

TWO QUESTIONS ON WALLMAN RINGS

JOSE L. BLASCO

In this paper we give an example of a Wallman ring \mathcal{A} on a topological space X such that the associated compactification $\omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}))$ is disconnected and \mathcal{A} is not a direct sum of any two proper ideals, herewith solving a question raised by H. L. Bentley and B. J. Taylor. Also, an example of a uniformly closed Wallman ring which is not a sublattice is given.

I. Introduction. Biles [2] has called a subring \mathcal{A} of the ring $C(X)$, of all real-valued continuous functions on a topological space X , a Wallman ring on X whenever $Z(\mathcal{A})$, the zero-sets of functions belonging to \mathcal{A} , forms a normal base on X in the sense of Frink.

H. L. Bentley and B. J. Taylor [1] studied relationships between algebraic properties of a Wallman ring \mathcal{A} and topological properties of the compactification $\omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}))$ of X . They proved that if \mathcal{A} is a Wallman ring on X such that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} \oplus \mathcal{C}$ where \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} are proper ideals of \mathcal{A} , then $\omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}))$ is disconnected. We shall prove that the converse of this result is not valid. But, when $\omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}))$ is disconnected we find a Wallman ring \mathcal{A}° , equivalent to \mathcal{A} , which is a direct sum of any two proper ideals.

It is well-known that every closed subring of $C^*(X)$, the ring of all bounded functions in $C(X)$, that contains all the rational constants is a lattice. But this is not true for arbitrary closed subrings of $C(X)$. We give an example of a uniformly closed Wallman ring on a space Y which is not a sublattice of $C(Y)$. This corrects an assertion stated in ([1], p. 27).

II. Definitions and basic results. All topological spaces under consideration will be completely regular and Hausdorff. A nonempty collection \mathcal{F} of subsets of a nonempty set X is said to be a ring of sets if it is closed under the formation of finite unions and finite intersections. The collection \mathcal{F} is said to be disjunctive if for each closed set G in X and point $x \in X \sim G$ there is a set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $x \in F$ and $F \cap G = \emptyset$. It is said to be normal if for F_1 and F_2 in \mathcal{F} with empty intersection there exist G_1 and G_2 which are complements of members of \mathcal{F} satisfying $F_1 \subset G_1$, $F_2 \subset G_2$ and $G_1 \cap G_2 = \emptyset$. The collection \mathcal{F} is a normal base for the topological space X in case it is a normal, disjunctive, ring of sets that is a base for the closed sets of X .

Throughout this section \mathcal{D} will denote a disjunctive ring of closed

sets in a topological space X that is a base for the closed sets of X . Let $\omega(X, \mathcal{D})$ denote the collection of all \mathcal{D} -ultrafilters, and topologize them with a topology having as a base for the closed sets, sets of the form $D^* = \{\mathcal{U} \in \omega(X, \mathcal{D}): D \in \mathcal{U}\}$ where $D \in \mathcal{D}$. Then X can be embedded in $\omega(X, \mathcal{D})$ as a dense subspace when it carries the relative topology. The embedding map takes each $x \in X$ into the unique \mathcal{D} -ultrafilter of supersets of x in \mathcal{D} . The space $\omega(X, \mathcal{D})$ is a T_1 -compactification of X ([3], p. 122).

We now state some facts concerning the space $\omega(X, \mathcal{D})$ which will be needed. For a proof see ([3], p. 119, p. 123).

PROPOSITION 2.1. *The space $\omega(X, \mathcal{D})$ is Hausdorff if and only if \mathcal{D} is a normal base on X .*

The following result is an interesting characterization of $\omega(X, \mathcal{D})$ due to Sanin.

