Seminar on Continuity in Semilattices

Volume 1 | Issue 1

Article 100

10-5-1976

An Error in the Copower Considerations

Gerhard Gierz University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, gerhard.gierz@ucr.edu

Klaus Keimel Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany, keimel@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.lsu.edu/scs

Part of the Mathematics Commons

Recommended Citation

Gierz, Gerhard and Keimel, Klaus (1976) "An Error in the Copower Considerations," *Seminar on Continuity in Semilattices*: Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 100. Available at: https://repository.lsu.edu/scs/vol1/iss1/100

(in defmann only confidential copy for hawson					
* ?	Gierz and Keimel: An Error in the Copy for Lawson SEMINAR ON CONTINUITY IN SEMILATTICES (SCS)				
1	NAME(S)g GIERZ KEIMEL	DATE M	D	Y	
<i>.</i>	NAME(S)g GIERZ KEIMEL	october 5	76		
	TOPIC An Error in the copower considerations ,				
	REFERENCE HOFAMNN SCS-Memoir from 9/20/76				
	In the SCS-Memoir cited above, the following assertion is used in the proof of lemma 2.4: For every compact@space S, $B(J \times S) \cong BJ \times S$. This is wrong for two reasons: Firstly, in Trans. Amer.Math. Soc. 90 (1959), p.369 ff., Glicksberg has shown that $X \times Y$ is pseudo- compact if and only if $B(XX Y) \cong BXX BY$ (A space is pseudo- compact if every bendeed realvalued continuous function on it is bouded), provided that X and Y are both infinite. More concretely, let us consider the example, where $J = IN$ and $S = I$ the unit interval. Let $x_h = (1/n,n)$ and $y_n = (0,n)$ for all natural numbers n. For every free ultrafilter u on IN, y_n and x_n converge to the same point $(\widetilde{O, u})$ in $BIN \times I$. At the other hand, let f: $IN \times I \longrightarrow I$ be defined by $f(n,a) = \min(na,1)$. Then f is continuous on $N \times I$, and $f(x_n) = 1$, $f(y_n) = 0$ for all n. Thus, f cannot be extended continuously onto all of $BIN \times I$. This also shows that $B(IN \times I) \notin BIN \times I$. Note, that f is a <u>CL</u> -morphism on all the fibers $\{n\} \times I$. Thus, this example also shows that $BIN \times I$ does not generate the copower INI . The coproduct of <u>CL</u> -objects L_i can abstractly be constructed in the following way: Let L be the topological sum of the L_i .				
	in I^F under evaluation. The <u>CL</u> -subobject of I^F generated by the image of L is the coproduct of the L. The closure of the			the	
:	image of L in I ^F is, what we would like to		CIIC		
	West Germany: TH Darmstadt (Gierz, Keimel) U. Tübingen (Mislove, Visit.)	<u> </u>	•		
	England: U. Oxford (Scott)	· · · · ·			
, D. J. J.	USA: U. California, Riverside (Str LSU Baton Rouge (Lawson)		[1	
PUDII	hed by LSU Scholarly Repository, 702Bane U., New Orleans (Hofma U. Tennessee, Knoxville (Carr		/	I	

this closure of the image of L is a union of continuous lattices which are disjoint except for the identity; one continuous lattice for easy ultrafilter on J. The breadth of these lattices does not exceed the maximum breadth of the L_i , if this maximum is finite. In particular, if all the L_i are totally ordered, the same holds for the L_u which come into play. The coproduct of the L_i is isomorphic to the lattice of all closed subsets of the union of the L_u , $u \in BJ$, which meet every L_u in a filter. These filters may be viewed as lower semicontinuous functions.