

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

## **COMPLEMENTATION IN THE LATTICE OF CONVERGENCE STRUCTURES**

CAROLL VERNON RIECKE

## COMPLEMENTATION IN THE LATTICE OF CONVERGENCE STRUCTURES

C. V. RIECKE

**This paper classifies the various complements in the lattice of convergence structures and considers some of the properties shared by given structures and their relative complements or differences.**

1. **Introduction.** The lattice of all convergence structures on a nonempty set has been investigated by several authors with some consideration given to the smaller lattices of pseudotopologies and pretopologies. The purpose here will be to show the lattice of convergence structures is a Stone lattice and has pseudo-differences, completely characterize relative pseudo-complements and pseudo-differences, establish that some types of convergence structures retain their classification after finding relative complements or differences and exhibit certain standard lattice operators as homomorphisms.

Lattice definitions follow those of Rasiowa and Sikorski [11], Birkhoff [2], and Szasz [15]. An element  $x$  of a lattice  $L$  is *compact* if whenever  $x \leq \bigvee \{y_j \mid j \in J\}$  implies that  $x \leq \bigvee \{y_j \mid j \in K\}$  for some finite subset  $K$  of  $J$ . The lattice  $L$  is *compactly generated* if each element of  $L$  is the join of compact elements. *Cocompact* elements and *cocompactly generated* lattices are defined dually. An element  $z$  in  $L$  is the *pseudo-complement* of  $x$  relative to  $y$  ( $x*y$ ) if  $z$  is the greatest element such that  $x \wedge z \leq y$ . If  $L$  has a least element  $0$ , the *pseudo-complement*  $-x$  of  $x$  is the greatest element for which  $x \wedge (-x) = 0$ . A *Brouwerian lattice* is one in which the relative pseudo-complement of any two members always exists; a Brouwerian lattice with a least element is *pseudo-Boolean* and a pseudo-Boolean lattice is a *Stone lattice* if there exists a greatest element  $1$  and  $(-x) \vee (- -x) = 1$  for every  $x$  in  $L$ . An element  $z$  is the *pseudo-difference* of  $y$  and  $x$  ( $y - x$ ) if  $z$  is the least element such that  $y \leq x \vee z$ .

Definitions on convergence structures used herein can be found in [1], [7] or [9].  $C(X)$  will denote the family of all convergence structures on a nondegenerate set  $X$ ,  $F(X)$  the lattice of filters on  $X$  and  $U(X)$  the set of ultrafilters. In this paper the power set or improper filter is considered a member of  $F(X)$ . This makes  $F(X)$  a complete lattice and facilitates the description of pseudo-differences in terms of the filter quotients of Ward [16].

For a point  $x$ ,  $\dot{x}$  will be the principal filter on  $X$  generated by  $\{x\}$  while in  $F(X)$   $[\mathcal{F}]$  signifies the principal filter generated by a

filter  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$  and  $(\mathcal{F}x) = \{\mathcal{G} \mid \mathcal{G} \cap \dot{x} \subset \mathcal{F}\}$ . For filters  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{G}$  is the filter sum or the lattice join in  $F(X)$  (see [14]).

For convenience the terms pseudotopology, pretopology and topology are abbreviated ps., pre. and top. The usage of these terms is that described by Fischer [6] and Choquet [5].

## 2. Lattice structure of $C(X)$ .

**DEFINITION 2.1.** A convergence structure on a nonempty set  $X$  is a map  $q: X \rightarrow \beta(F(X))$  such that for each  $x \in X$ ,  $\dot{x} \in q(x)$  and if  $\mathcal{F} \in q(x)$ ,  $\mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x} \in q(x)$  and  $\mathcal{G} \in q(x)$  for all filters  $\mathcal{G}$  finer than  $\mathcal{F}$ .

A filter  $\mathcal{F}$  is said to  $q$ -converge to  $x$  if  $\mathcal{F} \in q(x)$ . On  $C(X)$ , define a partial order by  $q \leq r$  if and only if  $r(x) \subseteq q(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ . Then  $C(X)$  with this order becomes a complete, distributive lattice [7, 8] in which for any  $\{q_j \mid j \in J\}$ , a subset of  $C(X)$ ,  $(\bigvee q_j)(x) = \bigcap q_j(x) (j \in J)$  and  $(\bigwedge q_j)(x) = \bigcup q_j(x) (j \in J)$ .