THEOREM 2.2. *The space $S = \omega(X, \mathcal{D})$ is uniquely determined (in the usual sense) among T_1 -compactifications of X by its properties*

- (a) $\{\text{cl}_S D: D \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is a base for the closed sets of $\omega(X, \mathcal{D})$.
- (b) For F_1, F_2 in \mathcal{D} , $\text{cl}_S F_1 \cap \text{cl}_S F_2 = \text{cl}_S(F_1 \cap F_2)$.

According to the Proposition 2.1 if any Hausdorff compactification of X satisfies (a) and (b), then \mathcal{D} is a normal base on X .

III. Disconnectedness of $\omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}))$. The next result is a necessary and sufficient condition for the disconnectedness of $\omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}))$ being \mathcal{A} a Wallman ring on X .

THEOREM 3.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be a Wallman ring on a space X . Then $\omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}))$ is disconnected if and only if there is a Wallman ring \mathcal{A}° , equivalent to \mathcal{A} (i.e., $\omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A})) = \omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}^\circ))$), which is the direct sum of any two proper ideals.*

Proof. The sufficiency has been proved in ([1], Theorem 3.14) with $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^\circ$. Necessity. Suppose that $S = \omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}))$ is disconnected. Then there exist nonempty disjoint closed subsets A and B of S whose union is S . Since A is a closed set of S ,

$$A = \bigcap \{\text{cl}_S Z: A \subset \text{cl}_S Z, Z \in Z(\mathcal{A})\}.$$

It follows from $A \cap B = \emptyset$ that $\{B, \text{cl}_S Z: A \subset \text{cl}_S Z, Z \in Z(\mathcal{A})\}$ does not have the finite intersection property. Therefore $B \cap \text{cl}_S Z_1 \cap \cdots \cap \text{cl}_S Z_n = \emptyset$, for some $Z_i \in Z(\mathcal{A})$, $A \subset \text{cl}_S Z_i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. This implies $A = \bigcap \{\text{cl}_S Z_i: 1 \leq i \leq n\} = \text{cl}_S \bigcap \{Z_i: 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. So $A = \text{cl}_S Z(f)$ where

$f \in \mathcal{A}$. In the same way we find that $B = \text{cl}_s Z(g)$, $g \in \mathcal{A}$.

The set $\mathcal{A}^\circ = \{h/s: h, s \in \mathcal{A}, Z(s) = \emptyset\}$ is a subring of $C(X)$ such that $Z(\mathcal{A}) = Z(\mathcal{A}^\circ)$. So \mathcal{A}° is a Wallman ring on X equivalent to \mathcal{A} . The functions $h_1 = f^2/(f^2 + g^2)$, $h_2 = g^2/(f^2 + g^2)$ belong to \mathcal{A}° and they are the characteristic functions of the zero-sets $Z(g)$ and $Z(f)$, respectively. Since $Z(f) \cap Z(g) = \emptyset$, the ideal (h_i) of \mathcal{A}° generated by h_i is proper, $1 \leq i \leq 2$. On the other hand, $1 = h_1 + h_2$ implies that $\mathcal{A}^\circ = (h_1) \oplus (h_2)$.

The following is an example of Wallman ring which cannot be expressed as the direct sum of nontrivial ideals.

EXAMPLE 3.2. Let $X = [0, 1] \cup [2, 3]$, $\mathcal{B} = \{f \in C(X): \text{for some compact set } K \subset X, f \text{ is an integer constant on } X \sim K\}$.

Since X is locally compact, $Z(\mathcal{B})$ is a disjunctive base for the closed sets of X .

Consider the following functions in $C(X)$

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_1(x) &= e, & x \in [0, 1] & & \varphi_1(x) &= 0, & x \in [2, 3] \\ \varphi_2(x) &= 0, & x \in [0, 1] & & \varphi_2(x) &= e, & x \in [2, 3]. \end{aligned}$$

Let \mathcal{A} be the subring of $C(X)$ generated by $\mathcal{B} \cup \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\}$. Since $\varphi_1 \varphi_2 = 0$, a function of \mathcal{A} will be of the form

$$f = g_{00} + g_{10} \varphi_1 + g_{20} \varphi_1^2 + \cdots + g_{m0} \varphi_1^m + g_{01} \varphi_2 + \cdots + g_{0j} \varphi_2^j$$

where g_{ik} belong to \mathcal{B} and m, j are nonnegative integers.

