

NEARNESS POSETS

TRISTAN BICE

ABSTRACT. We extend nearness frames to posets representing bases and even subbases of T_1 spaces. This allows us to put a classic duality due to Wallman, between compact T_1 spaces and abstract simplicial complexes, into a general nearness framework. Within this framework we extend Wallman's duality to locally compact T_1 spaces and, with further modifications, to completely metrisable spaces. Moreover, we provide an elementary sublocale-free version of an admissibility condition due to Picado and Pultr and show how it strengthens Wallman's admissibility condition.

INTRODUCTION

The story really begins 80 years ago with a paper of Wallman, namely [Wal38]. Most attention was focused on the earlier lattice theoretic part of [Wal38] which, together with Stone's famous papers around the same time, gave birth to the field of point-free topology. However, in the latter part of [Wal38], Wallman showed that more general posets arising from abstract simplicial complexes also provide a point-free description of compact T_1 spaces. Here the vertices of the complex correspond to a subbasis of the space, while the simplices in the complex determine the covers of the space. Thus the complex could be considered as a point-free 'generalised uniform space'. This duality was well ahead of its time and it would be many years before point-free uniform or nearness structures were considered again.

On the pointed side of things, however, entourage uniformities were introduced by Weil around the same time, while Tukey introduced covering uniformities in [Tuk40]. These were significantly generalised by Morita in a series of papers [Mor51] which were somewhat overlooked at the time, despite their importance. Indeed, to quote Collins in [CM98], Morita's papers formed an 'extended rewriting of the basis of general topology' via generalised uniformities. Our goal in the present paper is to explore similar ideas but in a point-free context.

The word 'basis' here really is the key. Indeed, Morita made two key observations about covering uniformities:

- (1) It is often best to weaken the star-refinement axiom.
- (2) It usually suffices to work with a basis rather than all open sets.

The first observation was made independently several times thereafter, although in equivalent but superficially different contexts, like Herrlich's nearness spaces and

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 06A06, 06A07, 54D10, 54D30, 54D35, 54D45, 54D70, 54D80, 54E15, 54E17, 54E35, 54E45, 54E50, 54H10.

Key words and phrases. Wallman duality, uniformity, nearness, poset, Cauchy filter, compact, locally compact, regular space, completely metrisable.

The author is supported by Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland.

Katětov’s merotopic spaces (see [BHH98] for more on the history and interrelatedness of these structures). Once this equivalence became apparent, ‘nearness spaces’ gradually came to be synonymous with Morita’s ‘generalised uniform spaces’.

More recently, uniform and nearness structures have been considered in the point free context, namely on frames (see [PP12]). However, what appears to have escaped attention is the fact that Morita’s second observation is still valid in the point free context. More precisely, instead of considering covers on a frame, representing the entire collection of open sets of some space, we can work with a poset, representing a mere basis of some space, leaving the covers to carry most of the topological information, just like Wallman did in [Wal38].

The significance of this observation is easy to overlook, but its practical and theoretical implications should not be underestimated. On the practical side of things, by working posets/bases we are dealing with much smaller, often countable objects. These will generally be easier to construct, often in more finite combinatorial ways, like from inverse systems of graphs in a manner similar to [DT18]. On the theoretical side of things, this illustrates that covers really do contain a lot of information about the space.

Indeed, on their own, posets arising from arbitrary bases of topological spaces do not retain much information about the space at all, excepting e.g. isolated points. For example, all second countable regular spaces without isolated points have bases which are isomorphic as posets (to the unique countable atomless Boolean algebra). So there is no way to distinguish, say, the unit interval from the Cantor space given just the order structure of some arbitrary basis.

To rectify this, we considered slightly stronger structures in locally compact Hausdorff spaces, namely bases closed under finite unions (see [BS18a]) or bases together with the compact containment relation (see [BS18b]). However, by obtaining the requisite extra structure from covers instead we are able to recover a much larger class of spaces than the locally compact Hausdorff ones. In fact, we can recover all T_1 spaces, including the non-sober ones. Moreover, as a bonus we get some additional uniform structure from which to define things like uniform continuity (although this will not be the focus of the present paper).