One can observe that the lattice of convergence structures contains a least and a greatest element as well as atoms and coatoms. The greatest element is the discrete topology  $D$  and the least element is the indiscrete topology  $I$ . A convergence structure  $q$  is an atom in  $C(X)$  if, for some  $x \in X$ ,  $q(x) = F(X) \setminus \{\{X, X \setminus \{x\}\}\}$  and  $q(y) = F(X)$  for  $y \neq x$ . Coatoms are of the form  $(x, \mathcal{F})$  for some  $x \in X$  and  $\mathcal{F} \in U(X)$  where  $(x, \mathcal{F})$  is the finest convergence structure  $q$  (in fact, topology) for which  $\mathcal{F} \in q(x)$ . While each member of  $C(X)$  is preceded (succeeded) by an atom (coatom) the lattice  $C(X)$  is not atomic (not coatomic). The sublattice generated by the atoms of  $C(X)$  is isomorphic to the power set of  $X$  whereas the coatoms generate a sublattice isomorphic to the lattice of pseudotopologies [4].

**LEMMA 2.2.** A convergence structure  $q$  is a compact element of  $C(X)$  if and only if there exists a finite subset  $Y = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  of  $X$  and for each  $x_k$  a finite subset  $\{\mathcal{F}(j, k) \mid j = 1, \dots, n(k)\}$  of  $F(X)$  such that  $q(x) = F(X)$  if  $x \notin Y$  and  $q(x_k) = F(X) \setminus \bigcup (F(j, k)x_k) (j = 1, \dots, n(k))$ .

*Proof.* If  $A = \{x \in X \mid q(x) \neq F(X)\}$  is infinite, for each  $x$  in  $A$  define  $q_x$  in  $C(X)$  to be  $q_x(y) = F(X)$  if  $y \neq x$  and  $q_x(x) = q(x)$ . Then  $q = \bigvee q_x (x \in A)$  but  $q \neq \bigvee q_x (x \in B)$  for any finite subset  $B$  of  $A$  and  $q$  is not a compact lattice element.

Suppose for some  $x \in A$  no finite family  $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_m$  of filters on  $X$  exists with  $q(x) = F(X) \setminus \bigcup (\mathcal{F}_j x) (j = 1, \dots, m)$ . For each  $\mathcal{F} \in F(X)$  with  $\mathcal{F} \notin q(x)$ , define  $q(\mathcal{F})$  in  $C(X)$  by  $q(\mathcal{F})(y) = q(y)$

for  $y \neq x$  and  $q(\mathcal{F})(x) = F(X) \setminus (\mathcal{F}x)$ . Now  $q = \bigvee q(\mathcal{F})(\mathcal{F} \in q(x))$  but  $q$  is not the join of any finite subset so again  $q$  could not be compact. The converse follows readily.

**THEOREM 2.3.**  $C(X)$  is compactly generated.

*Proof.* If  $q \in C(X)$ , for every  $x \in X$  and filter  $\mathcal{F}$  not in  $q(x)$ , let  $q(x, \mathcal{F})$  in  $C(X)$  be  $q(x, \mathcal{F})(y) = F(X)$  if  $y \neq x$  and  $q(x, \mathcal{F})(x) = F(X) \setminus (\mathcal{F}x)$ . Each  $q(x, \mathcal{F})$  is compact by Lemma 2.2 and  $q = \bigvee q(x, \mathcal{F})(x \in X, \mathcal{F} \notin q(x))$ .

**LEMMA 2.4.** A convergence structure  $q$  is a cocompact element of  $C(X)$  if and only if  $\{x \mid q(x) \neq [\dot{x}]\}$  is finite and if  $q(x) \neq [\dot{x}]$  there exists a finite subset  $\{\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n\}$  of  $F(X)$  such that  $q(x) = \{\mathcal{F} \in F(X) \mid \mathcal{F}_j \subseteq \mathcal{F} \text{ for some } j = 1, \dots, n\}$ .

*Proof.* The proof parallels the procedure in Lemma 2.2.

One can note from Lemma 2.4 that each cocompact member of  $C(X)$  is the meet of a finite set of topologies of the form  $(x, \mathcal{F})$  for  $\mathcal{F}$  a filter on  $X$ . One immediate consequence follows from Lemma 2.4.

**THEOREM 2.5.**  $C(X)$  is cocompactly generated.

*Proof.* If  $q \in C(X)$ ,  $q = \bigwedge \{(x, \mathcal{F}) \mid \mathcal{F} \in q(x), x \in X\}$  and each  $(x, \mathcal{F})$  is cocompact by Lemma 2.4.

