# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

# QUASICOMPACTIFICATIONS AND SHAPE THEORY

BILLY JOE BALL

Vol. 84, No. 2

June 1979

## QUASICOMPACTIFICATIONS AND SHAPE THEORY

## B. J. BALL

If  $f: X \to Y$  is an embedding of a space X into a space Y such that each component of Y is a compactification of the image of a quasicomponent of X and such that f induces a homeomorphism of the space QX of quasicomponents of X onto the space of components of Y, then (f, Y) is called a quasicompactification of X. After some preliminary results, it is shown that a locally compact metric space X has a locally compact metric quasicompactification if and only if QX is locally compact. Two canonical quasicompactifications,  $F^*X$  and  $\alpha X$ , of such a space are described, and it is shown that if  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X = \operatorname{Sh}_p Y$ , then  $\operatorname{Sh}_p F^*X = \operatorname{Sh}_p F^*Y$ ; the question whether also  $\operatorname{Sh}_p \alpha X = \operatorname{Sh}_p \alpha Y$  is left open. Finally, some techniques of this paper are used to obtain a proper shape version of a theorem due to Y. Kodama, generalizing previous work of the author.

1. Introduction. A subset A of a topological space X is a *component* of X if it is maximal with respect to the property that no two points of A are separated in the subspace A, and is a *quasicomponent* of X if it is maximal with respect to the property that no two points of A are separated in the whole space X. Thus quasicomponents are more dependent on, and indicative of, the global structure of X than are components.

It is easily shown that both the set  $\mathscr{C}_X$  of all components of Xand the set  $q\mathscr{C}_X$  of all quasicomponents of X are decompositions of X into disjoint closed sets. The resulting spaces  $X/\mathscr{C}_X$  and  $X/q\mathscr{C}_X$ (with the decomposition topologies) are not in general very nice spaces; for example, even if X is separable and metric,  $X/\mathscr{C}_X$  need not be Hausdorff and  $X/q\mathscr{C}_X$ , while always Hausdorff, need not have a basis of open and closed sets (see [12]). Retopologizing  $X/q\mathscr{C}_X$ , however, avoids this latter difficulty; specifcally, the quasicomponent space of X is the space QX whose points are the quasicomponents of X and whose topology has as a basis those sets of quasicomponents whose union is both open and closed in X. The space QXthus has a basis consisting of open and closed sets (i.e., QX is 0dimensional) and hence is regular and totally disconnected.

Elementary, well known arguments suffice to establish the following useful facts. If p is a point of a topological space X, the component of X about p is the union of all connected subsets of X containing p, and the quasicomponent of X about p is the intersection of all open and closed subsets of X containing p. Hence

any component of X contains every connected subset of X which intersects it, and every quasicomponent of X is contained in every open and closed subset of X which intersects it.

Any two components of a compact Hausdorff space X are separated in X, but this fails in the absence of compactness (even if X is locally compact and metrizable). However, any two quasicomponents of any topological space X are separated in X.

For a locally compact Hausdorff space X, any *compact* component of X is a quasicomponent of X. Combining this fact with other well known results gives the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.1. If X is a locally compact Hausdorff space such that every component of X is compact, then  $\mathscr{C}_X = q\mathscr{C}_X, \mathscr{C}_X$  is upper semicontinuous,  $X/\mathscr{C}_X$  is locally compact and totally disconnected (and is metrizable if X is), and  $QX = X/q\mathscr{C}_X = X/\mathscr{C}_X$ .

This observation suggests that it might be desirable, when possible, to construct a "nice" embedding of a given space X into a space Y which has compact components. In this paper it will be shown how this may be done for certain spaces, and some shapetheoretic properties of the resulting "quasicompactifications" will be considered.

2. Definitions and preliminary results. If  $\{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  is a collection of disjoint, nonempty topological spaces (with  $X_{\alpha} \neq X_{\beta}$  for  $\alpha \neq \beta$ ), then  $\bigcup X_{\alpha}$ , with the topology in which a set is open if and only if its intersection with each  $X_{\alpha}$  is open in  $X_{\alpha}$ , is called the *topological sum* of the  $X_{\alpha}$ 's and is denoted by  $\bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  or by  $\bigoplus X_{\alpha}$ . Equivalently, a space X is the topological sum of subspaces  $\{X_{\alpha}\}$  if the  $X_{\alpha}$ 's are disjoint, nonempty, open and closed subsets of X and  $\bigcup X_{\alpha} = X$ .

