

## ON ALEXANDROV LATTICES

ALBERT GORELISHVILI

Department of Mathematics  
New York Institute of Technology  
Old Westbury, New York 11568

(Received October 10, 1991 and in revised form January 20, 1992)

**ABSTRACT.** By an Alexandrov lattice we mean a  $\delta$  normal lattice of subsets of an abstract set  $X$ , such that the set of  $\mathcal{L}$ -regular countably additive bounded measures is sequentially closed in the set of  $\mathcal{L}$ -regular finitely additive bounded measures on the algebra generated by  $\mathcal{L}$  with the weak topology.

For a pair of lattices  $\mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2$  in  $X$  sufficient conditions are indicated to determine when  $\mathcal{L}_1$  Alexandrov implies that  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is also Alexandrov and vice versa. The extension of this situation is given where  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  and  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  are lattices of subsets of  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively and  $T$  is  $\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2$  continuous.

**KEY WORDS AND PHRASES.** Lattices, topological measures, Wallman topology.

**1991 AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODES.** Primary 28A32, 46E27, 28C15, 46G12.

### 1. INTRODUCTION.

We adhere for the most part to the basic terminology of A. Alexandrov [1] (see also H. Bergstrom [6]). Let  $X$  be an abstract set, and  $\mathcal{L}$  a lattice of subsets of  $X$ .  $MR(\mathcal{L})$  denotes the  $\mathcal{L}$ -regular finitely additive bounded measures on  $\mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{L})$ , the algebra generated by  $\mathcal{L}$ , and  $MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  those elements of  $MR(\mathcal{L})$  that are countably additive. We assume without loss of generality that all measures are non-negative.

A fundamental theorem of A. Alexandrov states that if  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $\delta$  normal and complement generated (i.e., completely normal), then  $\mu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  and  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  (i.e., converges weakly) implies that  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ .

In general we will call lattices for which this is true Alexandrov lattices, and our major concern in this paper is in determining further type lattices which are Alexandrov. In particular, we investigate the interrelationships between a pair of lattices  $\mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2$  in  $X$  and determine conditions when  $\mathcal{L}_1$  Alexandrov implies  $\mathcal{L}_2$  Alexandrov and conversely, and then extend this to the situation where  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  and  $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2$  are lattices of subsets of  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively and  $T$  is  $\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2$  continuous. It is well known (see [5]) that if  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ , then  $\mu$  induces measures  $\hat{\mu}$  and  $\bar{\mu}$  on the associated Wallman space  $IR(\mathcal{L})$  and also a measure  $\hat{\mu}'$  on the space  $IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  (see below for definitions), and we investigate how weak convergence:  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  in general is reflected over to these induced measures. This enables us to give alternative proofs of important results of Kirk and Crenshaw [8], who have also investigated certain aspects of topological measure theory in the Alexandrov framework.

We begin with certain notations and terminology which will be used throughout the paper, and then set up the general Alexandrov framework of reference. The associated Wallman space is then investigated, enabling us to readily generalize results of Varadarajan [9] and obtain in a different manner results of Kirk and Crenshaw. Finally, in the last section we investigate Alexandrov lattices and extend Alexandrov's fundamental theorem.

Our notation and terminology is standard for the most part (see [1], [6], [8], [5]), and we collect it in the next section for the reader's convenience.

## 2. TERMS AND NOTATION.

In this section we introduce some basic terms, facts, and notation of topological measure theory used throughout this paper.

Let  $X$  be a set and  $\mathcal{L}$  be any lattice of subsets of  $X$ . We shall always assume that  $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{L}$ . The following notation is used here:  $N$  for the natural numbers,  $R$  for the real numbers,  $x$  for the general element of  $X$ ,  $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$  for the smallest algebra containing  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $\sigma(\mathcal{L})$  for the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing  $\mathcal{L}$ .  $\delta(\mathcal{L})$  is the set of all arbitrary intersections  $\cap L_i$  with  $L_i \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\tau(\mathcal{L})$  is the set of all arbitrary intersections  $A_\alpha$  with  $A_\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ .  $\mathcal{L}$  is complemented if  $A \in \mathcal{L}$  implies  $A' \in \mathcal{L}$  where  $A' = X - A$ .  $\mathcal{L}'$  is the class of all complements of  $\mathcal{L}$ -sets, i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}' = \{L': L \in \mathcal{L}\}$ .  $\mathcal{L}$  is complement generated if  $A \in \mathcal{L}$  implies  $A = \cap A_i'$ , where  $A_i \in \mathcal{L}$ ;  $s(\mathcal{L})$  are the Souslin sets determined by  $\mathcal{L}$ .

$\mathcal{L}$  is separating or  $T_1$  if for all  $x, y \in X$ ,  $x \neq y$  implies there exists an  $A \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $x \in A$  and  $y \notin A$ .  $\mathcal{L}$  is disjunctive if for any  $A \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $x \notin A$ , there exists a  $B \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $x \in B$  and  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ .  $\mathcal{L}$  is Hausdorff or  $T_2$  if for all  $x, y \in X, x \neq y$  implies there exist  $A, B \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $x \in A, y \in B$  and  $A' \cap B' = \emptyset$ .  $\mathcal{L}$  is regular if for every  $x \in X$  and every  $A \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $x \notin A$  implies there exist  $B, C \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $x \in B, A \subset C$  and  $B \cap C' = \emptyset$ ;  $\mathcal{L}$  is normal if for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{L}, A \cap B = \emptyset$  implies there exist  $C, D \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $A \subset C, B \subset D$ , and  $C' \cap D' = \emptyset$ ;  $\mathcal{L}$  is strongly normal if it is  $\delta$ , normal, disjunctive and separating.  $\mathcal{L}$  is compact if any family of sets in  $\mathcal{L}$  with the finite intersection property has a non-empty intersection. Similarly, we define  $\mathcal{L}$  is countably compact (c.c.).  $\mathcal{L}$  is countably paracompact (c.p.) if  $A_n \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$  imply there exist  $B_n \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $A_n \subset B_n$  and  $B_n \downarrow \emptyset$ .

A function  $f: X \rightarrow R \cup \{\pm\infty\}$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -continuous if  $f^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{L}$  for every closed set  $C \subset R \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ . The set whose general element is a zero set of an  $\mathcal{L}$ -continuous function is denoted by  $\mathfrak{Z}(\mathcal{L})$ ;  $\mathfrak{Z} \in Z(\mathcal{L})$  iff  $Z = f^{-1}(0)$  for some  $\mathcal{L}$ -continuous function  $f$ . A measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$  is a finitely additive bounded real-valued set function.  $M(\mathcal{L})$  denotes the set of all measures on  $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$ . A measure  $\mu$  is said to be  $\sigma$ -smooth on  $\mathcal{L}$  if  $A_n \in \mathcal{L}, A_n \downarrow \emptyset$  implies  $\mu(A_n) \rightarrow 0$ . A measure  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{L})$  is said to be  $\mathcal{L}$ -regular if for every  $A \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$  and every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists an  $L \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $L \subset A$  and  $|\mu(A) - \mu(L)| < \epsilon$ . The set whose general element is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -regular measure on  $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$  is denoted by  $MR(\mathcal{L})$ , and the set whose general element is an element of  $M(\mathcal{L})$ , which is  $\sigma$ -smooth on  $\mathcal{L}$ , is denoted by  $M(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ . Moreover, we use the notation  $MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}) = MR(\mathcal{L}) \cap M(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ . The set of all measures  $\mu$  such that  $\mu(A) = \{0, 1\}$  for every  $A \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$  and  $\mu(X) = 1$  is denoted by  $I(\mathcal{L})$ . The set of all  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued  $\mathcal{L}$ -regular measures is denoted by  $IR(\mathcal{L})$ , i.e.,  $IR(\mathcal{L}) = I(\mathcal{L}) \cap MR(\mathcal{L})$ . The Dirac measure (concentrated) at  $x$  is denoted by  $\mu_x$ . For  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{L})$  the support of  $\mu$  is defined and denoted by  $S(\mu) = \cap \{L \in \mathcal{L}: |\mu|(L) = |\mu|(X)\}$ , where  $|\mu|$  denotes the variation of measure  $\mu$ .  $\mathcal{L}$  is said to be replete if for every  $\mu \in IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  we have  $S(\mu) \neq \emptyset$ , where  $IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}) = IR(\mathcal{L}) \cap I(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ . A measure  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$  is  $\tau$ -smooth if  $L_\alpha \downarrow \emptyset$  implies  $\mu(L_\alpha) \rightarrow 0$  for any net  $\{L_\alpha\}$  in  $\mathcal{L}$ . The set of  $\tau$ -smooth regular measures is denoted by  $MR(\tau, \mathcal{L})$ .