If  $L$  is a lattice,  $x \in L$ ,  $A \subset L$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is a filter on  $L$ ,  $A^- = \{y \mid x \leq y, \text{ all } x \text{ in } A\}$  and  $\mathcal{F}^- = \bigcup \{A^- \mid A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . The corresponding lower bounds are designated by  $A^+$  and  $\mathcal{F}^+$ . A filter  $\mathcal{F}$  order converges to  $x$  if  $x = \bigvee \mathcal{F}^+ = \bigwedge \mathcal{F}^-$ . The order topology on  $L$  is defined as that topology whose closed sets are those sets  $A$  which contain all points to which filters that contain  $A$  converge. Kent and Atherton [10] have shown that in a compactly and cocompactly generated lattice (i.e., bicomactly generated) order convergence is topological. Hence Theorems 2.3 and 2.5 with the result of Kent and Atherton imply that order convergence in the lattice of convergence structures is topological.

An inspection of the lattice operations will quickly show that  $C(X)$  is not a Boolean lattice. It is possible, however, to show that  $C(X)$  has pseudo-complements, relative pseudo-complements and pseudo-differences as well as present an internal characterization of each.

THEOREM 2.6.  $C(X)$  is Brouwerian.

*Proof.* If  $q$  and  $r$  are in  $C(X)$ , define  $q*r: X \rightarrow \beta(F(X))$  by  $q*r(x) = \{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \supseteq \dot{x} \text{ or } \mathcal{G} \cap \dot{x} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \text{ for some } \mathcal{G} \in r(x) \setminus q(x)\}$ . The map  $q*r$  is a convergence structure and is the pseudo-complement of  $q$  relative to  $r$  in  $C(X)$ .

COROLLARY 2.7.  $C(X)$  is a Stone lattice.

*Proof.* In any Brouwerian lattice with least element  $I$ , the pseudo-complement of  $q$  is  $-q = q*I$ . In  $C(X)$  this means that if  $A = \{x \in X \mid q(x) \neq F(X)\}$ ,  $-q(x) = [\dot{x}]$  if  $x \notin A$ ,  $-q(x) = F(X)$  if  $x \in A$  and  $(--q) \vee (-q) = D$ .

The characterization of the pseudo-complements of members of the lattice of convergence structures gives rise to a natural map between the class of all regular elements of  $C(X)$  and  $\beta(X)$ . The subsequent corollary has appeared in [12].

COROLLARY 2.8. The maximal Boolean sublattice of  $C(X)$  is isomorphic to  $\beta(X)$ .

Pseudo-differences were used in [12] to exhibit a classification of the group of lattice automorphisms of  $C(X)$ . Pseudo-differences in  $C(X)$  are closely related to the concept of a quotient filter defined by Ward [16]. The properties of pseudo-differences will be generalized slightly to an arbitrary distributive lattice.

LEMMA 2.9. In a distributive lattice  $L$ , for any cofinal subsets  $A$  and  $B$ , let  $A:B = \{x \mid x \vee y \in A \text{ for all } y \in B\}$ . Then:

- (i)  $A:B$  is cofinal.
- (ii) If  $A$  is a filter,  $A:B$  is a filter.
- (iii) If  $C$  is a cofinal subset of  $L$  with  $B \cup C \subseteq A$ , then  $C \subseteq A:B$ .
- (iv)  $A \subseteq A:B$ .
- (v)  $(A:B) \cap B \subseteq A$ .

*Proof.* The proof parallels a proof of a similar theorem for power set lattices by Schmidt [14].

DEFINITION 2.10. The set  $G:H$  in Lemma 2.9 will be called the quotient set of  $G$  and  $H$ .

THEOREM 2.11.  $C(X)$  is pseudo-differenced.

*Proof.* For  $q$  and  $r$  in  $C(X)$ , define  $q - r: X \rightarrow \beta(F(X))$  by  $(q - r)(x) = q(x):r(x)$ . That  $q - r$  is a convergence structure on  $X$  follows from (i) of Lemma 2.9 and the fact that if  $\mathcal{F} \in (q - r)(x)$  and  $\mathcal{G} \in r(x)$ ,  $(\dot{x} \cap \mathcal{F}) + \mathcal{G} = (\dot{x} + \mathcal{G}) \cap (\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{G})$  where  $\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{G}$  is the filter generated by  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  as used in [14].