LEMMA 2.1. If  $X = \bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$ , then  $QX = \bigoplus \{QX_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$ ; conversely, if  $QX = \bigoplus \{Z_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$ , then  $X = \bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  with  $QX_{\alpha} = Z_{\alpha}$  for each  $\alpha$ .

*Proof.* The first assertion follows immediately from the fact that if K is open and closed in X, then QK is open and closed in QX. For the converse, let  $p: X \to QX$  be the natural projection and let  $X_{\alpha} = p^{-1}(Z_{\alpha})$  for each  $\alpha$  in A. It is clear that  $X = \bigoplus X_{\alpha}$  and that  $QX_{\alpha} = Z_{\alpha}$  for each  $\alpha$ .

LEMMA 2.2. If X is a locally compact metrizable space, then QX is a Lindelöf space (i.e., every open cover has a countable subcover) if and only if X is separable.

*Proof.* If X is separable, then QX is a Lindelöf space since the Lindelöf property is preserved by continuous surjective maps.

For the converse, suppose QX has the Lindelöf property and write X in the form  $X = \bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  with each  $X_{\alpha}$  separable (see [5], p. 241, Th. 7.3). Then  $QX = \bigoplus \{QX_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  and since QX has the Lindelöf property, it follows that A is countable. Hence X is the union of a countable number of separable spaces and hence is separable.

LEMMA 2.3. If X is a locally compact metrizable space and QX is compact, then QX is metrizable.

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 2.2 that X is separable. Since any compact Hausdorff space which is the continuous image of a separable metric space is metrizable ([8], p. 115, Lemma 40), it follows that QX is metrizable.

LEMMA 2.4. If X is a locally compact metric space, then QX is locally compact if and only if  $X = \bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  with  $QX_{\alpha}$  compact for each  $\alpha$ .

*Proof.* Since, as observed before, any locally compact metric space can be written as the topological sum of separable spaces, it is sufficient to prove the result for the case in which X is separable. One direction follows immediately from Lemma 2.1; for the converse, suppose QX is locally compact and X is separable. By Lemma 2.2, QX is a Lindelöf space and, since QX is 0-dimensional, it easily follows that  $QX = \bigoplus \{Z_n | n = 1, 2, \cdots\}$  with  $Z_n$  compact for each n. By Lemma 2.1,  $X = \bigoplus \{X_n | n = 1, 2, \cdots\}$  with  $QX_n = Z_n$  for each n. The theorem follows.

It is clear that for any map (i.e., continuous function)  $f: X \to Y$ , the image under f of any quasicomponent of X lies in a (unique) quasicomponent of Y.

**LEMMA** 2.5. If  $f: X \to Y$  and for each  $A \in QX$ ,  $\phi_f(A)$  is the quasicomponent of Y containing f(A), then  $\phi_f$  is a continuous function from QX to QY.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathscr{U}$  be a basic open set in QY. Then  $\bigcup \mathscr{U}$  is open and closed in Y and hence  $f^{-1}(\bigcup \mathscr{U})$  is open and closed in X. If  $\mathscr{V} = \{A \in QX | A \subset f^{-1}(\bigcup \mathscr{U})\}$ , then  $\bigcup \mathscr{V} = f^{-1}(\bigcup \mathscr{U})$ , so  $\mathscr{V}$  is open in QX. Using the fact that  $\bigcup \mathscr{U}$  and  $\bigcup \mathscr{V}$  are open and closed in Y and X, respectively, it is easily shown that  $\phi_{J}^{-1}(\mathscr{U}) = \mathscr{V}$ . Thus  $\phi_{f}$  is continuous.

The map  $\phi_f$  described in Lemma 2.2 will be called the map of QX into QY induced by the map  $f: X \to Y$ .