Since any measure  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{L})$  splits into its non-negative and non-positive parts  $\mu^+$  and  $\mu^-$  respectively, w.l.o.g. we shall work with non-negative measures.

Let  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  be two lattices of subsets of  $X$ . Throughout this paper we shall assume that  $\mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2$ . The following describe relationships between  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$ .

$\mathcal{L}_1$  semiseparates (s.s.)  $\mathcal{L}_2$  if for every  $A \in \mathcal{L}_1$  and  $B \in \mathcal{L}_2$ ,  $A \cap B = \emptyset$  implies there exists a  $C \in \mathcal{L}_1$  such that  $B \subset C$  and  $A \cap C = \emptyset$ ;  $\mathcal{L}_1$  separates  $\mathcal{L}_2$  if for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_2$ ,  $A \cap B = \emptyset$  implies there exist  $C, D \in \mathcal{L}_1$  such that  $A \subset C, B \subset D$  and  $C \cap D = \emptyset$ .  $\mathcal{L}_1$  coseparates  $\mathcal{L}_2$  if for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_2$ ,  $A \cap B = \emptyset$  implies there exist  $C, D \in \mathcal{L}_1$  such that  $A \subset C', B \subset D'$  and  $C' \cap D' = \emptyset$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{L}_1$  coseparates  $\mathcal{L}_2$  implies  $\mathcal{L}_1$  separates  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_1$  separates  $\mathcal{L}_2$  implies  $\mathcal{L}_1$  semiseparates  $\mathcal{L}_2$ .  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is  $\mathcal{L}_1$  countably paracompact (c.p.) if for every  $A_n \in \mathcal{L}_2$ ,  $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$  imply there exist  $B_n \in \mathcal{L}_1$  such that  $A_n \subset B'_n$  and  $B'_n \downarrow \emptyset$ .  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is  $\mathcal{L}_1$  countably bounded (c.b.) if for all  $A_n \in \mathcal{L}_2$ ,  $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$  imply there exist  $B_n \in \mathcal{L}_1$  such that  $A_n \subset B_n$  and  $B_n \downarrow \emptyset$ .

For the restriction of  $\nu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$  to  $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L}_1)$  we adopt the notation  $\nu|_{\mathcal{L}_1}$  or, simply,  $\nu|$ . Note that if  $\nu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$  and if  $\mathcal{L}_1$  s.s.  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , then  $\nu| \in MR(\mathcal{L}_1)$ .

We conclude this section with the following general extension theorem.

**THEOREM 2.1** [4]. Let  $\mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2$  be two lattices of subsets of  $X$ . Then any measure  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_1)$  can be extended to a  $\nu$ ,  $\nu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$ , and if  $\mathcal{L}_1$  separates  $\mathcal{L}_2$  then  $\nu$  is unique. If  $\mu \in MR(\sigma_1, \mathcal{L}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is  $\mathcal{L}_1$  countably paracompact or countably bounded, then  $\nu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ .

### 3. WALLMAN SPACES.

Let  $X$  be an abstract set and  $\mathcal{L}$  be a lattice of subsets of  $X$  with  $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{L}$ . In this section we review some facts pertaining to the Wallman spaces  $IR(\mathcal{L})$  and  $IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ , and we introduce measures induced by  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{L})$  on various algebras generated by lattices in these spaces.

We assume for convenience throughout that  $\mathcal{L}$  is a disjunctive lattice, although this is not necessary in all statements that follow.

Define  $W(A) = \{\mu \in IR(\mathcal{L}): \mu(A) = 1\}$ , for  $A \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$ .

**PROPOSITION 3.1.** If  $\mathcal{L}$  is a disjunctive lattice, then  $\forall A, B \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$  we have

- i)  $W(A \cap B) = W(A) \cap W(B)$
- ii)  $W(A \cup B) = W(A) \cup W(B)$
- iii)  $A \subset B \Leftrightarrow W(A) \subset W(B)$
- iv)  $W(A') = W(A')$
- v)  $W(\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})) = \mathfrak{U}(W(\mathcal{L}))$

Consequently,

$W(\mathcal{L}) = \{W(A): A \in \mathcal{L}\}$  is a disjunctive lattice.

Note that if  $\mathcal{L}$  is separating and disjunctive, then the closure in  $IR(\mathcal{L})$  of  $L \in \mathcal{L}$  is given by  $\overline{L} = \cap \{W(A): L \subset W(A), A \in \mathcal{L}\} = W(L)$ .

**PROPOSITION 3.2.** To each  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{L})$ , there corresponds a  $\hat{\mu} \in M(W(\mathcal{L}))$  defined by  $\hat{\mu}(W(A)) = \mu(A)$ ,  $A \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$  such that

- a)  $\hat{\mu}$  is well-defined.
- b)  $\hat{\mu} \in M(W(\mathcal{L}))$ ,
- c) if  $\nu \in M(W(\mathcal{L}))$ , then  $\nu = \hat{\mu}$ , for some  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{L})$ ,
- d)  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$  if and only if  $\hat{\mu} \in MR(W(\mathcal{L}))$ .

**PROOF.**

- a) Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is disjunctive, we have  $W(A) = W(B) \Rightarrow A = B \Rightarrow \mu(A) = \mu(B) \Rightarrow \hat{\mu}(W(A)) = \hat{\mu}(W(B))$
- b) If  $W(A) \cap W(B) = W(A \cap B) = \emptyset$ , then  $A \cap B = \emptyset$  (because  $\mathcal{L}$  is disjunctive) and  $\hat{\mu}(\emptyset) = \mu(\emptyset) = 0$ .  $\hat{\mu}(W(A)) \cup W(B)) = \mu(A \cup B) = \mu(A) + \mu(B) = \hat{\mu}(W(A)) + \hat{\mu}(W(B))$ ,  $\hat{\mu} \in M(W(\mathcal{L}))$
- c) We have  $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \Rightarrow \mu_1(A) \neq \mu_2(A)$  for some  $A \in \mathcal{L}$ . Therefore,  $\hat{\mu}_1(W(A)) \neq \hat{\mu}_2(W(A))$ ; hence,  $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ . Suppose  $\nu \in M(W(\mathcal{L}))$ . Define  $\mu$  on  $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$  by  $\mu(A) = \nu(W(A))$  for all  $A \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$ . Then,  $\mu$  is well-defined and  $\nu = \hat{\mu}$ .

d) It suffices to show that  $\hat{\mu} \in MR(W(\mathcal{L}))$  implies  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ . Since  $\mu$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -regular,  $\mu(A) \sim \mu(L)$  and  $A \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L}), A \supset L$ . However,  $\mu(L) = \hat{\mu}(W(L))$ . Therefore,  $W(L) \subset W(A)$ . Hence,  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ .

We can define a closed set topology on  $IR(\mathcal{L})$  by taking the closed sets  $\mathfrak{F} = \tau W(\mathcal{L})$ . This generates the Wallman topology (W-top.). The topological space  $\{IR(\mathcal{L}), W\}$  is compact and  $T_1$ . It is  $T_2$  if and only if  $\mathcal{L}$  is normal.

Since  $W(\mathcal{L})$  and  $\tau W(\mathcal{L})$  are compact lattices,  $W(\mathcal{L})$  separates  $\tau W(\mathcal{L})$ . Therefore, if  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ , then  $\hat{\mu} \in MR(W(\mathcal{L}))$  and by Theorem 2.1 has a unique extension to  $\tilde{\mu} \in MR(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))$ . We note that since  $W(\mathcal{L})$  and  $\tau W(\mathcal{L})$  are compact lattices,  $\hat{\mu}$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  are not only  $\sigma$ -smooth on their respective lattices, but also  $\tau$ -smooth. Since both  $\hat{\mu}$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  are countably additive, we can extend them uniquely to  $\sigma(W(\mathcal{L}))$  and  $\sigma(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))$  respectively and continue to denote the extensions by  $\hat{\mu}$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$ . Note that  $\hat{\mu}$  is  $\delta W(\mathcal{L})$  regular on  $\sigma(W(\mathcal{L}))$  while  $\mu$  is still  $\tau W(\mathcal{L})$  regular on  $\sigma(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))$ .

We now summarize some smoothness properties of  $\mu$  in terms of  $\hat{\mu}$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  (further details can be found in [5]).

**PROPOSITION 3.3.** Let  $X$  be a set and let  $\mathcal{L}$  be separating and disjunctive. If  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ , then the following statements are equivalent:

- 1)  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$
- 2)  $\hat{\mu}(\cap W(L_i)) = 0$ ,  $\cap W(L_i) \subset IR(\mathcal{L}) - X$ ,  $L_i \downarrow$ ,  $L_i \in \mathcal{L}$
- 3)  $\hat{\mu}(\cap W(L_i)) = 0$ ,  $\cap W(L_i) \subset IR(\mathcal{L}) - IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ ,  $L_i \downarrow$ ,  $L_i \in \mathcal{L}$
- 4)  $\hat{\mu}^*(X) = \hat{\mu}(IR(\mathcal{L}))$ , where  $\hat{\mu}^*$  is the induced “outer” measure.

**PROPOSITION 3.4.** Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a separating and disjunctive lattice of subsets of  $X$  and let  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ . The following statements are equivalent:

- 1)  $\mu \in MR(\tau, \mathcal{L})$
- 2)  $\tilde{\mu}$  vanishes on every  $W$ -closed set of  $IR(\mathcal{L}) - X$
- 3)  $\tilde{\mu}^*(X) = \tilde{\mu}(IR(\mathcal{L}))$

Under the same conditions on  $\mathcal{L}$ , when  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ , we also have

**PROPOSITION 3.5.** The following statements are true:

- 1)  $\tilde{\mu}$  on  $\mathcal{O} = (\tau W(\mathcal{L}))'$  is  $W(\mathcal{L})$ -regular
- 2)  $\tilde{\mu}^* = \tilde{\mu}$  on  $\tau W(\mathcal{L})$

**PROOF.** Define  $\hat{\mu}(W(L)) = \mu(L)$ ,  $L \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$ ;  $\tilde{\mu}$  is  $\hat{\mu}$  extended to  $\mathfrak{U}(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))$ . Let  $O \in (\tau W(\mathcal{L}))'$ , i.e.,  $O$  is  $W$  open. Since  $\hat{\mu} \in MR(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))$ , there exists  $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ ,  $F \subset O$  such that  $\mu(O - F) < \varepsilon$ . Assume that  $F = \cap W(L_\alpha)$ . Then,  $F \cap O' = \emptyset$ . Thus,  $\cap W(L_{\alpha_k}) \cap O' = \emptyset$ . Hence,  $W(\mathcal{L}) = W(\cap L_{\alpha_k}) \subset O$ ,  $L \in \mathcal{L}$ . Since  $F = \cap W(L_\alpha)$ , then  $F \subset W(L)$  which implies that  $\tilde{\mu}(O - W(L)) \leq \mu(O - F) < \varepsilon$ , i.e.,  $\tilde{\mu}$  is  $W(L)$ -regular on  $\mathcal{O} = (\tau W(\mathcal{L}))'$ .

We now show that  $\tilde{\mu}(F) = \hat{\mu}^*(F)$ . Clearly,  $\tau W(L)$  is a  $\delta$  lattice. Also,  $\tilde{\mu}(F) = \tilde{\mu}(\cap W(L_\alpha)) = \inf \hat{\mu}(W(L_\alpha)) = \inf \hat{\mu}(W(L_\alpha)) \geq \mu^*(F)$ . Therefore,  $\hat{\mu}^* \leq \tilde{\mu}$  on  $\tau W(\mathcal{L})$ . On the other hand,  $\sigma(W(\mathcal{L})) \subset \sigma(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))$  and  $\tilde{\mu} \leq \hat{\mu}^*$  everywhere. For  $F \in \tau W(\mathcal{L})$ ,  $\tilde{\mu}(F) = \hat{\mu}^*(F) \leq \hat{\mu}^*(F)$ . Hence,  $\tilde{\mu} \leq \hat{\mu}^*$  on  $\tau W(\mathcal{L})$ . Finally,  $\tilde{\mu} = \hat{\mu}^*$  on  $\tau W(\mathcal{L})$  i.e.,  $\tilde{\mu} = \hat{\mu}^*$  on  $(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))'$ .

It is important to note that  $\hat{\mu}$  is defined on zero sets of the  $W$ -topology. Namely, we have

**PROPOSITION 3.6.** Every zero set  $Z$  of a continuous function on  $IR(\mathcal{L})$  is an element of  $\sigma(W(\mathcal{L}))$ .

**PROOF.**  $Z$  is compact, and also a  $G_\delta$  set; thus  $Z = \bigcap_1^\infty O_n$ ,  $O_n \in (\tau W(\mathcal{L}))'$ . Hence  $O_n = \bigcup_\alpha W(L_{n_\alpha})'$ ,  $L_{n_\alpha} \in \mathcal{L}$ . Thus  $Z \in \bigcup_\alpha W(L_{n_\alpha})'$ .  $Z$  has a finite cover  $\bigcup_1^N W(L_{n_{\alpha_i}})' = W(L)$ . Hence,  $Z \subset W(L_n)' \subset O_n$  for all  $n$  and consequently,  $Z \subset \bigcap_1^\infty W(L_n)' \subset \bigcap_1^\infty O_n = Z$ . Thus  $Z = \bigcap_1^\infty W(L_n)'$ , i.e.,  $Z$  is a countable intersection of  $W(L_n)'$ ,  $L_n \in \mathcal{L}$ , or  $Z \in \sigma(W(\mathcal{L}))$ .

Now, let us modify lightly the  $W$  mapping and consider  $W(\sigma, A) = \{\mu \in IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}) ; \mu(A) = 1\} \equiv W(A) \cap IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ . For  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$  define  $\mu'$  on  $\mathfrak{U}(W(\sigma, \mathcal{L})) = W(\sigma, \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L}))$  by  $\mu'(W(\sigma, B)) = \mu(B)$ ,  $B \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{L})$ .

