Pacific Journal of Mathematics

A CHARACTERIZATION OF COMPACT CONNECTED PLANAR LATTICES

CHARLES E. CLARK AND CARL EBERHART

Vol. 24, No. 2 June 1968

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 24, No. 2, 1968

A CHARACTERIZATION OF COMPACT CONNECTED PLANAR LATTICES

CHARLES E. CLARK and CARL EBERHART

In this paper it is proved that every topological lattice on the two-cell is topologically isomorphic (iseomorphic) to a sublattice of the product lattice $I \times I$. An explicit description of the compact connected sublattices of $I \times I$ containing $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$ is given. These results, together with a theorem of A. D. Wallace, yield a characterization of all compact connected lattices in the plane: each is iseomorphic to a sublattice of $I \times I$.

A topological lattice is a partially ordered space X with the property that every pair of elements a, b of X has a least upper bound, $a \vee b$, and a greatest lower bound, $a \wedge b$, so that the operations $\vee$ and $\wedge$ are continuous. A simple example of a topological lattice is the unit interval I with the usual ordering. The partial order on the n-cell I^n given by $(x_i) \leqq (y_i)$ if and only if $x_i \leqq y_i$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$ is a lattice ordering, in fact, it is the lattice ordering obtained by regarding I^n as a product lattice. L. W. Anderson and A. D. Wallace have found conditions under which a lattice ordering on the n-cell is the product order. One can also consider the following problem: determine all lattice orderings of the n-cell. It is well known that the usual order is the only lattice order on the interval. In this paper the problem is considered for the two-cell. It is shown that every topological lattice on the two-cell is iseomorphic to a sublattice of the product lattice $I \times I$. This result together with a theorem of A. D. Wallace is used to prove that every compact connected lattice in the plane is iseomorphic to a sublattice of $I \times I$. Finally, an explicit description of the compact connected sublattices of $I \times I$ containing $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$ is given.

1. Lattice orderings of the two-cell.

Let L be a topological lattice whose underlying space is homeomorphic to a two-cell. Since L is compact, L has a unique minimum element 0 and a unique maximum element 1. It is known [1] that 0 and 1 lie on the boundary of L and that the boundary arcs T and E determined by 0 and 1 are maximal chains in L and that T and E generate L in the sense that $L = T \vee E = T \wedge E$. In this section we prove that L is iseomorphic to a sublattice of $I \times I$. The proof requires several lemmas.

LEMMA 1. *Let $p, q \in L$. If $(p \wedge T) \cap T = (q \wedge T) \cap T$, then either*

$p \wedge T \subset q \wedge T$ or $q \wedge T \subset p \wedge T$.

Proof. We first assume that $p, q \in E$ and that $p \leqq q$. If $p = 0$, then $p \in q \wedge T$. Suppose $p > 0$ and that $p \notin q \wedge T$. It is well known that $p \vee T$ and $q \wedge T$ are arcs from p to 1 and from q to 0 respectively. Since L is a 2-cell, it must follow that $(p \vee T) \cap (q \wedge T) \neq \square$. Let $z \in (p \vee T) \cap (q \wedge T)$ and let

$$x = \sup \{(q \wedge T) \cap T\} = \sup \{(p \wedge T) \cap T\} .$$

Then $z = p \vee t$ for some $t \in T$. If $t \leqq x$, then by the definition of x, we would have $p \vee t = p$. Hence $t > x$. But now the inequality $t \leqq z \leqq q$ implies that $q \wedge t = t \in q \wedge T$ which contradicts the choice of x.

