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Abstract. Let us assume that Martin’s Axiom holds. We prove that if \( X \) is a
metrizable space whose product with every Lindelöf space is Lindelöf, then for
every metric \( d \) on \( X \), consistent with the topology of \( X \), \((X, d)\) is a countable
union of totally bounded subsets.

E. Michael proved that under the Continuum Hypothesis, abbreviated (CH), if
\( X \) is a metric space whose product with every Lindelöf space is Lindelöf, then \( X \)
is \( \sigma \)-compact. It is an open question whether (CH) can be relaxed to Martin’s
Axiom, abbreviated (MA). The aim of this note is to prove the result mentioned in
the abstract.

The topological terminology follows [E], and we have adopted set-theoretical
terminology from [K2]. In this note, \( N \) stands for the set of natural numbers and
\( P \) for the space of the irrational numbers. The irrational numbers will be viewed as
sequences of natural numbers. The symbol \( c \) will denote the initial ordinal number
of the cardinality continuum. Other ordinal numbers will be denoted by Greek
letters. If \( x = (x(n))_{n=1}^{\infty} \) and \( y = (y(n))_{n=1}^{\infty} \) are irrational numbers, we say that
\( x <^* y \), \( x \leq^* y \) or \( x =^* y \) if for all but finitely many \( n \), \( x(n) < y(n) \), \( x(n) \leq y(n) \) or
\( x(n) = y(n) \) respectively. If \( A \) is a subset of a metric space \((X, d)\), then the symbol
diam\( (A) < \epsilon \) means that the distance between any two points of \( A \) is less than \( \epsilon \).

Theorem (MA). If \( X \) is a metrizable space whose product with every Lindelöf
space is Lindelöf, then the following conditions hold:

a) For every metric \( d \) on \( X \), consistent with the topology of \( X \), \((X, d)\) is a countable
union of totally bounded subsets.

b) Every closed cover of \( X \) of cardinality less than continuum has a countable
subcover.

c) If \( X \) is an analytic space then \( X \) is \( \sigma \)-compact.

Proof of a). Let us first assume that \((X, d)\) is a zero-dimensional space. Note that
since \( X \) is separable, \( X = Z \cup A \), where \( A \) is \( \sigma \)-compact and \( Z \) is closed and not
locally compact at any point. Without loss of generality we can assume that \( X = Z \).
There is a sequence \((U_i)_{i=1}^\infty\), where \(U_i = \{U_p : p \in N^i\}\), of open covers of \(X\) such that

1) \(U_i\) consists of pairwise disjoint non-empty sets,
2) if \(U_p \in U_i\) then \(\text{diam}(U_p) < \frac{1}{i}\),
3) if \(p \in N^i\) and \(q \in N^{i+1}\) and \(p\) extends \(q\), then \(U_q \subset U_p\).

Let us define a continuous function \(g\) of \(X\) to \(P\) by the following formulas:

\[g(x) = p_x,\]

where \(p_x \in P\) is such that \(\{x\} = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty U_{p_x|n}\), \(p_x = (p_x(n))_{n=1}^\infty\) and \(p_x|n = (p_x(1), \ldots, p_x(n))\). It is obvious that \(g\) is well defined and that it is a continuous function.

Let \(\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma\}\) be a \(\gamma\)-scale in \(P\), which exists under (MA) (see [K2], exercise 8, p. 87).

**Claim.** There is \(\alpha < \gamma\) such that

\[g(X) \subset \{p \in P : p \leq, x_\alpha\} = P_\alpha.\]

Assume that the claim holds. Observe that if \(\{p \in P : p =, x_\alpha\} = \{p_n : n \in N\}\) and \(Z_n = \{p \in P : p \leq p_n\}\), then \(g^{-1}(Z_n) = X_n\) is totally bounded for \(n \in N\).

Indeed if \(\epsilon > 0\), \(\frac{1}{n} < \epsilon\), and \(T = \{t \in N^i : t \leq p_n|i\} \text{ and } U_t \cap X_n \neq \emptyset\), then let \(x_t\) be a point of \(U_t \cap X_n\) for \(t \in T\). Observe that the union of balls with centers at \(x_t\), for \(t \in T\), and radius \(\epsilon\) covers \(X_n\); and this means that \(X_n\) is totally bounded.

**Proof of Claim.** Suppose that

4) \(g(X) \setminus P_\alpha \neq \emptyset\) for \(\alpha < \gamma\).

Let \(Y\) be a metric compactification of \(P\) and put \(P_\gamma = Y\). The topology on \(P_\gamma\) is generated by the sets of the form \(P_0 \cap H\) or \((P_\alpha \setminus P_\gamma) \cap H\), where \(0 \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \leq \gamma\) and \(H\) is open in \(Y\). In [A1] it was proved that \(P_\gamma\) is Lindelöf. Observe that \(K = \{(y, y) : y \in g(X)\}\) is a closed subset of \(g(X) \times P_\gamma\); from 4) it follows that the family \(\{(g(X) \times P_\alpha) \cap K : \alpha < \gamma\}\) covers \(K\) and does not have a countable subcover, contradicting the Lindelöf property of \(g(X) \times P_\gamma\).

