

## PRODUCTS AND CARDINAL INVARIANTS OF MINIMAL TOPOLOGICAL GROUPS

BY

DOUGLASS L. GRANT AND W. W. COMFORT

ABSTRACT. It is a question of Arhangel'skiĭ [1] (Problem 2) whether the identity  $\psi(G) = \chi(G)$  holds for every minimal Hausdorff topological group  $G = \langle G, u \rangle$ . (Here, as usual,  $\psi(G)$ , the pseudocharacter of  $G$ , is the least cardinal number  $\kappa$  for which there is  $\bigcap \mathcal{A} \subset u$  such that  $|\mathcal{A}| = \kappa$  and  $\bigcap \mathcal{A} = \{e\}$ , and  $\chi(G)$ , the character of  $G$ , is the least cardinality of a local base at  $e$  for  $\langle G, u \rangle$ .) That  $\langle G, u \rangle$  is minimal means that, if  $v$  is a Hausdorff topological group topology for  $G$  and  $v \subset u$ , then  $v = u$ .

In this paper, we give some conditions on  $G$  sufficient to ensure a positive response to Arhangel'skiĭ's question, and we offer an example which responds negatively to a question on minimal groups posed some years ago (cf. [6] (p. 107) and [4] (p. 259)).

**1. Terminology and Notation.** The smallest infinite cardinal is denoted  $\omega$ . For an infinite cardinal  $\alpha$ , the symbol  $\alpha^+$  denotes the least cardinal  $\beta$  such that  $\beta > \alpha$ , and  $cf(\alpha)$  is the least cardinal  $\kappa$  for which there is a set  $\{\alpha_\xi : \xi < \kappa\}$  of cardinals such that  $\alpha_\xi < \alpha$  for all  $\xi < \kappa$ , and  $\sum_{\xi < \kappa} \alpha_\xi = \alpha$ . The cardinal  $\alpha$  is called regular if  $cf(\alpha) = \alpha$ , singular otherwise. For all  $\alpha \geq \omega$ , we say that a topological group  $G = \langle G, u \rangle$  is  $\alpha$ -totally bounded if, for every non-empty  $U \in u$ , there is  $S \subset G$  with  $|S| < \alpha$  such that  $G = US$ . (Those groups which many authors call totally bounded are, in our terminology, exactly the  $\omega$ -totally bounded groups.)

**2. On the relation  $\psi = \chi$ .** Our first lemma is closely related to [2] (1, Proposition 1), [10] (4.5) and [11] (§3, Proposition 1 and §20, Theorem 3). We outline a proof in some detail since (a) none of these sources fits our context exactly, and (b) the distinctions are crucial and unexpectedly subtle; in this latter connection, we note in particular that in 2.1(e) the inclusion  $\bigcap \mathcal{V} \subset u$  may fail.

LEMMA 2.1. Let  $G$  be a group and  $\mathcal{V}$  a family of non-empty subsets of  $G$  such that

- (i) if  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{V}$  and  $|\mathcal{F}| < \omega$  then  $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{V}$ ;
- (ii) for all  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ , there is  $U \in \mathcal{V}$  such that  $U^2 \subset V$ ;
- (iii) if  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ , then  $V = V^{-1}$ ; and
- (iv) for all  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $x \in G$ , there is  $U \in \mathcal{V}$  such that  $xUx^{-1} \subset V$ .

---

Received by the editors July 30, 1984, and, in revised form, February 5, 1985.

AMS Subject Classification (1980): Primary 54A25, 54D25; Secondary 22A05, 54A10

© Canadian Mathematical Society 1985.

For  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ , define  $\tilde{V} = \{x \in V : \text{there is } U \in \mathcal{V} \text{ such that } xU \subset V\}$ , and define  $v = \{\cup_{i \in I} x_i \tilde{V}_i : x_i \in G, V_i \in \mathcal{V}\}$ . Then

- (a) each  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  satisfies  $e \in \tilde{V}$ ;
- (b)  $\langle G, v \rangle$  is a topological group;
- (c)  $\{\tilde{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}\}$  is a local  $v$ -base at  $e$ ;
- (d) if  $\cap \mathcal{V} = \{e\}$ , then  $v$  is a Hausdorff topology; and
- (e) if  $u$  is a topology for  $G$  and  $\mathcal{V} \subset u$ , then  $v \subset u$ .