Part (v) of Lemma 2.9 implies  $r(x) \cap (q - r)(x) = r(x) \cap (q(x):r(x)) \subseteq q(x)$  for each  $x$  in  $X$  and  $q \leq r \vee (q - r)$ . If  $s \in C(X)$  with  $q \leq r \vee s$ , then  $r(x) \cap s(x) \subseteq q(x)$  and part (iii) of Lemma 2.9 implies  $s(x) \subseteq q(x):r(x)$  so  $q - r \leq s$  and  $q - r$  is the pseudo-difference of  $q$  and  $r$ .

### 3. Relative pseudo-complements in $C(X)$ .

**DEFINITION 3.1.** A subset  $A$  of a lattice  $L$  is *prime with respect to joins* in  $L$  if  $x \vee y \in A$  implies  $x \in A$  or  $y \in A$ .

**LEMMA 3.2.** For  $q$  in  $C(X)$ ,  $q*(r \vee s) = (q*r) \vee (q*s)$  for all convergence structures  $r$  and  $s$  in  $C(X)$  if and only if  $q(x) \setminus [\dot{x}]$  is prime with respect to joins in  $F(X)$  for every point  $x$ .

*Proof.* Since in any Brouwerian lattice  $q*(r \vee s) \geq (q*r) \vee (q*s)$ , it suffices to show the condition is equivalent to the reverse inequality.

Assume filters  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$  exist such that  $\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{G} \in q(x) \setminus [\dot{x}]$  and  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \notin q(x) \setminus [\dot{x}]$ . Define  $r, s$  in  $C(X)$  by  $r(y) = s(y) = [\dot{y}]$  if  $y \neq x$ ,  $r(x) = [\mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x}]$  and  $s(x) = [\mathcal{G} \cap \dot{x}]$ . Then  $\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{G}$  is in  $[(q*r) \vee (q*s)](x)$  but not in  $[q*(r \vee s)](x)$  and  $(q*r) \vee (q*s) \not\leq q*(r \vee s)$ .

Conversely, if for some  $x \in X$ , there exists  $\mathcal{F} \in [q*(r \vee s)](x)$  with  $\mathcal{F} \in [(q*r) \vee (q*s)](x)$  then there exist  $\mathcal{G} \in r(x) \setminus q(x)$  and  $\mathcal{H} \in s(x) \setminus q(x)$  with  $\mathcal{G} + \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ . Now  $\mathcal{G} + \mathcal{H} \in r(x) \cap s(x)$  so if  $\mathcal{G} + \mathcal{H} \notin q(x)$ ,  $\mathcal{F} \in [q*(r \vee s)](x)$ . But  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H} \neq \dot{x}$  and  $q(x) \setminus [\dot{x}]$  is not prime with respect to joins.

On  $C(X)$ , define, for any convergence structure  $q$ , the self-map  $f(q)$  by  $f(q)(r) = q*r$ .

**THEOREM 3.3.** For any convergence structure  $q$ :

- (i)  $f(q)$  is a meet-homomorphism
- (ii)  $f(q)$  is a join-homomorphism and an interior operator iff each  $q(x) \setminus [\dot{x}]$  is prime with respect to joins in  $F(X)$ .

*Proof.* Part (i) follows from ordinary properties of relative pseudo-complements and (ii) is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.2.

A natural question to consider is whether the relative pseudo-complement of two convergence structures preserves any of the properties of the original structures. Since  $q*r$  is the discrete structure whenever  $q \leq r$  such a question appears not to hold much promise of fruitful investigation. One interesting result holds when  $q$  is a limitierung (resp. ps., pre., top.).

**THEOREM 3.4.** *If  $q$  and  $r$  are convergence structures on  $X$  with  $r$  a limitierung (respectively ps., pre., top.) then  $q*r$  is also a limitierung (resp. ps., pre., top.).*

*Proof.* A proof will be exhibited for the case of  $r$  a topology. Since  $r \leq q*r$ , each  $r$ -open set is  $q*r$ -open and the  $q*r$ -neighborhood filter  $N_*$  has a base of  $q*r$ -open sets for each  $x \in X$  with  $N_r(x) \subseteq q(x)$  since for these points  $q*r(x) = [N_r(x)]$ . If  $N_r(x) \in q(x)$ ,  $q*r(x)$  is discrete and  $\{x\}$  is  $q*r$ -open so  $q*r$  is a topology.