PROPOSITION 3.7. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a separating and disjunctive lattice. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- 1)  $\mu' \in MR(W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))$  for all  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$
- 2) If  $\rho \in MR(W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))$  then  $\rho = \mu'$ , where  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$
- 3)  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  if and only if  $\mu' \in MR(\sigma, W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))$
- 4) If  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ , then  $\mu'$  is the projection of  $\hat{\mu}$  on  $IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  (since  $\hat{\mu}^*(IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})) = \hat{\mu}(IR(\mathcal{L}))$  in this case).

The proof of the equivalence is not difficult (see [5]).

#### 4. ALEXANDROV'S REPRESENTATION THEOREM AND WEAK CONVERGENCE.

In this section we summarize some of the properties of weak convergence of measures due to Alexandrov and investigate the relationship of these properties to the induced measures on  $IR(\mathcal{L})$  and  $IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  considered in the previous section, i.e.,  $\hat{\mu}$ ,  $\tilde{\mu}$ , and  $\mu'$  respectively.

Let  $X$  be an abstract set and let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a  $\delta$  normal lattice. The algebra of all  $\mathcal{L}$ -continuous functions is denoted by  $C(\mathcal{L})$ ; the algebra of bounded  $\mathcal{L}$ -continuous functions is denoted by  $C_b(\mathcal{L})$ .

We state for reference Alexandrov's Representation Theorem (A.R.T.).

**THEOREM** (Alexandrov) [1b]. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a  $\delta$  normal lattice. Then, the conjugate space  $C_b(\mathcal{L})'$  of  $C_b(\mathcal{L})$  is  $MR(\mathcal{L})$ . In more details: To every bounded linear functional  $\Phi$  there corresponds a unique  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$  such that  $\Phi(f) = \int f d\mu$  with  $\|\Phi\| = \|\mu\|$ . The positive and negative parts of  $\Phi$  correspond to those of  $\mu$ . Furthermore, if  $\Phi$  is non-negative, then  $\forall A \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $\mu(A) = \inf \Phi(f)$  where  $\inf$  is taken over all  $f$  in  $C_b(\mathcal{L})$  such that  $\chi_A \leq f \leq 1$ , where  $\chi_A$  is the characteristic function of  $A$ .

The spaces  $C(\mathcal{L})$  and  $C_b(\mathcal{L})$  are vector spaces. In particular,  $C_b(\mathcal{L})$  is a Banach space with sup norm. We can topologize  $MR(\mathcal{L})$  with the (weak \*) topology as follows: If  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ , then  $\mu_\alpha \in MR(\mathcal{L})$  converges to  $\mu$  in the weak topology if and only if  $\int f d\mu_\alpha$  converges to  $\int f d\mu$  for all  $f \in C_b(\mathcal{L})$ . In other words, we write  $\mu_\alpha \in MR(\mathcal{L})$  and  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu$ : iff  $\int f d\mu_\alpha \rightarrow \int f d\mu$  for all  $f \in C_b(\mathcal{L})$ .

PROPOSITION 4.1 (Portmanteau) [1c]. Let  $\{\mu_\alpha\}$  be a net in  $MR^+(\mathcal{L})$  the set of all non-negative measures of  $MR(\mathcal{L})$ . The following statements are equivalent:

- 1)  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu_0$
- 2)  $\mu_\alpha(X) \rightarrow \mu_0(X)$  and  $\overline{\lim} \mu_\alpha(L) \leq \mu_0(L)$  for all  $L \in \mathcal{L}$
- 3)  $\mu_\alpha(X) \rightarrow \mu_0(X)$  and  $\underline{\lim} \mu_\alpha(L') \geq \mu_0(L')$  for all  $L \in \mathcal{L}$

In what follows we assume that  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $\delta$  normal and disjunctive. Note the following facts:

- 1)  $IR(\mathcal{L})$  is closed in  $MR^+(\mathcal{L})$
- 2) If  $\mathcal{L}$  is separating, then  $[\bar{X}] = MR(\mathcal{L})$ , where  $[X]$  is the linear space spanned by all  $\mu_x$  in  $MR(\mathcal{L})$  and the closure is taken with respect to the weak topology.

These statements are not difficult to prove. In fact, with regards to 1), we have to use the  $W$ -compactness of  $IR(\mathcal{L})$  and the following

PROPOSITION 4.2. Let  $\mu_\alpha, \mu \in IR(\mathcal{L})$ . Then,

$$\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu \text{ if and only if } \mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu$$

**PROOF.** Let  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  and let  $L \in \mathcal{L}$  be such that  $\mu(L') = 1$ . Then,  $\mu \in W(L)'$ . Since  $W(L)'$  is  $W$ -open, hence  $\mu_\alpha \in W(L)'$  for all  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ , i.e.,  $\underline{\lim} \mu_\alpha(L') = 1 \geq \mu(L') = 1$ . Hence  $\underline{\lim} \mu_\alpha(L') \geq \mu(L'), \forall L \in \mathcal{L}$ . Obviously,  $\lim \mu_\alpha(X) = 1 = \mu(X)$ . By Proposition 4.1, we have  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu$ .

Conversely, suppose  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  and let  $\mu \in W(L)'$ . Then,  $\mu(L') = 1$  and by Proposition 4.1,  $\lim \mu_\alpha(L') = 1$ . Thus,  $\lim \mu_\alpha(L') = 1$  and  $\mu_\alpha \in W(L)'$  for all  $\alpha, \alpha \geq \alpha_0$ . Hence  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  because the open sets are generated by  $W(L)'$ .

COROLLARY 4.1. Proposition 4.2 holds if the topological space  $\{IR(\mathcal{L}), W\}$  is replaced by its subspace  $\{IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}), W\}$ .

Next, we consider the situation with two  $\delta$  normal lattices  $\mathcal{L}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2$ .

Set  $\mu^*(E) = \inf\{\mu(L'): E \subset L', L \in \mathcal{L}_1\}$ . Similarly, define  $\mu_*(E) = \sup\{\mu(L): L \subset E, L \in \mathcal{L}_1\}$  for  $E \subset X$ .

PROPOSITION 4.3. Let  $\mathcal{L}_1$  semiseparate  $\mathcal{L}_2$ . If  $B \in \mathcal{L}_2$ ,  $\mu_\alpha$ ,  $\mu \in MR^+(\mathcal{L}_1)$  and  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu$ , then  $\mu^*(B) \geq \overline{\lim} \mu_\alpha(B)$  and  $\mu_*(B) \leq \underline{\lim}(\mu_\alpha)$ .

PROOF. Since  $\mathcal{L}_1$  semiseparates  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , then for every  $B \in \mathcal{L}_2$  and  $L \in \mathcal{L}_1$ ,  $B \subset \tilde{L} \subset L'$ ,  $\tilde{L} \in \mathcal{L}_1$ . Hence

$$\mu^*(B) = \inf \{\mu(L): B \subset \tilde{L}, \tilde{L} \in \mathcal{L}_1\}.$$

Similarly, we get

$$\mu_*(B) = \sup \{\mu(A'): A' \subset B, A \in \mathcal{L}_1\}.$$

Now, the conclusion of the proposition follows from the Portmanteau theorem.

