

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

SEPARATION AXIOMS AND METRIC-LIKE FUNCTIONS

HOWARD ANTON AND WILLIAM J. PERVIN

SEPARATION AXIOMS AND METRIC-LIKE FUNCTIONS

HOWARD ANTON and WILLIAM J. PERVIN

Boltjanskii has constructed classes of semifield quasi-pseudo-metrics which are adequate to metrize topological spaces with various separation properties. In this paper we show that his condition given as adequate for T_0 spaces actually is satisfied by every semifield metric inducing the topology. On the other hand, we show that the condition he introduced for T_1 and T_2 spaces is never satisfied by a certain natural semifield quasi-pseudo-metric related to the usual (or Pervin) quasiuniformity. In this paper we completely characterize the classes of semifield quasi-pseudo-metrics which are not only adequate to metrize T_1 and T_2 spaces but actually contain all such metrics inducing such topologies. Characterizations of R_0 and R_1 inducing metrics will also be obtained. Applications to quasi-uniform and quasi-gauge spaces will be made.

1. **Background.** Topological semifields were first introduced by Antonovskii, Boltjanskii, and Sarymsakov in [1, 2, 3]. The reader is referred to these works and to [4] for details; however, for completeness, we will summarize here some of the essential results.

Let \mathcal{A} be an arbitrary nonempty set. The ring $R^{\mathcal{A}}$ of all real-valued functions on \mathcal{A} is called a (Tikhonov) semifield if it is given the Tikhonov topology and coordinatewise partial ordering. A semifield quasi-pseudo-metric on an arbitrary set X (over the semifield $R^{\mathcal{A}}$) is a mapping

$$d: X \times X \longrightarrow R^{\mathcal{A}}$$

which satisfies the axioms:

- M1. $d(x, x) = 0$ for any $x \in X$;
- M2. $d(x, y) \geq 0$ for any $x, y \in X$;
- M3. $d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, z)$ for any $x, y, z \in X$.

If $x \in X$ and U is an arbitrary neighborhood of zero in the semifield $R^{\mathcal{A}}$ then the family of all sets of the form

$$\{y \in X: d(x, y) \in U\}$$

is a basis for a topology induced on X . Since $R^{\mathcal{A}}$ is given the Tikhonov topology, a subbasic neighborhood U of zero is of the form $\pi_q^{-1}((-\varepsilon, \varepsilon))$ where π_q is the q th projection for some $q \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ so that the family of all sets of the form

$$(*) \quad \Omega(x, \varepsilon, q) = \{y \in X: d(x, y)(q) < \varepsilon\}$$

is a subbasis for the topology on X .

For each semifield quasi-pseudo-metric $d: X \times X \rightarrow R^d$ there is a semifield quasi-pseudo-metric $d^+: X \times X \rightarrow R^{d^+}$ where Δ^+ is the class of all nonempty finite subsets of Δ and d^+ is defined by

$$d^+(x, y)(q^+) = \max \{d(x, y)(q): q \in q^+\}$$

where $q^+ \in \Delta^+$. It is easy to see ([3]) that d^+ , called the directed metric associated with d , induces the same topology and quasi-uniformity as d , and the family of all sets of the form

$$(**) \quad \Omega(x, \varepsilon, q^+) = \{y \in X: d^+(x, y)(q^+) < \varepsilon\}$$

with $\varepsilon > 0$ and $q^+ \in \Delta^+$ is a base for the topology.

Let X be any topological space and set $\Delta = \{G: G \text{ is open}\}$. We define a semifield quasi-pseudo-metric d by setting $d(x, y)(G) = 1$ if $x \in G$ but $y \notin G$, and $d(x, y)(G) = 0$ otherwise. We note that $\{(x, y): d(x, y)(G) < \varepsilon\} = S_G$ (in the terminology of [10]) when $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and so this induces the Pervin quasiuniformity for the topology. We will call this semifield quasi-pseudo-metric the Pervin or usual metric.