3. Quasicompactifications. Throughout the remainder of this paper, unless the contrary is specifically indicated all spaces considered are assumed to be locally compact and metrizable. If X is such a space, then a quasicompactification of X is a pair (Y, f) such that Y is a (locally compact metrizable) space with compact components and  $f: X \to Y$  is an embedding satisfying (1) for each A in QX,  $cl_Y f(A)$ is a component of Y and (2) the map  $\phi_f: QX \to QY$  induced by f is a homeomorphism. (Here, as usual,  $cl_Y f(A)$  denotes the closure of f(A) in Y.) Following the usual practice with respect to compactifications, we will often call the space Y a quasicompactification of X, considering X as a subspace of Y with  $f: X \to Y$  the inclusion map.

Note that condition (1) alone implies that  $\phi_f$  is a continuous bijection of QX onto a subspace of QY. In general, however,  $\phi_f$  need not be a homeomorphism, even if it is surjective.

In order that X should have a quasicompactification, it is clearly necessary that QX be locally compact since  $QX \approx QY$  and QY is locally compact by Theorem 1.1. Local compactness of QX is also a sufficient condition for X to have a quasicompactification, as the following lemmas show.

Recall that the Freudenthal compactification FX of a rim-compact space X is characterized by the property that no open neighborhood of a point p of EX(=FX-X) is separated by EX into two disjoint open sets each having p as a limit point. (The definition of FX and additional properties of this compactification may be found in [6], [11] and [8]; additional references and a characterization of FX in terms of nonconvergent sequences, for X locally compact and metrizable and QX compact, are given in [2].)

LEMMA 3.1. The closure in FX of any open and closed subset of X is open and closed in FX.

This is an easy consequence of the characterization of FX quoted above.

THEOREM 3.2. If QX is compact, then FX is a quasicompactification of X.

*Proof.* It is well known that in this case FX is metrizable. Considering X as a subspace of FX and letting  $f: X \to FX$  be the inclusion map, we must show that conditions (1) and (2) of the definition are satisfied. First suppose A is a quasicomponent of X and let C be the component of FX containing A. By Lemma 3.1, any two points of X which are separated in X are separated in FX and hence  $C - A \subset EX$ . Since C is connected and EX is totally disconnected, it follows that  $C = \operatorname{cl}_{FX} A$ . Hence condition (1) holds, and it remains only to show that the induced map  $\phi(=\phi_f)$  is surjective and open.

To see that  $\phi$  is surjective, it is sufficient to show that each component C of FX intersects X, for then C contains some  $A \in QX$ and, by the argument above,  $cl_{FX}A = C = \phi(A)$ . If C is a component of FX which does not intersect X, then  $C = \{p\}$  for some point  $p \in$ EX. Since X is dense in FX (and FX is metrizable), there is a sequence  $\alpha = (x_1, x_2, \cdots)$  of points of X converging to p in FX. If any quasicomponent A of X contains infinitely many points of  $\alpha$ , then  $p \in \operatorname{cl}_{FX} A \subset C$  and hence  $A \subset C$ , contrary to the assumption that  $C \cap X = \emptyset$ . Hence suppose that no two points of  $\alpha$  belong to the same quasicomponent of X, and for each i, let  $A_i$  be the quasicomponent of X containing  $x_i$ . Since QX is compact, it is metrizable by Lemma 2.3 and hence some subsequence of  $\{A_i\}$  converges in QX; suppose, without loss, that  $\{A_i\} \rightarrow A \in QX$ . Then  $p \notin \operatorname{cl}_{FX} A$ , so FX = $H \cup K$ , with H and K closed and disjoint,  $A \subset H$  and  $p \in K$ . Since  $A_i \rightarrow A$  in QX and  $H \cap X$  is an open and closed subset of X containing A,  $A_i \subset H \cap X$  for almost all i; but  $x_i \in K$  for almost all i since  $x_i \rightarrow i$  $p \in K$ , and hence  $A_i \cap K \neq \emptyset$  for almost all *i*. This is a contradiction, and it follows that every component of FX intersects X, so  $\phi$  is surjective.