OUTLINE

First, we set out some basic notation and terminology in §1. In §2, we then examine some elementary properties of Cauchy and round up-sets. The more standard approach would be to consider regular filters, which would be fine for bases in T_3 spaces. However, we will be working with subbases in T_1 spaces, which is why we must consider more general round up-sets. Under suitable extra conditions, they turn out to be the same thing, as becomes clear later on. Following that, we introduce the spectrum of round Cauchy up-sets in §3. In particular, in Proposition 3.3, we note that the spectrum allows us to recover any T_1 space from an arbitrary subbasis.

We come to our first duality in §4. The results in this sections are essentially all from [Wal38], but reformulated in a way that makes it clearer how they relate to nearness structures and also easier to generalise. The main result is summarised in Theorem 4.6, which we repeat here:

Wallman posets are dual to subbases of compact T_1 spaces.

Here, Wallman posets are structures of the form $(\mathbb{P}, \leq, \Theta)$ where Θ consists of finite subsets of \mathbb{P} and Θ determines the ordering \leq in a natural way (see Proposition 4.3). For details, see the comments following Theorem 4.6.

Before moving on, we digress to examine near subsets in §5. This is necessary in order to define appropriate ‘restrictions’ $\Theta|_p$ to elements of \mathbb{P} . Using these restrictions, we extend Wallman’s duality to locally compact T_1 spaces. The main result is summarised in Theorem 6.9, we which again repeat here:

Generalised Wallman posets are dual to relatively compact subbases of locally compact T_1 spaces.

Basically, $(\mathbb{P}, \leq, \Theta)$ is a generalised Wallman poset if the restrictions $\Theta|_p$ are finite and can be patched together to obtain Θ , which is again required to determine the ordering \leq . For the technical details, see the comments following Theorem 6.9.

From §7 onwards, we move from general subbases to focus on bases. This is done in order to handle more general families of covers, like in the main result summarised in Theorem 7.9, specifically:

Abstract nearly finite proper Wallman admissible filters $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ are dual to concrete *-cointial filters $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ where $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ is a basis of relatively compact sets on a locally compact T_1 space $X \neq \emptyset$.

The key point is that *-cointial families of covers are general enough to include examples like the uniform covers of a locally compact metric space.

We temporarily digress again in §8 to examine a notion of cover that applies to general posets. This is done in order to extend an admissibility condition due to Picado and Pultr from frames to posets, which we examine in §9. Even in the case of frames, our condition is somewhat simpler than the original in that it avoids any mention of sublocales and can be stated concisely as

$$\text{(Picado-Pultr Admissible)} \quad p \leq q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall C \in \Theta \left(\bigvee_{p \neq c \in C} c \vee q = 1 \right)$$

(note that \Rightarrow is immediate if Θ consists of covers, it is the \Leftarrow part that is the key). In Theorem 9.3, we show that this is indeed equivalent to the sublocale version.

In §10, we examine the ‘uniformly below’ relation \triangleleft , bringing us closer to the theory in [PP12] (although we are still working with more general posets rather than frames). Finally, we examine \triangleleft -regularity and the slightly weaker notion of star-regularity. In Theorem 11.5, we then show how any admissible Θ can be turned into a regular admissible family Θ^R . This allows us to prove our final duality for completely metrisable spaces, summarised in Theorem 11.6 and repeated here:

Abstract countable admissible filters $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ are dual to concrete countable complete locally uniform compatible filters $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ where $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ is a basis of a completely metrisable space X .

1. PRELIMINARIES

For a relation \prec on a set \mathbb{P} and $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, define

$$S^\prec = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : \exists s \in S (s \prec p)\}.$$

Further define the following conditions on S .

$$\begin{aligned} (\prec\text{-Closed}) & & S^\prec &\subseteq S. \\ (\prec\text{-Regular}) & & S^\prec &\supseteq S. \\ (\prec\text{-Coinitial}) & & \mathbb{P} &\subseteq S^\prec. \\ (\prec\text{-Cofinal}) & & \mathbb{P} &\subseteq S^\succ. \end{aligned}$$

We call any \prec -closed $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ an *up-set* when the relation is clear.