PROOF: (a) follows from (iii) and (ii). Next we note (#) if  $x \in G$  and  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $e \in x\tilde{V}$ , then there is  $U \in \mathcal{V}$  such that  $x^{-1}U \subset V$  (and hence  $x^{-1}\tilde{U} \subset \tilde{V}$ , so  $e \in \tilde{U} \subset x\tilde{V}$ ).

From (#), it follows that, if  $p, x_i \in G$ , and  $V_i \in \mathcal{V}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) and if  $p \in x_1\tilde{V}_1 \cap x_2\tilde{V}_2$ , then there are  $U_i \in \mathcal{V}$  such that  $e \in \tilde{U}_i \subset p^{-1}x_i\tilde{V}_i$ . Then, with  $U = U_1 \cap U_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ , we have

$$p \in p\tilde{U} = p(\tilde{U}_1 \cap \tilde{U}_2) = p\tilde{U}_1 \cap p\tilde{U}_2 \subset x_1\tilde{V}_1 \cap x_2\tilde{V}_2.$$

It follows that  $v$  is a topology for  $G$  and that  $\{x\tilde{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}\}$  is a base for  $v$ ; indeed, from (#) we have (c). One completes the proof of (b) by showing that the functions  $(a, b) \rightarrow ab$  and  $a \rightarrow a^{-1}$  are  $v$ -continuous. We omit the detailed argument, since it is available as indicated in [2], [11], [10]. (We note that if  $U, V \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $U^2 \subset V$ , then  $(\tilde{U})^2 \subset \tilde{V}$ ; and if  $x \in G$  and  $U, V \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $xUx^{-1} \subset V$ , then  $x\tilde{U}x^{-1} \subset \tilde{V}$ .)

From (ii) and the inclusion  $\tilde{V} \subset V$  for  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ , (d) follows immediately.

We prove (e). Let  $x \in \tilde{V} \subset V \in \mathcal{V} \subset u$  and choose  $U, W \in \mathcal{V}$  so that  $xU \subset V$  and  $W^2 \subset U$ . Then  $(xW)W \subset V$  and hence  $xW \subset \tilde{V}$ , so  $\tilde{V}$  is  $u$ -open.

The centre of a group  $G$  is denoted  $Z(G)$ .

LEMMA 2.2. Let  $\alpha \geq \omega$  and let  $\langle G, u \rangle$  be a Hausdorff topological group such that  $\psi(G, u) < cf(\alpha)$  and  $G/Z(G)$  is  $\alpha$ -totally bounded. Then there is a Hausdorff topological group topology  $v$  for  $G$  such that  $v \subset u$  and  $\chi(G, v) < \alpha$ .

PROOF: There is  $\mathcal{A} \subset u$  such that  $|\mathcal{A}| = \psi(G, u)$  and  $\cap \mathcal{A} = \{e\}$ . If  $|\mathcal{A}| < \omega$  then  $\chi(G, u) = \psi(G, u) = 1$ , and it is enough to take  $v = u$ . We assume then that  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq \omega$  and we choose  $\mathcal{B} \subset u$  so that  $|\mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{A}|$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ , and  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies (the analogues of) properties (i), (ii) and (iii) of Lemma 2.1.

Let  $q: G \rightarrow G/Z(G)$  be the usual quotient map. Since  $G/Z(G)$  is  $\alpha$ -totally bounded, and  $q$  is open, for each  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  there is  $S_B \subset G/Z(G)$  such that  $|S_B| < \alpha$  and  $G/Z(G) = q(B)S_B$ . We set  $S = \cup\{S_B : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ . Then  $|S| < \alpha$ , and  $G/Z(G) = q(B)S$ , for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ .

There is  $A \subset G$  such that  $|A| = |S|$  and  $S = \{aZ(G) : a \in A\}$ . Denoting by  $H$  the subgroup of  $G$  generated by  $A$ , we have  $|H| < \alpha$  and  $G = BHZ(G)$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . We set  $\mathcal{U} = \{hBh^{-1} : h \in H, B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ , and  $\mathcal{V} = \{\cap \mathcal{F} : \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}, |\mathcal{F}| < \omega\}$ . It is clear that  $\mathcal{V} \subset u$ , that  $|\mathcal{V}| = |\mathcal{U}| < \alpha$ , and that  $\mathcal{V}$  satisfies (i) of Lemma 2.1; (ii) and (iii) of 2.1 also hold for  $\mathcal{V}$ , since they hold for  $\mathcal{B}$  and hence for  $\mathcal{U}$ . To verify

(iv) for  $\mathbb{V}$  it is enough to show that if  $h \in H$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{B}$  and  $x \in G$ , then there are  $k \in H$  and  $C \in \mathbb{B}$  such that  $xkCk^{-1}x^{-1} \subset hBh^{-1}$ . There is  $C \in \mathbb{B}$  such that  $C^3 \subset B$ , and since  $G = BHZ(G)$  there are  $k \in H$ ,  $z \in Z(G)$  such that  $h^{-1}x \in Ck^{-1}z$ . We then have  $xkCk^{-1}x^{-1} \subset (hCk^{-1}z)(kCk^{-1})(z^{-1}kCh^{-1}) = hC^3h^{-1} \subset hBh^{-1}$ , as required.

An appeal to Lemma 2.1 now completes the proof: the Hausdorff topology  $v$  given there satisfies  $v \subset u$ , and  $\chi(G, v) \leq |\{\tilde{V}: V \in \mathbb{V}\}| \leq |\mathbb{V}| < \alpha$ .

**THEOREM 2.3.** *Let  $\alpha \geq \omega$  and let  $G$  be a minimal Hausdorff topological group such that  $\psi(G) < cf(\alpha)$  and  $G/Z(G)$  is  $\alpha$ -totally bounded. Then  $\chi(G) < \alpha$ .*

**COROLLARY 2.4.** *Let  $G$  be a minimal Hausdorff topological group and set  $\alpha = \psi(G)$ .*

(a) *If  $G/Z(G)$  is  $\alpha^+$ -totally bounded, then  $\psi(G) = \chi(G)$ ;*

(b) *if  $G$  is Abelian, then  $\psi(G) = \chi(G)$ .*

**PROOF:** Statement (a) follows from 2.3 by substituting for  $\alpha$  the regular cardinal  $\alpha^+$ , and (b) is a consequence of (a).

**COROLLARY 2.5.** *If  $G$  is a minimal Hausdorff topological group and  $G$  is  $\omega^+$ -totally bounded, then  $\chi(G) = \psi(G)$ .*

**PROOF:** Set  $\alpha = \psi(G)$ . If  $\alpha < \omega$  the statement is clear, and if  $\alpha \geq \omega$  then  $G$  (and hence  $G/Z(G)$ ) is  $\alpha^+$ -totally bounded, so that 2.4(a) applies.

**REMARK 2.6.** (a) Our results above on the problem of Arhangel'skiĭ were obtained in collaboration at Wesleyan University during the academic year 1979–80 (see [4]) and announced at the Spring Topology Conference at Blacksburg in March, 1981. More recently, we have observed in the literature related results, also not definitive and achieved approximately simultaneously, by Guran [9]. Our Corollary 2.5 appears explicitly in [9], and Theorem 6 of [9] is essentially identical with our Lemma 2.1 except that in [9] the family  $\mathbb{V}$  is required to be a base at  $e$  for  $u$ , and  $u$  is assumed a topological group topology for  $G$ . For other related work, see Brown [3] (Remark 1).