Now suppose  $\mathscr{U}$  is a basic open set in QX. Then  $U = \bigcup \mathscr{U}$  is open and closed in X, so  $cl_{FX}U$  is open and closed in FX. If  $p \in cl_{FX}U$ , then by the preceding argument,  $p \in cl_{FX}A$  for some  $A \in QX$ . Since U is open and closed in X, this implies that

$$\operatorname{cl}_{{}_{FX}}U = \cup \{\operatorname{cl}_{{}_{FX}}A|A \subset U\}$$
.

Since  $\phi(\mathscr{U}) = \{ cl_{FX} A | A \subset U \}$  and  $\bigcup \{ cl_{FX} A | A \subset U \}$  is open and closed in FX,  $\phi(\mathscr{U})$  is open (and closed) in QFX. Hence  $\phi$  is an open map, and since it is 1-1 and onto,  $\phi: QX \to QFX$  is a homeomorphism. Thus FX is a quasicompactification of X.

COROLLARY 3.3. If QX is locally compact, then X has a quasicompactification.

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.4,  $X = \bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  with  $QX_{\alpha}$  compact for each  $\alpha$ . By Theorem 3.2,  $FX_{\alpha}$  is a quasicompactification of  $X_{\alpha}$  and it readily follows that  $\bigoplus \{FX_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  is a quasicompactification of X.

The following theorem shows that the quasicompactification of

X described in the proof of Corollary 3.3 is independent of the choice of the  $X_{\alpha}$ 's; this quasicompactification will be denoted by  $F^*X$  and will be called the *Freudenthal quasicompactification* of X.

THEOREM 3.4. If  $X = \bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  and  $X = \bigoplus \{Y_{\beta} | \beta \in B\}$ , with  $QX_{\alpha}$  and  $QY_{\beta}$  compact for  $\alpha \in A$  and  $\beta \in B$ , respectively, then  $\bigoplus \{FX_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  is homeomorphic to  $\bigoplus \{FY_{\beta} | \beta \in B\}$ .

*Proof.* We first observe that if Z is a space such that QZ is compact and  $Z = \bigoplus \{Z_{\tau} | \tau \in T\}$ , then  $FZ = \bigoplus \{FZ_{\tau} | \tau \in T\}$ . To see this, note that by Lemma 2.1,  $QX = \bigoplus \{QZ_{\tau} | \tau \in T\}$ , and since QZ is compact, T must be finite. Hence  $\bigoplus \{FZ_{\tau} | \tau \in T\}$  is a compactification of Z. Using the characterization of the Freudenthal compactification given earlier, it is easily shown that  $\bigoplus \{FZ_{\tau} | \tau \in T\} = FZ$ .

Now for each  $\alpha \in A$ ,  $X_{\alpha} = \bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} \cap Y_{\beta} | \beta \in B, X_{\alpha} \cap Y_{\beta} \neq \emptyset\}$  so, by the previous remark,  $FX_{\alpha} = \bigoplus \{F(X_{\alpha} \cap Y_{\beta}) | \beta \in B, X_{\alpha} \cap Y_{\beta} \neq \emptyset\}$ ; therefore  $\bigoplus \{FX_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\} = \bigoplus \{F(X_{\alpha} \cap X_{\beta}) | \alpha \in A, \beta \in B, X_{\alpha} \cap Y_{\beta} \neq \emptyset\}$ . Similarly  $\bigoplus \{FY_{\beta} | \beta \in B\} = \bigoplus \{F(Y_{\beta} \cap X_{\alpha}) | \beta \in B, \alpha \in A, Y_{\beta} \cap X_{\alpha} \neq \emptyset\}$ , and hence  $\bigoplus \{FX_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\} = \bigoplus \{FY_{\beta} | \beta \in B\}$ .

Simple examples show it is not the case that each component of the Freudenthal quasicompactification of X is necessarily the Freudenthal compactification of a quasicomponent of X. As the next theorem shows, however, if X has a quasicompactification at all, it has one in which each component is the Alexandroff compactification of a quasicomponent of X. (Here, the Alexandroff compactification of a space Z is the one-point compactification if Z is not compact, and is Z itself if Z is compact.)