As in [PP12, VIII.2.1], we extend \prec to $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}) = \{S : S \subseteq \mathbb{P}\}$ by defining

$$(\prec\text{-Refinement}) \quad R \prec S \iff R \subseteq S^\succ \iff \forall r \in R \exists s \in S (r \prec s).$$

When $R \prec S$, we say that R *refines* S . Note that above we are using the standard convention of writing \succ for the opposite relation of \prec , i.e. $s \succ r$ means $r \prec s$. For subsets, however, $S \succ R$ is not the same as $R \prec S$, indeed

$$\begin{aligned} R \prec S & \iff R \subseteq S^\succ \\ \text{while } S \succ R & \iff S \subseteq R^\prec. \end{aligned}$$

Also note that we abuse notation by identifying elements with singleton subsets whenever there is no risk of confusion, e.g.

$$R \prec q \text{ really means } R \prec \{q\}.$$

Let us denote the finite subsets of \mathbb{P} (including the empty set \emptyset) by

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P}) = \{F \subseteq \mathbb{P} : F \text{ is finite}\}.$$

Consider the following conditions on $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$.

$$\begin{aligned} (\prec\text{-Filter}) & & F \in \mathcal{F}(S) & \iff \exists s \in S (F \succ s). \\ (\prec\text{-Directed}) & & F \in \mathcal{F}(S) & \implies \exists s \in S (F \succ s). \end{aligned}$$

When the relation is clear, we just refer to *filters* and *directed* subsets. Note filters are just directed up-sets and directed subsets are always non-empty, as $\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}(S)$.

When \prec is transitive and reflexive, we call \prec a *preorder* and (\mathbb{P}, \prec) a *proset*. The extension of \prec to $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ is then also a preorder. When \prec is also antisymmetric, we call \prec a *partial order* and (\mathbb{P}, \prec) a *poset*. However, the extension of \prec to $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ is generally not antisymmetric (in fact this only happens when \prec is $=$).

A *topology* on a set X is a collection of open subsets $\mathcal{O}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ that is closed under taking arbitrary unions and finite intersections. In particular, $\emptyset = \bigcup \emptyset$ and $X = \bigcap \emptyset$ are always open. We call $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ a *basis* if every $p \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ is a union of elements of \mathbb{P} . We call $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ a *subbasis* if the finite intersections of elements of \mathbb{P} form a basis. Again note that we allow empty unions and intersections, so $\mathbb{P} = \emptyset$ is both a basis for the empty space $X = \emptyset$ and a subbasis for the one-point space $X = \{x\}$ (where *space* here means *topological space*, i.e. a set X together with a topology $\mathcal{O}(X)$, which is unique for the empty and one-point spaces).

2. CAUCHY VS ROUND

Our primary goal is to investigate posets together with some additional structure coming from a distinguished family of subsets. Accordingly, throughout we assume

$$(\mathbb{P}, \leq, \Theta) \text{ is structure where } (\mathbb{P}, \leq) \text{ is a poset and } \Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}).$$

So Θ is a very general kind of ‘nearness’. We leave ‘nearness’ itself as a vague term for Θ satisfying some ‘nice’ properties (although ‘near subset’ will take on a precise

meaning in §5). Exactly what these properties might be will depend on the kinds of spaces and coverings one is dealing with. The goal of the present paper is to explore these various properties, how they relate to each other and which ones are the weakest necessary to prove the results we want.

Our \mathbb{P} is meant to represent a basis of some space X , \leq is meant to represent inclusion \subseteq and Θ is meant to represent a family of basic open covers of X . We wish to recover the points of this hypothetical X via their basic open neighbourhood filters. Arbitrary filters in \mathbb{P} will not do, e.g. these could correspond to the neighbourhoods of a subset rather than a single point. However, Θ allows us to identify precisely which filters should really correspond to points.

Firstly, as every $C \in \Theta$ represents a cover of the space, every neighbourhood filter of $x \in X$ should contain some element of C . These are the ‘Cauchy’ filters, but again arbitrary Cauchy filters will not do, e.g. in a metric space different Cauchy filters can converge to the same point x . The neighbourhood filter of x is the smallest of these, which suggests we should consider minimal Cauchy filters.

In fact, at first we will even consider more general subbases. Then the above remarks still apply, the only difference is that the subbasic neighbourhoods of a point may only form an up-set, not a filter. Accordingly, we start by examining minimal or ‘round’ Cauchy up-sets.

