## A $T_{B}$ SPACE WHICH IS NOT KATETOV $T_{B}$

WILLIAM G. FLEISSNER

In 1943, E. Hewitt [1] proved the beautiful theorem that a compact Hausdorff space is minimal Hausdorff and maximal compact. Restating this result in more detail, if $(X, \tau)$ is a compact Hausdorff space and $\left(X, \tau^{\prime}\right)$ and $\left(X, \tau^{\prime \prime}\right)$ are spaces $\tau^{\prime} \subsetneq \tau \subsetneq \tau^{\prime \prime}$, then $\left(X, \tau^{\prime}\right)$ is not Hausdorff, and $\left(X, \tau^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is not compact. The converses to this theorem are appealing but false. There are noncompact minmal Hausdorff spaces [2] and non Hausdorff maximal compact spaces [2].

A compact space is maximal compact if every compact set is closed [3]. Let us call spaces in which all compact sets are closed $T_{B}$ spaces, as this notion can be thought of as a separation axiom between $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$. They are also called $K C$ spaces. R. Larson [4] asked whether a space is maximal compact iff it is minimal $T_{B}$. A related question is whether every $T_{B}$ topology is Katetov $T_{B}$, that is whether every $T_{B}$ topology contains a minimal $T_{B}$ topology. The author wishes to thank Douglas Cameron for bringing these questions to his attention. In this paper we construct a $T_{B}$ not Katetov $T_{B}$ tpace.

The point set of all spaces in this paper will be the countable ordinals. To avoid ambiguity, we will refer to the first uncountable ordinal (and cardinal) as $\omega_{1}$, and to the point set of the spaces as $\Omega$. A typical point of $\Omega$ will be $x_{\alpha}$, where $\alpha<\omega_{1}$. The point set $\left\{x_{\beta}: \beta<\alpha\right\}$ will be called $P(\alpha)$, the predecessors of $\alpha$; and the point set $\left\{x_{\beta}: \beta>\alpha\right\}$ will be called $S(\alpha)$, the successors of $\alpha$. The usual topology on $\Omega$, generated by $\left\{P(\alpha): \alpha<\omega_{1}\right\}$ $\bigcup\left\{S(\alpha): \alpha<\omega_{1}\right\}$ will be called $\ldots$. The cardinality of a set $S$ will be denoted $|S|$.

Lemma I. If $\tau^{\prime} \subset \tau$ and $K$ is $\tau$ compact, $K$ is $\tau^{\prime}$ compact.
Lemma 2. A compact $T_{B}$ space is a minimal $T_{B}$ space.
If $S \subset \Omega$, we denote the subspace of $(\Omega, \tau)$ with point set $S$ by $(S, \tau \mid S)$. Equivalently, $\tau \mid S=\{U \cap S: U \in \tau\}$. We say that $\tau, \tau^{\prime}$ agree on countable sets if for all $S \subset \Omega$ with $|S| \leqq \omega$,

$$
(S, \tau \mid S)=\left(S, \tau^{\prime} \mid S\right)
$$

Lemma 3. Suppose $\tau \subset$ "and $(\Omega, \tau)$ is $T_{B}$. Then $\tau$, "agree on countable sets.
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Lemma 4. If $\tau$, "agree on countable sets, then for all $\alpha, S(\alpha) \in \tau$.
Lemma 5. Suppose ( $\Omega, \tau$ ) and $G$ satisfy
i) $G \in \tau \subset «$,
ii) $\tau$, "agree on countable sets,
iii) $|\Omega-G|=\omega_{1}$,
iv) $\forall x_{\alpha} \in(\Omega-G) \exists G_{\alpha} \in \tau\left(x_{\alpha} \in G_{\alpha} \subset P(\alpha+1) \cup G\right)$.

Then $(\Omega, \tau)$ is $T_{B}$.
Proof. Suppose $K$ is $\tau$ compact. By ii) it is sufficient to show that $K$ is countable.

First, by considering the $\tau$ open cover $\{G\} \cup\left\{G_{\alpha}: x_{\alpha} \in \Omega-G\right\}$, we may conclude that $|K-G|<\omega_{1}$. Aiming for a contradiction, we assume $|K|=\omega_{1}$. With this assumption we can find $\{\alpha(i): i \in \omega\}, \alpha=\sup \{\alpha(i)$ : $i \in \omega\}$ so that $\left\{x_{\alpha(i)}: i \in \omega\right\} \subset K \cap G, x_{\alpha} \notin K \cup G$. Now $P(\alpha+1)$ is " closed, hence $\tau$ closed. Then $P(\alpha+1) \cap K$ is $\tau$ compact. But $P(\alpha+1) \cap$ $K$ is not $\approx$ compact, and $\tau$ and $\approx$ agree on countable sets.

Let I be the set of isolated points of $(\Omega, «)$. We define $(\Omega, \star)$, the space referred to in the title, by defining

$$
\iota=\left\{U \in \mu:\left(x_{0} \notin U \text { and } x_{1} \notin U\right) \text { or }|I-U|<\omega_{1}\right\}
$$

Clearly $\epsilon$ is a topology and $\not \subset \propto$. And $\not \epsilon \neq \pi$ as $\left\{x_{0}\right\} \in \approx-\not$. By Lemma $5,(\Omega, t)$ is $T_{B}$.

