Pacific Journal of Mathematics

PARACOMPACT C-SCATTERED SPACES

Louis M. Friedler, Harold W. Martin and Scott Warner Williams

Vol. 129, No. 2 June 1987

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol 129, No. 2, 1987

PARACOMPACT C-SCATTERED SPACES

L. M. FRIEDLER, H. W. MARTIN AND S. W. WILLIAMS

Telgársky calls a topological space C-scattered when each of its non-empty closed sets contains a compact set with non-empty relative interior. With respect to infinite products, hyperspaces, and the partially ordered set of compactifications, we study the class of paracompact C-scattered spaces and two of its subclasses, MacDonald and Willard's A'-spaces and A-spaces.

0. Introduction. All spaces are Hausdorff spaces. A space X is said to be *C-scattered* [**16**] provided that each of its non-empty closed subspaces contains a compact set with non-empty relative interior. The notion of C-scatteredness seems a simple simultaneous generalization of scattered ($\equiv$ each non-empty set has a relative isolated point) and of local compactness. However, the class of paracompact C-scattered spaces is most interesting because [**19**] it contains its perfect pre-images, it is closed under finite products, it contains all closed continuous images of paracompact locally compact spaces, and for each of its members X, $X \times Y$ is paracompact iff Y is paracompact. Presently we study this class and two of its subclasses.

Section 1 is due to the third author and §§2 and 3 are due to the first two authors.

In §1 of our paper, we show that each countable product of paracompact C-scattered spaces is paracompact. This result improves upon the same theorem, due to Rudin and Watson [**18**], for paracompact scattered spaces, and answers the question raised for A'-spaces by the first two authors of this paper. As a corollary, we find that each countable product of Lindelöf C-scattered spaces is Lindelöf, a result due to Alster [**2**].

In the second section, we investigate hyperspaces of paracompact C-scattered spaces—a situation so complex that we limit our attention to A'-spaces. An *A'-space* is a space whose set of accumulation points is compact [**10**]. Thus, an A'-space is paracompact C-scattered. It is known [**12**] that the compact-set hyperspace $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is locally compact (metrizable) iff X is locally compact (respectively, metrizable). Here we present an example of a Lindelöf scattered A'-space X such that $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is neither C-scattered or normal. Further, we prove that $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is an A'-space (contains a dense A'-space containing X) iff X is either compact or discrete (respectively, or $\operatorname{int}(\operatorname{acc}(X)) = \varnothing$).

In our final section we consider the metrizable A'-spaces termed as *A-spaces* by Willard [**21**]. A-spaces occur naturally in several ways; for example, a metrizable space is an A-space iff each closed continuous image is metrizable ([**17**] and [**21**]) iff each Hausdorff quotient space is metrizable ([**1**], [**9**], and [**18**]). A-spaces are also studied in [**3**], [**4**], [**7**], [**11**], [**13**], and [**14**]. The main result in the section shows that $K_M(X)$, the partially ordered set of metrically compactible Hausdorff compactifications, is a lattice when X is an A-space. However, we also obtain a characterization of A-space: A metrizable space is an A-space iff $K_M(X)$ has maximal element.

0.1. *Conventions.* All ordinals are von-Neumann ordinals. **N** denotes the set of positive integers and **R** denotes the set of reals. The interior, closure, and accumulation point-set operators are denoted, respectively, by int, cl, and acc.

0.2. DEFINITION. Let X be a space and $X^{(1)}$ be the set of points of X which fail to have a compact neighborhood in X. Now, letting $X^{(0)} = X$, inductively define for each ordinal α, $X^{(\alpha)} = \bigcap_{\beta<\alpha} X^{(\beta)(1)}$. Then X is C-scattered iff there exists an ordinal γ such that $X^{(\gamma)} = \varnothing$ [**19**].

Suppose X is C-scattered and $Y \subset X$. For each ordinal α define $Y^{(\alpha)} = X^{(\alpha)} \cap Y$. Then the *rank* of Y (in X), denoted by $\operatorname{rk}(X)$, is the least ordinal γ such that $Y^{(\gamma)} = \varnothing$. It is easily proved that an A'-space is a paracompact C-scattered space of rank at most 2.

1. Products of C-scattered spaces. The entirety of this section is directed to proving the following result:

1.1. THEOREM. *Suppose X_n is a paracompact C-scattered space for each positive integer n. Then $\prod_n X_n$ is paracompact.*

1.2. *A Reduction.* We begin our proof of 1.1 with a reduction to an easier case. We first observe that it suffices in Theorem 1.1 to assume that all the spaces X_n are homeomorphic and 0-dimensional in the sense of small inductive dimension. To see this, let

$$Y = \Big(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbf{N}} X_n \times \{n\}\Big) \cup \{\infty\}.$$

The space Y has the topology which makes each $X_n \times \{n\}$ clopen in Y and homeomorphic to X_n. Basic neighborhoods of ∞ have the form

$$Y \setminus \bigcup_{n \leq k} X_n \times \{n\}, \quad \text{for some } k \in \mathbf{N}.$$

Then Y is paracompact and C-scattered. So $\Pi^{\mathbf{N}} Y$ is paracompact implies $\Pi_n X_n$ is paracompact. Now let X be Ponomarev's absolute of Y **[16]**. Then X is paracompact, extremally disconnected and C-scattered **[19]**. Since $\Pi^{\mathbf{N}} X$ maps perfectly onto $\Pi^{\mathbf{N}} Y$, $\Pi^{\mathbf{N}} X$ is paracompact iff $\Pi^{\mathbf{N}} Y$ is paracompact. □

Henceforth, X will be a paracompact C-scattered 0-dimensional space, and we will show $\Pi^{\mathbf{N}} X$ paracompact. Actually we show a stronger result: Each open cover of $\Pi^{\mathbf{N}} X$ has a pairwise-disjoint open refinement; i.e. $\Pi^{\mathbf{N}} X$ is *ultraparacompact.* We approach this in stages.

1.3. LEMMA **[19]**. *If X is a paracompact C-scattered 0-dimensional space, then so is X^n for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$.* □

The following result was obtained (unpublished) by the third author in 1974.

1.4. LEMMA. *For a paracompact space Y the following are equivalent*:

(1) *Y is ultraparacompact.*

(2) $\operatorname{Ind}(Y) = 0$ (Ind $\equiv$ *large inductive dimension*).

(3) *Each non-empty closed subset F of Y contains an ultra-paracompact subspace with non-empty F-interior.*

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (2) is straightforward and (1) implies (3) is obvious. We prove (3) implies (1).

For a closed subset Z of Y, define Z^* to be the set of all points of Z which do not have Y-closed Y-ultraparacompact neighborhoods. Since Z^* is closed in Y, there is a family $\mathscr{A}$ of Z-open sets such that $\bigcup\mathscr{A} = Z \setminus Z^*$ and $\operatorname{Ind}(A) = 0 \ \forall A \in \mathscr{A}$.

Claim. If $Z^* = \varnothing$, then Z is ultraparacompact.

To see the claim, suppose $\mathscr{R}$ is a Z-open cover of Z. Since Z is paracompact and $Z^* = \varnothing$, there is a Z-locally finite refinement $\mathscr{T}$ such that $\{\mathrm{cl}_Y(T)\colon T \in \mathscr{T}\}$ refines $\{R \cap A\colon R \in \mathscr{R},\ A \in \mathscr{A}\}$. Applying the normality of Z and the condition $\operatorname{Ind}(A) = 0 \ \forall A \in \mathscr{A}$, we may choose a refinement $\mathscr{U} = \{U_T\colon T \in \mathscr{T}\}$ of $\mathscr{T}$ such that for each $T \in \mathscr{T}$, $U_T \subset T$ and U_T is $\mathrm{cl}_Y(T)$-clopen. Note that each U_T is actually Z-clopen. Since $\mathscr{T}$ is Z-locally finite, $\mathscr{U}$ is Z-locally finite. Let $\prec$ be a well-ordering of $\mathscr{U}$. Then

$$\{U \setminus \bigcup\{V \in \mathscr{U}\colon V \prec U\}\colon U \in \mathscr{U}\}$$

is the desired pairwise-disjoint Z-open refinement of $\mathscr{R}$. The claim is now proved.