2. A limitation of Boltjanskii's results; an example. The only aspect of the metrization problem addressed by Boltjanskii in [5] is finding "adequate" conditions with respect to various separation properties. By this is meant finding a condition such that every metric satisfying the condition induces a topology with the property and, as a weak converse, at least one such metric exists. He specifically does not treat the problem of finding conditions on a metric so that, in addition, every metric inducing the topology satisfies the condition.

As an example of this type of result, let us consider the sixth condition of Boltjanskii. To allow for a more consistent treatment with other cases, we shall relabel it B^* .

$$B^*. \quad d_{\wedge}(x, y) = d(x, y) \wedge d(y, x) = 0 \quad \text{only for } x = y.$$

(Since the partial ordering is done coordinatewise, the infimum indicated is taken coordinatewise; i.e., we use the equality $(a \wedge b)(q) = \min \{a(q), b(q)\}$ for each $q \in \Delta$.)

This condition is used in his results concerning both T -1 and T -2 spaces. In particular, he proves that B^* is an "adequate" condition for the T -1 separation property. That this condition is

not useful as a complete characterization of semifield metrics inducing T -1 spaces is clear from the following remarks.

Suppose we want a semifield quasi-pseudo-metric to satisfy condition B^* . This is equivalent to the requirement that if $x \neq y$ then $d(x, y) \wedge d(y, x) \neq 0$. The conclusion is equivalent to the existence of a $q \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\min\{d(x, y)(q), d(y, x)(q)\} \neq 0$ and so $d(x, y)(q) \neq 0$ and $d(y, x)(q) \neq 0$. In terms of the above usual metric, there must exist an open set G such that $x \in G$, $y \notin G$ and $y \in G$, $x \notin G$ which is an obvious contradiction. Thus the usual metric for any space can never satisfy B^* .

Since every topological space is semifield quasi-pseudo-metrizable by the usual metric, a new condition is required if we are to obtain the more complete characterization desired.

3. Characterizations of semifield metrics inducing T -0 and T -1 topologies. We will now consider the fifth condition of Boltjanskii; which, for consistency, we relabel B_0 .

B_0 . $d(x, y) \vee d(y, x) = 0$ only for $x = y$.

Boltjanskii has shown that condition B_0 is "adequate" for the T -0 separation property. However, the following stronger result holds:

THEOREM 0. *Let a topology on X be induced by the semifield quasi-pseudo-metric d , then X is T -0 iff d satisfies B_0 .*

Proof. Suppose $x \neq y$. The condition that X be T -0 is equivalent to the requirement that there exists some open set G such that G contains x but not y , or G contains y but not x . This is equivalent to the requirement that there exists a subbasic open set with the same property. In terms of the subbasis (*), this is equivalent to the existence of some $q \in \mathcal{A}$ and an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $y \notin \Omega(x, \varepsilon, q)$ or $x \notin \Omega(y, \varepsilon, q)$. By the definition of these subbasic neighborhoods, we have, equivalently, $d(x, y)(q) \geq \varepsilon$ or $d(y, x)(q) \geq \varepsilon$; i.e., $\max\{d(x, y)(q), d(y, x)(q)\} \geq \varepsilon$. This is equivalent to the requirement that $d(x, y) \vee d(y, x) \neq 0$ and so condition B_0 .

Let us consider the fourth condition of Boltjanskii which he used in his discussion of complete regularity. For consistency, we will relabel it B_1 .

B_1 . $d(x, y) = 0$ only for $x = y$.

Although Boltjanskii does not use this condition in his results concerning T -1 spaces, we have the following:

THEOREM 1. *Let a topology on X be induced by the semifield quasi-pseudo-metric d , then X is T -1 iff d satisfies B1.*

Proof. Similar to the above.