THEOREM 3.5. If QX is locally compact, there is a topologically unique quasicompactification Y of X such that each component of Y is the Alexandroff compactification of a quasicomponent of X.

*Proof.* For each quasicomponent A of X, let  $\overline{A}$  denote the closure of A in  $F^*X$  and let  $\mathscr{G} = \{\overline{A} - A \mid A \in q \mathscr{C}_X\}$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathscr{G}$  is an upper semicontinuous collection of disjoint closed subsets of  $F^*X$ . If  $Y = FX/\mathscr{G}$  and  $p: F^*X \to Y$  is the projection map, it is clear that for each  $A \in QX$ ,  $p(\overline{A})$  is the Alexandroff compactification of A. Since no element of  $\mathscr{G}$  intersects two components of  $F^*X$ , it easily follows that the components of Y are precisely the sets p(A) for  $A \in QX$ .

By definition, the map  $\phi: QX \to Q(F^*X)$  defined by  $\phi(A) = \overline{A}$  for  $A \in QX$  is a homeomorphism. Since the map  $\psi: Q(F^*X) \to QY$  defined by  $\psi(\overline{A}) = p(\overline{A})$  is also a homeomorphism, so is the map  $\psi \circ \phi: QX \to QY$  and it follows that Y is a quasicompactification of X.

To see that Y is topologically unique, suppose Y' is any quasicompactification of X with each component of Y' the Alexandroff compactification of a quasicomponent of X; for simplicity, assume that  $X \subset Y'$ . For each noncompact quasicomponent A of X, let  $p_A = (\operatorname{cl}_Y A) - A$  and  $p'_A = (\operatorname{cl}_{Y'} A) - A$ . If  $h: Y \to Y'$  is defined by h(x) = x for  $x \in X$  and  $h(p_A) = p'_A$  for A a noncompact quasicomponent of X, then h is a homeomorphism of Y onto Y'.

The quasicompactification Y described in the above proof will be called the Alexandroff quasicompactification of X, and will be denoted by  $\alpha X$ .

4. Shape properties. For an arbitrary topological space X, we denote the shape of X in the sense of Mardešić [10] by Sh X; if X is locally compact and metrizable,  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X$  will denote the proper shape of X in the sense of [4] and  $\operatorname{Sh}_p^1 X$  the proper shape of X in the alternative sense described in [3]. The following "decomposition theorem", which was essentially proved in [4], probably has analogues for  $\operatorname{Sh}_p^1 X$  and for Sh X, though this is by no means clear (to the present author, at least).

THEOREM 4.1. If X and Y are locally compact metric spaces and  $X = \bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$ , then  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} X = \operatorname{Sh}_{p} Y$  (respectively,  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} X \leq \operatorname{Sh}_{p} Y$ ) if and only if  $Y = \bigoplus \{Y_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  with  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} X_{\alpha} = \operatorname{Sh}_{p} Y_{\alpha}$  (resp.,  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} X_{\alpha} \leq \operatorname{Sh}_{p} Y_{\alpha}$ ) for each  $\alpha \in A$ .

**Proof.** It follows from Lemma 5.5 of [4] and from the proof of Lemma 5.8 of the same paper that  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X = \operatorname{Sh}_p Y$  if and only if there exist locally compact ANR's P and Q containing X and Y, respectively, as closed subsets, and proper fundamental nets  $\underline{f}: X \to Y$ in  $(P, Q), \underline{g}: Y \to X$  in (Q, P) such that  $\underline{gf} \cong \underline{i}_{X,P}$  and  $\underline{fg} \cong \underline{i}_{Y,Q}$ ; an analogous condition, requiring only that  $\underline{gf} \cong \underline{i}_{X,P}$ , characterizes the relation  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X \leq \operatorname{Sh}_p Y$ . It follows immediately that if  $X = \bigoplus$  $\{X_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in A\}$  and  $Y = \bigoplus \{Y_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in A\}$  with  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X_{\alpha} = \operatorname{Sh}_p Y_{\alpha}$  (respectively,  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X_{\alpha} \leq \operatorname{Sh}_p Y_{\alpha}$ ) for each  $\alpha \in A$ , then  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X = \operatorname{Sh}_p Y$  (respectively,  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X_{\alpha} \leq \operatorname{Sh}_p Y_{\alpha}$ ).