Now let p and q be arbitrary elements of L and choose $e, f \in E$ such that $p \in e \wedge T$ and $q \in f \wedge T$. This is possible since $E \wedge T = L$. If either of p or q is an element of T, then the lemma is trivial. For suppose $p \in T$. Then

$$p \wedge T = (p \wedge T) \cap T = (q \wedge T) \cap T \subset q \wedge T .$$

We may now assume that $p, q \notin T$. We contend that $(e \wedge T) \cap T = (p \wedge T) \cap T = (f \wedge T) \cap T = (q \wedge T) \cap T$. To establish the first equality, let $t \in (e \wedge T) \cap T$. Then since $e \wedge T$ is a chain and $p, t \in e \wedge T$, either $p \leqq t$ or $t \leqq p$. Suppose $p \leqq t$. Then for some $t_1 \in T, p = e \wedge t_1 = (e \wedge t_1) \wedge t = (e \wedge t) \wedge t_1 = t \wedge t_1 \in T$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $t \leqq p$ and $t \in (p \wedge T) \cap T$. Now suppose $t \in (p \wedge T) \cap T$. Then $t \leqq p \leqq e$ implies that $t \in (e \wedge T) \cap T$. This proves the first equality; the last equality is proved similarly. From the first part of the proof, we conclude that either $e \wedge T \subset f \wedge T$ or $f \wedge T \subset e \wedge T$. Suppose $f \wedge T \subset e \wedge T$. Then $p \wedge T$ and $q \wedge T$ are subchains of $e \wedge T$, so either $p \wedge T \subset q \wedge T$ or $q \wedge T \subset p \wedge T$.

For $x \in T$, we define $C_x \subset E$ by $C_x = \{h \in E \mid x = \sup \{(h \wedge T) \cap T\}\}$.

LEMMA 2. *The set C_x is closed for all $x \in T$.*

Proof. We consider the nontrivial case where $C_x \neq \square$. From the continuity of $\wedge$ it follows that the set $\{h \in E \mid x \in h \wedge T\}$ is closed. Let $e' = \inf \{h \in E \mid x \in h \wedge T\}$; then $x \in e' \wedge T$ and $e' \leqq e$ for all $e \in C_x$. If $t \in (e' \wedge T) \cap T$ and $t > x$, then for $e \in C_x$, we would have $t \leqq e' \leqq e$ and hence $t \in (e \wedge T) \cap T$ contradicting the fact that $e \in C_x$. Hence $x = \sup \{(e' \wedge T) \cap T\}$ and $e' \in C_x$.

Let $h_n \in C_x$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, and let $h_n \to h$. Then $e' \leqq h_n$ for each n and by Lemma 1, we have that $e' \wedge T \subset h_n \wedge T$ for all values of n and therefore $e' \wedge T \subset h \wedge T$. Let $x' = \sup \{(h \wedge T) \cap T\}$. Then

$x' \geqq x$ since $x \in (h \wedge T) \cap T$. We have that $e', x' \in h \wedge T$ and so one of the inequalities $x' \leqq e'$, $e' \leqq x'$ must hold. If $x' \leqq e'$, then $x' \in (e \wedge T) \cap T$ which implies that $x' \leqq x$ and hence $x' = x$ and $h \in C_x$. If $e' \leqq x'$, let $e' = h \wedge t$ for $t \in T$. Then

$$e' = e' \wedge x' = (h \wedge t) \wedge x' = (h \wedge x') \wedge t = x' \wedge t \in T .$$

This involves a contradiction unless $e' = 0$. However, if $e' = 0$, then $x = 0$ and $h_n \wedge T = 0$ for all values of n; hence $n \wedge T = 0$ and $h \in C_x$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

We now define relations $\mathscr{H}$ and $\mathscr{V}$ on T as follows: for $a, b \in T$,

$$a\mathscr{H}b \equiv a \in e \vee T \text{ if and only if } b \in e \vee T \text{ for all } e \in E .$$
$$a\mathscr{V}b \equiv a \in e \wedge T \text{ if and only if } b \in e \wedge T \text{ for all } e \in E .$$

LEMMA 3. *The relations $\mathscr{H}$ and $\mathscr{V}$ are closed congruences on T.*

Proof. It is easy to see that $\mathscr{H}$ and $\mathscr{V}$ are congruences on T. We will show that the relation $\mathscr{V}$ is closed. A dual argument will show that $\mathscr{H}$ is closed.