(b) The minimality hypothesis in 2.3–2.5 cannot legitimately be omitted, even for totally bounded (that is,  $\omega$ -totally bounded) groups  $G$ . For an example, let  $\alpha$  be an infinite cardinal such that  $\alpha > \log(\alpha)$  (e.g.,  $\alpha = 2^\beta$  for some  $\beta \geq \omega$ ) and, using the Hewitt–Marczewski–Pondiczery theorem [5] (Theorem 2.3.15), let  $G$  be a dense subgroup of the group  $\{-1, +1\}^\alpha$  (or of  $T^\alpha$ ) such that  $|G| = \log(\alpha)$ . Like every subgroup of a compact group,  $G$  is totally bounded, but  $\psi(G) \leq |G| = \log(\alpha) < \alpha = \chi(G)$ .

**3. On Čech-complete groups.** Here we give a further condition, quite independent of minimality, sufficient to yield the equality  $\chi(G) = \psi(G)$ . A Tychonoff space  $X$  is said to be Čech-complete if it is homeomorphic to a dense  $G_\delta$  in some compact Hausdorff space; a condition easily shown equivalent is that  $X$  be a  $G_\delta$  in  $\beta X$ . We say that  $X$  is locally Čech-complete at  $x \in X$  if  $x$  has an open Čech-complete neighbourhood.

It is well known (see, for example, [10] (8.4)), that every Hausdorff topological

group is a completely regular Hausdorff topological space, i.e., a Tychonoff space. In the following proof, we use these two elementary propositions, both valid in the context of Tychonoff spaces (and indeed in wider contexts):

- (1) If  $X$  is dense in  $Y$  and  $x \in X$ , then  $\chi(x, X) = \chi(x, Y)$ ;
- (2) If  $X$  is locally compact at the point  $x \in X$ , then  $\psi(x, X) = \chi(x, X)$ .

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Every locally Čech-complete topological group  $G$  satisfies  $\chi(G) = \psi(G)$ .*

**PROOF:** The statement is clear in case  $\psi(G) < \omega$ , so we assume  $\psi(G) \geq \omega$ . Choosing an open Čech-complete neighbourhood  $U$  of  $e$ , we have from (1) and (2) that  $\chi(G) = \chi(e, U) = \chi(e, \beta U) = \psi(e, \beta U) = \omega + \psi(e, U) = \psi(e, U) = \psi(G)$ .

**REMARK 3.2.** (a) The argument just given shows that, in effect, if  $G$  is locally  $\alpha$ -Čech-complete (in the sense that some open neighbourhood  $U$  of  $e$  in  $G$  is the intersection of at most  $\alpha$  open subsets of  $\beta U$ ), and if  $\psi(G) \geq \alpha$ , then  $\chi(G) = \psi(G)$ .

(b) An alternative proof of 3.1 in the case  $\psi(G) = \omega$  results upon juxtaposing these four sources: [3] (Theorem 1), [5] (Exercise 4.1.1), [12] and [1] (Theorem 3). Indeed,  $G$  is paracompact and Čech-complete, hence is metrizable since the diagonal of  $G$  is a  $G_\delta$  in  $G \times G$ .

**4. On powers of minimal groups.** Here we furnish a negative answer to the following question, raised in [7]: if  $G$  is a topological group such that  $G^n$  is minimal for every positive integer  $n$ , must  $G^\alpha$  be minimal for every cardinal number  $\alpha$ ?

Our construction uses the following special case of a theorem of Stephenson [13]: in order that a dense subgroup  $G$  of a compact, Abelian group  $K$  be minimal, it is necessary and sufficient that every closed, non-trivial subgroup  $N$  of  $K$  satisfy  $N \cap G \neq \{e\}$ .

As in [7] we denote by  $U$  the torsion subgroup of the circle group  $T$ , we denote by  $P = \{2, 3, 5, 7, \dots\}$  the set of positive primes, and for every integer  $r > 1$  we set  $G_r = \{x \in U : p \in P \text{ implies } p^r \nmid \text{ord}(x)\}$ .

