

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

WALLMAN'S TYPE ORDER COMPACTIFICATION

TAE HO CHOE AND YOUNG SOO PARK

WALLMAN'S TYPE ORDER COMPACTIFICATION

T. H. CHOE AND Y. S. PARK

For a completely regular ordered space X , the Stone-Čech order compactification $\beta_1(X)$ has been constructed by Nachbin. This compactification is a generalized concept of the ordinary Stone-Čech compactification $\beta(X)$ in the sense that if X has the discrete order: $x \leq y$ iff $x = y$, then $\beta_1 X = \beta X$. In this paper, for a convex ordered space X with a semi-closed order, the Wallman order compactification $\omega_0(X)$ is constructed by the use of the concept of maximal bifilters. $\omega_0(X)$ is a T_1 -compact ordered topological space in which X is densely embedded in both the topological and order sense.

Although the order of $\omega_0(X)$ is not semi-continuous, in general, most of the corresponding properties of the ordinary Wallman compactification can be generalized. For example, it can be shown that for any compact ordered topological space Y (with a closed order), a continuous increasing map from X into Y has a unique continuous increasing extension on $\omega_0(X)$, and if $\omega_0(X)$ has a closed order, then X is a normally ordered space.

First, we fix some notations and terminologies: Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set. For a subset $A \subseteq X$, we write $d(A) = \{y \in X: y \leq x \text{ for some } x \in A\}$ and $i(A) = \{y \in X: x \leq y \text{ for some } x \in A\}$. In particular, if A is a singleton set, say $\{x\}$, then we write $d(x)$ and $i(x)$ respectively. A subset A of X is decreasing (increasing, respectively) if $A = d(A)$ ($A = i(A)$, respectively). We say that a map f from X to a partially ordered space Y is increasing if $x \leq y$ in X implies $f(x) \leq f(y)$ in Y . For a (partially) ordered topological space (X, \mathcal{T}) in the order \leq , let

$$\mathcal{U} = \{U \in \mathcal{T}: U = i(U)\},$$

$$\mathcal{L} = \{U \in \mathcal{T}: U = d(U)\},$$

then \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{L} are evidently topologies for X , which are called the *upper*, *lower* topologies respectively ([6], [1]). We say that an ordered topological space X is *convex* if X has a subbase consisting of the sets in \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{L} , or equivalently, if every open set in X can be written as the intersection of an open decreasing set ([5]). Let X be an ordered topological space. The partial order is said to be *upper* (*lower*) *semi-closed* if, for any $x \in X$, $i(x)$ ($d(x)$, respectively) is closed. The partial order of X is *semi-closed* if it is both upper and lower semi-closed. It is said to be *closed* if, its graph, the set

of the points (x, y) such that $x \leq y$, is closed in the product space $X \times X$ ([4], [5] and [9]).

We recall that a filter \mathcal{F} in a topological space (X, \mathcal{T}) is an open (closed) filter if \mathcal{F} has a filter base consisting of open (closed) sets.

DEFINITION. Let $(X, \mathcal{T} \leq)$ be an ordered topological space. Let \mathcal{F} be a closed filter in (X, \mathcal{U}) and \mathcal{G} be a closed filter in (X, \mathcal{L}) . A pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ of closed filters \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} is called to be a bi-filter on X if $F \cap G \neq \emptyset$ for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and any $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

For given two bi-filters $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1)$ and $(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{G}_2)$, we define a relation $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1) \subseteq (\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{G}_2)$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2$ and $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_2$. We can easily remark that by Zorn's lemma, every bi-filter is contained in a maximal bi-filter. For an ordered topological space X , we write

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}X = \{A \subseteq X: A \text{ is closed decreasing set}\},$$

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}X = \{A \subseteq X: A \text{ is closed increasing set}\}.$$

The following two lemmas are analogous properties of maximal filters. Thus, the proofs are omitted.

