bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{B}_i^*$. In fact, it is clearly true for $m=1$. If it is also true for $m=s < n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{j=1}^{s+1} G_{i_0 \dots i_j} &= \bigcup_{j=1}^s G_{i_0 \dots i_j} \cup G_{i_0 \dots i_{s+1}} \supset \bigcup_{j=1}^s G_{i_0 \dots i_j} \cup A_{i_0 \dots i_s} \\ &\supset \bigcup_{j=1}^s G_{i_0 \dots i_j} \supset \left(\mathcal{B}_s^* \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^s G_{i_0 \dots i_j} \right) \supset \bigcup_{j=1}^s G_{i_0 \dots i_j} \cup \mathcal{B}_s^* \supset \bigcup_{i=0}^s \mathcal{B}_i^*. \end{aligned}$$

This means that $\bigcup_{j=1}^n G_{i_0 \dots i_j} \supset \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{B}_i^*$. Since \mathcal{B}_n is a discrete closed family in $X \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{B}_i^*$, $\mathcal{B}'_n = \left\{ B \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^n G_{i_0 \dots i_j} : B \in \mathcal{B}_n \right\}$ is a discrete closed family in X . By Lemma 2, there exists a σ -discrete closed family $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_n j}$ and a G_δ -set $A_{i_0 \dots i_n}$ such that $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_n j}$ refines \mathcal{G} and $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_n j}^* \supset A_{i_0 \dots i_n} \supset \mathcal{B}'_n{}^*$. Since $\mathcal{B}'_n{}^* = \mathcal{B}_n^* \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^n G_{i_0 \dots i_j}$, these $\mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_{n+1}}$ and $A_{i_0 \dots i_n}$ satisfy (i) and (ii). By induction, we see that for each tuple (i_0, \dots, i_n) there exists a discrete closed family $\mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_n}$ and a G_δ -set $A_{i_0 \dots i_{n-1}}$, and they satisfy (i) and (ii).

We set $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup \{ \mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_n} : (i_0, \dots, i_n) \in N^{n+1}, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \}$. Then it is clear that \mathcal{F} is a σ -discrete closed family which refines \mathcal{G} . Now we prove \mathcal{F} is a cover. For any $x \in X$, there is an n_0 with $x \in \mathcal{B}_{n_0}^*$. If $x \in A_{i_0 \dots i_k}$ with some $(i_0, \dots, i_k) \in N^{k+1}$ where $k < n_0$, then, by (ii), $x \in A_{i_0 \dots i_k} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_k j}^* \subset \mathcal{F}^*$. If

$$x \notin \bigcup \left\{ A_{i_0 \dots i_k} (i_0, \dots, i_k) \in \bigcup_{j=0}^{n_0-1} N^{j+1} \right\},$$

then there exists a tuple (i_0, \dots, i_{n_0}) with $x \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_0} G_{i_0 \dots i_j}$, and hence $x \in \mathcal{B}^* \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_0} G_{i_0 \dots i_j}$. By (ii), $x \in A_{i_0 \dots i_{n_0}} \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_{i_0 \dots i_{n_0} j}^* \subset \mathcal{F}^*$. It follows that \mathcal{F} is a cover. The proof of (1) \Rightarrow (2) is complete.

(5) \Rightarrow (1). Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_r: r \in I\}$ be a discrete closed family. For each $r \in I$, put $G_r = X \setminus \bigcup_{r' \neq r} F_{r'}$, and $G = X \setminus \mathcal{F}^*$. It is clear that $\mathcal{G} = \{G\} \cup \{G_r: r \in I\}$ is a boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover of X . By (5), there exists a σ -cushioned refinement $\mathcal{H} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_n$. Let $f_n: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ be the cushioned mapping (i.e., if $\mathcal{H}'_n \subset \mathcal{H}_n$, then $\overline{\bigcup \mathcal{H}'_n} \subset \bigcup \{f_n(h): h \in \mathcal{H}'_n\}$).

For each $r \in I$, let $V_{nr} = X \setminus \{h \in \mathcal{H}_n: f_n(h) \neq G_r\}$. Then $V_{nr} \supset X \setminus \bigcup_{r' \neq r} G_{r'} \supset F_r$, this means that $\mathcal{V}_n = \{V_{nr}: r \in I\}$ is an open expansion of \mathcal{F} . Hence, $\{\mathcal{V}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is the required one. In fact, for each $x \in X$, there is an n_0 such that $x \in \mathcal{H}_{n_0}^*$. Then if $r, r' \in I$ and $r \neq r'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{nr} \cap V_{nr'} &\subset (X \setminus \{h \in \mathcal{H}_{n_0}: f_{n_0}(h) \neq G_r\}) \\ &\cap (X \setminus \{h \in \mathcal{H}_{n_0}: f_{n_0}(h) \neq G_{r'}\}) = X \setminus \mathcal{H}_{n_0}^*. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $x \notin V_{nr} \cap V_{nr'}$, this means that $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_{n_0}) \leq 1$. Therefore, X is collectionwise subnormal. The proof of Theorem 1 is complete.

Corollary 1. *Let X be a collectionwise subnormal space and f be a closed mapping from X onto Y . Then Y is collectionwise subnormal.*

Proof Let \mathcal{G} be any boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover of Y . Then we can easily see that $f^{-1}(\mathcal{G}) = \{f(g): g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ is also a boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover of X . By Theorem 1 there exists a σ -closure preserving closed refinement \mathcal{F} of $f^{-1}(\mathcal{G})$. Then $f(\mathcal{F}) = \{f(F): F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is a σ -closure preserving closed refinement of \mathcal{G} . By Theorem 1, Y is collectionwise subnormal.

Recall that a space X is strong quasi-paracompact (Liu Ying-ming^[5]) if every open cover of X has a refinement $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_n$ such that $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset\}$ for each $n \geq 1$, \mathcal{F}_n is a discrete closed family in $X \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{F}_i^*$ and \mathcal{F} is a cover of X . Long Bing proved in [3] that a space X is strong quasi-paracompact if every open cover of X has a boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -refinement. We hence have the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *A space X is subparacompact iff it is strong quasi-paracompact and collectionwise subnormal.*

The author proved in [6] that the class of strong quasi-paracompact spaces lies between the class of θ -refinable spaces and the class of weak $\bar{\theta}$ -refinable spaces. Therefore Corollary 2 slightly improves a result of J. Chaber in [4].

References

- [1] Smith, J. C., On collectionwise normality, *Colloq Math.*, **40** (1978), 69—76.
- [2] Smith, J. C., Properties of weak $\bar{\theta}$ -refinable spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **53** (1975), 511—512.
- [3] Long Bing, Some separating or covering properties, (to appear).
- [4] Chaber, J., On subparacompactness related properties, *Gen. Topology and Appl.*, **101** (1979), 13—17.
- [5] Liu Ying-ming, A class of topological spaces which containing the classes of weakly paracompact space and subparacompact spaces, *Acta Mathematica Sinica*, **3** (1977) 212—214 (in Chinese).
- [6] Zhu Jun, Some properties of quasi-paracompact and strong quasi-paracompact spaces, *Journal of Mathematical Research and Exposition*, **1** (1984), 9—31 (in Chinese).
- [7] Junnila, H. J. K., Three covering properties, *Surveys in General Topology, Acad. Press. Inc.*, (1980), 195—245.