Definition 2.1. Consider the following conditions on $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$.

$$\begin{aligned} (\Theta\text{-Cauchy}) \quad & \forall C \in \Theta (C \cap S \neq \emptyset). \\ (\Theta\text{-Round}) \quad & \forall s \in S \exists C \in \Theta (C \cap S \leq s). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.2. Here we are following the terminology of [CH00, Definition 2.4 (b)], although the definitions there are restricted to filters. Also, the round subsets there are further required to satisfy $C \cap S \neq \emptyset$, presumably so that non-Cauchy subsets are not automatically round. We prefer the above definition so that roundness is preserved by subsets, just as Cauchyness is preserved by supersets. Cauchy filters are defined likewise in [Mor89, Definition 2.1] but round filters are instead called ‘weak star-filters’ in [Mor89, Definition 2.10]. This differs from Morita’s earlier terminology in [Mor51] where a stronger notion of Cauchy filter is given and round filters do not appear at all – round filters are originally from [Har71], although even there the focus was on a slightly stronger notion for Hausdorff spaces.

If Θ is an up-set, every Θ -round Θ -Cauchy subset is also an up-set.

Proposition 2.3. *If $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is Θ -round and Θ -Cauchy,*

$$\Theta \text{ is an up-set} \quad \Rightarrow \quad R \text{ is an up-set.}$$

Proof. Say $s \geq r \in R$. As R is Θ -round, we have some $C \in \Theta$ with $C \cap R \leq r \leq s$ and hence $C \leq D$ where $D = (C \setminus R) \cup \{s\}$. As Θ is an up-set, $D \in \Theta$. As R is Θ -Cauchy, $\emptyset \neq R \cap D \subseteq \{s\}$ and hence $s \in R$, showing that R is an up-set. \square

Likewise, if Θ is directed, so are all Θ -round Θ -Cauchy up-sets.

Proposition 2.4. *If $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a Θ -round Θ -Cauchy up-set then*

$$\Theta \text{ is directed} \quad \Rightarrow \quad R \text{ is directed.}$$

Proof. Take any finite $F \subseteq R$. As R is Θ -round, for all $f \in F$, we have $C_f \in \Theta$ with $C_f \cap R \leq f$. As Θ is directed, we have $C \in \Theta$ with $C \leq C_f$, for all $f \in F$.

As R is Θ -Cauchy, we have $c \in C \cap R$. For all $f \in F$, $C \leq C_f$ so we have $c_f \in C_f$ with $c_f \geq c$. As R is an up-set, $c \leq c_f \in C_f \cap R \leq f$, for all $f \in F$, showing that R is directed. \square

The same result for filters is immediate from Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.4.

Corollary 2.5. *If $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is Θ -round and Θ -Cauchy then*

$$\Theta \text{ is a filter} \quad \Rightarrow \quad R \text{ is a filter.}$$

As long as Θ avoids trivial subsets, so do Θ -round up-sets.

Proposition 2.6. *If \mathbb{P} has a minimum 0 then*

$$\emptyset \in \Theta \text{ or } \{0\} \in \Theta \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{P} \text{ is } \Theta\text{-round} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists \Theta\text{-round up-set } R \ni 0.$$

Proof. If $\emptyset \in \Theta$ or $\{0\} \in \Theta$ then \mathbb{P} is Θ -round. Conversely, if \mathbb{P} is Θ -round then, as $0 \in \mathbb{P}$, we have some $C \in \Theta$ with $C \leq 0$, the only possibilities for which are $C = \emptyset$ or $C = \{0\}$. This proves the first \Leftrightarrow , while the second is immediate. \square

Equivalent definitions of Θ -round and Θ -Cauchy could have been given in terms of the complement $\mathbb{P} \setminus R$. For up-sets, these can be stated as follows. Note here Θ^{\leq} denotes the \leq -closure of Θ , i.e. the family of all subsets refined by subsets in Θ .

Proposition 2.7. *If $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is an up-set then*

$$(2.1) \quad R \text{ is } \Theta\text{-Cauchy} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{P} \setminus R \notin \Theta^{\leq}.$$

$$(2.2) \quad R \text{ is } \Theta\text{-round} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall r \in R ((\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup \{r\} \in \Theta^{\leq}).$$

Proof.

(2.1) By definition, R is Θ -Cauchy iff $\mathbb{P} \setminus R \notin \Theta^{\leq}$. As R is an up-set, R is Θ -Cauchy iff R is Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy iff $\mathbb{P} \setminus R \notin \Theta^{\leq \leq} = \Theta^{\leq}$.

(2.2) By definition, R is Θ -round iff $(\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup r^{\geq} \in \Theta^{\leq}$, for all $r \in R$. As R is an up-set, $\mathbb{P} \setminus R$ is a down-set so $(\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup r^{\geq} \in \Theta^{\leq}$ iff $(\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup \{r\} \in \Theta^{\leq}$. \square

Next, we have the following analog of [Har71, Lemma 1 (b)].