**THEOREM 3.5.** *If  $r$  is a  $T_1(T_2)$  convergence structure, then  $q*r$  is  $T_1(T_2)$  for any convergence structure  $q$ .*

**COROLLARY 3.6.** *The lattice  $C_1(X)$  of  $T_1$  convergence structures on  $X$  is Brouwerian.*

*Proof.* Since  $C_1(X)$  is a principal filter in  $C(X)$ , the relative pseudo-complements of two  $T_1$ -structures must be the same for both lattices.

**4. Pseudo-difference.** Since properties of pseudo-differences are perhaps less familiar some of these properties are included for reference.

**THEOREM 4.1.** *If  $L$  is a distributive lattice having pseudo-difference and a least element, then for any  $x, y, z$  in  $L$ ,*

- (i)  $x - y \leq x$ .
  - (ii)  $x - z \leq y - z$  if  $x \leq y$ .
  - (iii)  $(x - y) - y = x - y$ .
- If  $L$  is complete and completely distributive,*
- (iv)  $(\bigvee x_j) - y = \bigvee (x_j - y) (j \in J)$ .
  - (v)  $(\bigwedge x_j) - y \leq \bigwedge (x_j - y) (j \in J)$ .

Although equality in part (v) of Theorem 4.1 does not always hold even for finite cases, equality can be determined for the lattice of convergence structures.

**THEOREM 4.2.** *For any convergence structure  $q$  on  $X$ , in  $C(X)$ :*

- (i)  $D - q = D$  iff each ultrafilter  $q$  - converges to every point.  
(ii)  $(r - q) \wedge (s - q) = (r \wedge s) - q$  for all  $r, s$  in  $C(X)$  iff  $q$  is a *limitierung*.

*Proof.* The proof of (i) is direct. A proof of only (ii) will be given.

Assume  $q$  is a *limitierung*,  $x \in X$  and  $\mathcal{F} \notin (r - q)(x) \cup (s - q)(x)$ . Then there exists  $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}$  in  $q(x)$  with  $\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{G} \notin r(x)$ ,  $\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{H} \notin s(x)$ . Since  $\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{H} \in q(x)$  and  $\mathcal{F} + (\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{H}) \subseteq (\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{G}) \cap (\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{H})$ ,  $\mathcal{F} + (\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{H}) \notin (r \wedge s)(x)$ . This together with Theorem 4.1., part (v) implies the desired equality.

Conversely, if  $(r - q) \wedge (s - q) \leq (r \wedge s) - q$  for all  $r, s$  in  $C(X)$ , suppose  $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \in q(x)$  with  $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \neq \dot{x}$  and  $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_2 \neq q(x)$ . Define  $r, s$  in  $C(X)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} r(x) &= \{\mathcal{F} \in F(X) \mid \mathcal{F} \supseteq \dot{x} \text{ or } \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \text{ for some } \mathcal{G} \in q(x) \\ &\quad \text{with } \mathcal{G} \cap \dot{x} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_1\} \text{ and } r(y) = q(y) \text{ if } y \neq x, \\ s(x) &= \{\mathcal{F} \in F(X) \mid \mathcal{F} \supseteq \dot{x} \text{ or } \mathcal{G} \cap \dot{x} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \text{ for some } \mathcal{G} \in q(x) \setminus \\ &\quad r(x)\} \text{ and } s(y) = q(y) \text{ if } y \neq x. \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{G}_2 \notin r(x)$  since  $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_2 \notin q(x)$  and similarly  $\mathcal{G}_1 \notin s(x)$ . Moreover,  $r \wedge s = q$  so  $(r \wedge s) - q = I$ . Since  $(\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_2) + \mathcal{G}_2 \notin r(x)$  and  $(\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_2) + \mathcal{G}_1 \notin s(x)$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_2 \notin [(r - q) \wedge (s - q)](x)$ , contradicting the assumption and showing  $q$  to be a *limitierung*.

In a fashion similar to that for relative pseudo-complements, a self-map of  $C(X)$  can be defined for each convergence structure  $q$  by  $\bar{f}(q)(r) = r - q$ . This *pseudo-difference map* was used in [12] to determine the group of lattice automorphisms of the lattice of convergence structures where a slightly different definition was used for a convergence structure corresponding to the definition used by Kent [8].

**THEOREM 4.3.** *The pseudo-difference map  $\bar{f}(q)$  associated with a given convergence structure  $q$  is a lattice homomorphism if and only if  $q$  is a *limitierung*. In addition  $\bar{f}(q)$  is an interior operator if and only if  $q$  is a *limitierung* satisfying the condition of (i) of Theorem 4.2.*

*Proof.* The proof is a consequence of Theorem 4.2 and parts (i)-(iv) of Theorem 4.1.