LEMMA 1. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a maximal bi-filter, and $A \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}X$. Then $A \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if given $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $G \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $A \cap F \cap G \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, a dual statement holds for \mathcal{G} .

LEMMA 2. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a maximal bi-filter.

(1) Let A_1 and A_2 be in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}X$ and $A_1 \cup A_2 \in \mathcal{F}$. Then either $A_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ or $A_2 \in \mathcal{F}$. Moreover, a dual statement holds for \mathcal{G} .

(2) Let $A \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}X$, $B \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}X$ and $A \cup B = X$. Then either $A \in \mathcal{F}$, or $B \in \mathcal{G}$.

REMARK 1. Let (X, \mathcal{T}, \leq) be an ordered topological space with a semi-closed order. For each $x \in X$, we write

$$\mathcal{S}(d(x)) = \{A \text{ is a subset of } X: d(x) \subseteq A\},$$

$$\mathcal{S}(i(x)) = \{A \text{ is a subset of } X: i(x) \subseteq A\}.$$

Then every $\mathcal{S}(d(x))$ is a closed filter, but it need not be a maximal closed filter in (X, \mathcal{U}) under the inclusion relation. Moreover, a dual statement holds for $\mathcal{S}(i(x))$. $\mathcal{S}(d(x))$ is obviously a closed filter in (X, \mathcal{U}) . In order to show that it need not be a maximal closed filter let us consider the following example:

Let $N = \{0, 1, 2\}$ be an ordered topological space with usual order and discrete topology. Then $\mathcal{S}(d(2))$ and $\mathcal{S}(d(1))$ are not maximal

closed filters in (N, \mathcal{U}) . However, if the order on N is given as discrete, $\mathcal{S}(d(x))$ is a maximal closed filter for every $x \in N$.

LEMMA 3. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) be an ordered topological space with a semi-closed order. Then for each $x \in X$, $(\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x)))$ is a maximal bi-filter.*

Proof. Let $A \in \mathcal{S}(d(x))$ and $B \in \mathcal{S}(i(x))$. Then $d(x) \subseteq A$ and $i(x) \subseteq B$. Hence $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Therefore $(\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x)))$ is a bi-filter. Suppose that there exists a bi-filter $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ such that $(\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x))) \subsetneq (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$. It follows that $\mathcal{S}(d(x)) \subsetneq \mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{S}(i(x)) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{S}(d(x)) \subsetneq \mathcal{F}$. Then there exists an $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F \notin \mathcal{S}(d(x))$. Hence $d(x) \not\subseteq F$. Since \mathcal{F} is a closed filter in (X, \mathcal{U}) , there exists a decreasing closed set A such that $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $A \subseteq F$. Hence $d(x) \not\subseteq A$ and $x \notin A$. Therefore $i(x) \subseteq X - A$ or $X - A \in \mathcal{S}(i(x))$. It follows that $X - A \in \mathcal{G}$. Hence $A \cap (X - A) = \emptyset$. It is a contradiction. Similarly in the case that $\mathcal{S}(i(x)) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}$, we have a contradiction. Therefore $(\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x)))$ is a maximal bi-filter.

In what follows, we assume that (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) is a convex ordered topological space with a semi-closed order. Let $\omega_0(X)$ be the collection of all maximal bi-filters $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ on X . For given closed decreased set A , and closed increasing set B in X , define

$$A^d = \{(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \in \omega_0(X) : A \in \mathcal{F}\},$$

$$B^i = \{(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \in \omega_0(X) : B \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

Then it is easy to see that $\{A^d : A \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}X\}$ forms a closed base for a topology, say $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}}$, on $\omega_0(X)$. Similarly, the family $\{B^i : B \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}X\}$ forms a closed base for a topology, say $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$, on $\omega_0(X)$. Let \mathcal{W} be the smallest topology containing $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$. Then every basic open set $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W})$ can be written in the form $\omega_0(X) - (A^d \cup B^i)$ for some $A \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}X$ and some $B \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}X$. We also note that $(A_1 \cap A_2)^d = A_1^d \cap A_2^d$ for A_1, A_2 in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}X$ and $(B_1 \cap B_2)^i = B_1^i \cap B_2^i$ for B_1, B_2 in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}X$. We define an order relation \leq on $\omega_0(X)$ as follows: $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1) \leq (\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{G}_2)$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{F}_2$ and $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_2$. Then obviously \leq is a partial order on $\omega_0(X)$. Hence $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}, \leq)$ is an ordered topological space.