Proposition 2.8. *If $Q \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a Θ -Cauchy up-set, and $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is Θ -round then*

$$Q \subseteq R \quad \Rightarrow \quad Q = R.$$

Proof. For any $r \in R$, we have $C \in \Theta$ with $\emptyset \neq C \cap Q \subseteq C \cap R \leq r$, as Q is Θ -Cauchy, $Q \subseteq R$ and R is Θ -round. Thus $r \in Q$, as Q is an up-set. \square

It follows immediately that any Θ -round Θ -Cauchy up-set $Q \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is both a maximal Θ -round subset and a minimal Θ -Cauchy up-set. In fact, among Θ -Cauchy up-sets, ‘ Θ -round’ really just means ‘minimal’.

Proposition 2.9. *If $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a Θ -Cauchy up-set then*

$$R \text{ is } \Theta\text{-round} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad R \text{ is minimal.}$$

Proof. The \Rightarrow part follows immediately from Proposition 2.8. Conversely, say R is not Θ -round, which means we have some $r \in R$ such that $C \cap R \not\leq r$, for all $C \in \Theta$. But this means $R \setminus r^{\geq} \not\subseteq R$ is a Θ -Cauchy up-set so R is not minimal. \square

If we expand Θ to Θ^{\leq} then ‘round’ even means minimal among arbitrary Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy subsets.

Theorem 2.10. *For any $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$,*

$$R \text{ is a } \Theta\text{-round } \Theta\text{-Cauchy up-set} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad R \text{ is minimal } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-Cauchy.}$$

Proof. Say R is Θ -Cauchy and \leq -closed. For any $D \in \Theta^{\leq}$, we have $C \in \Theta$ with $C \leq D$ and hence, as R is \leq -closed, $\emptyset \neq R \cap C \leq R \cap D$. As R is \leq -closed, this means $R \cap D \neq \emptyset$, i.e. R is Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy. If R is also round then, for any $r \in R$, we have $C \in \Theta$ with $C \cap R \leq r$. Setting $D = (C \setminus R) \cup \{r\}$, this means $C \leq D$ and hence $D \in \Theta^{\leq}$. By definition, $D \cap (R \setminus \{r\}) = \emptyset$ which means $R \setminus \{r\}$ is not Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy. As $r \in R$ was arbitrary, this means R is minimal Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy.

Say R is a minimal Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy subset, i.e.

$$\text{(Minimality)} \quad \forall r \in R \exists C \in \Theta^{\leq} (C \cap R = \{r\}).$$

Thus R is certainly Θ^{\leq} -round and hence an up-set, by Proposition 2.3. To see that R is also Θ -round, take any $r \in R$ and $C \in \Theta^{\leq}$ with $C \cap R = \{r\}$. Further take $D \in \Theta$ with $D \leq C$. If we had $d \in D \cap R$ with $d \not\leq r$ then we would have $c \in C$ with $d \leq c$ and hence $c \in R$, as R is an up-set. But then $c \not\leq r$ too so $c \neq r$, contradicting $C \cap R = \{r\}$. Thus we must have had $D \cap R \leq r$, i.e. R is Θ -round. \square

Note that being Θ -Cauchy depends only on Θ , not on the order structure. So what the above result shows is that, once we know Θ^{\leq} , we can forget about the order and yet still determine the Θ -round Θ -Cauchy up-sets. Sometimes Θ even determines the order structure itself – see Proposition 3.6 below.

3. THE SPECTRUM

For any $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, let

$$\Theta_S = \{Q \in \Theta : S \subseteq Q\}.$$

Here we again identify elements with singleton subsets, i.e. $\Theta_p = \Theta_{\{p\}}$.

Definition 3.1. The Θ -spectrum is the space with subbasis $(\hat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ and points

$$\hat{\Theta} = \{R \subseteq \mathbb{P} : R \text{ is a } \Theta\text{-round } \Theta\text{-Cauchy up-set}\}.$$

The first natural question to ask is what kind of spaces arise in this way.

Definition 3.2. We call $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ a T_1 family if, for all $x, y \in X$,

$$(T_1) \quad x \neq y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists O, N \in \mathbb{P} (x \in O \setminus N \text{ and } y \in N \setminus O).$$

Recall that X is said to be a T_1 space iff $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is a T_1 family. In this case, one immediately sees that every subbasis $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ is also a T_1 family.