**THEOREM 4.1.** (a) *The groups  $G_r^m$  ( $r > 1, 0 \leq m < \omega$ ) are minimal;* (b) *the groups  $G_r^\omega$  ( $r > 1$ ) are not minimal.*

**PROOF:** (a) For  $m$  fixed, we have the dense inclusions  $G_2^m \subset G_r^m \subset U^m \subset T^m$ , so by Stephenson's criterion cited above it is enough to show  $G_2^m$  is minimal. Since  $U^m$  is known to be minimal [6], [7] (and hence has non-trivial intersection with each non-trivial closed subgroup of  $T^m$ ), it is enough to show that every non-trivial closed subgroup  $N$  of  $U^m$  satisfies  $N \cap G_2^m \neq \{e\}$ .

Let  $\{(1)\} \neq x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) \in N \subset U^m$  and for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  let  $\text{ord}(x_i) = \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} p_{ij}^{e_{ij}}$  with each  $p_{ij} \in P$  and  $e_{ij} \geq 0$ . (Since  $x \neq (1)$ , there are  $i, j$  such that  $e_{ij} > 0$ .) Then, with  $f_{ij} = \max\{0, e_{ij} - 1\}$  and  $q = \text{lcm}\{\prod_{j=1}^{n_i} p_{ij}^{f_{ij}} : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ , we have  $(1) \neq x^q \in N \cap G_2^m$ , as required.

(b) Fix  $r > 1$ , choose  $p \in P$ , and for  $1 \leq i < \omega$  choose  $x_i \in U$  such that

$\text{ord}(x_i) = p^i$ . Let  $N$  be the closure in  $T^\omega$  of the cyclic subgroup generated by  $x = (x_i: 1 \leq i < \omega) \in T^\omega$ . To show  $G_r^\omega$  is not minimal, it is enough to show  $N \cap G_r^\omega = \{(1)\}$ .

Let  $y = (y_i: 1 \leq i < \omega) \in N \cap G_r^\omega$  and (using the fact that the metric space  $T^\omega$  is first countable) choose a sequence  $\{n_k: k < \omega\}$  of positive integers such that  $x^{n_k} \rightarrow y$ . For  $1 \leq i < \omega$  the set  $\{x_i^{n_k}: n_k < \omega\}$  is a finite (discrete) subgroup of  $T$ , so for each  $i$  the sequence  $\{x_i^{n_k}: k < \omega\}$  is eventually constant.

We show  $y_i = 1$  ( $1 \leq i < \omega$ ). Fix such  $i$ , define  $j = i + r - 1$ , and choose  $n = n_k$  such that  $x_i^n$  and  $y_i$  and  $x_j^n = y_j$ . From  $y_j \in G_r$ , it follows that

$$p^r \nmid \text{ord}(y_j) = \text{ord}(x_j^n) = p^j / \gcd(n, p^j),$$

and hence  $p^i | n$ . Then, from  $\text{ord}(x_i) = p^i$  follows  $y_i = 1$ , as required.

REMARK 4.2. (a) Let  $G$  be a minimal group which is dense in a compact Abelian group  $K$ , and let  $H$  be a (relatively) closed subgroup of  $G$ . From Stephenson's criterion, it follows that  $H$  itself is minimal. (For, let  $K' = Cl_K H$  and let  $N$  be a closed, non-trivial subgroup of  $K'$ . We need  $N \cap H \neq \{e\}$ . We have  $H = K' \cap G$  and hence  $N \cap H = N \cap (K' \cap G) = N \cap G \neq \{e\}$ , as required.)

Now let  $\alpha \geq \omega$ , and continue the notation of 4.1. Since  $G_r^\omega$  is (topologically isomorphic to) a closed subgroup of  $G_r^\alpha$ , we have that  $G_r^\alpha$  is not minimal.