REMARK 2. Let $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}, \leq)$ be the ordered topological space obtained in the above. Let $A \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}X$ and $B \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}X$. Then A^d is a closed decreasing set and B^i is a closed increasing set in $\omega_0(X)$. Moreover, $\omega_0(X)$ is a convex ordered topological space.

LEMMA 4. Let (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) be a convex ordered topological space with a semi-closed order. Then the map $\Phi: X \rightarrow \omega_0(X)$ defined by $\Phi(x) = (\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x)))$ for any $x \in X$ is a dense embedding into $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}, \leq)$.

Proof. First, we show that Φ is an order isomorphism into $\omega_0(X)$. To show that Φ is one to one, let $x \neq y$ in X . Then $x \not\leq y$ or $y \not\leq x$. If $x \not\leq y$ then $y \notin i(x)$ or $i(y) \not\subseteq i(x)$. It follows that $i(x) \notin \mathcal{S}(i(y))$ or $\mathcal{S}(i(x)) \not\subseteq \mathcal{S}(i(y))$. Hence $(\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x))) \neq (\mathcal{S}(d(y)), \mathcal{S}(i(y)))$. Similarly, if $y \not\leq x$ then $\Phi(x) \neq \Phi(y)$. Clearly, Φ is increasing. It is also immediate that if $\Phi(x) \leq \Phi(y)$, then $x \leq y$. Hence Φ is an order isomorphism into $\omega_0(X)$. Secondly, we show that Φ is a dense homeomorphism from X into $\Phi(X)$. We observe the following: For a given closed decreasing set A ,

$$\begin{aligned} A^d \cap \Phi(X) &= \{(\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x))) : A \in \mathcal{S}(d(x))\} \\ &= \{\Phi(x) : x \in A\} = \Phi(A). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for a given closed increasing set B , $B^i \cap \Phi(X) = \Phi(B)$. Since X is a convex ordered topological space, Φ is evidently a homeomorphism from X onto $\Phi(X)$.

To show that $\Phi(X)$ is a dense subset of $\omega_0(X)$, let $\omega_0(X) - (A^d \cup B^i)$ be a nonempty basic open set, where $A \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{W}} X$ and $B \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}} X$. Then there exists a maximal bi-filter $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ such that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \in \omega_0(X) - (A^d \cup B^i)$. It follows that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \notin A^d$ and $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \notin B^i$. Hence $A \notin \mathcal{F}$ and $B \notin \mathcal{G}$. By Lemma 2, $A \cup B \neq X$. Therefore $(X - A) \cap (X - B) \neq \emptyset$. Let $y \in (X - A) \cap (X - B)$. Then it is easy to show that $\Phi(y) \in \omega_0(X) - (A^d \cup B^i)$. Hence $\Phi(X) \cap (\omega_0(X)) - (A^d \cup B^i) \neq \emptyset$. Hence $\Phi(X)$ is a dense subset of $\omega_0(X)$. This completes the proof.

LEMMA 5. $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}, \leq)$ is a T_1 -compact ordered space.