From the definition of \mathcal{B} , there exist compact sets $K_1 \subset [0, 1]$ and $K_2 \subset [2, 3]$ such that if $x \in X \sim (K_1 \cup K_2)$ then $g_{ik}(x) = \alpha_{i,k} \in Z$ (the set of integer numbers). Therefore

$$(*) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x) &= \alpha_{00} + \alpha_{10}e + \cdots + \alpha_{m0}e^m, & x \in [0, 1] \sim K_1 \\ f(x) &= \alpha_{01} + \alpha_{01}e + \cdots + \alpha_{0j}e^j, & x \in [2, 3] \sim K_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $Z(\mathcal{B}) \subset Z(\mathcal{A})$ it follows that $Z(\mathcal{A})$ is a disjunctive base for the closed sets of X and a ring of sets.

Now, we will show that $K = [0, 1] \cup [2, 3]$ is a compactification of X equivalent to $\omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}))$. According to Theorem 2.2 it suffices to show that: (a) The family $\{\text{cl}_K Z: Z \in Z(\mathcal{A})\}$ is a base for the closed sets of K (b) For Z_1, Z_2 in $Z(\mathcal{A})$, $\text{cl}_K(Z_1 \cap Z_2) = \text{cl}_K Z_1 \cap \text{cl}_K Z_2$.

(a) If C is a closed set in K and $1 \notin C$, then the set $C \cap [0, 1]$ is compact and $1 \notin C \cap [0, 1]$. Let β be a point in $[0, 1]$ such that $C \cap [\beta, 1] = \emptyset$. Then, there exists a function $f \in C(K)$ such that $f([\beta, 1] \cup [2, 3]) = \{1\}$ and $f(C \cap [0, 1]) = \{0\}$. If g is the restriction of f to X , then $g \in \mathcal{B}$, $h = \varphi_1 g \in \mathcal{A}$, $C \subset \text{cl}_K Z(h)$ and $1 \notin \text{cl}_K Z(h)$. With the point 3 a similar argument can be used (also in (b)).

(b) Let $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$ and suppose that $1 \in \text{cl}_K Z(f) \cap \text{cl}_K Z(g)$. From (*) there exists $\beta \in [0, 1)$ such that $f(x) = m_1$ and $g(x) = m_2$ for every $x \in [\beta, 1)$. By our assumption $m_1 = m_2 = 0$, therefore $1 \in \text{cl}_K(Z(f) \cap Z(g))$.

Then $K = \omega(X, Z(\mathcal{A}))$, hence $Z(\mathcal{A})$ is a normal base on X and \mathcal{A} is a Wallman ring.

Now, we will show that the characteristic function of the interval $[0, 1)$ is not in \mathcal{A} . Let $h \in \mathcal{A}$. From (*), there exist $\beta \in [0, 1)$, $\gamma \in [2, 3)$ and $\alpha_{ik} \in Z$, $0 \leq i \leq m$, $0 \leq k \leq j$ such that

$$h(x) = \alpha_{00} + \alpha_{01}e + \cdots + \alpha_{0j}e^j, \quad x \in [\gamma, 3)$$

$$h(x) = \alpha_{00} + \alpha_{10}e + \cdots + \alpha_{m0}e^m, \quad x \in [\beta, 1).$$

If $[2, 3) \subset Z(h)$, then $\alpha_{00} = \alpha_{01} = \cdots = \alpha_{0j} = 0$ because e is a transcendental number. Therefore $h(x) = \alpha_{10}e + \cdots + \alpha_{m0}e^m \neq 1$ if $x \in [\beta, 1)$.