According to the claim, Y is ultraparacompact whenever $Y^* = \varnothing$. We contend the latter is true. Suppose, by way of contradiction, that $Y^* \neq \varnothing$. Then applying regularity and (3), there is a Y-closed set Z such that $Z \cap Y^*$ is ultraparacompact and $Y^* \cap \mathrm{int}_Y(Z) \neq \varnothing$. Clearly, $\varnothing \neq Z^* \subset Y^*$. Now suppose $\mathscr{R}$ is a Z-open cover of Z. Then there is a pairwise-disjoint Z^*-open cover $\mathscr{S}$ of Z refining $\mathscr{R}|Z^*$. Since Z is collectionwise normal, there is a pairwise-disjoint family $\mathscr{T} = \{T_S\colon S \in \mathscr{S}\}$ consisting of Z-open sets such that for each $S \in \mathscr{S}$, $T_S \cap Z^* = S$ and there exists $R_S \in \mathscr{R}$ with $T_S \subseteq R_S$. Let $K = Z \setminus \bigcup\mathscr{T}$, and, by normality, choose a Z-open set G such that

$$K \subset G \subset \mathrm{cl}_Y(G) \subset Z \setminus Z^*.$$

Clearly, $(\mathrm{cl}_Y(G))^* = \varnothing$. So the claim above shows there is a $\mathrm{cl}_Y(G)$-open pairwise-disjoint family $\mathscr{U}$ covering $\mathrm{cl}_Y(G)$ and refining the family

$$\{\mathrm{cl}_Y(G) \setminus K\} \cup \{R \cap G\colon R \in \mathscr{R}\}.$$

Let $\mathscr{V} = \{U \in \mathscr{U}\colon U \cap K \neq \varnothing\}$. Then each $V \in \mathscr{V}$ is a $\mathrm{cl}_Y(G)$-open subset of G and $\mathrm{cl}_Y(G)$-closed. Hence, each $V \in \mathscr{V}$ is Z-clopen. So $\mathscr{V}$ is Z-locally-finite and $\bigcup\mathscr{V}$ is clopen. Certainly

$$\mathscr{V} \cup \{T \setminus \bigcup\mathscr{V}\colon T \in \mathscr{T}\}$$

is a Z-open pairwise-disjoint refinement of $\mathscr{R}$. So Z is ultraparacompact. Hence $\mathrm{int}_Y(Z) \cap Y^* = \varnothing$—a contradiction. □

Now we know $\prod^n X$ is ultraparacompact for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$. However, we need a much stronger result.

1.5. DEFINITION. Suppose that Y is a C-scattered space and $A \subset Y$. Define the *top* of A by

$$\mathrm{tp}(A) = \begin{cases} \varnothing & \text{if } \mathrm{rk}(A) \text{ is a limit ordinal,} \\ A^{(\alpha)} & \text{if } \mathrm{rk}(A) = \alpha + 1. \end{cases}$$

We say that A is *capped* provided there exists an α such that $A^{(\alpha)}$ is compact and non-empty. Obviously if A is open and capped, then $\text{rk}(A)$ will be $\alpha + 1$ when $A^{(\alpha)}$ is compact and non-empty.

1.6. LEMMA. *A 0-dimensional C-scattered space Y has a base of clopen capped sets.*

Proof. For $y \in Y$, $\text{rk}(y) = \alpha + 1$ for some α. Given a neighborhood G of Y, choose a clopen set H with $y \in H \subseteq G \setminus Y^{(\alpha+1)}$. Then $H^{(\alpha)}$ is clopen in the locally compact space $Y^{(\alpha)} \setminus Y^{(\alpha+1)}$. So there is a Y-clopen neighborhood K of y such that $K \cap H^{(\alpha)}$ is compact. □

1.7. LEMMA. *Each open covering of X is refined by a pairwise-disjoint family of clopen capped sets.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathscr{R}$ is an open covering X. According to 1.4 we may assume $\mathscr{R}$ to consist of pairwise-disjoint clopen sets. Inductively, we construct for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$, a family $\mathscr{R}_n$ as follows: First set $\mathscr{R}_1 = \mathscr{R}$. For each $n > 1$

(i) $\mathscr{R}_n$ is a pairwise-disjoint open refinement of $\mathscr{R}_{n-1}$.

(ii) If $R \in \mathscr{R}_{n-1}$ is capped, then $R \in \mathscr{R}_n$.

(iii) If $R \in \mathscr{R}_{n-1}$ is not capped, then $\text{rk}(R^*) < \text{rk}(R)$ for each non-capped $R^* \in \mathscr{R}_n$ with $R' \subseteq R$.

Assume that we have $\mathscr{R}_n$ for all $n \leq m$; we will find $\mathscr{R}_{m+1}$. Let

$$\mathscr{S} = \{R \in \mathscr{R}_m \colon R \text{ is not capped}\}$$

and fix $S \in \mathscr{S}$. Note that S is clopen. For each $x \in S$ we use 1.6 to find an open capped set S_x such that $x \in \text{tp}(S_x)$ and $S_x \subseteq S$.

Now suppose $\text{rk}(S)$ is a limit ordinal. Then $\text{rk}(S_x) < \text{rk}(S)$ for each $x \in S$. From 1.6 there is a pairwise-disjoint refinement $\mathscr{T}_S$ of $\{S_x\colon x \in S\}$ (we are assuming that the union of the refinement is the union of the family that it refines).

On the other hand, suppose $\text{rk}(S) = \alpha + 1$. Then $(X^{(\alpha)} \cap S) \setminus X^{(\alpha+1)}$ is a locally compact ultraparacompact space, and hence, the union of a pairwise-disjoint family $\mathscr{U}$ consisting of compact $X^{(\alpha)}$-open sets. For each $U \in \mathscr{U}$, let $V_U \subset S$ be an open set such that $(V_U)^{(\alpha)} = U$. From 1.4 there is a pairwise-disjoint X-open refinement $\mathscr{T}_S$ of $\{S \setminus X^{(\alpha)}\} \cup \{V_U\colon U \in \mathscr{U}\}$. Observe that for each $T \in \mathscr{T}_S$, $T^{(\alpha)}$ is closed in some $U \in \mathscr{U}$. Hence, $T^{(\alpha)}$ is compact. Clearly, if T is not capped, then $T^{(\alpha)} = \varnothing$ and so $\text{rk}(T) < \text{rk}(S)$.

We complete the construction by defining

$$\mathscr{R}_{m+1} = (\mathscr{R} \setminus \mathscr{S}) \cup \left(\bigcup\{\mathscr{T}_S \colon S \in \mathscr{S}\}\right).$$

Now $\mathscr{R}_n$ is defined for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Define

$$\mathscr{R}_\infty = \left\{R \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \mathscr{R}_n \colon R \text{ is capped}\right\}.$$

Then (i) and (ii) imply $\mathscr{R}_\infty$ is a pairwise-disjoint open capped family. Also, (i) shows that if $\mathscr{R}_\infty$ covers X, then $\mathscr{R}_\infty$ refines $\mathscr{R}$. So suppose $\mathscr{R}_\infty$ does not cover X, i.e., $x \in X \setminus \bigcup \mathscr{R}_\infty$. Then we may find for each $n > 1$ a set $R_n \in \mathscr{R}_n$ such that $x \in R_n \subset R_{n-1}$. As R_n is not capped, $\operatorname{rk}(R_n) < \operatorname{rk}(R_{n-1})$. However, this implies there is a decreasing sequence of ordinals, an impossibility. So $\mathscr{R}_\infty$ must cover X. □

1.8. Definition. Fix $n \in \mathbf{N}$. By a *box* in $\prod^n X$, we mean a set of the form $B = \prod_{i \leq n} B_i$, where each B_i is open in X. A *capped box* is a box B such that B_i is capped in X for each $i \leq n$.