Proof. First, we show that $\omega_0(X)$ is a T_1 -space. Suppose that $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1) = (\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{G}_2)$ in $\omega_0(X)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\mathcal{F}_1 \not\subseteq \mathcal{F}_2$. Then there exists an $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ such that $F_1 \notin \mathcal{F}_2$. Since \mathcal{F}_1 is a closed filter in (X, \mathcal{W}) , there exists a closed decreasing set A_1 such that $A_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $A_1 \subseteq F_1$. Hence $A_1 \notin \mathcal{F}_2$. It follows that $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1) \in A_1^d$ and $(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{G}_2) \notin A_1^d$. Therefore $\omega_0(X) - A_1^d$ is an open neighborhood of $(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{G}_2)$ in $\omega_0(X)$ such that $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1) \notin \omega_0(X) - A_1^d$. Since $\mathcal{F}_1 \not\subseteq \mathcal{F}_2$, we may consider the following two cases:

Case 1. $\mathcal{F}_2 \not\subseteq \mathcal{F}_1$: By the same method as before, there exists an open neighborhood of $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{G}_1)$, which does not contain $(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{G}_2)$.

Case 2. $\mathcal{F}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1$; then $\mathbb{G}_2 \not\subseteq \mathbb{G}_1$. Hence there exists a closed increasing set B_2 such that $B_2 \in \mathbb{G}_2$ and $B_2 \notin \mathbb{G}_1$. It follows that $(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{G}_2) \in B_2^i$ and $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1) \notin B_2^i$. Therefore, $\omega_0(X) - B_2^i$ is an open neighborhood of $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1)$ in $\omega_0(X)$, which does not contain $(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{G}_2)$. Hence $\omega_0(X)$ is a T_1 -space.

Now we show that $\omega_0(X)$ is a compact space. Let $\{A_\alpha^d, B_\beta^i: \alpha \in \Gamma, \beta \in \Delta\}$ be a family of subbasic closed sets having a finite intersection property. Since $A_\alpha^d \cap B_\beta^i \neq \emptyset$ implies $A_\alpha \cap B_\beta \neq \emptyset$, $\{A_\alpha, B_\beta: \alpha \in \Gamma, \beta \in \Delta\}$ has a finite intersection property. Let \mathcal{A} be the filter generated by $\{A_\alpha: \alpha \in \Gamma\}$ and \mathcal{B} be the filter generated by $\{B_\beta: \beta \in \Delta\}$. Then $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is obviously a bi-filter, and hence there exists a maximal bi-filter $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G})$ containing $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$. It follows that $A_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ and $B_\beta \in \mathbb{G}$ for all $\alpha \in \Gamma$ and all $\beta \in \Delta$. Therefore $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}) \in A_\alpha^d$ and $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}) \in B_\beta^i$. That is, $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}) \in A_\alpha^d \cap B_\beta^i$ for all α and all β . It follows that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}) \in \bigcap_{\alpha, \beta} (A_\alpha^d \cap B_\beta^i)$. Hence $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W})$ is compact.

By Lemmas 4 and 5, we have the following theorem:

THEOREM 1. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) be a convex ordered topological space with a semi-closed order. Then $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}, \leq)$ is a T_1 -compact ordered space in which X is densely embedded.*

REMARK 3. In the proof of Lemma 5, we see that $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}, \leq)$ is an ordered topological space which has either a lower semi-closed order or an upper semi-closed order. We note that a compact ordered space with a lower semi-closed order need not have a semi-closed order. For example, let Z^+ be the set of all natural numbers with the usual ordering and the cofinite topology. Then obviously Z^+ is compact and its order is lower semi-closed. But its order is not a semi-closed order because it is not upper semi-closed. In particular, this shows that a T_1 -compact ordered space need not have a semi-closed order. We also note that if the given order on X in Theorem 1 is discrete, then it reduces to the Wallman compactification of (X, \mathcal{F}) in the general topology.

Let (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) be an ordered topological space with a semi-closed order and (Y, \mathcal{F}', \leq') a compact ordered space with a closed order, and let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a continuous increasing map. Define \mathcal{F}^* to be the filter generated by a family $\{A \text{ is a closed decreasing set in } Y: f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{F}\}$, and \mathbb{G}^* to be the filter generated by a family $\{B \text{ is a closed increasing set in } Y: f^{-1}(B) \in \mathbb{G}\}$.