Finally, we will show that \mathcal{A} cannot be expressed as the direct sum of nontrivial ideals. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}$ where \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{H} are proper ideals of \mathcal{A} . Then $1 \in \mathcal{A}$ implies that there exist $f \in \mathcal{C}$ and $g \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $1 = f + g$ and $fg = 0$. Hence $\{Z(g), Z(f)\}$ is a partition on X . On the other hand, since \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{H} are proper ideals, the zero-sets $Z(f)$ and $Z(g)$ are nonempty, so $[0, 1) = Z(f)$ and $[2, 3) = Z(g)$. Therefore $g \in \mathcal{A}$ is the characteristic function of the interval $[0, 1)$, which is a contradiction.

IV. An example of a closed Wallman ring which is not a lattice. Let N denote the set of natural numbers. By a sublattice of $C(X)$ we mean a subset of $C(X)$ which contains the supremum and infimum of each pair of its elements. By a closed subring of $C(X)$ we mean a subring of $C(X)$ which is closed in the uniform topology on $C(X)$.

EXAMPLE 4.1. Let \mathcal{B} be the set $\{f \in C(N) : \text{for some finite subset } M \subset N, f \text{ is an integer constant on } N \sim M\}$. Then \mathcal{B} is a subring of $C(N)$ and $Z(\mathcal{B}) = \{B \subset N : B \text{ or } N \sim B \text{ is finite}\}$. It is well-known that \mathcal{B} is a Wallman ring on N such that $\omega(N, Z(\mathcal{B}))$ is the one-point compactification of N .

Let φ be the function defined $\varphi(2n) = n$, $\varphi(2n - 1) = -n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Let \mathcal{A} be the subring of $C(N)$ generated by $\mathcal{B} \cup \{\varphi\}$. Obviously $Z(\mathcal{B}) \subset Z(\mathcal{A})$. To show that $Z(\mathcal{A}) \subset Z(\mathcal{B})$, let $f \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $f = g_0 + g_1\varphi + \cdots + g_m\varphi^m$, where $g_i \in \mathcal{B}$, $0 \leq i \leq m$. From the definition of \mathcal{B} , there exist $n_0 \in N$, $\alpha_i \in Z$, $0 \leq i \leq m$ such that $g_i(2n - 1) = g_i(2n) = \alpha_i$, $0 \leq i \leq m$ for every $n \geq n_0$. If $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_m = 0$, then $f(2n - 1) = f(2n) = \alpha_0$ for every $n \geq n_0$ and therefore

$f \in \mathcal{B}$. Suppose $\alpha_{i_0} \neq 0$ for some $i_0 \geq 1$. Then, if $n \geq n_0$, $f(2n) = \alpha_0 + n\alpha_1 + \cdots + n^m\alpha_m$ and $f(2n-1) = \alpha_0 - n\alpha_1 + \cdots + (-1)^m n^m\alpha_m$. So $Z(f)$ is finite and $Z(f) \in Z(\mathcal{B})$. Hence \mathcal{A} is a Wallman ring on X .

If $\varphi^+ = \varphi \vee 0$, then $Z(\varphi^+) = \{1, 3, 5, \dots\} \notin Z(\mathcal{A})$. Therefore $\varphi^+ \notin \mathcal{A}$ and \mathcal{A} is not a lattice. Finally, since the functions of \mathcal{A} are integer-valued, it follows that \mathcal{A} is uniformly closed in $C(N)$.

REFERENCES

1. H. L. Bentley and B. J. Taylor, *Wallman rings*, Pacific J. Math., **58** (1975), 15-35.
2. C. M. Biles, *Gelfand and Wallman-type compactifications*, Pacific J. Math., **35** (1970), 267-278.
3. J. Nagata, *Modern General Topology*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-Gronigen, 1968.

Received May 2, 1979.

CATEDRA DE MATEMATICAS II
 FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS
 BURJASOT, VALENCIA
 SPAIN