4. A new Hausdorff characterization. Let X be a topological space whose topology is induced by the semifield quasi-pseudo-metric $d: X \times X \rightarrow R^d$. In terms of the directed metric d^+ associated with d let us define a mapping $d^*: X \times X \rightarrow R^{d^+}$ by setting

$$d^*(x, y) = \inf \{d^+(x, z) + d^+(y, z) : z \in X\}.$$

As was the case with the function d_\wedge used by Boltjanskii in his condition B^* , the function d^* is not a metric. We can now formulate our new condition:

B2. $d^*(x, y) = 0$ only for $x = y$.

We may now prove the following:

THEOREM 2. *Let a topology on X be induced by the semifield quasi-pseudo-metric d , then X is T -2 iff d satisfies B2.*

Proof. (B2 \Rightarrow T -2) Let d satisfy B2 and suppose $x \neq y$. By B2, $d^*(x, y) \neq 0$ and so there exists some $q \in \mathcal{A}^+$ such that $d^*(x, y)(q) \neq 0$. Hence, for that q , we must have $\inf \{d^+(x, z)(q) + d^+(y, z)(q) : z \in X\} \neq 0$. Thus, for that q and some $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $d^+(x, z)(q) + d^+(y, z)(q) \geq 2\varepsilon$ for every $z \in X$. Equivalently, there exists a $q \in \mathcal{A}^+$ and an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $z \in X$ either $d^+(x, z)(q) \geq \varepsilon$ or $d^+(y, z)(q) \geq \varepsilon$. In terms of the base (**) for the topology, the sets $\Omega(x, \varepsilon, q)$ and $\Omega(y, \varepsilon, q)$ are open and contain x and y respectively. The condition we have found states that every z fails to belong to one or the other of the sets. Thus they are disjoint, and X is T -2.

(T -2 \Rightarrow B2) Let X be T -2 and again suppose $x \neq y$. There must exist disjoint open sets $\Omega(x, \varepsilon_1, q_1)$ and $\Omega(y, \varepsilon_2, q_2)$ from the basis (**) containing these points. Disjointness implies that for any $z \in X$ either $d^+(x, z)(q_1) \geq \varepsilon_1$ or $d^+(y, z)(q_2) \geq \varepsilon_2$. Choosing $\varepsilon = 2 \min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$ and $q = q_1 \cup q_2 \in \mathcal{A}^+$, we easily see that $d^+(x, z)(q) + d^+(y, z)(q) \geq \varepsilon$ for every $z \in X$. Thus $d^*(x, y)(q) = \inf \{d^+(x, z)(q) + d^+(y, z)(q) : z \in X\} \neq 0$, and $d^*(x, y) \neq 0$ as desired.

We note that the above proof shows that $d^*(x, y) = 0$ iff the

points x and y have no disjoint neighborhoods.

5. **Characterizations of $R-0$ and $R-1$ inducing metrics.** Although Boltjanskii did not consider the properties $R-0$ and $R-1$ introduced by Davis in [6], we can obtain complete characterizations of these separation axioms in terms of any inducing semifield quasi-pseudo-metric. We recall that a topological space is $R-0$ iff x belonging to an open set implies that \bar{x} is contained in the open set. The $R-1$ axiom requires that two points with distinct closures be contained in disjoint open sets.

In order to express our results consistently with our previous theorems, we shall introduce the following condition.

D0. $d(x, y) = 0$ only for $d(y, x) = 0$.

We may now state the following characterization.

THEOREM 3. *Let a topology on X be induced by the semifield quasi-pseudo-metric d , then X is $R-0$ iff d satisfies D0.*

Proof. ($R-0 \Rightarrow D0$) Let X be $R-0$ and suppose x and y are such that $d(y, x) \neq 0$. Then there exists some $q \in \Delta$ and some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $d(y, x)(q) = \varepsilon > 0$ and we have $x \notin \Omega(y, \varepsilon, q)$. The complement of the sphere $\Omega(y, \varepsilon, q)$ is closed and does not contain y . By $R-0$ there must exist an open set G such that G contains that complement but does not contain y . But then $x \in G$ and so $x \in \Omega(x, \varepsilon', q') \subseteq G$ for some $q' \in \Delta^+$ and $\varepsilon' > 0$. Since $y \notin G$, $y \notin \Omega(x, \varepsilon', q')$; i.e., $d^+(x, y)(q') \geq \varepsilon'$ and so $d(x, y) \neq 0$. Thus d satisfies D0.