For pseudo-differences the situation regarding pretopologies and topologies is not so clear as for relative pseudo-complements. The next two theorems show some results on preservation of the various



types of structures.

**THEOREM 4.4.** *If  $q$  and  $r$  are in  $C(X)$ ,  $r - q$  is a limitierung (pseudotopology) if  $r$  is a limitierung (pseudotopology).*

*Proof* (for  $r$  a pseudotopology). If  $\mathcal{F} \in F(X)$  has the property that  $\mathcal{G} \in (r - q)(x)$  for every ultrafilter  $\mathcal{G}$  with  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  then for any  $\mathcal{H} \in q(x)$  and any ultrafilter  $\mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathcal{K} \in (r - q)(x)$ . But this implies  $\mathcal{K} \in r(x)$ ,  $\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{H} \in r(x)$  and  $\mathcal{F} \in (r - q)(x)$  so  $r - q$  is a pseudotopology.

**EXAMPLE 4.5.** Let  $X$  be an infinite set,  $x \in X$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  be a free ultrafilter on  $X$ . For each  $y \in X$ ,  $y \in [D - (x, \mathcal{F})](x)$  from which it follows that the filter  $\{X\} \in [D - (x, \mathcal{F})](x)$  if  $[D - (x, \mathcal{F})]$  is a pretopology. However,  $\{X\} + \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F} \notin D(x)$  so  $D - (x, \mathcal{F})$  is not a pretopology even though both original structures are topologies.

**LEMMA 4.6.** *If  $q$  and  $r$  are in  $C(X)$  an ultrafilter  $\mathcal{F}$   $q - r$  converges to  $x$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$   $q$  - converges to  $x$  or does not  $r$  - converge to  $x$ .*

**THEOREM 4.7.** *If  $q$  and  $r$  are convergence structures on  $X$  and  $(\lambda q) - r$  is a pretopology, then  $(\lambda q) - r = \lambda(q - r)$  where  $\lambda q$  is the finest pretopology preceding  $q$  in  $C(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\lambda q \leq q$ , by part (ii) of Theorem 4.1, it suffices to show  $\lambda(q - r) \leq (\lambda q) - r$ . If  $s = (\lambda q) - r$  and  $x \in X$ , the  $s$  - neighborhood filter of  $x$  is  $N_s(x) = \cap \{\mathcal{F} \in U(X) \mid \mathcal{F} \in s(x)\} = \cup \{\mathcal{F} \in U(X) \mid \mathcal{F} \notin r(x) \text{ or } \mathcal{F} \in \lambda q(x)\}$  by Lemma 4.6. But  $N_s(x) = \cap \{\mathcal{F} \in U(X) \mid \mathcal{F} \in \lambda q(x)\} = \{\cap \{\mathcal{F} \in U(X) \mid \mathcal{F} \in q(x)\}$  which implies  $N_s(x) = \cap \{\mathcal{F} \in U(X) \mid \mathcal{F} \in (q - r)(x)\}$ ,  $N_s(x) \in \lambda(q - r)(x)$  and  $\lambda(q - r) \leq (\lambda q) - r$ .

For  $T_1(T_2)$  - convergence structures, one can ascertain precisely the conditions under which the pseudo-difference of two  $T_1(T_2)$  structures is also  $T_1(T_2)$  but the conditions are not especially elegant or illuminating. One result on  $T_1$ -structures is worth stating although we omit the proof which can be obtained by a check of the definitions.

**THEOREM 4.8.** *The lattice  $C_1(X)$  of all  $T_1$ -convergence structures on  $X$  has pseudo-differences. In particular, if  $q$  and  $r$  are  $T_1$ -structures on  $X$ , the pseudo-difference  $q - r$  in  $C_1(X)$  is  $(q - r)(x) = \{\mathcal{F} \in (q - r)(x) \mid \{x\} \supseteq \cap A (A \in \mathcal{F})\}$ .*

5. **Lattice homomorphisms in  $C(X)$ .** The families of limitierungs (resp. pre., ps., top.) are well-known to be complete lattices whose order is the order induced from  $C(X)$ . Moreover, each of these lattices is a join-complete subsemilattice of  $C(X)$ . Information on completions of many families of special types of structures in  $C(X)$  is contained in [7] or [13]. With each convergence structure  $q$  is associated the finest limitierung (pre., ps., or top.) coarser than  $q$ . This gives rise to maps  $\phi$ ,  $\sigma$ ,  $\lambda$ ,  $\omega$  of  $C(X)$  into the lattices of limitierungs (ps., pre., top.) where  $\phi q(\sigma q, \lambda q, \omega q)$  is the finest limitierung (ps., pre., top.) coarser than  $q$ . These functions were essentially all defined by Kent [8] or Fischer [6] and subsequent investigations of  $\omega q$  and  $\lambda q$  appear in [6, 8, 9]. The purpose here is to show that most of these functions are lattice homomorphisms.