Proposition 3.3. *The Θ -spectrum is always a T_1 space.*

Proof. For any distinct $R, S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ that are maximal or minimal within any $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$, we can find $r \in R \setminus S$ and $s \in S \setminus R$. But this means $R \in \Theta_r \not\supseteq S$ and $S \in \Theta_s \not\supseteq R$, which is precisely the T_1 condition. This applies to $\hat{\Theta}$ because, by Proposition 2.8, Proposition 2.9 and Theorem 2.10,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta} &= \{R \subseteq \mathbb{P} : R \text{ is a minimal } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-Cauchy subset}\} \\ &= \{R \subseteq \mathbb{P} : R \text{ is a minimal } \Theta\text{-Cauchy up-set}\} \\ &\subseteq \{R \subseteq \mathbb{P} : R \text{ is a maximal } \Theta\text{-Round up-set}\}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Conversely, all T_1 spaces arise in this way. First let

$$\mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) = \{C \subseteq \mathbb{P} : X \subseteq \bigcup C\},$$

i.e. $\mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ denotes the family of all \mathbb{P} -covers of X .

Proposition 3.4. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ then $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ if and only if, for all $x \in X$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_x = \{N \in \mathbb{P} : x \in N\} \text{ is } \Theta\text{-Cauchy.}$$

Proof. If $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ then each $C \in \Theta$ satisfies $\bigcup C = X$ so, for each $x \in X$, we have $c \in C$ with $x \in c$ and hence $c \in \mathbb{P}_x$, i.e. \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -Cauchy. If $\Theta \not\subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ then we have some $C \in \Theta$ and $x \in X$ with $x \notin \bigcup C$ and hence $C \cap \mathbb{P}_x = \emptyset$, i.e. \mathbb{P}_x is not Θ -Cauchy. \square

Proposition 3.5. *If X is a T_1 space, $\leq = \subseteq$ on a subbasis $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ and Θ is a coinital subset of $\mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ then X is homeomorphic to $\widehat{\Theta}$ via the map*

$$x \mapsto \mathbb{P}_x = \{N \in \mathbb{P} : x \in N\}.$$

Proof. For every $x \in \mathbb{P}$, \mathbb{P}_x is Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy, by Proposition 3.4, as $\Theta^{\leq} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$. Also observe that, for all distinct $x, y \in X$, we have $O \in \mathbb{P}$ with $x \notin O \ni y$, as X is T_1 and \mathbb{P} is a subbasis. In particular, $\mathbb{P}_x \neq \mathbb{P}_y$ and hence $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}_x$ is injective. This observation also means that $\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}_x$ always covers $X \setminus \{x\}$ so, for each $N \in \mathbb{P}_x$,

$$\{N\} \cup (\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}_x) \in \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) = \Theta^{\leq}.$$

This shows that \mathbb{P}_x is minimal Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy and hence a Θ -round Θ -Cauchy up-set, by Theorem 2.10. Thus $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}_x$ maps X to $\widehat{\Theta}$. Moreover, the image is homeomorphic to X because \mathbb{P} and $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ are subbases of X and $\widehat{\Theta}$ and

$$x \in p \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p \in \mathbb{P}_x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{P}_x \in \widehat{\Theta}_p.$$

On the other hand, any Θ -Cauchy up-set $Q \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ must contain \mathbb{P}_x , for some $x \in X$. Otherwise, $\mathbb{P} \setminus Q$ would have non-empty intersection with each \mathbb{P}_x and hence cover X , i.e. $\mathbb{P} \setminus Q \in \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) = \Theta^{\leq}$. So we would have $C \in \Theta$ with $C \leq \mathbb{P} \setminus Q$ which, as Q is Θ -Cauchy, would yield $c \in C \cap Q$ and $p \in \mathbb{P} \setminus Q$ with $c \leq p$, contradicting the fact that Q is an up-set. As we already know $\mathbb{P}_x \in \widehat{\Theta}$, for each $x \in X$, $(\mathbb{P}_x)_{x \in X}$ must exhaust all minimal/ Θ -round Θ -Cauchy up-sets, i.e. $\widehat{\Theta} = \{\mathbb{P}_x : x \in X\}$. \square

So Proposition 3.3 tells us that Θ can always be represented concretely on some T_1 space. Conversely, Proposition 3.5 tells us that if Θ already is a coinital family of covers of a T_1 space then we can recover that space via the spectrum. This could already be seen as a weak kind of duality between nearness posets and T_1 spaces. But there are a couple of things that stop it from really being a duality.