($D0 = R-0$) Let x belong to an open set G . Then $x \in \Omega(x, \varepsilon, q) \subseteq G$ for some $q \in \Delta^+$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. If $y \notin \Omega(x, \varepsilon, q)$, $d^+(x, y)(q) \geq \varepsilon > 0$. By D0, $d(y, x) \neq 0$ so $d(y, x)(q') \geq \varepsilon'$ or $x \notin \Omega(y, \varepsilon', q')$ for some $q' \in \Delta$ and $\varepsilon' > 0$. Thus y is not in the closure of x . It follows that the closure of x is contained in $\Omega(x, \varepsilon, q) \subseteq G$ as desired.

We see immediately that such implications as $T-1 = T-0 + R-0$ follow from this result. For our treatment of the $R-1$ property we shall introduce the following condition.

D1. $d^*(x, y) = 0$ only for $d(x, y) = 0$.

Before proving the next characterization we note that the closure of a point x is exactly $\{z: d(z, x) = 0\}$.

THEOREM 4. *Let a topology on X be induced by the semifield*

quasi-pseudo-metric d , then X is R -1 iff d satisfies D1.

Proof. (R -1 \Rightarrow D1) Let $d(x, y) \neq 0$ for some $x, y \in X$. As noted above, $x \notin \bar{y}$. Since $x \in \bar{x}$, we have $\bar{x} \neq \bar{y}$. By R -1, x and y have disjoint neighborhoods which, by the remark following Theorem 2, implies that $d^*(x, y) \neq 0$.

(D1 $=$ R -1) Suppose x and y have no disjoint neighborhoods. Again, this implies that $d^*(x, y) = 0$. By D1, we have $d(x, y) = 0$. From the symmetry of d^* it follows that $d(y, x) = 0$. By the above remark, both $x \in \bar{y}$ and $y \in \bar{x}$. It follows that $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ as desired.

We see immediately that such implications as T -2 $=$ T -1 + R -1 and R -1 implies R -0 follow immediately.

6. Application to quasi-uniform spaces. Since every quasi-uniform space is semifield quasi-pseudometrizable (the usual or Pervin semifield quasi-pseudo-metric induces the quasi-uniformity), we can now apply our results from the previous sections to the case of quasi-uniform spaces. For quasi-uniform T -0 spaces, Murdeshwar and Nainpally [9, p. 35] have given two characterizations, one in terms of the quasiuniformity \mathcal{O} and the other in terms of an inducing (real) quasi-pseudo-metric d .

(i) (X, \mathcal{O}) is T -0 iff $\cap \{U: U \in \mathcal{O}\}$ is anti-symmetric.

(ii) (X, d) is T -0 iff $d(x, y) + d(y, x) = 0$ only for $x = y$.

It is clear that our Theorem 0 yields the second of these results immediately. In the case of T -1 spaces, again there are two characterizations [9, p. 36]:

(i) (X, \mathcal{O}) is T -1 iff $\cap \{U: U \in \mathcal{O}\} = \mathfrak{S}_x$ (the diagonal).

(ii) (X, d) is T -1 iff $d(x, y) = 0$ only for $x = y$.

Again it is clear that our Theorem 1 yields the second result in this case. For T -2 spaces, however, Murdeshwar and Nainpally [9, p. 36] give only the single condition:

(i) (X, \mathcal{O}) is T -2 iff $\cap \{U^{-1} \circ U: U \in \mathcal{O}\} = \mathfrak{S}_x$.

Using our Theorem 2 we can now give a condition for T -2 in terms of an inducing (real) quasi-pseudo-metric d . For a real quasi-pseudo-metric, $d^+ = d$ and so condition B2 reduces to

$$\inf \{d(x, z) + d(y, z): z \in X\} = 0 \quad \text{only for } x = y,$$

and we obtain the result

(ii) (X, d) is T -2 iff $\inf \{d(x, z) + d(y, z): z \in X\} = 0$ only for $x = y$,

or, equivalently.

