

# On Hereditarily Baire Space

Batkhuu Tserennadmid

School of Mathematic and Statistics of Mongolian State University of Education

Email: tsbatkhuu@yahoo.com

**Keywords:**  $\alpha_0$ -box topology product of topological spaces, strong Choquet space, hereditarily Baire space

## Abstract

In this note we give a definition of  $\alpha_0$ -box topology product of topological spaces and using this concept we prove that there exists a strong Choquet space and regular topological space which not contains closed subspace homeomorphic to rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$  but both are not hereditarily Baire spaces.

## 1 Introduction

We start with some definitions and well-known results:

Let  $X$  be topological space. A set  $A \subseteq X$  is called nowhere dense if its closure  $\overline{A}$  has empty interior, i.e.,  $Int(\overline{A}) = \emptyset$ .

A set  $A \subseteq X$  is meager (of first category) if  $A = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$ , where  $A_n$  is nowhere dense. A non-meager set is also called of a second category. The complement of a meager set is called comeager.

A topological space  $X$  is called a Baire space if it satisfies following equivalent conditions:

- (i). Every non-empty open set in  $X$  is non-meager.
- (ii). Every comeager set in  $X$  is dense.
- (iii). The intersection of countably many dense open sets in  $X$  is dense.

A Baire space is called hereditarily Baire if every closed subspace of  $X$  is a Baire.

Let  $X$  be non-empty topological space. The Choquet game  $G_X$  of  $X$  is defined as follows: Players I and II take turns in playing non-empty open subsets of  $X$

$$\begin{array}{cccc} I & U_0 & U_1 & \dots \\ II & V_0 & V_1 & \dots \end{array}$$

so that  $U_0 \supset V_0 \supset U_1 \supset V_1 \supset \dots$

We say that II wins this run of the game if  $\bigcap_n V_n (= \bigcap_n U_n) \neq \emptyset$ . Thus I wins if  $\bigcap_n U_n (= \bigcap_n V_n) = \emptyset$ .

A strategy for I in this game is a "rule" that tells him how to play, for each  $n$ , his  $n$ -th move  $U_n$ , given II's previous moves  $V_0, V_1, \dots, V_{n-1}$ .

Oxtoby theorem: A non-empty topological space  $X$  is Baire space iff player I has no winning strategy in the Choquet game  $G_X$ .

A non-empty topological space  $X$  is called a Choquet space if player II has a winning strategy in the Choquet game  $G_X$ .

Since it is not possible for both players to have a winning strategy in  $G_X$ , it follows that every Choquet space is Baire. The converse fails even for non-empty separable metrizable spaces, using the axioms of Choice.

Given a non-empty topological space  $X$ , the strong Choquet game  $G_X^s$  is defined as follows: Players I and II take turns in playing non-empty open subsets of  $X$  a

$$\begin{array}{llll} I & x_0, U_0 & x_1, U_1 & \dots \\ II & & V_0 & V_1 \dots \end{array}$$

Players I and II take turns in playing non-empty open sets of  $X$  as a in Choquet game, but additionally I is required to play a poin  $x_n \in U_n$  and II must then play  $V_n \subset U_n$  with  $x_n \in V_n$ . So we must have  $U_0 \supset V_0 \supset U_1 \supset V_1 \supset \dots$ ,  $x_n \in U_n, V_n$ .

Player II wins this run of the game  $\bigcap_n V_n (= \bigcap_n U_n) \neq \emptyset$ . Thus I wins if  $\bigcap_n U_n (= \bigcap_n V_n) = \emptyset$ . A non-empty topological space  $X$  is called a strong Choquet space if player II has a winning strategy in the strong Choquet game  $G_X^s$ .

It is obvious that any strong Choquet space is Choquet. About of a connection between a hereditarily Baire space and a strong Choquet spaces in class of metric spaces are known following theorems:

A metric space  $X$  is a strong Choquet space if and only if it is a complete metric space.(Choquet)

A metric space  $X$  is a hereditarily Baire space if and only if player I have no winning strategy in  $G_X^s$ . Particularly, from it follows that every metric Choquet space is hereditarily Baire.(Debs)

A first countable regular space is a hereditarily Baire if and only if which not contains a closed subspace homeomorphich to rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$ .(Hurewicz-van Jeroen Doumen)

## 2 $\alpha_0$ -box topology and a construction of the strong Choquet and the regular topological spaces which not contains closed subspace homeomorphic to rational numbers $\mathbb{Q}$ but both are not hereditarily Baire spaces

Definition 1. Suppose we are given a family  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  of topological spaces and consider the Cartesian product  $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$  and the family of mappings  $p_A$ ,  $A$ -countable set of  $I$ , where  $p_A$  assigns to the point  $x = (x_i)_{i \in I} \in X = \prod_{i \in I} X_i$  it's  $A$ -th side  $x = (x_i)_{i \in A}$ .