PROPOSITION 4.4. Let  $\mathcal{L}_1$  separate  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , and for  $\mu_\alpha$ ,  $\mu \in MR^+(\mathcal{L}_1)$  let  $\nu_\alpha$ ,  $\nu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$  denote the extensions of  $\mu_\alpha$ ,  $\mu$  to  $\mathcal{L}_2$ . Then

$$\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu \Rightarrow \nu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \nu.$$

PROOF. By Theorem 2.1  $\nu_\alpha$  and  $\nu$ , respectively are determined uniquely. Since  $\mathcal{L}_1$  semiseparates  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , we have

$$\mu^*(E) = \inf\{\mu(A'): E \subset A', A \in \mathcal{L}_1\} = \inf\{\mu(\tilde{A}): E \subset \tilde{A}, \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{L}_1\}.$$

However,  $\nu = \mu^*$  on  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , and  $\nu = \mu_*$  on  $\mathcal{L}_2$ . By Proposition 4.3 we have  $\mu^*(B) \geq \overline{\lim} \mu_\alpha(B)$  or  $\nu(B) \geq \overline{\lim} \nu_\alpha(B)$  for  $B \in \mathcal{L}_2$ .

On the other hand,  $\mu_\alpha(X) \rightarrow \mu(X)$ ,  $\mu_\alpha(X) = \nu_\alpha(X)$ ,  $\mu(X) = \nu(X)$ . By the Portmanteau theorem we have

$$\nu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \nu$$

It is of interest to note that if  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{L})$ , then  $\Phi(f) = \int_X f d\mu$  for  $f \in C_b(\mathcal{L})$  is a bounded linear functional on  $C_b(\mathcal{L})$ , and even a positive linear functional if  $\mu \geq 0$ . By A.R.T.  $\Phi(f) = \int_X f d\nu$ , where  $\nu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ , and it is not difficult to see that  $\mu \leq \nu$  on  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mu(X) = \nu(X)$ .

PROPOSITION 4.5. If  $\mathcal{L}$  is a strongly normal lattice of subsets of  $X$  and  $\mu_\alpha \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ , then

$$\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu \Leftrightarrow \tilde{\mu}_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \tilde{\mu}.$$

PROOF. Let  $f \in C_b(\mathcal{L})$ . Define  $\hat{f}$  on  $IR(\mathcal{L})$  by  $\hat{f}(\mu) = \int_X f d\mu$ . Since  $\hat{f}(\mu_x) = \int_X f d\mu_x = f(x)$ , then  $\hat{f}$  extends  $f$ . Also,  $\hat{f}$  is continuous with respect to the weak topology, i.e., (be definition)

$$\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu \Rightarrow \hat{f}(\mu_\alpha) = \int_X f d\mu_\alpha \rightarrow \int_X f d\mu = \hat{f}(\mu).$$

Without loss of generality we can assume  $f \geq 0$  and  $\mu \geq 0$ . We show that  $\int f d\mu = \int \hat{f} d\tilde{\mu}$ , for all  $f \in C_b(\mathcal{L})$ . Note that the set  $\{\hat{f}: f \in C_b(\mathcal{L})\}$  with the sup norm is a subalgebra of the Banach algebra  $C(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))$  and is isometrically isomorphic to the Banach algebra  $C_b(\mathcal{L})$ . Moreover, by the Stone-Weierstrass theorem  $\{\hat{f}: f \in C_b(\mathcal{L})\}$  is a dense subset of  $C(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))$ . Thus, we have  $C(\tau W(\mathcal{L})) = \{\hat{f}: f \in C_b(\mathcal{L})\}$ .

Let  $\Phi$  be a bounded linear functional on  $C_b(\mathcal{L})$ . Thus, by A.R.T.,  $\Phi(f) = \int f d\mu$ , where  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ . Define  $\hat{\Phi}$  on  $C(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))$  by

$$\hat{\Phi}(\hat{f}) = \Phi(f) \text{ for } f \in C_b(\mathcal{L}).$$

Clearly,  $\hat{\Phi}$  is a bounded linear functional. Again, by A.R.T.

$$\hat{\Phi}(\hat{f}) = \int f d\tilde{\nu}$$

where  $\tilde{\nu} \in MR(\tau W(\mathcal{L}))$  and  $\tilde{\nu}(W(L)) = \inf\{\Phi(f): \chi_{W(L)} \leq f \leq 1\}$

$$= \inf\{\Phi(f): \chi_L \leq f \leq 1\} = \mu(L) = \tilde{\mu}(W(L)).$$

Hence,  $\tilde{\nu} = \tilde{\mu}$  and  $\hat{\Phi}(\hat{f}) = \Phi(f) = \int \hat{f} d\tilde{\mu} = \int f d\mu$ .

Thus  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu \Leftrightarrow \tilde{\mu}_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \tilde{\mu}$ .

Proposition 4.4 and Proposition 4.5 together give an alternative proof of a theorem of Kirk and Crenshaw in the following formulation.

**COROLLARY 4.5.1.** Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a strongly normal lattice of subsets of  $X$  and  $\tau W(\mathcal{L})$  be the Wallman topology on  $IR(\mathcal{L})$ . Let  $\{\mu_\alpha\}$  be a net in  $MR^+(\mathcal{L})$  and  $\mu \in MR^+(\mathcal{L})$ . The following are equivalent:

- 1)  $\hat{\mu}_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \hat{\mu}$
- 2)  $\mu_\alpha(X) \rightarrow \mu(X)$  and  $\overline{\lim} \mu_\alpha(L) \leq \mu(L)$  for all  $L \in \mathcal{L}$
- 3)  $\mu_\alpha(X) \rightarrow \mu(X)$  and  $\underline{\lim} \mu_\alpha(L') \geq \mu(L')$  for all  $L \in \mathcal{L}$

**PROOF.** Let  $\mu_\alpha, \mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$  and suppose that  $\hat{\mu}_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \hat{\mu}$  where we are, of course, referring here to the lattice  $W(\mathcal{L})$  and the space  $C_b(W(\mathcal{L}))$ . Then, since  $W(\mathcal{L})$  separates  $\tau W(\mathcal{L})$ , Proposition 4.4 gives  $\tilde{\mu}_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \tilde{\mu}$  which is equivalent to  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  (by Proposition 4.5). This in conjunction with the Portmanteau theorem completes the proof.

We introduce a set of measures  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L})$  as follows:

$M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L}) = \{\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L}) \text{ and for any } \rho \in IR(\mathcal{L}) - IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}), \text{ there exists a } G \in (\tau W(\mathcal{L}))' \text{ such that } \rho \in G \text{ and } |\mu|(G) = 0\}$ .

Note that the measures of  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L})$  integrate all  $f \in C(\mathcal{L})$ .

Let  $\mu_o \in M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L})$ , and let  $\mathcal{O}: \{V(\mu_o, f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n, \varepsilon) = \mu \in MR(\mathcal{L}): |\int_X f_i d\mu - \int_X f_i d\mu_o| < \varepsilon\}$ , where  $f_i \in C(\mathcal{L}), (1 \leq i \leq n)\}$  be a neighborhood system at point  $\mu_o$ .  $\mathcal{O}$  is a base for topology  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$  on  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L})$ . Clearly,  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$  and  $(\tau W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))'$  coincide on  $IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ .

**PROPOSITION 4.6.** Let  $\mu_\alpha, \mu_o \in M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L})$ . Then,

$$\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}} \mu_o \Leftrightarrow \mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu_o$$

**PROOF.** By definition, a net  $\{\mu_\alpha\}$  on  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L})$  converges to  $\mu \in M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L})$  with respect to  $\mathcal{O}$  if and only if  $\int_X f d\mu_\alpha \rightarrow \int_X f d\mu$  for all  $f \in C(\mathcal{L})$ . Therefore, if  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}} \mu_o$ , then clearly  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu_o$ .