Let $a_n \rightarrow a$, $b_n \rightarrow b$ with $a_n, b_n \in T$ and $a_n\mathscr{V}b_n$ for each n. Assume that $a \leqq b$. If $h \in e \wedge T$ for $e \in E$, it follows trivially that $a \in e \wedge T$. Suppose $a \in e \wedge T$ for $e \in E$. Let $x = \sup\{(e \wedge T) \cap T\}$; then $a \leqq x$. If $a < x$, then for n sufficiently large, $a_n < x$ and hence $a_n \in e \wedge T$. Since $a_n\mathscr{V}b_n$ we must have $b_n \in e \wedge T$ for n sufficiently large and therefore $b \in e \wedge T$. This gives $a\mathscr{V}b$.

We now assume that $a = x$ and let $f = \sup C_x$. This sup exists since C_x is closed by Lemma 2. If $f = 1$, then $a = b = 1$. Suppose $f < 1$ and let $f_m \rightarrow f$ where $f_m \in E, f_m > f$ for $m = 1, 2, \cdots$. Let $y_m = \sup\{(f_m \wedge T) \cap T\}$. Then since $f_m \notin C_x$, $y_m > a$. Thus for fixed m, there exists a positive integer N_m such that if $n \geqq N_m$, then $a_n < y_m$, or $a_n \in f_m \wedge T$. Therefore $b_n \in f_m \wedge T$ for $n \leqq N_m$. We conclude that $b \in f_m \wedge T$ for each positive integer m and hence $b \in f \wedge T$. But $a = \sup\{(f \wedge T) \cap T\}$ and hence $b \leqq a$. Therefore $a = b$.

LEMMA 4. *Let $e \in E$ and let $x = sup\{(e \wedge T) \cap T\}$, $e' = sup\, C_x$, $x' = inf\, V_x$ where V_x denotes the congruence class modulo $\mathscr{V}$ which contains x. Then $\{z \mid x' \leqq z \leqq e'\} \subset e' \wedge T$.*

Proof. If $z \in T$, then $z \leqq x \leqq e'$ implies $z = e' \wedge z \in e' \wedge T$. Suppose $z \notin T$ and let $f \in E$ such that $z \in f \wedge T$. If $f = 0$, then $z = 0 \in e' \wedge T$. Suppose $f > 0$. We have $x' \leqq z \leqq f$ and therefore $x' \in f \wedge T$ and since $x' \mathscr{V} x$, $x \in f \wedge T$. If $t \in (f \wedge T) \cap T$, then $t \in (z \wedge T) \cap T$ since

$z \wedge T \subset f \wedge T$ and $z \notin T$. From the inequality $t \leqq z \leqq e'$ we conclude that $t \in (e' \wedge T) \cap T$ and hence $t \leqq x$. Hence $x = \sup\{(f \wedge T) \cap T\}$ and by Lemma 1 we have $f \wedge T \subset e' \wedge T$ and therefore $z \in e' \wedge T$.

LEMMA 5. *If* $e, f \in E$ *and* $p \in [(f \vee T) \cap (e \wedge T)] \backslash T$, *then* $\{p\} = (f \vee T) \cap (e \wedge T)$.

Proof. Suppose $p' \in (f \vee T) \cap (e \wedge T)$. Then either $p' \leqq p$ or $p' \geqq p$ and in either case it is easily seen that $p' \notin T$ since $p \notin T$. Assume that $p' \leqq p$ and let $x = \sup\{(e \wedge T) \cap T\}$. Then since $p, p' \notin T, x = \sup\{(p \wedge T) \cap T\} = \sup\{(p' \wedge T) \cap T\}$. Since $p' \leqq p$ on $f \vee T$, we have that $p \in p' \vee T$ so that $p = p' \vee t$ for some $t \in T$ and since $x = \sup\{(p' \wedge T) \cap T\}$, it follows that $t \geqq x$. But $t \leqq p \leqq e$ implies that $t \in (e \wedge T) \cap T$ and so $t \leqq x$. Hence $t = x$ and $p = p' \vee x = p'$.