1.9. Lemma. *For a fixed natural number n, each open cover of $\prod^n X$ is refined by a pairwise-disjoint collection of capped box.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on n. As the Lemma 1.6 shows our result for $n = 1$, we suppose it is true for some $m \in \mathbf{N}$ and show it is true for $m + 1$. Suppose $\mathscr{R}$ is an open cover of $\prod^{m+1} X$. Let Y denote the set of all points in X such that x does not have a neighborhood 0 for which $\mathscr{R}|(0 \times \prod^m X)$ is refined by a pairwise-disjoint family of capped boxes. If $Y =$ empty, then we may, by 1.7, write X as the union of a disjoint family $\mathscr{G}$ if open capped sets G such that $\mathscr{R}|(G \times \prod^m X)$ is refined by a pairwise-disjoint capped box family $\mathscr{S}_G$. Clearly, in this case, $\bigcup\{\mathscr{S}_G \colon G \in \mathscr{G}\}$ is the desired refinement of $\mathscr{R}$.

Of course, it is always true that $Y = \varnothing$. To see this suppose not. Then there is a compact subset K of Y such that $\operatorname{int}_Y(K) \neq \varnothing$. For each $v \in \prod^m X$, there is a capped box $A_v = \prod_i A_{vi}$ neighborhood of v such that $K \times A_v$ is the union of a finite pairwise-disjoint $(K \times \prod^m X)$-capped box refinement $\mathscr{T}_v$ of $\mathscr{R}|K \times T$. By the induction hypothesis, there is a pairwise-disjoint capped box refinement $\mathscr{U}$ of $\{A_v \colon v \in \prod^m X\}$. For each $U \in \mathscr{U}$, choose a $v(U) \in \prod^m X$ such that $U \subseteq A_{v(U)}$. Then

$$\mathscr{W} = \left\{(K \times U) \cap T \colon U \in \mathscr{U},\, T \in \mathscr{T}_{v(U)}\right\}$$

is a pairwise-disjoint $(K \times \prod^m X)$-capped box refinement of the restriction of $\mathscr{R}$ to $K \times \prod^m X$. For each $W = \prod_{i \leq m+1} W_i \in \mathscr{W}$ choose an open set H_W of X and an $R_W \in \mathscr{R}$ such that $H_W \cap K = W_{m+1}$ and $H_W \times \prod_{i \leq m} W_i \subset R_W$. But, according to the definition of Y, the existence of the family

$$\{H_W \times \prod_{i \leq m} W_i \colon W \in \mathscr{W}\}$$

implies that $\operatorname{int}_X(K) \cap Y = \varnothing$, a contradiction. So $Y = \varnothing$. □

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section, from which 1.1 follows.

1.10. THEOREM. *$\prod^{\mathbf{N}} X$ is ultraparacompact.*

Proof. By a *cube* in $\prod^{\mathbf{N}} X$, we mean a set of the form $C = \prod_n C_n$, where each C_n is a clopen capped set in X, and there exists $m(C) \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $C_n \neq X$ $\forall n < m(C)$ and $C_n = X$ $\forall n \geq m(C)$ [Notice that in the reduction 1.2, X is capped. We assume, without loss of generality, that such is the case here.] Therefore, the family of cubes in $\prod^{\mathbf{N}} X$ forms a base. For a cube C let $\operatorname{tp}(C) = \prod_n \operatorname{tp}(C_n)$.

Suppose that $\mathscr{R}$ is a cube cover of $\prod^{\mathbf{N}} X$. We construct, inductively, for each $i \in \mathbf{N}$, a cube cover $\mathscr{S}_i$ of $\prod^{\mathbf{N}} X$ satisfying the conditions below for $i = j + 1$:

(1) $\mathscr{S}_i$ is a pairwise-disjoint refinement of $\mathscr{S}_j$.

(2) If $S \in \mathscr{S}_j$ is such that $\operatorname{tp}(S) \subset \bigcup \mathscr{R}'$, where $\mathscr{R}' \subset \mathscr{R}$ and $m(R) \leq m(S)$ $\forall R \in \mathscr{R}'$, then

(a) $m(S') = m(S)$ for each S' with $S \supset S' \in \mathscr{S}_i$, and

(b) $S' \in \mathscr{S}_i$ and $S' \cap \operatorname{tp}(S) \neq \varnothing$ implies $\exists R \in \mathscr{R}$ with $S' \subset R$.

(3) If $S \in \mathscr{S}_j$ is such that $\nexists \mathscr{R}' \subset \mathscr{R}$ with $\operatorname{tp}(S) \subset \bigcup \mathscr{R}'$ and $m(R) \leq m(S)$ $\forall S' \in \mathscr{S}_i$ with $S' \subset S$.

(4) If $S \in \mathscr{S}_j$ is such that $\exists R \in \mathscr{R}$ with $S \subset R$, then $S \in \mathscr{R}_i$.

The construction proceeds as follows. First let $\mathscr{S}_1 = \{\prod^{\mathbf{N}} X\}$, and suppose we have found $\mathscr{S}_i$ $\forall i \leq k$. We construct $\mathscr{S}_{k+1}$. Since $\mathscr{S}_k$ is a pairwise-disjoint clopen cover of $\prod^{\mathbf{N}} X$, it is sufficient to find $\mathscr{S}_{k+1} \mid S$ for a fixed $S = \prod_n S_n \in \mathscr{S}_k$. If there is an $R \in \mathscr{R}$ with $S \subset R$, then define $(\mathscr{S}_{k+1} \mid S) = \{S\}$. If there does not exist a subfamily $\mathscr{R}'$ of $\mathscr{R}$ such that $\operatorname{tp}(S) \subset \bigcup \mathscr{R}'$ and $m(R) \leq m(S)$ $\forall R \in \mathscr{R}'$, then we apply 1.9 to obtain a pairwise-disjoint capped box family $\mathscr{T}$ covering $\prod_{n \leq m(S)} S_n$ such that $\forall T \in \mathscr{T}$ $\forall n \leq m(S)$ $T_n \neq X$. In this case we define

$$(\mathscr{S}_{k+1} \mid S) = \left\{ \left(\prod_{n \leq m(S)} T_n \right) \times \prod^{\{n \in \mathbf{N} \colon n > m(S)\}} X \colon T \in \mathscr{T} \right\}.$$

Finally, if $\exists\mathscr{R}' \subset \mathscr{R}$ such that $\operatorname{tp}(S) \subset \bigcup\mathscr{R}'$ and $m(R) \leq m(S)\ \forall R \in \mathscr{R}'$, then there is a finite subfamily of $\{\prod_{n<m(S)} R_n\colon R \in \mathscr{R}'\}$ covering the compact set $\prod_{n<m(S)} \operatorname{tp}(S_n)$. Applying 1.9 we choose a pairwise-disjoint clopen capped box cover $\mathscr{W}$ of $\prod_{n<m(S)} S_n$ refining

$$\left\{\left(\prod^{m(S)} X\right) \Big\backslash \left(\prod_{n<m(S)} \operatorname{tp}(S_n)\right)\right\} \cup \left\{\prod_{n<m(S)} R_n\colon R \in \mathscr{R}'\right\}.$$

We define

$$(\mathscr{S}_{k+1} \mid S) = \left\{\left(\prod_{n<m(S)} W_n\right) \times \prod^{\{n:\ n \geq m(S)\}} X\colon W \in \mathscr{W}\right\}.$$

It is clear that the conditions (1) through (4) are satisfied. So we assume that we have defined the families $\mathscr{S}_i\ \forall i \in \mathbf{N}$.