(iii) (X, d) is T -2 iff $d^*(x, y) = 0$ only for $x = y$.

In the case of R -0 spaces, again there are two characterizations [9, p. 38]:

- (i) (X, \mathcal{O}) is R -0 iff $\cap \{U: U \in \mathcal{O}\}$ is symmetric.
- (ii) (X, d) is R -0 iff $d(x, y) = 0$ iff $d(y, x) = 0$.

It is clear that our Theorem 3 yields the second result in this case. For R -1 spaces, however, Murdeshwar and Naimpally [9, p. 40] give only the single condition:

- (i) (X, \mathcal{O}) is R -1 iff $\cap \{U^{-1} \circ U: U \in \mathcal{O}\} = \{(x, y): \bar{x} = \bar{y}\}$.

Using our Theorem 4 we can now give a condition for R -1 in terms of an inducing (real) quasi-pseudo-metric d as follows:

- (ii) (X, d) is R -1 iff $d^*(x, y) = 0$ only for $d(x, y) = 0$.

This extends the earlier results also given in [8].

7. Application to quasi-gauge spaces. In his thesis [11] (see also [12, 13]), Reilly has generalized many results concerning gauge spaces (see [7]). Reilly defines a quasi-gauge space to be a set with a family \mathcal{S} of (real) quasi-pseudo-metrics inducing a topology by taking as a subbase the family of all spheres $S(x, \varepsilon, p) = \{y: p(x, y) < \varepsilon\}$, where $p \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Clearly, the notion of a semifield-valued quasi-pseudo-metric is equivalent to this and may allow a more convenient notation and terminology.

Reilly calls a quasi-gauge \mathcal{S} on a set X augmented if for any two elements p^1 and p^2 of \mathcal{S} there exists an element p^3 in \mathcal{S} such that

$$p^3(x, y) \geq \max \{p^1(x, y), p^2(x, y)\}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Further, the augmented quasi-gauge \mathcal{S}^+ determined by \mathcal{S} is the family of all quasi-pseudo-metrics of the form $\max \{p^1, \dots, p^n\}$, where $\{p^1, \dots, p^n\}$ is a finite subset of \mathcal{S} . He shows that the family of all spheres using \mathcal{S}^+ determines a base rather than just a subbase for the topology for X .

It is clear that the augmented quasi-gauges are just the directed semifield metrics we have used above. Other results given by Reilly are easy to state in terms of semifield metrics. The fact that every topological space is a quasi-gauge space is equivalent to the result that every topological space is semifield metrizable; indeed, the usual metric introduced above is based on Reilly's usual quasi-gauge.

From the identification between quasi-gauges and semifield metrics, it follows that the separation axioms T -0, T -1, T -2, R -0, and R -1 could be characterized in quasi-gauge spaces by the corres-

ponding translated versions of properties B0, B1, B2, D0, and D1. We will not carry out the details of this translation.

REFERENCES

1. M. Ja. Antonovskii, V. G. Boltjanskii, T.A. Sarymsakov, *Topological Semifields*, Tashkent, 1960.
2. ———, *Metric Spaces Over Semifields*, Tashkent, 1961.
3. ———, *Topological Boolean Algebras*, Tashkent, 1963.
4. ———, *An outline of the theory of topological semifields*, Russian Math. Surveys, **21** (1966), 163–192.
5. V.G. Boltjanskii, *Separability Axioms and a Metric*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **197** (1971) = Soviet Math. Dokl., **12** (1971), 639–643.
6. A. S. Davis, *Indexed systems of neighborhoods for topological spaces*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **68** (1961), 886–893.
7. J. Dugundji, *Topology*, Allyn & Bacon, Boston, 1967.
8. M. G. Murdeshwar, S. A. Naimpally, *Trennungsaxioms in quasi-uniform spaces*, Nieuw Archief voor Wiskunde, (3) **14** (1964), 97–101.
9. M. G. Murdeshwar, S. A. Naimpally, *Quasi-uniform Topological Spaces*, Noordhoff, Groningen, 1966.
10. W. J. Pervin, *Quasi-uniformization of topological spaces*, Math. Annalen, **147** (1962), 316–317.
11. I. L. Reilly, *Quasi-gauges, quasi-uniformities, and bitopological spaces*, Thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1970.
12. ———, *On generating quasi uniformities*, Math. Ann., **189** (1970), 317–318.
13. ———, *Quasi-gauge spaces*, J. London Math. Soc., (2) **6** (1973), 481–487.