LEMMA 6. *Let* $x \in T$ *and let* $x' = \sup Vx$. *Then* $C_{x'} \neq \Box$.

Proof. The set $\{h \in E \mid x \in h \wedge T\}$ is closed by the continuity of $\wedge$ and is nonempty since $x \in 1 \wedge T$. Let $e = \inf\{h \in E \mid x \in h \wedge T\}$. Then $x \in e \wedge T$ and since $x \mathscr{V}^\frown x'$ it follows that $x' \in e \wedge T$. Let $x'' = \sup\{(e \wedge T) \cap T\}$. Then $x'' \leqq x'$. Suppose $h \in E$ and $x \in h \wedge T$. Then $h \geqq e$ by the definition of e and since $x'' \in e \wedge T$ it follows that $x'' \in h \wedge T$. On the other hand, if $x'' \in h \wedge T$ for some $h \in E$, then $x \in h \wedge T$ since $x \leqq x''$. Therefore $x \mathscr{V}^\frown x''$ but since $x'' \geqq x'$ and $x' = \sup \mathscr{V}^\frown x$, we must have $x'' = x'$. Hence $e \in C_{x'}$.

We are now prepared to define the iseomorphism from L into $I \times I$. For $p \in L$, define

$$\alpha_1(p) = \sup\{(p \wedge T) \cap T\}$$

and

$$\alpha_2(p) = \inf\{(p \vee T) \cap T\} .$$

Let η_1, η_2, denote the natural maps from T onto $T/\mathscr{V}^\frown = T_1$ and $T/\mathscr{H} = T_2$ respectively. Let $\phi_1 = \eta_1 \circ \alpha_1$, $\phi_2 = \eta_2 \circ \alpha_2$ and define

$$\phi : L \rightarrow T_1 \times T_2$$

by

$$\phi = \phi_1 \times \phi_2 .$$

THEOREM 1. *If L is a topological lattice which is homeomorphic to a 2-cell, then L is iseomorphic to a sublattice of $I \times I$.*

Proof. We will show that the map defined above is a one-to-one continuous homomorphism from L into $T_1 \times T_2$. The theorem then follows since $T_1 \times T_2$ is iseomorphic to $I \times I$.

(i) The map ϕ is continuous. We show ϕ_1 is continuous. A dual argument shows that ϕ_2 is continuous.

Let $x \in T_1$ and let $a = \sup \eta_1^{-1}(x)$. Then $C_a \neq \Box$ by Lemma 6. Let $e = \sup C_a$. We claim that $\phi_1^{-1}[0, x] = e \wedge L$. A similar argument shows that $\phi_1^{-1}[x, 1] = a' \vee L$ where $a' = \inf \eta_1^{-1}(x)$. Thus the inverse under ϕ_1 of a subbasic closed set is closed in L and hence α_1 is continuous.

Let $z \in e \wedge L$. Then $b = \sup\{(z \wedge T) \cap T\} \leqq z \leqq e$ and so $b \leqq a$. Then $\phi_1(z) = \eta_1(\alpha_1(z)) = \eta_1(b) \leqq \eta_1(a) = x$. Hence $z \in \phi_1^{-1}[0, x]$. Now let $z \in \phi_1^{-1}[0, x]$, $b = \sup \eta_1^{-1}(\phi_1(z))$, and $f \Rightarrow \sup C_b$. Since $\phi_1(z) \leqq x$, then $b \leqq a$. If $z \in T$ then $z \leqq b \leqq a \leqq e$; thus $z \in e \wedge L$.