LEMMA 6. *Under the above assumption, $(\mathcal{F}^*, \mathbb{G}^*)$ is a bi-filter on Y and there exists a unique point y in Y such that $y \in \bigcap \{F \cap G: F \in \mathcal{F}^*, G \in \mathbb{G}^*\}$.*

Proof It is straightforward that $(\mathcal{F}^*, \mathbb{G}^*)$ is a bi-filter in Y . Since Y is compact, $\{F \cap G: F \in \mathcal{F}^*, G \in \mathbb{G}^*\}$ has a limit point y , that is,

$$\begin{aligned} y &\in \overline{\{F \cap G: F \in \mathcal{F}^*, G \in \mathbb{G}^*\}} \\ &\subseteq \cap \{A \cap B: A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{F}^*}, B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{G}^*}\} \\ &\subseteq \cap \{F \cap G: F \in \mathcal{F}^*, G \in \mathbb{G}^*\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{F}^*}$ is a filter base for \mathcal{F}^* consisting only of decreasing closed sets, and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{G}^*}$ is a filter base for \mathbb{G}^* consisting only of increased closed sets. Hence there exists a y in Y such that $y \in \cap \{F \cap G: F \in \mathcal{F}^*, G \in \mathbb{G}^*\}$. In order to show the uniqueness of y , suppose that there exist $x \neq y$ in Y such that x and y are elements of $\cap \{F \cap G: F \in \mathcal{F}^*, G \in \mathbb{G}^*\}$. Then we may assume that $x \not\leq y$. Hence $i(x) \cap d(y) = \emptyset$. Since Y is a compact ordered space with a closed order, there exists an open increasing neighborhood U of x and an open decreasing neighborhood V of y such that $U \cap V = \emptyset$. Hence $(Y - U) \cup (Y - V) = Y$, and hence $f^{-1}(Y - U) \cup f^{-1}(Y - V) = X$. Since f is a continuous increasing map, $f^{-1}(Y - U) \in \mathcal{F}$ or $f^{-1}(Y - V) \in \mathbb{G}$ by Lemma 2. By the definition of \mathcal{F}^* and \mathbb{G}^* , $(Y - U) \in \mathcal{F}^*$ or $(Y - V) \in \mathbb{G}^*$. If $(Y - U) \in \mathcal{F}^*$, then $x \in Y - U$, and hence $x \notin U$, which contradicts the fact that $x \in U$. Similarly, in the case that $(Y - V) \in \mathbb{G}^*$, we have a contradiction. Hence $x = y$.

THEOREM 2. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) be a convex ordered topological space with a semi-closed order, and (Y, \mathcal{F}', \leq') a compact ordered space with a closed order. For a continuous increasing map $f: X \rightarrow Y$, there exists a unique continuous increasing map \bar{f} from $\omega_0(X)$ into Y such that $\bar{f} \circ \Phi = f$, where Φ is the embedding: $X \rightarrow \omega_0(X)$.*

Proof. For given $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}) \in \omega_0(X)$, let \mathcal{F}^* and \mathbb{G}^* be the filters given as before. By Lemma 6, there exists a unique point $y \in \cap \{F \cap G: F \in \mathcal{F}^*, G \in \mathbb{G}^*\}$. We show that the map $\bar{f}: \omega_0(X) \rightarrow Y$ defined $\bar{f}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}) = y$ is the required map. Indeed, (1): $\bar{f} \circ \Phi = f$; let x be any point of X . It is easy to see that $[\mathcal{S}(d(x))]^* = \mathcal{S}(d(f(x)))$ and $[\mathcal{S}(i(y))]^* = \mathcal{S}(i(f(x)))$. Hence $([\mathcal{S}(d(x))]^*, [\mathcal{S}(i(x))]^*) = (\mathcal{S}(d(f(x))), \mathcal{S}(i(f(x))))$. It follows that $(\bar{f} \circ \Phi)(x) = \bar{f}((\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x)))) = f(x)$. (2): \bar{f} is a continuous map: Since $\omega_0(X)$ and Y are convex ordered spaces, it is sufficient to show that \bar{f} is continuous from $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}_u)$ into (Y, \mathcal{L}) . For a fixed point $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}) \in \omega_0(X)$, let U be an open decreasing neighborhood of $\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}))$ in Y . Then $Y - U$ is a closed increasing set, which does not contain $\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}))$.