Define $\mathscr{S} = \{\bigcap\mathscr{B}\colon \mathscr{B}$ is a maximal chain of $\bigcup_{i\in\mathbf{N}}\mathscr{S}_i$ and $\bigcap\mathscr{B} \neq \varnothing\}$. Now (i) implies $\mathscr{S}$ is a pairwise-disjoint cover of $\prod^{\mathbf{N}} X$. So the proof is complete once we show that $\mathscr{S}$ consists of open sets. This follows immediately from

(#) *Each maximal chain $\mathscr{B}$ of $\bigcup_{i\in\mathbf{N}}\mathscr{S}_i$ is finite.*

Suppose # is false. Then for each $i \in \mathbf{N}\ \exists S(i) \in \mathscr{S}_i$ such that, by (1), $S(i+1)$ is a proper subset of $S(i)$. Also $m(S(i+1)) \geq m(S(i))$ $\forall i \in \mathbf{N}$, and $\operatorname{rk}(S(i+1)_n) \leq \operatorname{rk}(S(i)_n)\ \forall i \in \mathbf{N}$. Since any non-increasing sequence of ordinals is eventually constant, we may choose for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $i_n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\operatorname{rk}(S(i)_n) = \operatorname{rk}(S(i_n)_n)\ \forall i \geq i_n$. There is a finite family $\mathscr{R}' \subset \mathscr{R}$ covering the compact set $\prod_n \operatorname{tp}(S(i_n)_n)$. Let $m = \sup\{m(R)\colon R \in \mathscr{R}'\}$.

Suppose there is a j so large that $m(S(j)) \geq m$. Let $i \geq j$ be such that $i \geq i_n\ \forall n < m$. Then for each $n < m$, $\operatorname{tp}(S(i)_n) \subset \operatorname{tp}(S(i_n)_n)$. Since $R_n = X\ \ \forall R \in \Omega'\ \ \forall n \geq m$, $\operatorname{tp}(S(i)) \subset \bigcup\mathscr{R}'$. Since $m(S(i)) > m$, (2a) implies $m(S(i+1)) = m(S(i))$. Thus, for each $k \in \mathbf{N}$, $m(S(i+k)) \neq m(S(i))$. since $S(i+k+1) \neq S(i+k+2)$, (2b) implies that

$$\operatorname{tp}(S(i+k+1)) \cap \operatorname{tp}(S(i+k)) = \varnothing.$$

So for each $k \in \mathbf{N}$, there exists $n(k) \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n(k) < m(S(i))$ and

$$\operatorname{rk}(S(i+k+1)_{n(k)}) < \operatorname{rk}(S(i+k)_{n(k)}).$$

But then there exists $n \in \mathbf{N}$ with $n = n(k)$ for infinitely many n. As this implies there is an infinite decreasing sequence of ordinals, we have a contradiction.

Now suppose there is $m(S(i)) < m\ \forall i \in \mathbf{N}$. Then (3) implies there is $j \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall i \geq j\ \ \exists\mathscr{R}_i \subset \mathscr{R}$ with $\operatorname{tp}(S(i)) \subset \bigcup\mathscr{R}_i$ and $m(R) \leq m(S(i)) < m\ \ \forall R \in \mathscr{R}_i$. Let $i \geq j$. As in the previous paragraph, (2) implies there exists $n(i) < m$ such that

$$\mathrm{rk}\big(S(i+1)_{n(i)}\big) < \mathrm{rk}\big(S(i)_{n(i)}\big).$$

So there is an $n < m$ with $n(i) = n$ for infinitely many i, which leads to a contradiction. □

1.11. COROLLARY [2]. *If X_n is a Lindelöf C-scattered space for each natural number n, then $\prod_n X_n$ is Lindelöf.*

Proof. The absolute of a Lindelöf space is Lindelöf, as is the space X constructed in the reduction 1.2. In particular, each of the families $\mathscr{S}_i$ of the Theorem 1.10 may be taken to be countable. □

1.12. COROLLARY [18]. *If X_n is a paracompact scattered space for each natural number n, then $\prod_n X_n$ is ultraparacompact.*

Proof. The Lemma 1.4(3) ⇒ (2) shows that each X_n is 0-dimensional. So we simply replace X, in the reduction, by Y. Then this result is a consequence 1.10. □

2. Hyperspaces of C-scattered spaces. Given a space X, we use 2^X, according to Michael [12], for the set of all non-empty closed subsets of X topologized by the *Vietoris topology* as follows:

First, given a finite set $\{S_1, \ldots, S_n\}$ of subsets of X, define

$$\langle S_1, \ldots, S_n \rangle = \left\{ F \in 2^X \colon F \subset \bigcup_{i \le n} S_i \text{ and } F \cap S_i \neq \varnothing \ \forall i \le n \right\}.$$

Then the Vietoris topology is the topology on 2^X with base the set of all sets of form $\langle V_1, \ldots, V_n \rangle$, where $\{V_1, \ldots, V_n\}$ is some finite (n is not fixed) family of open subsets of X.

The hyperspace 2^X has two distinguished subspaces, the *compact-set hyperspace* $\mathscr{C}(X) = \{F \in 2^X \colon F$ is compact in $X\}$, and the *finite-set hyperspace* $\mathscr{F}(X) = \{F \in 2^X \colon F$ is a finite subset of $X\}$.

It is known that X is compact iff 2^X is compact iff 2^X is normal [20]. Further, we know that $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is locally compact (discrete) iff X is locally compact (discrete) [12]. More recently, Bell [5] discovered that $\mathscr{F}(X)$ is paracompact iff $\prod^n X$ is paracompact $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}$; hence $\mathscr{F}(X)$ is paracompact whenever X is a paracompact C-scattered space (a result, unpublished, due to the third author). From these results one might conjecture that $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is C-scattered whenever X is C-scattered, or that $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is an A'-space whenever X is an A'-space. In this section we kill both conjectures and prove the right theorems in their stead.

2.1. LEMMA. *For a space X, $\mathscr{C}(X)^{(1)} \subset \langle X, X^{(1)}\rangle$.*

Proof. If $F \notin \langle X, X^{(1)}\rangle$, then $F \cap X^{(1)} = \varnothing$. So F is covered by open sets with compact closures. If $F \in \mathscr{C}(X)$, then F has a compact neighborhood K in X. Since $\langle K\rangle = 2^K$ is compact, $\langle K\rangle \cap \mathscr{C}(X)^{(1)} = \varnothing$. So $F \notin \mathscr{C}(X)^{(1)}$. □

2.2. LEMMA. *For an A'-space X, $\operatorname{acc}(\mathscr{C}(X)) = \mathscr{C}(X) \cap \langle X, \operatorname{acc}(X)\rangle$.*

Proof. If $F \in \mathscr{C}(X)$ and $F \cap \operatorname{acc}(X) = \varnothing$, then F is finite and clopen in X, say $F = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$. But then $\{F\} = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n\rangle$ is open in $\mathscr{C}(X)$. So $f \notin \operatorname{acc}(\mathscr{C}(X))$.

Conversely, if $F \in \mathscr{C}(X) \cap \langle X, \operatorname{acc}(X)\rangle$, let $x \in F \cap \operatorname{acc}(X)$ and suppose $\langle V_1, \ldots, V_n\rangle$ is an arbitrary basic neighborhood of F in $\mathscr{C}(X)$. Since x is an accumulation point of X, we may choose, for each $i \leq n$, an $x_i \in V_i \setminus \{x\}$. Clearly,

$$F \neq \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \in \langle V_1, \ldots, V_n\rangle.$$

So $F \in \operatorname{acc}(\mathscr{C}(X))$. □

2.3. EXAMPLE. *There is a Lindelöf scattered A'-space X such that $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is neither C-scattered nor normal.*

Proof. Let $X = (\mathbf{N} \times \omega_1) \cup \{\infty\}$ have as a base the set

$$\{\{(n, \alpha)\} : (n, \alpha) \in \mathbf{N} \times \omega_1\}$$
$$\cup \{X \setminus (\mathbf{N} \times W) : W \text{ is a finite subset of } \omega_1\}.$$

Then the only non-isolated point of X is ∞, and the complement of a neighborhood of ∞ is countable. So X is a Lindelöf scattered A'-space. Since $\prod^{\omega_1} \mathbf{N}$ is not normal (see 2.7.16 in [6]), our proof will be complete once we show the following assertions:

(1) $(\mathscr{C}(X))^{(1)} \neq \varnothing$.