Now suppose that $z \notin T$. From the definition of b we have $\eta_1(b) = \eta_1(\alpha_1(z))$ and hence $b \mathscr{Y}^{\frown} \alpha_1(z)$. Therefore $\alpha_1(z) \leqq b$. Let $h \in E$ such that $z \in h \wedge T$. Then since $z \notin T$, it was shown in the proof of Lemma 1 that $\sup\{(z \wedge T) \cap T\} = \sup\{(h \wedge T) \cap T\}$. Therefore $\alpha_1(z) \in h \wedge T$ and since $b \mathscr{Y}^{\frown} \alpha_1(z)$, we have $b \in (h \wedge T) \cap T$ and hence $b \in (z \wedge T) \cap T$. Then by the definition of $\alpha_1(z)$, we have $b \leqq \alpha_1(z)$. Thus $\alpha_1(z) = b$, and $(z \wedge T) \cap T = (f \wedge T) \cap T$. By Lemma 1, $z \wedge T \subset f \wedge T$. Since $b \leqq a$, then $f \leqq e$. Hence $z \leqq f \leqq e$ implies that $z \in e \wedge L$.

(ii) ϕ is one-to-one. Suppose $p, p' \in L$ such that $\phi_i(p) = \phi_i(p')$, $i = 1, 2$. We will show that $p = p'$. We consider three cases.

Case 1. $p, p' \in L \backslash T$. Then since $\phi_1(p) = \eta_1(\alpha_1(p)) = \eta_1(\alpha_1(p')) = \phi_1(p')$, we have that $\alpha_1(p) \mathscr{Y}^{\frown} \alpha_1(p')$. Choose $e, f \in E$ such that $p \in e \wedge T$ and $p' \in f \wedge T$. Then from the proof of Lemma 1, it follows that

$$\sup\{(e \wedge T) \cap T\} = \sup\{(p \wedge T) \cap T\} = \alpha_1(p),$$

and

$$\sup\{(f \wedge T) \cap T\} = \sup\{(p' \wedge T) \cap T\} = \alpha_1(p') .$$

But since $\alpha_1(p) \mathscr{Y}^{\frown} \alpha_1(p')$, we must have $\alpha_1(p') \in (e \wedge T) \cap T$ and $\alpha_1(p) \in (f \wedge T) \cap T$. It now follows that $\alpha_1(p') \leqq \alpha_1(p) \leqq \alpha_1(p')$ and hence $\alpha_1(p) = \alpha_1(p') = \alpha_1(e) = \alpha_1(f)$. Hence by Lemma 1, either $f \wedge T \subset e \wedge T$ or $e \wedge T \subset f \wedge T$. Suppose $f \wedge T \subset e \wedge T$. Then $p, p' \in e \wedge T$. Using a similar argument and the dual of Lemma 1 we obtain $g \in E$ such that $p, p' \in g \vee T$. Since $p, p' \notin T$, we conclude from Lemma 5 that $p = p'$.

Case 2. $p, p' \in T$. Assume $p \leqq p'$. If $p' = 1$, then $p' \in 1 \vee T$ and $p' \mathscr{H} p$ implies that $p \in 1 \vee T$ and so $p = 1$. Suppose $p' < 1$ and let $f = \sup\{h \in E \mid p \in h \vee T\}$. Then $f < 1$. Let $f_n \rightarrow f$, where $f_n \in E$ and $f_n > f$ for all n. Then $p \notin f_n \vee T$ and hence $p' \notin f_n \vee T$ for all n. Therefore if $f_n \vee p \in T$, then $f_n \vee p > p'$, and if $f_n \vee p \notin T$ then

$p = (f_n \vee p) \wedge p \in (f_n \vee p) \wedge T$ and hence $p' \in (f_n \vee p) \wedge T$ since $p \mathscr{V}\hat{\ } p'$ and $f_n \vee p \notin T$. So $f_n \vee p \geqq p'$ for all n. Therefore, by the continuity of $\vee$, $p = f \vee p \leqq p'$. Then $p = p'$.