Conversely, let  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu_o$ . We have to prove that  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}} \mu_o$  or, equivalently, that the functional

$$\hat{f}(\mu) = \int_X f d\mu, \mu \in IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$$

is continuous with respect to  $\tau W(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ , for all  $f \in C(\mathcal{L})$ .

First we show that  $\hat{f}: IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

Let  $F_n = \{x \in X: |f(x)| \leq n\} \in \mathcal{L}$ . Since  $f \in C(\mathcal{L})$ , then  $F_n \uparrow X$  and consequently,  $\mu(F_n) \uparrow 1$ , i.e., there exists  $N$  such that  $\mu(F_n) = 1$  for  $n \geq N$ . Thus,

$$|\hat{f}(\mu)| = |\int_X f d\mu| = |\int_{F_n} f d\mu| \leq \int_{F_n} |f| d\mu \leq N.$$

Next, we show that  $\hat{f}$  is continuous. Assume w.l.o.g.  $f \geq 0$ . Let  $L_n = \{x: f(x) \geq n\}$  where  $L_n \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $L_n \downarrow \emptyset$ . Then,  $\mu_\alpha(L_n) = 0$  for some  $N$ . Clearly,  $\mu_\alpha(L_n) = 0$  for all  $\alpha > \alpha_n$  and

$$|\hat{f}(\mu_\alpha) - \hat{f}(\mu_\alpha)| = \left| \int_X f d\mu_\alpha - \int_X f d\mu_\alpha \right| = \left| \int_X f_N d\mu_\alpha - \int_X f_N d\mu_\alpha \right|$$

for all  $\alpha > \alpha_n$ , where  $f_N = f \wedge N \in C_b(\mathcal{L})$ . Since  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu_\alpha$ , we have  $|\hat{f}(\mu_\alpha) - \hat{f}(\mu_\alpha)| \rightarrow 0$ . Thus  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{\tilde{\sigma}} \mu_\alpha$ .

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be topological spaces and  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  be lattices of closed subsets of  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively. Suppose  $T$  is a linear mapping of  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L}_1)$  onto  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L}_2)$  and 1:1 such that  $\|T\mu\| = |\mu|$  and  $T$  is continuous both ways in the respective topologies, i.e.,  $T$  is  $\tilde{\sigma}_1 - \tilde{\sigma}_2$  homeomorphic.  $\tilde{\sigma}_i$  is a neighborhood system at point  $\mu_i, i = 1, 2$  which forms a basis for the topology of  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L}_i)$ . By Proposition 4.6  $\tilde{\sigma}_i$  topology restricted to  $IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_i)$  yields the same closed sets as  $\tau W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_i)$ . If  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  are separating, disjunctive and replete, then we can identify  $IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1) = X$  and  $IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2) = Y$ .

**PROPOSITION 4.7.** Let  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  be separating, disjunctive and replete. If  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L}_1)$  and  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{L}_2)$  are isomorphic, then  $X$  and  $Y$  are homeomorphic with respect to the  $\tau\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\tau\mathcal{L}_2$  topologies of closed sets.

The proof follows immediately from Proposition 4.6 and the definitions of the relevant topologies.

This isomorphism proposition gives the following results:

- 1) If  $X$  is  $T_{3\frac{1}{2}}$  (a Tychonov space) and  $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{Z}_1$  and if  $Y$  is  $T_{3\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{Z}_2$  where  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  are replete, i.e.,  $X$  and  $Y$  are real-compact, then  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{Z}_1)$  and  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{Z}_2)$  isomorphic implies that  $X$  and  $Y$  are homeomorphic [9].
- 2) If  $X, \mathcal{L}_1 (= \mathcal{F}_1)$  and  $Y, \mathcal{L}_2 (= \mathcal{F}_2)$  are  $T_4$  spaces and each  $\mathcal{L}_i$  is replete, then  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{F}_1)$  and  $M\tilde{R}(\mathcal{F}_2)$  isomorphic implies that  $X$  and  $Y$  are homeomorphic.

We now turn attention to  $C(\mathcal{L})$ ; unlike the situation with  $C_b(\mathcal{L})$  we have

$$C(\mathcal{L}) \leftrightarrow C(W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))$$

$$f \leftrightarrow \hat{f}$$

where  $\hat{f}(\mu) = \int_X f d\mu, \mu \in IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ , i.e.,  $C(\mathcal{L})$  is algebraically isomorphic to  $C(W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))$ . Details can be found in [3].

**PROPOSITION 4.8.**  $\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu \Leftrightarrow \mu'_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu'$  where  $\mu'_\alpha, \mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  for all  $\mu \geq 0$ .

**PROOF.** We have

$$\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu \Rightarrow \int_X f d\mu_\alpha \rightarrow \int_X f d\mu, \text{ for all } f \in C_b(\mathcal{L}).$$

On the other hand,

$$\mu'_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu' \Leftrightarrow \int_{IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})} \hat{f} d\mu'_\alpha \rightarrow \int_{IR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})} \hat{f} d\mu', f \in C_b(W(\sigma, \mathcal{L})),$$

since  $C_b(\mathcal{L})$  and  $C_b(W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))$  are isomorphic ( $f \leftrightarrow \hat{f}$ ). Let  $\Phi(f) = \int f d\mu, \mu \geq 0$ . By A.R.T. define  $\bar{\Phi}(\hat{f}) = \Phi(f)$  on  $W(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ . Clearly,  $\Phi$  is a bounded linear functional. Again, by A.R.T.  $\bar{\Phi}(\hat{f}) = \int f d\rho$  where  $\rho \in MR(W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))$  and  $\rho(W(\mathcal{L})) = \inf \bar{\Phi}(\hat{f}) = \inf \Phi(f) = \mu(L) = \mu'(W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))$ .  $\chi_{W(\sigma, \mathcal{L})} \leq \hat{f} \leq 1, \chi_L \leq f \leq 1$ . Thus  $\bar{\Phi}(\hat{f}) = \Phi(f) = \int \hat{f} d\mu' = \int f d\mu$ . Hence,

$$\mu_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu \Leftrightarrow \mu'_\alpha \xrightarrow{w} \mu'$$

**REMARK.** If  $h \in C(\tau W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))$ , then  $f = h|_X \in C(\tau\mathcal{L})$ , and if  $f \in C(\mathcal{L})$  then  $h = \hat{f}$  and  $h \in C(W(\sigma, \mathcal{L}))$ . This situation arises, for example, if  $X$  is  $T_{3\frac{1}{2}}$  space and  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{Z}$  (the lattice of zero sets of  $X$ ).

## 5. ALEXANDROV LATTICES.

Consider  $X, \mathcal{L}$  where  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $\delta$  normal and complement generated (completely normal). Then Alexandrov's Fundamental Theorem [1b], states that  $MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  is weakly sequentially closed in  $MR(\mathcal{L})$ , i.e., if  $\mu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  and  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu$ , then  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ . We will call lattices for which this is true, Alexandrov lattices and will initiate a consideration of such lattices in this section. Formally, then we have

**DEFINITION.** A  $\delta$  normal lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  of subsets of  $X$  is said to be an Alexandrov lattice if  $\mu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  and  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu$ , where  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ , imply  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$

**PROPOSITION 5.1.** Let  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2$ , be  $\delta$  normal lattices. If  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is  $\mathcal{L}_1$  c.p. or c.b. and  $\mathcal{L}_1$  s.s.  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , then if  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is an Alexandrov lattice,  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is also an Alexandrov lattice.