Thus $d(\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}))) \cap (Y - U) = \emptyset$. Let W be an open decreasing set and V an open increasing set such that $d(\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}))) \subseteq W$, $Y - U \subseteq V$ and $W \cap V = \emptyset$. Then $(Y - W) \cup (Y - V) = Y$. Therefore $f^{-1}(Y - W) \cup f^{-1}(Y - V) = X$. Furthermore, $[f^{-1}(Y - W)]^i \cup [f^{-1}(Y - V)]^i = \omega_0(X)$. Since $\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G})) \notin Y - W$, $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}) \notin [f^{-1}(Y - W)]^i$. Hence $\omega_0(X) - [f^{-1}(Y - W)]^i$ is an open decreasing neighborhood of $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G})$ in $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}_u)$. And clearly, $\bar{f}(\omega_0(X) - [f^{-1}(Y - W)]^i) \subseteq U$. Therefore \bar{f} is continuous from $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}_u)$ into (Y, \mathcal{L}) . Dually, \bar{f} is continuous from $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}_u)$ into (Y, \mathcal{U}) . Finally, (3): \bar{f} is an increasing map: Suppose that $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1) \leq (\mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{G}_2)$ and $\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1)) \not\leq \bar{f}((\mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{G}_2))$. Since Y is a compact ordered space with a closed order, there exists an open increasing neighborhood U of $\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1))$ and an open decreasing neighborhood V of $\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{G}_2))$ such that $U \cap V = \emptyset$. Thus $\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1)) \notin V$. Since \bar{f} is continuous from $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}_u)$ into (Y, \mathcal{L}) , there exists a closed increasing set A in X such that $\omega_0(X) - A^i$ is an open decreasing set containing $(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{G}_2)$ and $\bar{f}(\omega_0(X) - A^i) \subseteq V$. Since $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1) \leq (\mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{G}_2)$, $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1) \in \omega_0(X) - A^i$. It follows that $\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1)) \in V$, which contradicts the fact that $\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1)) \notin V$. Therefore $\bar{f}((\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{G}_1)) \leq \bar{f}((\mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{G}_2))$. In particular, the uniqueness of \bar{f} is straightforward (see [7], page 97, Theorems 14, 19).

THEOREM 3. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) be a compact convex ordered space with a semi-closed order. Then (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) is isomorphic with $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}, \leq)$.*

Proof. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G})$ be a maximal bi-filter on X . Then $\{F \cap G: F \in \mathcal{F}, G \in \mathbb{G}\}$ has a limit point, say x , in X . It follows that $\{x\} \subseteq \cap \{A \cap B: A \in \mathcal{B}_\mathcal{F}, B \in \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{G}\}$, where $\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{G}$ are closed bases of \mathcal{F} in (X, \mathcal{U}) and \mathbb{G} in (X, \mathcal{L}) respectively. Since X has a semi-closed order, we have $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}) \subseteq (\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x)))$. By the maximality of $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G})$, $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}) = (\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x)))$. Hence $\Phi(X) = \omega_0(X)$, that is, (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) is isomorphic with $(\omega_0(X), \mathcal{W}, \leq)$.

We recall that an ordered topological space (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) is *normally ordered* if, for every two disjoint subsets A, B of X , where A is a decreasing closed set and B is an increasing closed set, there exist two disjoint open sets U and V such that U contains A and is decreasing, and V contains B and is increasing [5].