Case 3. $p \notin T, p' \in T$. Choose $e, f \in E$ such that

$$p \in (e \wedge T) \cap (f \vee T)\ .$$

Then since $p \notin T, \{p\} = (e \wedge T) \cap (f \vee T)$ by Lemma 5. Since $\phi_1(p) = \phi_1(p')$, we have $\sup\{(p \wedge T) \cap T\} \mathscr{V}\hat{\ } p'$ from which follows $p' \in p \wedge T \cap e \wedge T$. Similarly, $p' \in f \vee T$, contradicting Lemma 5.

(iii) ϕ is a homomorphism. We will show that ϕ_1 is a homomorphism with respect to $\vee$, Similar arguments will show that ϕ_1 is a homomorphism with respect to $\wedge$ and that ϕ_2 is a homomorphism with respect to $\vee$ and $\wedge$.

Let $p, p' \in L$; $x = \alpha_1(p) = \sup\{(p \wedge T) \cap T\}$,

$$x' = \alpha_1(p') = \sup\{(p' \vee T) \cap T\}\ ,$$

and

$$z = \alpha_1(p \vee p') = \sup\{((p \vee p') \wedge T) \cap T\}\ .$$

Assume that $x \leqq x'$. Then $x \vee x' = x'$ and $\eta_1(x \vee x') = \eta_1(x) \vee \eta_1(x') = \eta_1(x')$. Then $\phi_1(p) \vee \phi_1(p') = \eta_1(x) \vee \eta_1(x') = \eta_1(x')$. We will show that $\phi_1(p \vee p') = \eta_1(z) = \eta_1(x')$, i.e., $z \mathscr{V}\hat{\ } x'$.

We have that $x' \leqq p' \leqq p \vee p'$, so $x' \in ((p \vee p') \wedge T) \cap T$ and hence $x' \leqq z$. If $z \in e \wedge T$ for $e \in E$, then clearly $x' \in e \wedge T$. Now suppose $x' \in e \wedge T, e \in E$. We consider two cases.

Case 1. $p' \notin E$. We may assume that $e = \inf\{h \in E \mid x' \in h \wedge T\}$. If $p' \in T$, then $p' = x' \in e \wedge T$. If $p' \notin T$, then choose $g \in E$ such that $p' \in g \wedge T$. Then $x' \leqq p' \leqq g$ implies that $x' \in g \wedge T$ and hence $e \leqq g$.

From Lemma 6, $e = \sup C_{x'}$. But the proof of Lemma 1 gives

$$x' = \sup\{(p' \wedge T) \cap T\} = \sup\{(g \wedge T) \cap T\}\ ,$$

and therefore $g \leqq e$. Hence $g = e$ and $p' \leqq e$.

We will show that $p \leqq e$ also. If $p \in T$, then $p = x \leqq x' \leqq e$. Suppose $p \notin T$ and let $f = \inf\{h \in E \mid p \in h < T\}$. Then since $p \notin T$, $\sup\{(f \wedge T) \cap T\} = \sup\{(p \wedge T) \cap T\} = x \leqq x'$ and hence $f \leqq e$. Then the inequality $p \leqq f \leqq e$ gives the desired conclusion.

We now have $p' \leqq e, p \leqq e$; hence $p \vee p' \leqq e$. Since $p' \in e \wedge T$, the inequality $p' \leqq p \vee p' \leqq e$ and Lemma 4 gives $p \vee p' \in e \wedge T$. Hence $z \in e \wedge T$. This concludes the proof for Case 1.

Case 2. $p' \in E$. If $p' \leqq p$, then $p \vee p' = p$ implies $x = z$. But then $x \leqq x' \leqq z$ implies $x' = z$ and so $z \in e \wedge T$.

If $p' \notin p \wedge L$ then since

$$x = \sup\{(p \wedge T) \cap T\} \leqq x' = \sup\{(p' \wedge T) \cap T\},$$

the proof of the continuity of ϕ_1 shows that $p \in p' \wedge L$. Hence $p \vee p' = p'$ and again we conclude that $z = x'$. This concludes the proof that ϕ_1 is a homomorphism with respect to $\vee$, and the proof of Theorem 1.