**PROOF.** Suppose  $\nu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$  and  $\nu_n \xrightarrow{w} \nu$ ,  $\nu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_1$  s.s.  $\mathcal{L}_2$  and  $C_b(\mathcal{L}_2) \supset C_b(\mathcal{L}_1)$ , then we have

$$\nu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu, \mu_n = \nu_n| \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1), \mu = \nu|.$$

Since  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is Alexandrov,  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$  and consequently,  $\nu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$  (since  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is  $\mathcal{L}_1$  c.p. or c.b.). Thus  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is also an Alexandrov lattice.

**REMARK.** If instead of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  s.s.  $\mathcal{L}_2$  we assume that  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is  $\delta$  and  $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_1) \subset s(\mathcal{L}_1)$ , then in this case  $\mu_n = \nu_n| \in M(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$  and therefore, by Choquet's capacity theorem [7]  $\mu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$ . Also,  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu = \nu| \in M(\mathcal{L}_1)$ , but  $\mu \leq \rho$  on  $\mathcal{L}_1$ , where  $\rho \in MR(\mathcal{L}_1)$  and  $\mu(X) = \rho(X)$ , and since  $\int f d\mu = \int f d\rho$  for all  $f \in C_b(\mathcal{L}_1)$ ,  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \rho$ . Hence  $\rho \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$  since  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is Alexandrov and consequently  $\mu \in M(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$ .

Note that if  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  are  $\delta$  normal and  $C(\mathcal{L}_1) = C(\mathcal{L}_2)$ , which implies that  $\mathcal{L}_1$  separates  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , and if  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is c.p., then  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is  $\mathcal{L}_1$  c.p. and  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$ . Then by Theorem 2.1  $\mu$  extends uniquely to  $\nu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ . In other words, we have

**COROLLARY 5.1.** Let  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  be  $\delta$  normal,  $C(\mathcal{L}_2) = C(\mathcal{L}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  be c.p.. Then,

$$\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ Alexandrov} \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2 \text{ Alexandrov}.$$

By Proposition 5.1 we also have the following

**COROLLARY 5.2.** If  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $\delta$  normal and c.p. then  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $\mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{L})$  c.p. and  $\mathcal{L}$  is also Alexandrov since  $\mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{L})$  is Alexandrov.

Suppose  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  are  $\delta$  normal lattices,  $\mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2$  and  $C(\mathcal{L}_1) = C(\mathcal{L}_2)$ . Let  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  where  $\mu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$  and  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_1)$ . Then, if  $\nu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$  is the unique extension of  $\mu_n$ , and  $\nu$  that of  $\mu$ , we have  $\nu_n \xrightarrow{w} \nu$  and  $\nu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$  assuming  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is Alexandrov. Therefore,  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is Alexandrov. This fact together with Corollary 5.1 gives

**COROLLARY 5.3.** If  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  are  $\delta$  normal lattices,  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is c.p. and  $C(\mathcal{L}_2) = C(\mathcal{L}_1)$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is Alexandrov if and only if  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is Alexandrov.

**PROPOSITION 5.2.** If  $\mathcal{L}$  is a  $\delta$  normal and c.p. lattice of subsets of  $X$  and  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  where  $\mu_n \in M(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ ,  $\mu \in M(\mathcal{L})$ , then  $\mu \in M(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ .

**PROOF.** Let  $\mu_n \in M(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$  and  $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu$ . The functional  $\phi_n(f) = \int f d\mu_n$  is a bounded linear functional of  $f \in C_b(\mathcal{L})$ , and by A.R.T., we have  $\Phi_n(f) = \int f d\mu_n = \int f d\nu_n$ ,  $\nu_n \in MR(\mathcal{L})$ ,  $\mu_n(X) = \nu_n(X)$  and  $\mu_n \leq \nu_n$  on  $\mathcal{L}$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is c.p., we also have  $\nu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ . Thus  $\int f d\nu_n = \int f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int f d\mu$ . Also, by A.R.T.,  $\Phi(f) = \int f d\mu = \int f d\nu$ ,  $\nu \in MR(\mathcal{L})$  and  $\mu(X) = \nu(X)$  on  $\mathcal{L}$ . Therefore,  $\int f d\nu_n \rightarrow \int f d\mu$  or  $\nu_n \xrightarrow{w} \nu$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $\delta$  normal and c.p., by Alexandrov's theorem  $\nu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ . On the other hand, we have  $\mu \leq \nu$  on  $\mathcal{L}$ . Therefore,  $\mu \in M(\sigma, \mathcal{L})$ .

**PROPOSITION 5.3.** Let  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  be lattices of subsets of  $X$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{L}_1$  separates  $\mathcal{L}_2$  and  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is an Alexandrov lattice. If  $M(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2) \cap MR(\mathcal{L}_2) \subset M(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is also an Alexandrov lattice.

PROOF. Let  $\nu_n \xrightarrow{w} \nu$  where  $\nu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$  and  $\nu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is an Alexandrov lattice and  $\nu_n| = \mu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$ , we have  $\nu_n| = \mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \nu| = \mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$ .  $\mathcal{L}_1$  actually coseparates  $\mathcal{L}_2$  since  $\mathcal{L}_1$  separates  $\mathcal{L}_2$  and  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is normal. It is not difficult to see that  $\nu \in M(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$  since  $\nu$  must be  $\mathcal{L}_1$ -regular on  $\mathcal{L}_2$ . Now, since  $\nu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$  and  $\nu \in M(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ , we have  $\nu \in M(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2) \cap MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$ . Clearly, if  $M(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2) \cap MR(\mathcal{L}_2) \subset M(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ , then  $\nu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is an Alexandrov lattice.

Let  $\mathcal{L}_1$  be a lattice of subsets of  $X$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  be a lattice of subsets of  $Y$ . Again, we assume that  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  are  $\delta$  normal.

Let  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  be  $\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2$  continuous. Consider a mapping  $A: C_b(\mathcal{L}_2) \rightarrow C_b(\mathcal{L}_1)$ , such that  $A$  is linear and bounded.

If the mapping  $A$  is defined by  $Ag = gT$  where  $g \in C_b(\mathcal{L}_2)$ , then define the adjoint map by  $A': C_b(\mathcal{L}_1)' \rightarrow C_b(\mathcal{L}_2)'$  where  $C_b(\mathcal{L}_i)'$  is congruent to  $MR(\mathcal{L}_i)$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) and  $(A'\Phi)(g) = \Phi(Ag)$ . By A.R.T., we have

$\Phi \leftrightarrow \mu$ ,  $\mu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_1)$  and  $A'\Phi \leftrightarrow \nu, \nu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$ . Then,

$$\Phi(AG) = \int Ag d\mu \text{ and } (A'\Phi)(g) = \int gd\nu, \text{ for all } g \in C_b(\mathcal{L}_2)$$

and consequently  $A': MR(\mathcal{L}_1) \rightarrow MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$  where  $A'\mu = \nu$  and

$$\int_Y gd\nu = (A'\Phi)(g) = \Phi(AG) = \int_X Ag d\mu = \int_X gT d\mu = \int_Y gd\mu T^{-1}, \quad g \in C_b(\mathcal{L}_2).$$

Note that  $A$  is a linear mapping and that  $Ag_1g_2 = g_1Tg_2T = Ag_1Ag_2$ . Therefore,  $A$  is an algebra homeomorphism. Also, we have  $\|Ag\| = \|gT\| \leq \|g\|$ . Indeed,  $A$  is bounded. If  $T$  is surjective, then  $\|Ag\| = \|g\|$ , i.e.,  $A$  is an isometry, and consequently  $A$  is invertible.