THEOREM 4. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}, \leq) be a convex ordered topological space with a semi-closed order. If $\omega_0(X)$ has a closed order, then X is a normally ordered space.*

Proof. Clearly, $\omega_0(X)$ is a normally ordered space. Let A and B be two disjoint subsets of X , where A is a decreasing closed set and B is an increasing closed set. Thus $A^d \cap B^i = \emptyset$. Since $\omega_0(X)$ is normally ordered, there exists an open decreasing set W and an open increasing set W' in $\omega_0(X)$ such that $A^d \subseteq W$, $B^i \subseteq W'$ and $W \cap W' = \emptyset$. Further, W and W' could be written in the form: $W = \bigcup_j (\omega_0(X) - B_j^i)$ and $W' = \bigcup_j (\omega_0(X) - A_j^d)$, where B_j in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{Q}}X$ and A_j in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{Q}}X$. Since A^d and B^i are compact, $A^d \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^n (\omega_0(X) - B_j^i) = \omega_0(X) - \bigcap_{j=1}^n B_j^i = \omega_0(X) - (\bigcap_{j=1}^n B_j)^i$. Similarly, $B^i \subseteq \omega_0(X) - (\bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j)^d$. Let $U = X - (\bigcap_{j=1}^n B_j)$ and $V = X - (\bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j)$. Then U is an open decreasing set and V is an open increasing set. Let $x \in A$. Then $d(x) \subseteq A$, and hence $(\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x))) \in A^d$. Since $A^d \subseteq \omega_0(X) - (\bigcap_{j=1}^n B_j)^i$, $(\mathcal{S}(d(x)), \mathcal{S}(i(x))) \notin (\bigcap_{j=1}^n B_j)^i$. It follows that $\bigcap_{j=1}^n B_j \notin \mathcal{S}(i(x))$. Hence $i(x) \not\subseteq \bigcap_{j=1}^n B_j$. Therefore $x \in X - \bigcap_{j=1}^n B_j$. Hence $A \subseteq U$. Similarly, $B \subseteq V$. Since $[\omega_0(X) - (\bigcap_{j=1}^n B_j)^i] \cap [\omega_0(X) - (\bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j)^d] = \emptyset$, we have $U \cap V = \emptyset$. Hence X is a normally ordered space.

REMARK 4. If the given order on X is discrete, then the previous results reduce the corresponding results in the general topology. However, we do not know whether the converse of Theorem 4 is true. We finally note that, in [2], a compact ordered space $\beta_0 X$ with a closed order for a completely regular ordered space X is constructed. It immediately follows that given the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \omega_0(X) \\ \beta_0 \downarrow & \nearrow \bar{\beta}_0 & \\ \beta_0 X & & \end{array}$$

there exists a continuous increasing map $\bar{\beta}_0$ from $\omega_0(X)$ onto $\beta_0(X)$ such that $\bar{\beta}_0 \circ \Phi = \beta_0$. Furthermore, if $\omega_0(X)$ has a closed order, $\beta_0 X$ and $\omega_0(X)$ are isomorphic under $\bar{\beta}_0$ such that the above diagram commutes.

REFERENCES

1. M. J. Canfell, *Semi-algebras and rings of continuous functions*, Ph. D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, (1968).
2. T. H. Choe and Y. H. Hong, *Extensions of completely regular ordered spaces*, Pacific J. Math., **64** (1976).
3. J. L. Kelly, *General Topology*, Van Nostrand, New York, 1955.
4. S. D. McCartan, *Separation axioms for topological ordered spaces*, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc., **64** (1968), 965-973.
5. L. Nachbin, *Topology and Order*, Van Nostrand Mathematical studies 4, Princeton, N. J., 1965.

