
BOLLETTINO UNIONE MATEMATICA ITALIANA

SZYMON DOLECKI, MICHEL PILLOT

Relatively maximal convergences

*Bollettino dell'Unione Matematica Italiana, Serie 8, Vol. 1-B (1998),
n.3, p. 699–704.*

Unione Matematica Italiana

http://www.bdim.eu/item?id=BUMI_1998_8_1B_3_699_0

L'utilizzo e la stampa di questo documento digitale è consentito liberamente per motivi di ricerca e studio. Non è consentito l'utilizzo dello stesso per motivi commerciali. Tutte le copie di questo documento devono riportare questo avvertimento.

*Articolo digitalizzato nel quadro del programma
bdim (Biblioteca Digitale Italiana di Matematica)
SIMAI & UMI*

<http://www.bdim.eu/>

Relatively Maximal Convergences.

SZYMON DOLECKI - MICHEL PILLOT

Sunto. – *Topologie, pretopologie, paratopologie e pseudotopologie sono importanti classi di convergenze, chiuse per estremi superiori (superiormente chiuse) ed inoltre caratterizzabili mediante le aderenze di certi filtri. Convergenze J -massimali in una classe superiormente chiusa $D \supset J$, cioè massimali fra le D -convergenze aventi la stessa immagine per la proiezione su J , svolgono un ruolo importante nella teoria dei quozienti; infatti, una mappa J -quoziente sulla convergenza J -massimale in D è automaticamente D -quoziente; d'altro lato, per $D \supset J$, una mappa D -quoziente conserva più proprietà topologiche che una mappa J -quoziente. Si stabilisce una caratterizzazione generale della J -massimalità in D quando J ed D appartengono alle classi di topologie, pretopologie, paratopologie e pseudotopologie. In casi particolari si ritrova le topologie di accessibilità di Whyburn e di forte accessibilità di Siwiec.*

By a convergence ξ on a set X we understand here a relation between X and the set of all filters on X , denoted

$$x \in \lim_{\xi} \mathcal{F},$$

such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$ implies $\lim_{\xi} \mathcal{F} \subset \lim_{\xi} \mathcal{G}$ and such that the principal filter (x) of x converges to x for every $x \in X$. Given a convergence ξ on X and a convergence τ on Y , a mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is *continuous* if $f(\lim_{\xi} \mathcal{F}) \subset \lim_{\tau} f(\mathcal{F})$ for every filter \mathcal{F} on X ; a convergence ξ on X is *finer* than a convergence ζ on X (in symbols, $\xi \geq \zeta$) if the identity i_X is continuous from ξ to ζ .

Several important classes of convergences, like topologies, pretopologies, paratopologies and pseudotopologies, are closed for arbitrary suprema in the class of convergences. To every sup-closed class of convergences there corresponds a projection J (i.e., an isotone decreasing idempotent map) such that this class (of J -convergences) is equal to $\{\xi: J\xi \geq \xi\}$.

If J and D are projections with $J \leq D$, then a D -convergence τ is *J -maximal at x_0 with respect to the class of D -convergences* (shortly, *J -maximal at x_0 in D*) if for every D -convergence $\xi \geq \tau$ such that $J\xi = J\tau$, one has $x_0 \in \lim_{\tau} \mathcal{F}$ implies $x_0 \in \lim_{\xi} \mathcal{F}$.

Thanks to the characterizations of various classes of quotient maps in

terms of projections on classes of convergences [2, 6]⁽¹⁾, relative maximality of an image space automatically improves the quotient class of the corresponding map.

V. Kannan in [5] characterizes implicitly (i.e., without introducing the notion of maximality) topologies that are topologically maximal with respect to the class of pretopologies; one of his characterizations amounts to accessibility (a notion due to G. T. Whyburn [8]). Unaware of [5] S. Dolecki and G. Greco gave in [3] a characterization of pretopologies that are topologically maximal with respect to the class of pretopologies extending the result of Kannan. In [4] we provided a unified characterization of topological maximality with respect to pretopologies, paratopologies and pseudotopologies. In particular we showed that a topology is topologically maximal with respect to paratopologies if and only if it is strong accessibility (the notion is due to F. Siwiec [7]).

In this paper, we succeed to give a single general criterion of J -maximality in D (in terms of adherences for special classes of filters dependent on J and D), where J and D are projections on topologies, pretopologies, paratopologies or pseudotopologies (Theorem 2); it specializes to the known criteria mentioned above.

Quotient maps onto maximal convergences.