(2) If $\mathscr{V} = \langle V_1, \ldots, V_n\rangle$ is a basic open set of $\mathscr{C}(X)$ and if $\mathscr{V} \cap (\mathscr{C}(X))^{(1)} \neq \varnothing$, then there is a closed set $\mathscr{K}$ of $(\mathscr{C}(X))^{(1)}$ such that $\mathscr{K} \subset \mathscr{V}$ and $\mathscr{K}$ is homeomorphic to $\prod^{\omega_1} \mathbf{N}$ [i.e., every compact subset of $(\mathscr{C}(X))^{(1)}$ has empty interior].

For simplicity, let $\mathscr{C}^1$ denote $(\mathscr{C}(X))^{(1)}$ and Π denote $\Pi^{\omega_1}\mathbf{N}$. Of course (1) follows since X is not locally compact; however, using the Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, we can easily establish more:

(3) $\mathscr{C}^1 = \mathscr{C}(X) \cap \langle X, \{\infty\}\rangle$.

In order to see (2), we use (3) to assume, without loss of generality, $V_i = \{(k_i, \alpha_i)\} \subset \mathbf{N} \times \omega_1\ \forall i < n$, and $V_n = X \setminus (\mathbf{N} \times W)$, where W is a finite subset of ω_1. Let $\{\bar{\alpha}: \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ be a listing of $\omega_1 | (W \cup \{\alpha_i: i < n\})$. Define a function $\Phi: \Pi \to \mathscr{C}^1$ by

$$\Phi(g) = \{\infty\} \cup \{(k_i, \alpha_i): i < n\} \cup \{(g(\alpha), \bar{\alpha}): \alpha \in \omega_1\} \quad \forall g \in \Pi.$$

Now Φ is a function because each $\Phi(g)$ is (homeomorphic to) the one-point compactification of the discrete subspace $\Phi(g) \setminus \{\infty\}$. Clearly Φ is an injection into $\mathscr{V}$. Further, for each finite subset S of ω_1 and each $g \in \Pi$, we have

$$\Phi\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in S} \overset{-1}{\prod_{\alpha}} \{g(\alpha)\}\right) = \Phi(\Pi) \cap \langle (k_1, \alpha_1), \ldots, (k_n, \alpha_n), \{x_1\}, \ldots, \{x_m\}, \\ X \setminus (\mathbf{N} \times (S \cup W))\rangle,$$

where $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\} = g(S)$. Therefore, Φ is an embedding.

In order to see that $\Phi(\Pi)$ is closed in $\mathscr{C}^1$, suppose that $F \in \mathscr{C}^1 \setminus \Phi(\Pi)$. Then at least one of the following hold:

(4) $\exists \beta \in \omega_1$ such that $F \cap (N \times \{\bar{\beta}\})$ has more than one element, or

(5) $\exists \beta \in \omega_1$ such that $F \cap (N \times \{\bar{\beta}\}) = \varnothing$, or

(6) $\exists x \in F \cap (N \times \{\alpha_i: i < n\}) \setminus \{(k_i, \alpha_i): i < n\}$, or

(7) $\exists i < n$ such that $(k_i, \alpha_i) \notin F$.

In case (4), suppose $\{(j_1, \bar{\beta}), (j_2, \bar{\beta})\} \subset F$ and $j_1 \neq j_2$. Then $\langle X, \{(j_1, \bar{\beta})\}, \{(j_2, \bar{\beta})\}\rangle$ is a neighborhood of F missing $\Phi(\Pi)$. In case (5)

$$\langle X \setminus (\mathbf{N} \times \{\bar{\beta}\})\rangle$$

is a neighborhood of F missing $\Phi(\Pi)$. The cases (6) and (7) are similar to (4) and (5), respectively. So $\Phi(\Pi)$ is a closed subset of $\mathscr{C}^1$. □

An example similar to our 2.3 was discovered independently by S. Mrowka.

2.4. THEOREM. *The hyperspace $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is an A'-space iff X is either compact or discrete.*

Proof. If X is compact, then $\mathscr{C}(X) = 2^X$. If X is discrete, then $\mathscr{C}(X) = \mathscr{F}(X)$, which is discrete. In either case, $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is an A'-space.

Conversely, suppose $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is an A'-space. Since $x \to \{x\}$ gives an embedding of X onto a closed subspace of $\mathscr{C}(X)$, X is an A'-space. Now suppose X is neither compact nor discrete. Since X is not discrete, there exists $y \in \operatorname{acc}(X)$. Since X is not compact and $\operatorname{acc}(X)$ is compact, there exists a non-compact, closed, discrete subspace $D \subset X \setminus \operatorname{acc}(X)$. Let $\mathscr{D} = \{\{y, d\}: d \in D\}$. Obviously $\mathscr{D}$ is a closed, non-compact subset of $\mathscr{C}(X)$. According to 2.2, $\mathscr{D} \subset \operatorname{acc}(\mathscr{C}(X))$. Thus, $\operatorname{acc}(\mathscr{C}(X))$ is not compact—a contradiction. □

Since $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is metrizable iff X is metrizable [**12**], the following is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.4.

2.5. COROLLARY. *The hyperspace $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is an A-space iff A is compact metrizable or discrete.* □

We do not, at this time, have a reasonable characterization for "$\mathscr{C}(X)$ is paracompact C-scattered". However, according to [**22**] and to the inverse limit characterization of absolute, the absolute of $\mathscr{C}(X)$ is $\mathscr{C}$ (the absolute of X). Thus, one might follow the path we used in 1.2 to reduce the situation to the extremally disconnected X case.

For the remaining part of this section, identify X with its image in $\mathscr{C}(X)$ under the map $x \to \{x\}$. We wish to examine the truth of the statement "When X is an A'-space, there is an A'-space X' such that $X \subset X'$ and X' is dense in $\mathscr{C}(X)$". Since $X \subset \mathscr{F}(X)$ and since $\mathscr{F}(X)$ will be paracompact (see the first paragraph of this section), $\mathscr{F}(X)$ is a natural candidate for X' in the statement in question. However, when X is the space of example 2.3, $\mathscr{F}(X)$ is not even C-scattered. Before we present the last result of this section, we state a lemma whose proof is straight-forward and easy.

2.6. LEMMA. *Suppose Y is dense in a space X. Then* $\operatorname{acc}(Y) = Y \cap \operatorname{acc}(X)$. □

2.7. THEOREM. *Suppose X is an A'-space. Then there is an A'-space X' such that $X \subset X'$ and X' is dense in $\mathscr{C}(X)$ iff X is compact or* $\operatorname{int}_X(\operatorname{acc}(X)) = \varnothing$.

Proof. Suppose X is compact. Then $X' = \mathscr{C}(X)$ works. So we suppose that $\operatorname{int}_X(\operatorname{acc}(X)) = \varnothing$. Define

$$X' = \mathscr{C}(X) \cap (\langle \operatorname{acc}(X) \rangle \cup \langle X \setminus \operatorname{acc}(X) \rangle).$$

Clearly $X \subset X'$. To see that X' is dense in $\mathscr{C}(X)$, suppose $\langle V_1, \ldots, V_n \rangle$ is a basic open set in 2^X. Since $\operatorname{int}_X(\operatorname{acc}(X)) = \varnothing$, we may choose an isolated point $x_i \in V_i$ $\forall i \leq n$. Then

$$\{x_i: i \leq n\} \in X' \cap \langle V_1, \ldots, V_n \rangle.$$

So X' is dense in $\mathscr{C}(X)$. To see that X' is an A'-space, first observe that 2.6 shows that $\operatorname{acc}(X') = X' \cap \operatorname{acc}(\mathscr{C}(X))$. Applying 2.2, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{acc}(X') &= X' \cap \langle X, \operatorname{acc}(X') \rangle \\ &= X' \cap \langle \operatorname{acc}(X) \rangle = \mathscr{C}(X) \cap \langle \operatorname{acc}(X) \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\operatorname{acc}(X)$ is compact, $\operatorname{acc}(X') = \mathscr{C}(X) \cap \langle \operatorname{acc}(X) \rangle$ is compact [**12**].