For the converse, suppose  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X = \operatorname{Sh}_p Y$  (respectively,  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X \leq \operatorname{Sh}_p Y$ ) and  $X = \bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$ . As above, there exist locally compact ANR's P and and Q containing X and Y, respectively, as closed subsets, and proper fundamental nets  $\underline{f}: X \to Y$  in  $(P, Q), \underline{g}: Y \to X$  in (Q, P) such that  $\underline{g}f \cong \underline{i}_{X,P}$  and  $\underline{f}g \cong \underline{i}_{Y,Q}$  (or only the first of these if  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X \leq \operatorname{Sh}_p Y$ ). Theorem 5.2 of [4] shows that Y can be written

as  $Y = \bigoplus \{Y_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  with  $\underline{g}f \cong \underline{i}_{X_{\alpha},P}$  and  $\underline{f}g \cong \underline{i}_{Y_{\alpha},Q}$  (or only the first of these, if  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} X \leq \operatorname{Sh}_{p} Y$ ) for each  $\alpha \in A$ . It follows that  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} X_{\alpha} = \operatorname{Sh}_{p} Y_{\alpha}$  (resp.,  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} X_{\alpha} \leq \operatorname{Sh}_{p} Y_{\alpha}$ ), as required.

LEMMA 4.2. If  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} X \leq \operatorname{Sh}_{p} Y$  and QX is compact, then QY is compact.

**Proof.** Lemma 2.2 implies that X is separable and hence ([4], Lemma 5.3) Y is also separable. By Lemma 2.2, QY is a Lindelöf space. If QY is not compact then, since it is 0-dimensional,  $QY = \bigoplus Z_n$ , where  $Z_1, Z_2, \cdots$  is an infinite set of disjoint (nonempty) open subsets of QY. By Lemma 2.1,  $Y = \bigoplus Y_n$  with  $QY_n = Z_n$  for each n, and by Theorem 4.1,  $X = \bigoplus X_n$  with  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X_n \leq \operatorname{Sh}_p Y_n$  for each n. But then  $QX = \bigoplus QX_n$ , and this is impossible since QX is compact and therefore cannot be the union of infinitely many disjoint open sets.

THEOREM 4.3. If  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X = \operatorname{Sh}_p Y$  and QX is locally compact, then QY is locally compact and  $\operatorname{Sh}_p F^*X = \operatorname{Sh}_p F^*Y$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.4,  $X = \bigoplus \{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  with each  $QX_{\alpha}$  compact. By Theorem 4.1,  $Y = \bigoplus \{Y_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  with  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p}X_{\alpha} = \operatorname{Sh}_{p}Y_{\alpha}$  for each  $\alpha$ ; since  $QX_{\alpha}$  is compact,  $QY_{\alpha}$  is compact by Lemma 4.2 and since  $QY = \bigoplus \{QY_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}, QY$  is locally compact. By definition,  $F^{*}X = \bigoplus \{FX_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  and  $F^{*}Y = \bigoplus \{FY_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$ ; since  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p}X_{\alpha} = \operatorname{Sh}_{p}Y_{\alpha}$ , Corollary 4.8 of [4] implies  $\operatorname{Sh} FX_{\alpha} = \operatorname{Sh} FY_{\alpha}$ , and hence by Theorem 4.1,  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p}F^{*}X = \operatorname{Sh}_{p}F^{*}Y$ .

NOTE. In the version of this paper presented at the 1978 Topology Conference in Warsaw, it was claimed that the hypothesis of Theorem 4.3 implies also that  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} \alpha X = \operatorname{Sh}_{p} \alpha Y$ . The author's argument for this has proved to be defective, and the conjecture remains unsettled.

Finally, we show that Theorem 4.1 can be used to obtain a proper shape version of a result due to Y. Kodama ([9], Theorem 2), without the restriction that the spaces involved be finite dimensional.

LEMMA 4.4. If each component of X is compact, then X is the topological sum of compact subspaces.