Let \(X\) be an arbitrary metric space whose product with every Lindelöf space is Lindelöf. There exist a zero-dimensional metric and separable space \(Y\) and a perfect continuous function \(f\) of \(Y\) onto \(X\). Since a perfect preimage of a Lindelöf space is Lindelöf, we conclude that for every Lindelöf space \(Z\) the product \(Y \times Z\) is Lindelöf. Let \(d_1\) and \(d\) be metrics on \(Y\) and \(X\) respectively. Let us define a new metric \(d_2\) on \(Y\) by

5) \(d_2(y_1, y_2) = d_1(y_1, y_2) + d(f(y_1), f(y_2)).\)

Then

\[(Y, d_2) = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty Y_n,
\]

where \(Y_n\) is totally bounded. As \(d_2(y_1, y_2) \geq d(f(y_1), f(y_2))\), we conclude that \(f(Y_n)\) is totally bounded in \((X, d)\).

**Proof of b.** Let \(\{X_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}\) be a closed cover of \(X\) with \(\lambda < \gamma\) which does not have a countable subcover. Let \((Y_\tau')\) be a metric compactification of \(X\) and \(\tau\) a new topology on \(Y\) generated by \(\{X_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}\) and \(\tau'\). Put \(Z = (Y, \tau)\). By (MA) and the fact that \(Z \setminus X\) is a Lindelöf subset of \(Z\), we infer that \(Z\) is Lindelöf. The product \(X \times Z\) is not Lindelöf, because \(K = \{(x, x) : x \in X\}\) is a closed subset of \(X \times Z\) and \((X \times X_\alpha) \cap K : \alpha < \lambda\) is an open cover of \(K\) without a countable subcover.

\(\square\)
Proof of c). By the Hurewicz theorem, (see [K1], theorem 21.18), if $X$ is not $\sigma$-compact then $X$ contains a closed subset homeomorphic to the irrational. By the example from [A1] there is a Lindelöf space $Y$ such that $X \times Y$ is not Lindelöf.

**Question 1** (MA). Let $X$ be a metrizable separable space such that for every metric $d$ on $X$, consistent with the topology of $X$, $(X, d)$ is a countable union of totally bounded subsets. Is it true that $X$ is a union of less than continuum compact sets?

We do not know the answer to this question even for (CH). In this case we ask if $X$ is $\sigma$-compact.

**Remark 2.** Observe that the following conditions are equivalent for a metrizable separable space $X$:

(i) For every metric $d$ on $X$, consistent with the topology of $X$, $(X, d)$ is a countable union of totally bounded subsets.

(ii) For every complete metric space $Y$ containing $X$ there is a $\sigma$-compact set $Z$ such that $X \subset Z \subset Y$.

**Proof.** (i)$\rightarrow$(ii). If $X \subset (Y, d)$, where $(Y, d)$ is a complete metric space, then by (i) $(X, d)X \times X = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$, where $X_n$ is totally bounded, and $X_n^Y$ is compact as a complete totally bounded metric space.

(ii)$\rightarrow$(i). There is a complete separable metric space $(Y, d')$ such that $(X, d) \subset (Y, d')$ and $d'[X \times X = d$ (see [E], Theorem 4.3.14). By (ii) there is $Z$ such that $X \subset Z = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n \subset Y$, where $Z_n$ is compact. Then $X_n = Z_n \cap X$ is totally bounded.

Another proof of this implication follows from the fact that (ii) implies that there is $a \in P$ such that $g(X) \subset \{ p \in P : p \leq a \}$, where $g$ is taken from the proof of part a) of the theorem.

**Remark 3.** One can also prove the theorem using Remark 2, but in this case the reasoning is not so constructive as in the original proof (cf. [A2], Remark 16).

**Question 4.** Is (MA) essential in the theorem?

**Question 5.** Is it consistent with ZFC to assume that there is a metric space $(X, d)$ which is not a countable union of totally bounded subsets and whose product with every Lindelöf space is Lindelöf?

Question 5 is related to a well known problem:

**Question 6.** Is it consistent with ZFC to assume that for every Lindelöf space $Y$ the product $Y \times P$ is Lindelöf?

Let us finish with the following:

**Proposition (MA).** If $X$ is a metrizable space whose product with every Lindelöf space is Lindelöf, then the following condition holds:

There is an increasing sequence $\{ A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \}$ of $\sigma$-compact subsets in $X$, where $\lambda < \omega$, which cannot be extended, which means that there is no $\sigma$-compact set $Z$ in $X$ containing $\bigcup \{ A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \}$ as a proper subset.