For the converse, suppose X is a non-compact space such that $U = \operatorname{int}_X(\operatorname{acc}(X)) = \varnothing$, and assume $X \subset \mathscr{Z}$ and $\mathscr{Z}$ is dense in $\mathscr{C}(X)$. We shall show that $\mathscr{Z}$ is not an A'-space. Since X is an A'-space, there is an infinite closed set $D \subset X \setminus \operatorname{acc}(X)$. For each $d \in D$, $\langle U, \{d\} \rangle \cap \mathscr{C}(X) = \varnothing$. Since $\mathscr{Z}$ is dense in $\mathscr{C}(X)$, there is, for each $d \in D$, $K_d \in \mathscr{Z} \cap \langle U, \{d\} \rangle$. Clearly, $K_d \setminus \{d\} \subset \operatorname{acc}(X)$. Hence, Lemma 2.2 shows that each $K_d \in \operatorname{acc}(\mathscr{C}(X))$. According to 2.6, each $K_d \in \operatorname{acc}(\mathscr{Z})$. Now $\mathscr{K} = \{K_d: d \in D\}$ is certainly discrete in $\mathscr{C}(X)$, and hence, in $\mathscr{Z}$. Suppose $F \in \mathscr{Z} \setminus \mathscr{K}$. Since F is compact, $F \cap D$ is finite, say $F \cap D = \{d(1), \ldots, d(n)\}$, where $n = 0$ is the $F \cap D = \varnothing$ case. Then

$$\langle \{x_1\}, \ldots, \{x_n\}, X \setminus D \rangle \setminus \{K_{d(1)}, \ldots, K_{d(n)}\}$$

is a neighborhood of F missing $\mathscr{K}$. Thus, $\mathscr{K}$ is closed and discrete in $\operatorname{acc}(\mathscr{Z})$. So $\operatorname{acc}(\mathscr{Z})$ is not compact. □

3. Compactifications of metrizable C-scattered spaces. For a metrizable space X, let $K(X)$ denote the collection of all Hausdorff compactifications of X. $BX \in K(X)$ is said to be *metrically compatible* provided that BX is the Smirnov compactification [**15**] induced by a metrizable proximity. Let $K_M(X)$ denote the set of all metrically compatible members of $K(X)$. We will consider $K_M(X)$ to be partially ordered, inheriting the natural partial order of $K(X)$.

In this section we will present a characterization of A-spaces in terms of $K_M(X)$, and a study of $K_M(X)$ when X is an A-space. The principal result of our study is that $K_M(X)$ is a lattice when X is an A-space. In order to facilitate our study we first develop some machinery.

3.1. DEFINITION. Suppose that X is a metrizable space. Let $M(X)$ denote the set of all metrics (on X) compatible with X. Define a partial order $\ll$ on $M(X)$ as follows: if $d_1, d_2 \in M(X)$, then $d_1 \ll d_2$ holds provided that for each pair $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ of sequences in X, $d_2(a_n, b_n) \to 0$ implies $d_1(a_n, b_n) \to 0$.

Given $d_1, d_2 \in M(X)$, we say that d_1 and d_2 are *coherently equivalent*, and write $d_1 \equiv d_2$, provided that both $d_1 \ll d_2$ and $d_2 \ll d_1$ hold. It is easily determined that coherent equivalence is an equivalence relation on $M(X)$. Let $[d]$ designate the equivalence class of $d \in M(X)$ under $\equiv$. Let $(E(X), \ll)$ denote the quotient partially ordered set $M(X)/\equiv$ ordered by $[d_1] \ll [d_2]$ iff $d_1 \ll d_2$. That $(E(X), \ll)$ is an upper semi-lattice follows from defining $[d_1] \vee [d_2] = [d_1 \vee d_2]$, where

$$(d_1 \vee d_2)(x, y) = \max\{d_1(x, y), d_2(x, y)\} \qquad \forall x, y \in X.$$

The following lemma is the principal reason why we introduced $E(X)$, and is a consequence of the theorem: Suppose that $d_1, d_2 \in M(X)$. Then $d_1 \equiv d_2$ iff d_1 and d_2 induce the same proximity [**8**].

3.2. LEMMA. *Suppose that X is a metrizable space. Then $K_M(X)$ and $(E(X), \ll)$ are order-isomorphic.* □

When X is an A-space, we can simplify our study by considering a less complicated space.

3.3. DEFINITION. Suppose that X is an A'-space. We define a space X^* as follows: First let ∞ be an object not in X and define

$$X^* = \begin{cases} (X \setminus \operatorname{acc}(X)) \cup \{\infty\}, & \text{if } \operatorname{acc}(X) \neq \varnothing, \\ X, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

X^* is topologized by $U \subset X^*$ is open iff $U \cap X$ is open.

Obviously $\operatorname{acc}(X^*) = \{\infty\}$, and X^* is the perfect image of X under the map $x \to x$ if $x \notin \operatorname{acc}(X)$, and $x \to \infty$ otherwise. Further, X^* is an A-space whenever X is an A-space.

3.4. LEMMA. *Suppose that X is an A-space. Then $(E(X), \ll)$ and $(E(X^*), \ll)$ are order isomorphic.*

Proof. We may assume, without loss of generality, that $\operatorname{acc}(X) \neq \varnothing$. Suppose $d \in M(X)$. We may define $d^* \in M(X^*)$ by allowing

(i) $d^*(\infty, \infty) = 0$,
(ii) $d^*(x, \infty) = d(x, \operatorname{acc}(X))$, if $x \neq \infty$, and
(iii) $d^*(x, y) = \min\{d(x, y),\ d(x, \operatorname{acc}(X)) + d(y, \operatorname{acc}(X))\}$, if $\infty \notin \{x, y\}$.

Define $\Phi = \{([d], [d^*]) \colon d \in M(X)\}$. We will show that Φ is an order-preserving bijection from $(E(X), \ll)$ onto $(E(X^*), \ll)$.

Claim 1. If $d_1, d_2 \in M(X)$ and if $d_1 \ll d_2$, then $d_1^* \ll d_2^*$. To establish this claim, let (x_n) and (y_n) be sequences in X^* such that $d_2^*(x_n, y_n) \to 0$. We show that $d_1^*(x_n, y_n) \to 0$. First, let $I_1 = \{n \in \mathbf{N}: \infty \in \{x_n, y_n\}\}$.

If I_1 is finite, then go to the next paragraph. Let (a_n) and (b_n) be the subsequences, respectively, of (x_n) and (y_n) such that $\infty \in \{u_n, v_n\}$ $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}$. Since $d_2^*(x_n, y_n) \to 0$, we must have $a_n \to \infty$ and $b_n \to \infty$. Therefore, the following holds:

$$d_1^*(a_n, b_n) \to 0. \tag{1}$$

If $\mathbf{N} \setminus I_1$ is finite, then (1) shows $d_1^*(x_n, y_n) \to 0$. So we assume $\mathbf{N} \setminus I_1$ is infinite, and proceed to the next paragraph.