Received February 18, 1976.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AND
DREXEL UNIVERSITY

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

J. DUGUNDJI
Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. A. BEAUMONT
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

D. GILBARG AND J. MILGRAM
Stanford University
Stanford, California 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
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
OSAKA UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
* * *
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

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 your manuscript. You may however, 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. Items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. 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**. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics expects the author's institution to pay page charges, and reserves the right to delay publication for nonpayment of charges in case of financial emergency.

100 reprints 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: \$72.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$36.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

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 © 1975 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Manufactured and first issued in Japan

Andrew Adler, <i>Weak homomorphisms and invariants: an example</i>	293
Howard Anton and William J. Pervin, <i>Separation axioms and metric-like functions</i>	299
Ron C. Blei, <i>Sidon partitions and p-Sidon sets</i>	307
T. J. Cheatham and J. R. Smith, <i>Regular and semisimple modules</i>	315
Charles Edward Cleaver, <i>Packing spheres in Orlicz spaces</i>	325
Le Baron O. Ferguson and Michael D. Rusk, <i>Korovkin sets for an operator on a space of continuous functions</i>	337
Rudolf Fritsch, <i>An approximation theorem for maps into Kan fibrations</i>	347
David Sexton Gilliam, <i>Geometry and the Radon-Nikodym theorem in strict Mackey convergence spaces</i>	353
William Hery, <i>Maximal ideals in algebras of topological algebra valued functions</i>	365
Alan Hopenwasser, <i>The radical of a reflexive operator algebra</i>	375
Bruno Kramm, <i>A characterization of Riemann algebras</i>	393
Peter K. F. Kuhfittig, <i>Fixed points of locally contractive and nonexpansive set-valued mappings</i>	399
Stephen Allan McGrath, <i>On almost everywhere convergence of Abel means of contraction semigroups</i>	405
Edward Peter Merkes and Marion Wetzel, <i>A geometric characterization of indeterminate moment sequences</i>	409
John C. Morgan, II, <i>The absolute Baire property</i>	421
Eli Aaron Passow and John A. Roulier, <i>Negative theorems on generalized convex approximation</i>	437
Louis Jackson Ratliff, Jr., <i>A theorem on prime divisors of zero and characterizations of unmixed local domains</i>	449
Ellen Elizabeth Reed, <i>A class of T_1-compactifications</i>	471
Maxwell Alexander Rosenlicht, <i>On Liouville's theory of elementary functions</i>	485
Arthur Argyle Sagle, <i>Power-associative algebras and Riemannian connections</i>	493
Chester Cornelius Seabury, <i>On extending regular holomorphic maps from Stein manifolds</i>	499
Elias Sai Wan Shiu, <i>Commutators and numerical ranges of powers of operators</i>	517
Donald Mark Topkis, <i>The structure of sublattices of the product of n lattices</i>	525
John Bason Wagoner, <i>Delooping the continuous K-theory of a valuation ring</i>	533
Ronson Joseph Warne, <i>Standard regular semigroups</i>	539
Anthony William Wickstead, <i>The centraliser of $E \otimes_{\lambda} F$</i>	563
R. Grant Woods, <i>Characterizations of some C^*-embedded subspaces of $\beta\mathbb{N}$</i>	573