(b) A condition strongly analogous to that called "Stephenson's Criterion" in this paper has a long history in functional analysis. In fact, it was L. J. Sulley [15], working in the context of open mapping theorems for Abelian topological groups, who first observed that  $G_2$  satisfies the criterion. Slightly later and without knowledge of Sulley's work [15], Stephenson [13] achieved his own formulation after constructing weak topological group topologies on the real line.

(c) The result announced in [8] is less startling (though perhaps conceptually simpler) than an example obtained by Stojanov [14] subsequently: there is a totally bounded, Abelian group  $G$  such that  $G^\omega$  is not minimal and each  $G^m$  ( $0 \leq m < \omega$ ) is even totally minimal in the sense that each of its (Hausdorff) quotients is minimal.

(d) [Note added December, 1984] We announced the existence of groups  $G$  as in Theorem 4.1 above in [4]. It was remarked to us in conversation by V. Eberhardt in September, 1984 in Primorsko, Bulgaria that the fact that the groups  $G_r^m$  ( $r > 1$ ,  $0 \leq m < \omega$ ) are minimal is immediate from the fact that the product of a minimal torsion group and a minimal group is itself minimal; this result appears in his work with U. Schwanengel (Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. 27 (1982), 957–964, Example 2).

The first author gratefully acknowledges the support of the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, through Operating Grant A8344.

#### REFERENCES

1. A. V. Arhangel'skii, *Cardinal invariants of topological groups, embeddings and condensation*, Soviet Math. Doklady **20** (1979), pp. 783–787.

2. N. Bourbaki, *Topologie Générale, Chapitres 3 et 4*, (Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, No. 1143.) Hermann. Paris, France. 1980.
3. L. G. Brown, *Topologically complete groups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **35** (1972), pp. 593–600.
4. W. W. Comfort and Douglass L. Grant, *Cardinal invariants, pseudocompactness and minimality: some recent advances in the topological theory of topological groups*, Topology Proceedings **6** (1981), pp. 227–265.
5. Ryszard Engelking, *General Topology*, Polska Akademia Nauk, Monographie Matematyczne volume 60. Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe—Polish Scientific Publishers. Warszawa. 1977.
6. Douglass L. Grant, *Topological groups which satisfy an open mapping theorem*, Pacific J. Math. **68** (1977), pp. 411–423.
7. Douglass L. Grant, *Arbitrary powers of the roots of unity are minimal Hausdorff topological groups*. Topology Proceedings **4** (1979), pp. 103–108.
8. D. L. Grant and W. W. Comfort, *Infinite products and cardinal invariants of minimal topological groups (preliminary report)*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. **2** (1981), pp. 540–541 [Abstract 81T-22-564].
9. I. I. Guran, *On topological groups close to being Lindelöf*, Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR 256 (1981), pp. 1305–1307. [In Russian. English translation: Soviet Math. Doklady **23** (1981), 173–175.]
10. Edwin Hewitt and Kenneth A. Ross, *Abstract Harmonic Analysis*, Volume I. Grundlehren der math. Wissenschaften volume 115. Springer-Verlag. Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg. 1963.
11. Taqdir Husain, *Introduction to Topological Groups*, W. B. Saunders Company. Philadelphia and London. 1966.
12. J. Nagata, *On a necessary and sufficient conditions of metrizability*, J. Inst. Polytech. Osaka City Univ. **1** (1950), pp. 93–100.
13. R. M. Stephenson, *Minimal topological groups*, Mathematische Annalen **192** (1971), pp. 193–195.
14. Luchesar N. Stojanov, *On products of minimal and totally minimal groups*, In: Proc. Eleventh Spring Conference (1982) of the Bulgarian Mathematical Society of Slunchev brjag, pp. 79–91. Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Sophia, Bulgaria. 1982.
15. L. J. Sulley, *A note on B- and B<sub>1</sub>-complete topological abelian groups*, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **66** (1969), pp. 275–279.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF CAPE BRETON

Box 5300,  
SYDNEY, NOVA SCOTIA,  
CANADA B1P 6L2

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT  
06457 U.S.A.