If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is surjective and if ξ is a convergence on X , then $f\xi$ stands for the finest convergence on Y making f into a continuous mapping. If τ is a convergence on Y , then f is a J -quotient map if and only if $\tau = J(f\xi)$. We consider a broader notion of J -map, i.e., such that $\tau \geq J(f\xi)$. A J -map is J -quotient if and only if it is continuous. It turns out that J -quotient maps onto J -maximal convergences in D are D -quotient maps.

THEOREM 1 [2],[4]. – *A D -convergence τ is J -maximal in D if and only if every J -quotient map f from a D -convergence ξ to τ is a D -quotient map.*

PROOF. – Let f be a J -quotient map from (X, ξ) onto (Y, τ) and let $D(f\xi) > \tau$. As $J(D(f\xi)) = J(f\xi) = J\tau$, the D -convergence τ is not J -maximal in D .

Conversely, if τ is not J -maximal in D , then there exists a D -convergence ξ such that $\xi > \tau$ and $J\xi = J\tau = \tau$. Therefore the identity map $\iota: \xi \rightarrow \tau$ is J -quotient but not D -quotient. ■

⁽¹⁾ Bi-quotient maps coincide with pseudotopologically quotient maps, hereditarily quotient with pretopologically quotient [6], almost open with convergence quotient, countably bi-quotient with paratopologically quotient, and quotient with topologically quotient [2]; here the first term corresponds to classical terminology and the latter to convergence-theoretic terminology.

In the terms of J -maps, classical quotient maps are continuous topological quotient maps. It was pointed out in [6] that *pseudo-open* (i.e., *hereditarily quotient*) maps coincide with pretopological quotients ($\tau \geq P(f\xi)$), while *bi-quotient* maps coincide with pseudotopological quotients ($\tau \geq S(f\xi)$), and in [2] that *countably bi-quotient* maps coincide with paratopological quotients ($\tau \geq P_\omega(f\xi)$) and *almost open* maps coincide with convergence quotients ($\tau \geq f\xi$).

Actually, for the discussed four classes of convergences the sufficiency part of the above theorem can be improved on replacing «a convergence ξ » by «a J -convergence ξ » (see [4, Theorem 4.4]). In particular, one recovers the results of G. Whyburn [4, Theorem 4.4] and [9, Theorem 2] that a T_1 topology is accessibility if and only if every quotient map onto it is pseudo-open, and of F. Siwiec [7, Theorem 4.3] that a topology is strong accessibility if and only if every quotient map onto it is countably bi-quotient.

Adherence-representable convergences.

Let \mathcal{F} be a filter on a convergence space X . The *adherence* of \mathcal{F} is the union of the limits of all filters that are finer than \mathcal{F} :

$$(1) \quad \text{adh } \mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{G} \supset \mathcal{F}} \lim \mathcal{G} .$$

The *closure* of a subset A of X is equal to the adherence of the principal filter of A . A subset A of X is ξ -closed whenever for every filter \mathcal{F} with $A \in \mathcal{F}$, one has $\lim_\xi \mathcal{F} \subset A$. A set is ξ -open if its complement is ξ -closed. A convergence with unicity of limits is called *Hausdorff*.

A convergence is a *pseudotopology* (G. Choquet [1]) if $x \in \lim \mathcal{F}$ whenever $x \in \lim \mathcal{U}$ for every ultrafilter \mathcal{U} finer than \mathcal{F} . A convergence is a *pretopology* (G. Choquet [1]) if for every point x , its neighborhood filter

$$\mathcal{N}(x) = \bigcap_{x \in \lim \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{F}$$

converges to x . A pretopology is a *topology* if each neighborhood filter admits a base of open sets.

As we have already mentioned, the classes of pseudotopologies, pretopologies and topologies are closed for suprema. The corresponding projections are denoted by S (pseudotopologization) P (pretopologization) and T (topologization).

The projections S, P and T can be expressed in terms of adherences. Recall that the *grill* $\mathcal{C}^\#$ of a family \mathcal{C} is the set of all G such that $G \cap H \neq \emptyset$. Families \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{C} *mesh* ($\mathcal{F} \# \mathcal{C}$) whenever $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{C}^\#$ (equivalently $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{F}^\#$).

$$(2) \quad \lim_{D\xi} \mathcal{F} = \bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \# \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}} \text{adh}_\xi \mathcal{C} ,$$

where $\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{D}(\xi)$ is respectively the class of all filters (case of S), of the principal filters (case of P) and of the principal filters of ξ -closed sets (case of T).

A convergence ξ is a *paratopology* [2] if (2) holds with \mathfrak{D} being the class of countably based filters. It follows that the class of paratopologies is sup-closed; we denote the corresponding projection P_ω .

Characterization of maximality.