2. Compact connected lattices in the plane. In [4] Wallace proved that a compact connected lattice L which is imbeddable in the plane is a cyclic chain (in the sense of Whyburn {5]) and that each true cyclic element is a convex sublattice and is homeomorphic to a 2-cell. Thus by Theorem 1, each true cyclic element is iseomorphic to a sublattice of $I \times I$. Let Δ denote the diagonal thread in $I \times I$. Label the true cyclic elements of L, $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$. Denote the 0 and 1 of C_i by a_i and b_i respectively. Let T be any maximal chain from 0 to 1 in L, and let h be an iseomorphism from T onto Δ, the diagonal in $I \times I$. Then the "square" in $I \times I$ with upper right hand vertex $h(b_i)$ and lower left hand vertex $h(a_i)$ is a sublattice of $I \times I$ which is iseomorphic to $I \times I$. Hence C_i may be imbedded in this sublattice as in Theorem 1. In this manner an iseomorphism of L into $I \times I$ is determined. Thus we have proven:

THEOREM 2. *Every compact connected lattice in the plane is iseomorphic to a sublattice of $I \times I$.*

Finally we state an explicit description of the compact connected sublattices of $I \times I$ containing $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$.

THEOREM 3. *Let f and g be functions from I into I satisfying*

(i) *f, g are nondecreasing, $f(0) = 0$, $g(1) = 1$,*

(ii) *$f(x) \leqq g(x)$ for all $x \in I$,*

(iii) *f is continuous from the left and g is continuous from the right.*

Then the set $L = \{(x, y) : f(x) \leqq y \leqq g(x)\}$ is a compact connected sublattice of $I \times I$ containing $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$. Conversely, if L is a compact connected sublattice of $I \times I$ containing $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$ then there exist functions f and g satisfying i-iii *such that*

$$L = \{(x, y) : f(x) \leqq y \leqq g(x)\}.$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward and will be omitted. The functions f and g alluded to in the second part are defined as follows:

$$g(x) = \sup \{L \cap (\{x\} \times I)\} \qquad \text{for } x \in I$$
$$f(x) = \inf \{L \cap (\{x\} \times I)\} \qquad \text{for } x \in I\,.$$

3. Comments. Edmondson has given an example of a topological lattice on a 3-cell which is nonmodular; hence this lattice is not a sublattice of $I \times I \times I$ [2]. This shows that the higher dimensional analogous of Theorem 1 are false.

This the result of this paper does not hold if the term "lattice" be replaced by "semilattice" is a consequence of the results of D. R. Brown, [1], regarding semilattice structures on the two-cell.

Wallace has conjectured that every 2-dimensional compact connected lattice with no cutpoints is a two-cell. A related conjecture is that every 2-dimensional compact connected lattice can be imbedded in the plane. If this were true, the words "in the plane" in the statement of Theorem 2 could be replaced by "2-dimensional."

The authors are pleased to acknowledge their indebtedness to Professor R. J. Koch for his suggestions in the preparation of this paper.

References

1. D. R. Brown, *Topological semilattices on the two-cell* Pacific J. Math. **15** (1965).
2. Don E. Edmondson, *A nonmodular compact connected topological lattice*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **7** (1956).
3. A. D. Wallace, *Factoring a lattice*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1958).
4. ———, *Two theorems on topological lattices*. Pacific J. Math. **7** (1957).
5. G. T. Whyburn, *Analytic Topology*, Coll. Pub. Amer. Math. Soc., 1942.

Received May 2, 1966.

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. It should not contain references to the bibliography. Manuscripts may be sent to any one of the four editors. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, Richard Arens, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

Each author of each article receives 50 reprints free of charge; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published monthly. Effective with Volume 16 the price per volume (3 numbers) is $8.00; single issues, $3.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: $4.00 per volume; single issues $1.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley 8, California.

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), 7-17, Fujimi 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

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

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners of publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 24, No. 2 June, 1968