**THEOREM 5.1.**

- (i)  $\phi(\sigma, \lambda, \omega)$  is a complete meet homomorphism
- (ii)  $\phi$  is a finite join homomorphism
- (iii)  $\sigma$  and  $\lambda$  are complete lattice homomorphisms.

*Proof.* Most of the appropriate homomorphism properties follow directly from the properties of  $C(X)$  and the definition of the maps. Let us show that  $\lambda$  is a complete lattice homomorphism. If  $\{q_i\}$  is any family of convergence structures on  $X$ ,  $\bigwedge^\circ \lambda q_i = \lambda(\bigwedge^\circ \lambda q_i) \leq \lambda(\bigwedge q_i)$  by definition of  $\lambda(\bigwedge^\circ$  in the lattice of pretopologies). If  $\mathcal{F} \in \bigvee^\circ \lambda q_i(x)$ ,  $N_i(x)$ , the  $q_i$ -neighborhood filter of  $x$ , is contained in  $\mathcal{F}$  for each  $q_i$ . If  $q = \bigvee q_i$ ,  $N_q(x) = \Sigma N_i(x) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F} \in \lambda(\bigvee q_i)(x)$  so  $\bigvee^\circ \lambda q_i \geq \lambda(\bigvee q_i)$ . The necessary reverse inequalities follow directly.

**EXAMPLE 5.2.** The map  $\omega$  is not of necessity join preserving. If  $X = \{x, y, z\}$  with  $q$  and  $r$  defined on  $X$  by  $r(x) = [\dot{x} \cap \dot{z}]$ ,  $r(y) = [\dot{x} \cap \dot{y}]$ ,  $r(z) = [\dot{y} \cap \dot{z}]$  with  $q(x) = [\dot{x} \cap \dot{y}]$  and  $q$  discrete at  $y$  and  $z$ ,  $\omega(q \vee r) = D$  but  $\omega q \vee \omega r = \omega q \neq D$ .

**EXAMPLE 5.3.** Let  $N$  be the positive integers and for each positive integer  $n > 1$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_n$  be the filter generated by  $N \setminus \{n\}$  and define the convergence structure  $q_n$  by  $q_n(1) = \{\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{F} \text{ or } \mathcal{F}_{n+1} \subseteq \mathcal{F}\}$  and  $q_n$  discrete at all other points of  $N$ . Then  $\bigvee q_n (n > 1)$  is a limitierung different from the discrete topology at 1 whereas each  $\phi q_n$  is indiscrete,  $\bigvee \phi q_n = D$  and  $\phi$  does not preserve arbitrary joins.

In consequence of Theorem 5.1 we find that each of the lattices of limitierungs (ps., pre.) inherits any property of  $C(X)$  preserved

by lattice homomorphisms. For example, that each of these three lattices is distributive (a well-known result) and that each lattice has pseudo-differences are consequences of Theorem 5.1.

**6. Acknowledgment.** Most of the results of this paper are contained in the author's dissertation written at the University of Houston under the direction of Professor A. R. Vobach. The author extends his appreciation to the referee for a correction of Theorem 2.5.