We study the cases where J and D correspond to one of the usual classes: pseudotopologies, paratopologies and pretopologies. The remaining case where $J = T$ is the class of topologies has been characterized in [4].

The maximality characterization theorem that we present in this section is restricted to convergences classes D and J corresponding to fixed families \mathfrak{D} and \mathfrak{F} in (2). The characterizing condition is the same as in [4, Theorem 3.1], but the argument although very similar to that used in the proof of that theorem, at one point uses a different property, namely that

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{D}, \quad A \notin \mathcal{H} \Rightarrow \mathcal{H} \setminus A \in \mathfrak{D}.$$

This property is satisfied in all the considered cases ($\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{S}, \mathfrak{F}_\omega, \mathfrak{F}$). We were unable to find a unified proof for both the mentioned theorems.

THEOREM 2. – *Let $J \subset D$ be convergence classes defined by (2) with respect to families $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathfrak{D}$ so that \mathfrak{D} fulfills (3) and \mathfrak{F} is independent of convergence. A D -convergence τ is J -maximal at x_0 in D if and only if for each $\mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{D}$ with $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{H} \setminus x_0)$, there exists $\mathcal{G} \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{G} \setminus x_0)$ and*

$$(4) \quad \forall_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \quad x_0 \notin \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{G} \setminus H \setminus x_0).$$

In [4, Theorem 3.1], for the topological maximality, the family of τ -closed subsets has the role of \mathfrak{F} .

PROOF. – (\Rightarrow) Let $\mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{D}$ be such that $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{H} \setminus x_0)$ and such that for every $\mathcal{G} \in \mathfrak{F}$,

$$(5) \quad x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{G} \setminus x_0) \Rightarrow \exists_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \quad x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{G} \setminus H \setminus x_0).$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H} \setminus x_0$. Then $\mathcal{H}_0 \in \mathfrak{D}$ by our assumption. We define the following convergence θ :

$$(6) \quad \lim_\theta \mathcal{F} = \begin{cases} \lim_\tau \mathcal{F} \setminus \{x_0\}, & \text{if } \mathcal{H}_0 \notin \mathcal{F}, \\ \lim_\tau \mathcal{F}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is a D -convergence strictly finer than τ at x_0 . Let us show that $J\tau = J\theta$. To

this end by (2) used for \mathfrak{S} independent of convergences, it is enough to prove that for each $\mathcal{G} \in \mathfrak{S}$, the difference $\text{adh}_\tau \mathcal{G} \setminus \text{adh}_\theta \mathcal{G}$ is empty. Since this difference is included in $\{x_0\}$, we need only assume $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau \mathcal{G} \setminus \text{adh}_\theta \mathcal{G}$ and get a contradiction. We infer that $x_0 \notin \bigcap_{G \in \mathcal{G}} G$, hence $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{G} \setminus x_0)$, thus by (5), there is

$H \in \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_0$ such that $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{G} \setminus H \setminus x_0) = \text{adh}_\theta(\mathcal{G} \setminus H \setminus x_0)$ by (6).

(\Leftarrow) Let $\tau = D\tau$ be not J -maximal at x_0 in D : there exists $\xi = D\xi \geq \tau$ with $J\xi = J\tau$ and such that for some filter \mathcal{F} , $x_0 \in \lim_\tau \mathcal{F} \setminus \lim_\xi \mathcal{F}$. Consequently by (2), there exists a filter $\mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau \mathcal{H} \setminus \text{adh}_\xi \mathcal{H}$. Therefore, $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{H} \setminus x_0)$ and thus with the aid of $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H} \setminus x_0$ we can define by (6) the convergence θ .

Let now $\mathcal{G} \in \mathfrak{S}$ be such that $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{G} \setminus x_0)$. As $\xi \geq \theta > \tau$, one has $J\theta = J\tau$ and $\mathcal{G} \setminus x_0 \in \mathfrak{S}$, therefore by (2) for \mathfrak{S} fixed, $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\theta(\mathcal{G} \setminus x_0)$. By (6), there exists $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $H^c \cup \{x_0\} \in (\mathcal{G} \setminus x_0)^\#$, hence $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\theta(\mathcal{G} \setminus H \setminus x_0)$ and thus (5) holds. ■

COROLLARY 3. – A paratopology τ (resp. a pseudotopology τ), on a set X , is pretopologically maximal at x_0 in the class of paratopologies on X (resp. pseudotopologies on X) if and only if for each countably based filter \mathcal{H} (resp. each filter), with $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{H} \setminus x_0)$, there exists $G \subset X$ such that $x_0 \in \text{cl}_\tau(G \setminus x_0)$ and

$$(7) \quad \bigvee_{H \in \mathcal{H}} x_0 \notin \text{cl}_\tau(G \setminus H \setminus x_0).$$