*Proof.* By Theorem 1.1,  $\mathscr{C}_X(=q\mathscr{C}_X)$  is upper semicontinuous. Hence the projection map  $p: X \to QX(=X/\mathscr{C}_X)$  is closed and since each point-inverse under p is compact, p is a compact mapping (i.e., the inverse of any compact set is compact). Moreover, by Lemma 2.4,  $X = \bigoplus \{X_\alpha \mid \alpha \in A\}$  with  $QX_\alpha$  compact for each  $\alpha$ . Since  $X_\alpha =$   $p^{-1}(QX_{\alpha}), X_{\alpha}$  is compact.

THEOREM 4.5. If  $\operatorname{Sh}_p X = \operatorname{Sh}_p Y$  and each component of X is compact, then each component of Y is compact and there is a homeomorphism  $\Lambda: QX \to QY$  such that for each locally compact subset F of  $QX, \operatorname{Sh}_p p^{-1}(F) = \operatorname{Sh}_q q^{-1}(\Lambda(F))$ , where  $p: X \to QX$  and  $q: Y \to QY$ are the projection maps.

Proof. By Lemma 4.4,  $X = \bigoplus\{X_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  with each  $X_{\alpha}$  compact and hence by Theorem 4.1,  $Y = \bigoplus\{Y_{\alpha} | \alpha \in A\}$  with  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} X_{\alpha} = \operatorname{Sh}_{p} Y_{\alpha}$ for each  $\alpha$ ; since  $X_{\alpha}$  is compact, Y is compact ([4], p. 172) and therefore  $\operatorname{Sh} X_{\alpha} = \operatorname{Sh} Y_{\alpha}$  by Theorem 3.15 of [4]. Hence by Theorem 2.2 of [1], for each  $\alpha \in A$  there is a homeomorphism  $\Lambda_{\alpha}: QX_{\alpha} \to QY_{\alpha}$ such that for every compact subset  $K_{\alpha}$  of  $QX_{\alpha}$ ,  $\operatorname{Sh} p^{-1}(K_{\alpha}) = \operatorname{Sh} q^{-1}(\Lambda(K_{\alpha}))$ . Let  $\Lambda: QX \to QY$  be the combination of the  $\Lambda_{\alpha}$ 's(i.e.,  $\Lambda(\alpha) = \Lambda_{\alpha}(\alpha)$  if  $\alpha \in X_{\alpha}$ ). If F is a locally compact subset of QX and for each  $\alpha$ ,  $F_{\alpha} =$  $F \cap QX_{\alpha}$ , then  $F_{\alpha}$  is a locally compact subset of QX. The argument for Lemma 2.3 of [1], using Theorem 4.1 in in place of Theorem 4.2 of [7], shows that  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} p^{-1}(F_{\alpha}) = \operatorname{Sh}_{p} q^{-1}(\Lambda_{\alpha}(F_{\alpha}))$ . Since  $p^{-1}(F) = \bigoplus\{p^{-1}(F_{\alpha}) | \alpha \in A\}$ and  $q^{-1}(\Lambda(F)) = \bigoplus\{q^{-1}(\Lambda_{\alpha}(F_{\alpha})) | \alpha \in A\}$ , it follows from Theorem 4.1 that  $\operatorname{Sh}_{p} p^{-1}(F) = \operatorname{Sh}_{p} q^{-1}(\Lambda(F))$ .

#### References

B. J. Ball, Shapes of saturated subsets of compacta, Coll. Math., 29 (1974), 241-246.
*—*, Proper shape retracts, Fund. Math., 89 (1975), 178-189.

3. \_\_\_\_\_, Alternative approaches to proper shape theory, Studies in Topology (Proceedings of the 1974 Charlotte Topology Conference), Academic Press, 1975, 1-27.

4. B. J. Ball and R. B. Sher, A theory of proper shape for locally compact metric spaces, Fund. Math., 86 (1974), 163-192.

5. J. Dugundji, Topology, Allyn and Bacon, 1970.

6. H. Freudenthal, Neuaufbau der Endentheorie, Ann. of Math., 43 (1942), 261-279.

 S. Godlewski and S. Nowak, On two notions of shape, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astron. Phys., 20 (1972), 387-393.