Let $I_2 = \{n \in \mathbf{N}: \{x_n, y_n\} \subset X \text{ and } d_2^*(x_n, y_n) = d_2(x_n, y_n)\}$. If I_2 is finite, then go to the next paragraph. Let (p_n) and (q_n) be the subsequences, respectively, of (x_n) and (y_n) such that $\{p_n, q_n\} \subset X$ and $d_2^*(p_n, q_n) = d_2(p_n, q_n)$. Since $d_1 \ll d_2$ and $d_2^*(p_n, q_n) \to 0$, we have $d_1(p_n, q_n) \to 0$. Since $d_1^*(p_n, q_n) \le d_1(p_n, q_n)$, we have

$$d_1^*(p_n, q_n) \to 0. \tag{2}$$

If $\mathbf{N} \setminus (I_1 \cup I_2)$ is finite, then (1) and (2) show $d_1^*(x_n, y_n) \to 0$. So we assume $\mathbf{N} \setminus (I_1 \cup I_2)$ is infinite, and proceed to the next paragraph.

Let $I_3 = \mathbf{N} \setminus (I_1 \cup I_2)$. Let (s_n) and (t_n) be the subsequences, respectively, of (x_n) and (y_n) whose indices come from I_3. Since $\operatorname{acc}(X)$ is compact, we may choose for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$, u_n, $v_n \in \operatorname{acc}(X)$ such that

$$d_2(s_n, u_n) = d_2(s_n, \operatorname{acc}(X)) \quad \text{and} \quad d_2(t_n, v_n) = d_2(t_n, \operatorname{acc}(X)).$$

Since $d_2(s_n, \operatorname{acc}(X)) + d_2(t_n, \operatorname{acc}(X)) = d_2^*(s_n, t_n) \to 0$, we have that $d_2(s_n, u_n) \to 0$ and $d_2(t_n, v_n) \to 0$. Since $d_1 \ll d_2$, we find that $d_1(s_n, u_n) \to 0$ and $d_1(t_n, v_n) \to 0$. So $d_1^*(s_n, \infty) \to 0$ and $d_1^*(t_n, \infty) \to 0$. From the triangular inequality, we have

$$d_1^*(s_n, t_n) \to 0. \tag{3}$$

Certainly (1), (2), and (3) together imply $d_1^*(x_n, y_n) \to 0$. Thus, claim 1 is established.

Claim 2. Φ is an order-preserving function.

This is obvious from claim 1 which shows that $d_1^* \equiv d_2^*$ whenever $d_1 \equiv d_2$.

Claim 3. Φ is an injection.

Let $d_1, d_2 \in M_2(X)$ be such that $d_1 \not\equiv d_2$. Without loss of generality we may assume that there exist sequences (x_n) and (y_n) in X and an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following hold:

$$d_2(x_n, y_n) \to 0, \quad \text{and} \tag{4}$$

$$d_1(x_n, y_n) > \varepsilon \quad \forall n \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{5}$$

If there is a subsequence (a_i) of (x_n) such that $d_2(a_i, \operatorname{acc}(X)) \to 0$, then (a_i) has a subsequence (b_j) converging to some $z \in \operatorname{acc}(X)$. But then (4) implies (y_n) has a subsequence converging to z, contradicting (5). Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\varepsilon > 0$ is chosen so that

$$d_1(x_n, \operatorname{acc}(X)) > \varepsilon \quad \forall n \in \mathbf{N} \tag{6}$$

holds. In a similar manner, we may additionally assume that the $\varepsilon > 0$ and the sequences (x_n) and (y_n) satisfy the following:

$$d_i(z_n, \operatorname{acc}(X)) > 0 \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2\}\ \forall z_n \in \{x_n, y_n\}\ \forall n \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{7}$$

Now combining (4), (7), and the definition of d_1^* and d_2^*, we conclude that sufficiently large n, we have $d_i^*(x_n, y_n) = d_i(x_n, y_n)\ \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$. Therefore, $d_2^*(x_n, y_n) \to 0$ while $d_1^*(x_n, y_n) > \varepsilon$ for sufficiently large n. Thus, $d_1^* \not\equiv d_2^*$.

Claim 4. Φ is a surjection.

Suppose $\delta \in M(X^*)$ and $d \in M(X)$. Given $x \in X \setminus \operatorname{acc}(X)$, we use the compactness of $\operatorname{acc}(X)$ to choose $\bar{x} \in \operatorname{acc}(X)$ such that $d(x, \bar{x}) = d(x, \operatorname{acc}(X))$. For each pair $x, y \in X$, define $\rho(x, y) = 0$, if $x = y$; otherwise define

$$\rho(x, y) = \begin{cases} d(x, y), & \text{if } x, y \in \operatorname{acc}(X) \\ d(\bar{x}, y) + \delta(x, \infty), & \text{if } x \in X \setminus \operatorname{acc}(X) \text{ and } y \in \operatorname{acc}(X) \\ d(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \delta(x, \infty) + \delta(y, \infty), & \text{if } x, y \in X \setminus \operatorname{acc}(X). \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that ρ is a metric for X. Since $X \setminus \operatorname{acc}(X)$ is discrete, $\rho \in M(X)$. Clearly, $\rho^* = \delta$. Thus, Φ is surjective. □

It is interesting to note that much of 3.4 did not require the full force of "A-space". For example, if in 3.3 we merely assume that X is metrizable with $X^{(2)} = \varnothing$, and replace $\operatorname{acc}(X)$ with $X^{(3)}$ in the definitions of X^* and d^*, then Φ is still an order-preserving function. Requiring $X^{(1)}$ to be compact seems necessary for showing Φ is injective. However, it is unclear how to prove Φ is surjective in this context.

3.5. LEMMA [**13**]. *Suppose that* (X, d) *is a metric space such that for each pair* F_0 *and* F_1 *of non-empty disjoint closed subsets of* X, $d(F_0, F_1) > 0$, *then* X *is an* A*-space.* □

Nagata [**14**] has shown that the A-spaces are precisely those spaces whose finest compatible uniformities are metric. Here is a similar characterization.

3.6. THEOREM. *A metrizable space* X *is an* A*-space iff* $K_M(X)$ *has a maximum.*

Proof. According to 3.2, we may use $(E(X), \ll)$ as a representation for $K_M(X)$.

Assume that X is not an A-space. Let $d \in M(X)$. From 3.5 there exist non-empty disjoint closed sets F_0 and F_1 such that $d(F_0, F_1) = 0$. By Urysohn's lemma there exists a continuous map $f\colon X \to [0,1]$ such that $f(F_i) = \{i\}$ for each $i \in \{0,1\}$. Define a metric $\rho \in M(X)$ by $\rho(x, y) = d(x, y) + |f(x) - f(y)|$ (this is standard, see [7]). Since $d \le \rho$, $[d] \ll [\rho]$. Since $d(F_0, F_1) = 0$, there exist sequences (x_n) and (y_n) in, respectively, F_0 and F_1 such that $d(x_n, y_n) \to 0$. However, $\rho(x_n, y_n) > 1$ $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}$. Thus $d \not\equiv \rho$. So $[d]$ is not a maximum.

Now suppose that X is an A-space. According to 3.4, it suffices to show $(E(X^*), \ll)$ has a maximum element. Let $\delta \in M(X^*)$ be arbitrary. If acc$(X) \neq \varnothing$, we define

$$\mu(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x = y \\ \delta(x, \infty) + \delta(y, \infty), & \text{if } x \neq y. \end{cases}$$

If acc$(X) = \varnothing$, we define

$$\mu(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x = y \\ 1, & \text{if } x \neq y. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that $d \ll \mu$ $\forall d \in M(X)$. □

It is known that a metrizable space X is locally compact iff $K(X)$ is a lattice. The main result of this section is similar in nature.

3.7. THEOREM. *If X is an A-space, then $K_M(X)$ is a lattice.*

Proof. From 3.2, we need only show $(E(X), \ll)$ is a lattice. From 3.4, it suffices to prove that $(E(X^*), \ll)$ is a lattice. So we assume X has at most one accumulation point which will be denoted by ∞. As we have already established $(E(X), \ll)$ to be an upper semi-lattice under the operation $\vee$, we only need to define $\wedge$.