COROLLARY 4. – A pseudotopology τ , on a set X , is paratopologically maximal at x_0 in the class of pseudotopologies on X if and only if for each filter \mathcal{H} with $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{H} \setminus x_0)$, there exists a countably based filter \mathcal{G} such that $x_0 \in \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{G} \setminus x_0)$ and

$$(8) \quad \bigvee_{H \in \mathcal{H}} x_0 \notin \text{adh}_\tau(\mathcal{G} \setminus H \setminus x_0).$$

EXAMPLE 5 (A pseudotopology ξ such that $\xi > P_\omega \xi > P\xi > T\xi$). – Recall that the Stone topology on the set βX of the ultrafilters of X admits the following base: $\beta W = \{\mathcal{U} \in \beta X: W \in \mathcal{U}\}$, $W \subset X$.

A pseudotopology on X is determined by the collection

$$(9) \quad \{\mathfrak{B}(x): x \in X\}$$

of families of the ultrafilters convergent to each $x \in X$; conversely, every class (9) with the property that the principal ultrafilter of x belongs to $\mathfrak{B}(x)$ for each $x \in X$, determines a pseudotopology.

It has been shown in [2] that a pseudotopology on X is a paratopology if and only if all the sets in (9) are closed for the topology $G_\delta(\beta)$, i.e., the topology

generated by the base for open sets composed of the countable intersections of the Stone open sets.

On the other hand, a pseudotopology on X is a pretopology if and only if the class (9) consists of Stone closed sets.

Consider a subset \mathfrak{B} of free ultrafilters on an infinite countable set X which is $G_\delta(\beta)$ -closed but not Stone closed. Such sets exist, because for each strictly decreasing sequence $(W_n)_n$ of infinite subsets of X , the set $\bigcap_n \beta W_n$ is not open. On the other hand, as the Stone interior of $\bigcap_n \beta W_n$ is not empty hence the discrete sets for the Stone topology and for $G_\delta(\beta)$ coincide such sets are not discrete. Let $\mathcal{U} \in \text{cl}_{G_\delta(\beta)} \mathfrak{B} \setminus \{\mathcal{U}\}$. Consider the set $\{0\} \cup \{1/n : 0 \neq n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$, where X_n are copies of X . Define the following pseudotopology ξ the points of $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$ are isolated, the ultrafilters convergent to $1/n$ are: the principal ultrafilter and all the elements of $\mathfrak{B}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{U}_n\}$ (the n -th copies of $\mathfrak{B} \setminus \{\mathcal{U}\}$); each free ultrafilter on $\{1/n : 0 \neq n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ converges to 0. \mathcal{U}_n is the only ultrafilter that converges to $1/n$ for $P_\omega \xi$ but not for ξ . All the ultrafilters of $\text{cl}_\beta \mathfrak{B}_n$ converge to $1/n$ for P_ξ . Finally the trace on $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$ of the topological neighborhood filter of 0 is $\bigcup_n \bigcup_{k \geq n} \bigcup_{W \in \text{cl}_\beta \mathfrak{B}_k} W$.

Therefore, ξ , $P_\omega \xi$, P_ξ , T_ξ are examples of convergences that are not maximal in any of the discussed cases.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. CHOQUET, *Convergences*, Ann. Univ. Grenoble, **23** (1947-48), 55-112.
- [2] S. DOLECKI, *Convergence-theoretic methods in quotient quest.*, Topology Appl., **73** (1996), 1-21.
- [3] S. DOLECKI - G. H. GRECO, *Topologically maximal pretopologies*, Studia Math., **77** (1984), 265-281.
- [4] S. DOLECKI - M. PILLOT, *Topologically maximal convergences and types of accessibility*, submitted (1996).
- [5] V. KANNAN, *Ordinal invariants in topology*, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc., **32**, No. 245 (1981), 1-164.
- [6] D. C. KENT, *Convergence quotient maps*, Fund. Math., **65** (1969), 197-205.
- [7] F. SIWIEC, *Sequence-covering and countably bi-quotient mappings*, Gen. Topology Appl., **1** (1971), 143-154.
- [8] G. T. WHYBURN, *Mappings on inverse sets*, Duke Math. J., **23** (1956), 237-240.
- [9] G. T. WHYBURN, *Accessibility spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **24** (1970), 181-185.

Département de Mathématiques, Université de Bourgogne
 BP 400, 21011 Dijon, France
 e-mail: dolecki@satie.u-bourgogne.fr