Henceforth let $\tau$ be a topology with $\tau \subset \ell$.
Lemma 6. If $(\Omega, \tau)$ is $T_{B}$ then for all $\alpha<\omega_{1}$ there is $V_{\alpha} \in \tau$ satisfying $x_{\alpha} \in V_{\alpha}$ and $\left|\Omega-V_{\alpha}\right|=\omega_{1}$.

Proof. Suppose not, that for some $\alpha, x_{\alpha} \in V \in \tau$ implies $|\Omega-V|<\omega_{1}$. Let $y \in\left\{x_{0}, x_{1}\right\}-\left\{x_{\alpha}\right\}$. We aim for the contradiction that $\Omega-\{y\}$ is $\tau$ compact but not $\tau$ closed. From $\tau \subset \neq$ and the definition of $\ell$, $\Omega-\{y\}$ is not $\tau$ closed.

Let $\mathscr{U}$ be a $\tau$ open cover of $\Omega-\{y\}$. Then there is $V \in \mathscr{U}, x_{\alpha} \in V \in \tau$. By hypothesis, $|\Omega-V|<\omega_{1}$, so there is a $\beta$ with $\Omega-V \subset P(\beta+1)$. Now $P(\beta+1)-\{y\}$ is "compact, so by Lemma 1 , there is $\mathscr{U}^{\prime} \subset \mathscr{U}, \mathscr{U}^{\prime}$ a finite subcover of $P(\beta+1)-\{y\}$. Then $\mathscr{U}^{\prime} \cup\{V\}$ is a finite subcover of $\Omega-\{y\}$, establishing the contradiction that $\Omega-\{y\}$ is $\tau$ compact.

We assume $(\Omega, \tau)$ is $T_{B}$; we aim towards constructing a coarser $T_{B}$ topology.

For all $\alpha<\omega_{1}$, let $V_{\alpha}$ be as asserted in Lemma 6. We define

$$
\Delta=\left\{x_{\alpha}: x_{\alpha} \notin \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} V_{\beta}\right\}
$$

Note that $x_{0} \in \Delta$. (By definition, if you like.)
Lemma 7. $\Omega-\Delta \in \tau$.

Proof. If $x_{\alpha} \in \Omega-\Delta$, then there is $\beta<\alpha$ such that $x_{\alpha} \in V_{\beta}$. Since $\tau \subset w$ and $\tau$ is $T_{B}$, by Lemmas 3 and $4, S(\beta) \in \tau$. Thus $x_{\alpha} \in V_{\beta} \cap S(\beta) \subset$ $\Omega-\Delta, V_{\beta} \cap S(\beta) \in \tau$.

Lemma 8. $|\Delta|=\omega_{1}$.
Proof. By definition $\alpha<\omega_{1}$ means that there is a map $f_{\alpha}$ from $\omega$ onto $\{\beta: \beta<\alpha\}$. Let $g$ and $h$ be maps from $\omega-\{0\}$ to $\omega$ such that $g(i)<i$, and for all $(m, n) \in \omega \times \omega$ there are infinitely many $i \in \omega$ such that $(g(i), h(i))=(m, n)$.

Let $\alpha(0)<\omega_{1}$ be arbitrary. We will establish Lemma 8 by finding $\alpha>\alpha(0)$ with $x_{\alpha} \in \Delta$.

For $i>0$, we may choose, by our assumption on $V_{\alpha}, \alpha(i)>\alpha(i-1)$ such that $x_{\alpha(i)} \in \Omega-V_{f_{\alpha(g(i))}(h(i))}$. Let $\alpha=\sup \{\alpha(i): i \in \omega\}$; we claim $x_{\alpha} \in \Delta$. For let $\beta<\alpha$. Then $\beta<\alpha(j)$ for some $j \in \omega$, and so $\beta=$ $f_{\alpha(j)}(k)$ for some $k<\omega$. Now $g(i)=j, h(i)=k$ implies $x_{\alpha(i)} \in \Omega-V_{\beta}$, a closed set. By our choice of $g$ and $h, \alpha=\sup \{\alpha(i): g(i)=j, h(i)=k\}$, so $x_{\alpha} \in \Omega-V_{\beta}$, establishing our cliam.

Now we define $I^{\prime}$ to be the set of isolated points of $(\Delta, \tau \mid \Delta)$. That is, $I^{\prime}=\left\{x_{\alpha}: U \in \tau, U \cap J=\left\{x_{\alpha}\right\}\right\}$.

Lemma 9. $\left|I^{\prime}\right|=\omega_{1}$.
Proof. Let $\alpha<\omega_{1}$. Let $\beta=\inf \left\{\gamma: x_{r} \in \Delta, \gamma>\alpha\right\}$. Then $\Delta \cap V_{\beta} \cap$ $S(\alpha)=\left\{x_{\beta}\right\}$.

Finally, we define a $T_{B}$ topology coarser than $\tau$. Set $\tau^{\prime}=\{U \in \tau$ : $\left(x_{0} \notin U\right)$ or $\left.\left|I^{\prime}-U\right|<\omega_{1}\right\}$.

Clearly $\tau^{\prime}$ is a topology and $\tau^{\prime} \subset \tau$. By Lemma $3 \tau$, " agree on countable sets, and by definition $\tau^{\prime}, \tau$ agree on countable sets. Also, $\tau^{\prime} \neq \tau$ because $V_{0} \in \tau-\tau^{\prime} .\left(\Omega, \tau^{\prime}\right)$ is $T_{B}$ by Lemma 5 , setting $G=(\Omega-\Delta) \cup I^{\prime}$, and $G_{\alpha}=V_{\alpha}-\left\{x_{0}\right\}$.
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