Claim. If $d_1, d_2 \in M(X)$, then there is $d \in M(X)$ such that $d(x, y) \leq d_i(x, y)$ for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

To establish the claim, first define a continuous semi-metric ρ compatible with X by $\rho(x, y) = \min\{d_1(x, y), d_2(x, y)\}$. The semi-metric ρ generates a shortest path semi-metric d in the following standard way. Let $x, y \in X$. Define

$$d(x, y) = \inf\left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n} \rho(x_{i-1}, x_i) : \{x_0, \ldots, x_n\} \subset X,\ n \in \mathbf{N},\ x_0 = x,\ x_n = y \right\}.$$

Suppose that $x \neq y$. Not both x and y are ∞, so suppose $x \neq \infty$. Since x is an isolated point, each of $d_1(x, X \setminus \{x\}) > 0$ and $d_2(x, X \setminus \{x\}) > 0$. So

$$0 < \rho(x, X \setminus \{x\}) \leq d(x, y) \leq \min\{d_1(x, y), d_2(x, y)\}.$$

It is easy to verify that $d \in M(X)$. Thus, our claim is proved.

Now define, for each pair $x, y \in X$,

$$(d_1 \wedge d_2)(x, y) = \sup\{\delta(x, y) : \delta \in M(X),\ \delta(u, v) \leq \rho(u, v)\ \forall u, v \in X\}.$$

It is easy to verify that $d_1 \wedge d_2 \in M(X)$, that $d_1 \wedge d_2 \ll d_1$, and that $d_1 \wedge d_2 \ll d_2$. Define $[d_1] \wedge [d_2] = [d_1 \wedge d_2]$. □

Question Suppose X is a metrizable space with $X^{(1)}$ compact. Is $K_M(X)$ a lattice?

We complete this section with a result on the size of $K_M(X)$ when X is an A-space. First observe that $|K_M(X)| = 1$ whenever X is compact.

3.8. THEOREM. *Suppose that X is a non-compact A-space. Then there is $K \subset K_M(X)$, $|K| = 2^{\aleph_0}$, such that each distinct pair of members of K are pairwise incomparable. Further, if X is separable, then $|K_M(X)| = 2^{\aleph_0}$.*

Proof. We show the result for $(E(X), \ll)$, and we assume, without loss of generality, that X has at most one accumulation point to be denoted by ∞. Since X is non-compact, it has a countably infinite closed discrete subset $\{x_i\colon i \in \mathbf{N}\}$. Let $\mathscr{I}$ be an independent set in $\mathbf{N}$ (i.e., for each disjoint pair $\mathscr{I}_1$ and $\mathscr{I}_2$ of non-empty finite subsets of $\mathscr{I}$ we have $\bigcap \mathscr{I}_1 \setminus \bigcup \mathscr{I}_2$ is infinite) of cardinality $2^{\aleph_0}$ (see 3.6F in [6]). Let $\mu \in M(X)$ be as defined in 3.6, above, such that $[\mu]$ is the maximum of $(E(X), \ll)$. For each $I \in \mathscr{I}$, define $\mu_I\colon X \times X \to \mathbf{R}$ by

$$\mu_I(x, y) = \begin{cases} \left|\dfrac{1}{i} - \dfrac{1}{j}\right| \mu(x, y), & \text{if } x = x_i,\ y = x_j, \text{ and } i, j \in I, \\ \mu(x, y), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that $\mu_I \in M(X)\ \forall I \in \mathscr{I}$.

Suppose $I \in \mathscr{I}$. Then $\mu_I(a_n, b_n) \to 0$ iff either $a_n \to \infty$ and $b_n \to \infty$, or $a_n = b_n$ for sufficiently large n, or $\{a_n, b_n\} \subset \{x_i\colon i \in I\}$ for all but finitely many n. So if $J \in \mathscr{I} \setminus \{I\}$ and if $j(n)$ is the nth element of J, then $\mu_J(x_{j(n)}, x_{j(n+1)}) \to 0$. While

$$0 < \mu(\infty, D) \le \mu_I(x_{j(n)}, x_{j(n+1)})$$

for infinitely many $n \in J$. Therefore, $\mu_J \ll \mu_I$ is false. Let $K = \{[\mu_I]\colon I \in \mathscr{I}\}$.

Further, suppose $Y \subset X$ is countable and dense. Then there are at most $2^{\aleph_0}$ many continuous functions from $Y \times Y$ into $\mathbf{R}$. Hence $|M(X)| \le 2^{\aleph_0}$. □

REFERENCES

[1] K. Alster, *Metric spaces all of whose decompositions are metric*, Bull. Polon. Sci., **20** (1972), 395–400.

[2] ———, *A class of spaces whose cartesian product with every hereditary Lindelöf space is Lindelöf*, Func. Approx. Commen. Math., **114** (1981), 173–181.

[3] M. Atsuji, *Uniform continuity of continuous functions of metric spaces*, Pacific J. Math., **8** (1958), 11–16.

[4] C. E. Aull, *Initial and final topologies*, Glasnik Mat., **8** (28) (1973), 305–310.

[5] M. G. Bell, *Hyperspaces of finite subsets*, Math. Centre Tracts, **115** (1979), 15–28.

[6] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, PWN-Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw, (1977).

[7] J. Ginsburg, *The metrizability of spaces whose diagonals have a countable base*, Canad. Math. Bull., **20** (1977), 513–514.

[8] S. Leader, *Metrization of proximity spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **18** (1967), 1084–1088.
[9] S. MacDonald, *Resolvants for several classes of mappings and spaces*, Ph.D. Thesis, Case Western Reserve University (1972).
[10] S. MacDonald and S. Willard, *Domains of paracompactness and regularity*, Canad. J. Math., **24** (1972), 1079–1085.
[11] H. W. Martin, *Derived subsets of metric spaces*, Canad. Math. Bull., **23** (1980), 465–467.
[12] E. Michael, *Topologies of spaces of subsets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **71** (1951), 152–182.
[13] S. G. Mrowka, *On normal metrics*, Amer. Math. Monthly, (1965), 998–1001.
[14] J. Nagata, *On the uniform topology of bicompactification*, J. Inst. Poly. Osaka City Univ., **1** (1950), 28–38.
[15] S. A. Naimpally and B. D. Warrack, *Proximity Spaces*, Cambridge Univ. Press (1970).
[16] V. I. Ponomarev, *On the absolute of a topological space*, Soviet Math. Dokl., **4** (1963), 299–302.
[17] J. Rainwater, *Spaces whose finest uniformity is metric*, Pacific J. Math., **9** (1959), 567–570.
[18] M. E. Rudin and S. G. Watson, *Countable products of scattered paracompact spaces*, to appear (Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.).
[19] R. Telgársky, *C-scattered and paracompact spaces*, Fund. Math., **73** (1971), 59–74.
[20] N. V. Velichko, *On spaces of closed subsets*, Siberian Math. J., **16** (1975), 484–486.
[21] S. Willard, *Metric spaces all of whose decompositions are metric*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **21** (1969), 126–128.
[22] P. Zenor, *On the completeness of the space of compact subsets*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **26** (1970), 190–192.

Received July 20, 1984. The delay in publication is in part due to the untimely death of Professor Dugundji. The third author was partially supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation.

UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT
BRIDGEPORT, CT 06602

NORTHERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
MARQUETTE, MI 49855

AND

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO
BUFFALO, NY 14214

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

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 must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. In particular it should contain no bibliographic references. 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.

There are page-charges associated with articles appearing in the Pacific Journal of Mathematics. These charges are expected to be paid by the author's University, Government Agency or Company. If the author or authors do not have access to such Institutional support these charges are waived. Single authors will receive 50 free reprints; joint authors will receive a total of 100 free reprints. 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: $190.00 a year (5 Vols., 10 issues). Special rate: $95.00 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. Old back numbers obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics at P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924 (ISSN 0030-8730) publishes 5 volumes per year. Application to mail at Second-class postage rates is pending at Carmel Valley, California, and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924.

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

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 129, No. 2 June, 1987