The set  $X = \prod_{i \in I} X_i$  with the topology generalized by the family of mappings  $p_A$ ,  $A$ -countable set of  $I$  is called  $\alpha_0$ -box topology product of the spaces  $X_i, i \in I$  and denoted by  $\bigotimes_{i \in I} X_i$ .

If we define the game  $G_{X,\beta}^s$  as a Choquet game but only difference is choosing open subset of  $X$  from it's open base  $\beta$  than it is not hard to see following lemma.[2]

Lemma 1. Let  $\beta_1, \beta_2$  are bases of topological space  $X$ . Than following conditions are equivalent.

- (i). Player I(Player II) has a winning strategy in  $G_{X,\beta_1}^s$ .
- (ii). Player I(Player II) has a winning strategy in  $G_{X,\beta_2}^s$ .

Theorem 1. Any  $\alpha_0$ -box topology product of strong Choquet spaces is a strong Choquet space.

Proof. By the previous lemma it is suffices to prove that player II has a winning strategy in  $G_{X,\beta}^s$  game.

Let  $\sigma_i$  is a player II's winning strategy in  $G_{X_i}^s$ . Suppose player I's n-th move is  $(x_n, U_n)$ , where  $U_n = \bigotimes_{i \in I} U_{n_i}$ .

Let's define player II's strategy

$$\sigma((x_1, U_1), V_1, \dots, (x_n, U_n)) = V_n = \bigotimes_{i \in I} V_{n_i}$$

, where

$$V_{n_i} = \begin{cases} V_{n_i} = \sigma_i((x_{1_i}, U_{1_i}), V_1, \dots, (x_{n_i}, U_{n_i})), & \text{if } U_{n_i} \neq X_i, \\ X_i, & \text{if } U_{n_i} = X_i \end{cases}$$

Now if we remember that each  $\sigma_i$  is a player II's winning strategy in  $G_X^s$  then  $\bigcap_n U_n \neq \emptyset$  or  $\sigma$  is player II's winning strategy in  $G_{X, \beta}^s$ .  $\square$

Corollary 1. There exists a strong Choquet space which is not hereditarily Baire space.

Proof. Suppose that  $X$  is  $\alpha_0$ -box topology product space of topological spaces  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ , where  $X_i$  coincides with real line  $\mathbb{R}$ .

From Theorem 1 it follows that  $X$  is strong Choquet space. Now we shall show that  $X$  is not a hereditarily Baire space. It suffices to point a closed subset  $Z$  in  $X$ , which is meager (set of first category) in itself.

$$\text{Consider } Z = \{x = (x_i)_{i \in I} \in X \mid |\{i \in I \mid x_i \neq 0\}| < \alpha_0\}.$$

At first let us show that  $Z$  is closed subset in  $X$ . Let  $x = (x_i)_{i \in I} \in X \setminus Z$ . Then there exists a countable set  $A \subset I$  such that  $x_i \neq 0$  for every  $i \in A$ . Let us take a non-empty neighbourhood  $U_i$  of  $x_i$ . Then open set  $V = \bigotimes_{i \in I} V_i$  in which  $V_i = U_i$  if  $i \in A$  and  $V_i = \mathbb{R}$  if  $i \in I \setminus A$  will be a neighbourhood of  $x = (x_i)_{i \in I}$  and  $V \cap Z = \emptyset$ .

Now let us prove that  $Z$  is meager set.

For every  $n < \alpha_0$  consider  $Z_n = \{x = (x_i)_{i \in I} \in X \mid |\{i \in I \mid x_i \neq 0\}| \leq n\}$ . It is obvious that  $Z_n \subset Z_{n+1}$  and  $Z = \bigcup_n Z_n$  and  $Z_n$  closed in  $Z$ .