6. H. A. Priestly, *Ordered topological spaces and the representation of distributive lattices*, Proc. London Math. Soc., (3) **24** (1972), 507-530.
7. W. J. Thron, *Topological Structures*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1966.
8. H. Wallman, *Lattices and topological spaces*, Ann. Math., **39** (1938), 112-116.
9. L. E. Ward, *Partially ordered topological spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **5** (1954), 144-161.

Received December 6, 1976 and in revised form October 30, 1978.

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONTARIO, CANADA

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

DONALD BABBITT (Managing Editor)

University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

HUGO ROSSI

University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

C. C. MOORE and ANDREW OGG

University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

J. DUGUNDJI

Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90007

R. FINN and J. MILGRAM

Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

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

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of the manuscript. However, you may use them in the displayed equations. 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. Please propose a heading for the odd numbered pages of less than 35 characters. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. **39**. Supply name and address of author to whom proofs should be sent. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints to each author are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$84.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$42.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for numbers issued in the last three calendar years, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924, U.S.A. Older back numbers obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

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

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.).

8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Copyright © 1979 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Manufactured and first issued in Japan

Krishnaswami Alladi and Paul Erdős, <i>On the asymptotic behavior of large prime factors of integers</i>	295
Alfred David Andrew, <i>A remark on generalized Haar systems in L_p, $1 < p < \infty$</i>	317
John M. Baker, <i>A note on compact operators which attain their norm</i>	319
Jonathan Borwein, <i>Weak local supportability and applications to approximation</i>	323
Tae Ho Choe and Young Soo Park, <i>Wallman's type order compactification</i>	339
Susanne Dierolf and Ulrich Schwanengel, <i>Examples of locally compact noncompact minimal topological groups</i>	349
Michael Freedman, <i>A converse to (Milnor-Kervaire theorem) $\times R$ etc.</i> ..	357
George Golightly, <i>Graph-dense linear transformations</i>	371
H. Groemer, <i>Space coverings by translates of convex sets</i>	379
Rolf Wim Henrichs, <i>Weak Frobenius reciprocity and compactness conditions in topological groups</i>	387
Horst Herrlich and George Edison Strecker, <i>Semi-universal maps and universal initial completions</i>	407
Sigmund Nyrop Hudson, <i>On the topology and geometry of arcwise connected, finite-dimensional groups</i>	429
K. John and Václav E. Zizler, <i>On extension of rotund norms. II</i>	451
Russell Allan Johnson, <i>Existence of a strong lifting commuting with a compact group of transformations. II</i>	457
Bjarni Jónsson and Ivan Rival, <i>Lattice varieties covering the smallest nonmodular variety</i>	463
Grigori Abramovich Kolesnik, <i>On the order of Dirichlet L-functions</i>	479
Robert Allen Liebler and Jay Edward Yellen, <i>In search of nonsolvable groups of central type</i>	485
Wilfrido Martínez T. and Adalberto Garcia-Maynez Cervantes, <i>Unicoherent plane Peano sets are σ-unicoherent</i>	493
M. A. McKiernan, <i>General Pexider equations. I. Existence of injective solutions</i>	499
M. A. McKiernan, <i>General Pexider equations. II. An application of the theory of webs</i>	503
Jan K. Pachl, <i>Measures as functionals on uniformly continuous functions</i>	515
Lee Albert Rubel, <i>Convolution cut-down in some radical convolution algebras</i>	523
Peter John Slater and William Yslas Vélez, <i>Permutations of the positive integers with restrictions on the sequence of differences. II</i>	527
Raymond Earl Smithson, <i>A common fixed point theorem for nested spaces</i>	533
Indulata Sukla, <i>Generalization of a theorem of McFadden</i>	539
Jun-ichi Tanaka, <i>A certain class of total variation measures of analytic measures</i>	547
Kalathoor Varadarajan, <i>Modules with supplements</i>	559
Robert Francis Wheeler, <i>Topological measure theory for completely regular spaces and their projective covers</i>	565