#### REFERENCES

1. C. R. Atherton Jr., *On the lattice of primitive convergence structures*, Can. J. Math., **23** (1971) 392-397.
2. G. Birkhoff, *Lattice theory*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications **25**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I. (1967).
3. A. M. Carstens *The lattice of pretopologies on an arbitrary set S*, Pacific J. Math., **29** (1969) 67-71.
4. ———, *The lattice of pseudotopologies on S*, Portugal Math., **32**, (1973), 71-73.
5. G. Choquet, *Convergences*, Ann. Univ. Grenoble Sect. Sci. Math. Phys. (N. S.), **23**, (1948), 57-112.
6. H. R. Fischer, *Limesraum*, Math. Ann., **137**, (1959), 269-303.
7. B. V. Hearnsey and D. C. Kent, *Convergence structures*, Portugal Math., **31**, (1972), 105-118.
8. D. C. Kent, *Convergence functions and their related topologies*, Fund. Math., **54**, (1964) 125-133.
9. ———, *Convergence quotient maps*, Fund. Math., **65**, 197-205.
10. D. C. Kent, and C. R. Atherton, *The order topology in a bicomactly generated lattice*, J. Austral Math. Soc., **8**, (1968), 345-349.
11. H. Rasiowa and R. Sikorski, *The mathematics of metamathematics*, Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw, (1968).
12. C. V. Riecke, *The lattice of convergence structures*, Proc. Univ. Houston Point Set Topology Conf., (1971), 157-163.
13. ———, *Lattice completion of the metrizable topologies*, J. Austral Math. Soc., **18**, (1974), 447-449.
14. J. Schmidt, *Beitrage zur filtertheorie I*, Math. Nachr., **7** (1952) 359-378.
15. G. Szasz, *Introduction to Lattice Theory*, Academic Press, New York, (1963).
16. M. Ward, *Structure residuation*, Ann. Math., Princeton, II S., **39** (1938) 555-568.

Received July 14, 1976 and in revised form September 28, 1976.

CAMERON UNIVERSITY  
LAWTON, OK 73501

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

## EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)

University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

R. A. BEAUMONT

University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98105

C. C. MOORE

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  
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

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 69, No. 2

June, 1977

Carol Alf and Thomas Alfonso O'Connor, <i>Unimodality of the Lévy spectral function</i> .....	285
S. J. Bernau and Howard E. Lacey, <i>Bicontractive projections and reordering of <math>L_p</math>-spaces</i> .....	291
Andrew J. Berner, <i>Products of compact spaces with bi-k and related spaces</i> .....	303
Stephen Richard Bernfeld, <i>The extendability and uniqueness of solutions of ordinary differential equations</i> .....	307
Marilyn Breen, <i>Decompositions for nonclosed planar <math>m</math>-convex sets</i> .....	317
Robert F. Brown, <i>Cohomology of homomorphisms of Lie algebras and Lie groups</i> .....	325
Jack Douglas Bryant and Thomas Francis McCabe, <i>A note on Edelstein's iterative test and spaces of continuous functions</i> .....	333
Victor P. Camillo, <i>Modules whose quotients have finite Goldie dimension</i> .....	337
David Downing and William A. Kirk, <i>A generalization of Caristi's theorem with applications to nonlinear mapping theory</i> .....	339
Daniel Reuven Farkas and Robert L. Snider, <i>Noetherian fixed rings</i> .....	347
Alessandro Figà-Talamanca, <i>Positive definite functions which vanish at infinity</i> .....	355
Josip Globevnik, <i>The range of analytic extensions</i> .....	365
André Goldman, <i>Mesures cylindriques, mesures vectorielles et questions de concentration cylindrique</i> .....	385
Richard Grassl, <i>Multisectioned partitions of integers</i> .....	415
Haruo Kitahara and Shinsuke Yorozu, <i>A formula for the normal part of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on the foliated manifold</i> .....	425
Marvin J. Kohn, <i>Summability <math>R_r</math> for double series</i> .....	433
Charles Philip Lanski, <i>Lie ideals and derivations in rings with involution</i> .....	449
Solomon Leader, <i>A topological characterization of Banach contractions</i> .....	461
Daniel Francis Xavier O'Reilly, <i>Cobordism classes of fiber bundles</i> .....	467
James William Pendergrass, <i>The Schur subgroup of the Brauer group</i> .....	477
Howard Lewis Penn, <i>Inner-outer factorization of functions whose Fourier series vanish off a semigroup</i> .....	501
William T. Reid, <i>Some results on the Floquet theory for disconjugate definite Hamiltonian systems</i> .....	505
Caroll Vernon Riecke, <i>Complementation in the lattice of convergence structures</i> .....	517
Louis Halle Rowen, <i>Classes of rings torsion-free over their centers</i> .....	527
Manda Butchi Suryanarayana, <i>A Sobolev space and a Darboux problem</i> .....	535
Charles Thomas Tucker, II, <i>Riesz homomorphisms and positive linear maps</i> .....	551
William W. Williams, <i>Semigroups with identity on Peano continua</i> .....	557
Yukinobu Yajima, <i>On spaces which have a closure-preserving cover by finite sets</i> .....	571