Let  $V = \bigotimes_{i \in I} V_i$  is a base element such that  $U = V \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $n_0 = |\{i \in I \mid 0 \notin V_i\}|$ . Then for every  $n \leq n_0$  there exists a point  $x \in U$  such that  $x \notin Z_n$ . Since  $Z_n$  nowhere dense in  $Z$  for every  $n \leq n_0$  or  $Z$  is set of first category.  $\square$

Definition 2. Let  $X = \bigotimes_{i \in I} X_i$  and  $p_A : \bigotimes_{i \in I} X_i \mapsto \bigotimes_{i \in A} X_i$  projection map. If  $Y \subset X$  and  $p_{I \setminus A}(x) = p_{I \setminus A}(y)$  for any  $x, y \in Y$  then we call  $Y$  depends on  $A$  coordinates.

It is not hard to prove next lemma.[2]

Lemma 2. Let  $X = \bigotimes_{i \in I} X_i$  and  $Y \subset X$ ,  $A \subset I$ . The following conditions are equivalent.

- (i).  $Y$  depends on  $A$  coordinates and  $A \subset B$  then  $Y$  depends on  $B$  coordinates.
- (ii).  $Y = \bigcup_{n=1}^k Y_n$  and every  $Y_n$  depends on  $A$  coordinates then  $Y$  depends on  $A$  coordinates.
- (iii).  $Y$  depends on  $A$  coordinates then  $p_{I \setminus A}^{-1}(p_{I \setminus A}(Y))$  contains  $Y$  and depends on  $A$  coordinates. Also  $p_{I \setminus A}^{-1}(p_{I \setminus A}(Y))$  closed subset in  $X$  and homeomorphic to  $\bigotimes_{i \in A} X_i$ .

Lemma 3. Let  $X = \bigotimes_{i \in I} X_i$ ,  $x \in X$  and a sequence of sets  $K_n \subset X$  converges to  $x$ , i.e., there exists a number  $n_0$  such that  $K_n$  contained in every neighbourhood  $V$  of  $x$  for every  $n > n_0$ . Then there exists a finite set  $H \subset I$  and number  $n_0$  such that  $K_n$  depends on  $H$  coordinates for every  $n > n_0$ .

Proof. Suppose that there not exists such a set and number. Then we can find the sequence of pairwise distinctive indexes  $i_n \in I$  and  $x^n = (x_i^n)_{i \in I} \in K_n$  points such that  $d(X_i) < 2^{-\alpha_0}$ . From it follows that there exists a neighbourhood  $V$  of  $x$

which not contains  $x_n$  for every  $n$ . Contradiction.  $\square$

Corollary 2. There exists a regular topological space  $X$  which not contains closed subspace homeomorphic to rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$  but that is not a hereditarily Baire space.

Proof. Suppose that  $X = \bigotimes_{i \in I} X_i$  where every  $X_i$  coincides with real line  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Consider there exists closed subspace homeomorphic to rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$  in  $X$ . For every point  $x \in Z$  let us take a fundamental neighbourhood system  $U_n(x)$ , consisting of open-closed sets in  $Z$  such that  $U_{n+1}(x) \subset U_n(x)$ .

It is obvious that  $U_n(x)$  converges to  $x$ . By the Lemma 3. there exists a finite set  $A \subset I$  and a number  $n_0$  such that  $U_{n_0}(x)$  depends on  $A$  coordinates and  $U_{n_0}(x)$  homeomorphic to closed subspace in  $X = \bigotimes_{i \in I} \mathbb{R}_i$  according to Lemma 2.3. Clearly,  $U_{n_0}(x)$  does not contain isolated points, then homeomorphic to rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$ . That is contradiction to the completeness of  $A$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] Batkhoo Ts., Sokolov G.A.,  $\alpha_0$ -box topology, All Siberian Seminar on Mathematics and Mechanics, Vol.1., Tomsk State University Press, 1997, p 84-86.
- [2] Batkhoo Ts.,  $\alpha_0$ -box topology, Ph.D. Thesis, Ulaanbaatar,1998.
- [3] Debs G., Espaces hereditairement de Baire, Fund.Math., 1986, Vol. 129., p 199-206.
- [4] van Jeroen Doumen, Closed copies of the rationals, Comm.Math.Univ.Carol.,1987, Vol.28.,p 137-139.

- [5] Hurewicz W., Relativ perfect Teile von Punktmengen und Mengen, Fund.Math.,1928,Vol.12., p 78-109.
- [6] Pryce J., A Device of R.J.Whitley's applied to poinwise compactness in spaces of continuous functions, Proc. Amer.Math.Soc.,1971, Vol.23., p 532-546.