Some basic properties of  $A'$  are collected in the following

PROPOSITION 5.4. a) If  $\mu \geq 0$ , then  $\nu = A'\mu \geq 0$   
b)  $A'\mu = \nu \geq \mu T^{-1}$  on  $\mathcal{L}_2$  and  $\nu(Y) = \mu T^{-1}(Y)$   
c)  $A'(IR(\mathcal{L}_1)) \subset IR(\mathcal{L}_2)$   
d)  $A'|_{IR(\mathcal{L}_1)}$  is Wallman continuous.

PROOF. We show only b). Further details can be found in [2]. We have  $\mu T^{-1}(L) = \int_L d\mu T^{-1} = \int_Y \chi_L d\mu T^{-1} \leq \int_Y gd\mu T^{-1} = \int_Y gd\nu$  where  $g \in C_b(\mathcal{L}_2)$  and  $\chi_L \leq g \leq 1$ . Therefore,  $\mu T^{-1}(L) \leq \nu(L)$  for all  $L \in \mathcal{L}_2$ . If  $g = 1$ , we obtain  $\int_Y d\nu = \int_Y d\mu T^{-1}$ . Hence  $\nu(Y) = \mu T^{-1}(Y)$ .

PROPOSITION 5.5. a) If  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is c.p., then  $A'(MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)) \subset MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$   
b) If  $T$  is surjective and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is  $T^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_2)$  c.b., then  $MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2) \subset A'(MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1))'$   
c) If a) and b) hold, then  $A'(MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)) = MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$

PROOF. Here we show only a). Suppose  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is c.p.. Let  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$  and consider any element of  $A'(MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1))$ ,  $A'\mu$ . We must show that  $A'\mu = \nu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ . By A.R.T., we have  $\mu \leftrightarrow \Phi$  and  $\Phi$  is  $\sigma$ -smooth. In fact, consider  $\{g_n\}$ ,  $g_n \in C_b(\mathcal{L}_2)$ ,  $g_n \downarrow 0$ . Then,  $g_n T \downarrow 0$  and, therefore,  $\lim \int g_n T d\mu = 0$ . However,  $\lim \int g_n T d\mu = \lim \int g_n d\nu = 0$  which means  $\Phi \leftrightarrow \nu$  where  $\Phi(g) = \int gd\nu$ , for all  $g \in C_b(\mathcal{L}_2)$ . Since  $\Phi$  is  $\sigma$ -smooth and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is c.p., we have  $A'\mu = \nu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ . Hence

$$A'(MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)) \subset MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2).$$

PROPOSITION 5.6. 1) Under the assumption a) of Proposition 5.5, if  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is an Alexandrov lattice and

$$\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu, \quad \mu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1),$$

then  $A'\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} A'\mu$  and  $A'\mu_n, A'\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ ;

2) Under the assumptions a) and b) of Proposition 5.5 and if  $A$  is surjective, then  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is an Alexandrov implies that  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is an Alexandrov.

PROOF. 1) Since  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is Alexandrov, we have

$$\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu, \mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1).$$

Then by Proposition 5.4 d)  $A'\mu_n \rightarrow A'\mu$ . By Proposition 5.5 a)

$$A'\mu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2) \text{ and } A'\mu \in A'(MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)) \subset MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2).$$

2) Let  $\nu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ . Then  $\nu_n \xrightarrow{w} \nu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_2)$ .

By Proposition 5.5 b) we have

$$\nu_n = A'\mu_n, \mu_n \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1); \nu = A'\mu, \mu \in MR(\mathcal{L}_1).$$

Since  $A$  is surjective, we have

$$\int Agd\mu_n = \int gd\nu_n \rightarrow \int gd\nu = \int Agd\mu.$$

Hence

$$\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} \mu.$$

Since  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is Alexandrov,  $\mu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_1)$ . Therefore, by Proposition 5.5 a)  $A'\mu = \nu \in MR(\sigma, \mathcal{L}_2)$ . Hence  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is Alexandrov.

Thus, under the above assumptions the measure defined on Alexandrov lattices is invariant under adjoint mappings.

#### REFERENCES

1. ALEXANDROV, A.D., Additive set functions in abstract spaces, Mat. Sb. (a)8, 50, (1940), 307-348; (b)9, 51, (1941), 563-628; (c)13, 55, (1943), 139-268.
2. BACHMAN, G. & STRATIGOS, P., Some applications of the adjoint to lattice regular measures, Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata IV, Vol. 138 (1984), 379-397.
3. BACHMAN, G. & SULTAN, A., Extensions of regular lattice measures with topological applications, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 57 (1977), 539-559.
4. BACHMAN, G. & SULTAN, A., On regular extensions of measures, Pacific J. Math. 2 (1980), 389-395.
5. BACHMAN, G. & SZETO, M., On strongly measure replete lattices and the general Wallman remainder, Fundamenta Mathematicae, CXXII (1984), 199-217.
6. BERGSTROM, H., Weak Convergence of Measures, Academic' Press, New York, London, 1982.
7. CHOQUET, G., Theory of capacities, Ann. Inst. Fourier 5 (1953-1954), 131-295.
8. KIRK, R.B. & CRENSHAW, J.A., A generalized topological measure theory, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Vol. 207 (1975), 189-217.
9. VARADARAJAN, V.S., Measures on topological spaces, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2) 48, (1965), 161-228.

## Special Issue on Time-Dependent Billiards

### Call for Papers

This subject has been extensively studied in the past years for one-, two-, and three-dimensional space. Additionally, such dynamical systems can exhibit a very important and still unexplained phenomenon, called as the Fermi acceleration phenomenon. Basically, the phenomenon of Fermi acceleration (FA) is a process in which a classical particle can acquire unbounded energy from collisions with a heavy moving wall. This phenomenon was originally proposed by Enrico Fermi in 1949 as a possible explanation of the origin of the large energies of the cosmic particles. His original model was then modified and considered under different approaches and using many versions. Moreover, applications of FA have been of a large broad interest in many different fields of science including plasma physics, astrophysics, atomic physics, optics, and time-dependent billiard problems and they are useful for controlling chaos in Engineering and dynamical systems exhibiting chaos (both conservative and dissipative chaos).

We intend to publish in this special issue papers reporting research on time-dependent billiards. The topic includes both conservative and dissipative dynamics. Papers discussing dynamical properties, statistical and mathematical results, stability investigation of the phase space structure, the phenomenon of Fermi acceleration, conditions for having suppression of Fermi acceleration, and computational and numerical methods for exploring these structures and applications are welcome.

To be acceptable for publication in the special issue of Mathematical Problems in Engineering, papers must make significant, original, and correct contributions to one or more of the topics above mentioned. Mathematical papers regarding the topics above are also welcome.

Authors should follow the Mathematical Problems in Engineering manuscript format described at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/mpe/>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/> according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	December 1, 2008
First Round of Reviews	March 1, 2009
Publication Date	June 1, 2009

### Guest Editors

**Edson Denis Leonel**, Departamento de Estatística, Matemática Aplicada e Computação, Instituto de Geociências e Ciências Exatas, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Avenida 24A, 1515 Bela Vista, 13506-700 Rio Claro, SP, Brazil ; [edleonel@rc.unesp.br](mailto:edleonel@rc.unesp.br)

**Alexander Loskutov**, Physics Faculty, Moscow State University, Vorob'evy Gory, Moscow 119992, Russia; [loskutov@chaos.phys.msu.ru](mailto:loskutov@chaos.phys.msu.ru)