Moreover, if in addition $X$ is not $\sigma$-compact, then there is a compact set $C$ in $X$ such that $\{ \alpha < \lambda : A'_\alpha \cap C \neq \emptyset \}$ is cofinal with $\lambda$, where $A'_\alpha = A_\alpha \setminus \bigcup \{ A_\beta : \beta < \alpha \}$.
Proof. Suppose not, and let \( \{ C_\alpha : \alpha < \omega \} \) be the family of all compact subsets of \( X \). Put \( A_0 = C_0 \). If \( A_\alpha \) has been defined for \( \alpha < \beta \), then by the assumption there is a \( \sigma \)-compact set \( Z \) such that the union of \( \{ A_\alpha : \alpha < \beta \} \) is a proper subset of \( Z \). Put \( A_\beta = Z \cup C_\beta \cup \{ x_\beta \} \), where \( x_\beta \) is an arbitrary point of \( X \setminus \bigcup \{ A_\alpha : \alpha < \beta \} \).

From the construction it follows that
\[
\bigcup \{ C_\alpha' : \alpha' < \alpha \} \subset \bigcup \{ A_\alpha' : \alpha' < \alpha \} \text{ for } \alpha < \omega.
\]

Let \( (Y', \tau_1) \) be a metrizable compactification of \( X \). Then put \( A_\xi = Y' \) and \( Y = (Y', \tau_2) \), where \( \tau_2 \) is generated by \( \tau_1 \cup \{ A_\alpha \setminus A_\alpha' : \alpha' < \alpha \leq \omega \} \cup \{ A_0 \} \).

We shall show that \( Y \) is a Lindelöf space and \( X \times Y \) is not. Observe that \( Y \setminus X \) is a Lindelöf space as a subspace of \( (Y', \tau_1) \). Let \( U \) be an open subset of \( Y \) containing \( Y \setminus X \). Then there is a \( \sigma \)-compact set \( C \) in \( X \) such that \( Y \setminus U \subset C \), and by \((*)\) there is an \( \alpha \) such that \( C \subset A_\alpha \). To finish the proof of the Lindelöf property of \( Y \) it is enough to show that \( A_\alpha \) is a Lindelöf subspace of \( Y \) for all \( \alpha \). It is obvious that \( A_0 \) is Lindelöf. Suppose that \( A_\beta \) is Lindelöf for \( \beta < \alpha \). Note that \( A_\alpha' = A_\alpha \setminus \bigcup \{ A_\beta : \beta < \alpha \} \) is Lindelöf as a subspace of \( X \). Let \( U \) be an open set in \( Y \) containing \( A_\alpha' \). Then there is a \( \sigma \)-compact set \( D \) in \( X \) such that \( A_\alpha \setminus U \subset D \subset \bigcup \{ A_\beta : \beta < \alpha \} \). Since \( (\text{MA}) \) implies that every closed cover of a metrizable compact set of cardinality less than continuum has a countable subcover (see \([A1]\), Lemma 2), by the inductive assumption we conclude that \( A_\alpha \) is a Lindelöf space.

The product \( X \times Y \) is not Lindelöf, because \( K = \{(x, x) : x \in X\} \) is a closed subset of \( X \times Y \) and the family \( \{ K \cap (X \times A_\alpha) : \alpha < \omega \} \) is an open cover of \( K \) without countable subcover.

Suppose that \( \{ A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \} \) is an increasing sequence of \( \sigma \)-compact subsets in \( X \), where \( \lambda < \omega \), and there is no a compact subset \( C \) in \( X \) such that \( \{ \alpha < \lambda : A_\alpha' \cap C \neq \emptyset \} \) is cofinal with \( \lambda \), where \( A_\alpha' = A_\alpha \setminus \bigcup \{ A_\beta : \beta < \alpha \} \). Then, using a similar reasoning as in the first part of the proof, we conclude that \( T = \bigcup \{ A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \} \cup Y \setminus X \) is a Lindelöf subspace of \( Y \) and \( X \times T \) is not Lindelöf.

Remark 7. One can strengthen the second part of the proposition by showing that if \( Z \) is a \( \sigma \)-compact set then there is a compact set \( C \) in \( X \) such that \( \{ \alpha < \lambda : (C \setminus Z) \cap A_\alpha' \neq \emptyset \} \) is cofinal with \( \lambda \).

Question 8 (MA). Let \( \lambda' \) be an ordinal number less than continuum. Is it possible to relax the phrase “\( \sigma \)-compact”, in the formulation of the proposition, to “union of \( \lambda' \) compact sets”?

Added in proof. J. Chaber pointed out to me that W. Hurewicz \( (\text{On sequences of continuous functions}, \text{Fund. Math.} 9(1927), 193-204) \) proved that a metric space \( M \) is a Hurewicz space if and only if every sequence \( (f_n) \) of continuous real valued functions on \( M \) is bounded, i.e. there is a sequence \( (r_n) \) of real numbers such that for all but finitely many \( n \) the range of \( f_n \) is bounded by \( r_n \).

Recently R. Pol has answered Question 1 in the negative way.
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