8. J. Isbell, Uniform Spaces, Mathematica Surveys, No. 12, Amer. Math. Soc., 1964.

9. Y. Kodama, Decomposition spaces and shape in the sense of Fox, Fund, Math., 97 (1977), 199-208.

10. S. Mardešić, Shapes for topological spaces, General Topology and Appl., 3 (1973), 265-282.

11. K. Morita, On bicompactifications of semibicompact spaces, Sci. Rep. Tokyo Bunrika Daigaku, Sec. A, 4, 94 (1952), 221-229.

12. R. L. Wilder, A point set which has no true quasi-components, and which becomes connected upon the addition of a single point, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 33 (1927), 423-427.

Received January 30, 1979. Presented at the 1978 Conference on Geometric Topology in Warsaw, and summarized in the proceedings of that conference, under the title Shapes of component-compactifications.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA ATHENS, GA 30602

## PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

### EDITORS

DONALD BABBITT (Managing Editor) University of California

Los Angeles, CA 90024

HUGO ROSSI

University of Utah Salt Lake City, UT 84112

C. C. MOORE and ANDREW OGG University of California Berkeley, CA 94720 J. DUGUNDJI

Department of Mathematics University of Southern California Los Angeles, CA 90007

R. FINN and J. MILGRAM Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305

#### ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

K. Yoshida

#### SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

F. WOLF

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF OREGON UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA STANFORD UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF UTAH WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of the manuscript. However, you may use them in the displayed equations. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Please propose a heading for the odd numbered pages of less than 35 characters. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. **39**. Supply name and address of author to whom proofs should be sent. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints to each author are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$84.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$42.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for numbers issued in the last three calendar years, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924, U.S.A. Older back numbers obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.). 8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

> Copyright © 1979 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics Manufactured and first issued in Japan

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics Vol. 84, No. 2 June, 1979

| Somesh Chandra Bagchi and Alladi Sitaram, <i>Spherical mean periodic</i><br><i>functions on semisimple Lie groups</i> | 241 |
|---|-----|
| Billy Joe Ball, <i>Quasicompactifications and shape theory</i>  | 251 |
| Maureen A. Bardwell, <i>The o-primitive components of a regular ordered</i>   | 231 |
| permutation group   | 261 |
|   | 201 |
| Peter W. Bates and James R. Ward, <i>Periodic solutions of higher order</i>   | 275 |
| systems   | 215 |
| Jeroen Bruijning, A characterization of dimension of topological spaces by<br>totally bounded pseudometrics           | 283 |
| • •   | 203 |
| Thomas Farmer, On the reduction of certain degenerate principal series representations of $SP(n, C)$                  | 291 |
| Richard P. Jerrard and Mark D. Meyerson, <i>Homotopy with m-functions</i>   | 305 |
|   | 505 |
| James Edgar Keesling and Sibe Mardesic, <i>A shape fibration with fibers of different shape</i>                       | 319 |
| 00 1  | 519 |
| Guy Loupias, Cohomology over Banach crossed products. Application to bounded derivations and crossed homomorphisms    | 333 |
| •   |     |
| Rainer Löwen, <i>Symmetric planes</i>   | 367 |
| Alan L. T. Paterson, Amenable groups for which every topological left<br>invariant mean is invariant                  | 391 |
|   | 391 |
| Jack Ray Porter and R. Grant Woods, <i>Ultra-Hausdorff H-closed</i>   | 399 |
| extensions  |     |
| Calvin R. Putnam, <i>Operators satisfying a G</i> <sub>1</sub> condition  | 413 |
| Melvin Gordon Rothenberg and Jonathan David Sondow, <i>Nonlinear smooth</i>   | 407 |
| representations of compact Lie groups   | 427 |
| Werner Rupp, <i>Riesz-presentation of additive and</i> $\sigma$ <i>-additive set-valued</i>                           | 445 |
| measures  | 445 |
| A. M. Russell, A commutative Banach algebra of functions of generalized   | 455 |
|   | 455 |
| Judith D. Sally, <i>Superregular sequences</i>  | 465 |
| Patrick Shanahan, On the signature of Grassmannians   | 483 |