Firstly, given some abstract Θ , there is no guarantee that resulting covers on $\widehat{\Theta}$ will be coinital. Secondly, there is also no guarantee that Θ will be faithful or, more precisely, that \leq on \mathbb{P} will be faithfully represented as \subseteq on $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$, i.e.

$$\text{(Faithful)} \quad p \leq q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \widehat{\Theta}_p \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}_q.$$

To get a true duality we need some extra ‘admissibility’ condition on Θ . Several such conditions will be discussed in the following sections.

For the moment we just note that the \Rightarrow part of (Faithful) always holds, even when \leq is replaced by a weaker preorder defined from Θ . First let

$$\Theta^S = \{R \subseteq \mathbb{P} : R \cup S \in \Theta\},$$

for any $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$. Then define \leq_{Θ} on \mathbb{P} by

$$(\Theta\text{-Preorder}) \quad p \leq_{\Theta} q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \Theta^p \subseteq \Theta^q.$$

Proposition 3.6. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ is a T_1 family and $\Theta = \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ then*

$$(\subseteq = \leq_{\Theta}) \quad p \subseteq q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p \leq_{\Theta} q.$$

Proof. Certainly if $p \subseteq q$ then, for any $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, $p \cup \bigcup S = X$ implies $q \cup \bigcup S = X$, i.e. $p \leq_{\Theta} q$. Conversely, if $p \not\subseteq q$ then we have some $x \in p \setminus q$. As \mathbb{P} is T_1 , for every $y \in X \setminus \{x\}$, we have $r_y \in \mathbb{P}$ with $x \notin r_y \ni y$. So $p \cup \bigcup_{y \in X \setminus \{x\}} r_y = X$ but $x \notin q \cup \bigcup_{y \in X \setminus \{x\}} r_y$ and hence $p \not\leq_{\Theta} q$, as required. \square

Alternatively, one could note that Θ above is faithful, by Proposition 3.5, and then the following abstract result yields Proposition 3.6.

Proposition 3.7. *For any $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$,*

$$p \leq q \quad \Rightarrow \quad p \leq_{\Theta^{\leq}} q \quad \Rightarrow \quad \widehat{\Theta}_p \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}_q.$$

Proof. For the first implication, note that if $p \leq q$ and $S \in \Theta^{\leq p}$, i.e. $\{p\} \cup S \in \Theta^{\leq}$ then $\{q\} \cup S \in \Theta^{\leq}$, i.e. $S \in \Theta^{\leq q}$, showing that $p \leq_{\Theta^{\leq}} q$. For the next implication, say $p \leq_{\Theta^{\leq}} q$ and take $R \in \widehat{\Theta}_p$. As R is Θ -round, we have some $C \in \Theta$ with $R \cap C \leq p$. Let $D = (C \setminus p^{\geq}) \cup \{q\}$ so $C \leq D$ and hence $D \in \Theta^{\leq}$. Thus $R \cap D = \{q\}$, as R is Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy and $R \cap C \leq p$, so $R \in \widehat{\Theta}_q$, as required. \square

For Θ to be faithful, it follows that we must at least have $\leq = \leq_{\Theta^{\leq}}$. There are a couple of easily identifiable situations in which this fails very badly. For example, if $\Theta = \emptyset$ then $\Theta^{\leq} = \Theta^{\leq p} = \emptyset$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$, while if $\emptyset \in \Theta$ then $\Theta^{\leq} = \Theta^{\leq p} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$. In either case, $\leq_{\Theta^{\leq}}$ is the weakest relation possible, i.e.

$$\leq_{\emptyset} = \leq_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})} = \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}.$$

It then follows from Proposition 3.7 that the representation in Proposition 3.3 will be completely degenerate. This can also be shown directly as follows.

Proposition 3.8. *We always have the following general implications.*

$$(3.1) \quad \emptyset = \Theta \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \emptyset \in \widehat{\Theta} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \{\emptyset\} = \widehat{\Theta}.$$

$$(3.2) \quad \emptyset \in \Theta \quad \Rightarrow \quad \emptyset = \widehat{\Theta}.$$

If \mathbb{P} has a minimum 0 then

$$(3.3) \quad \{0\} \in \Theta \text{ and } \emptyset \notin \Theta \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{P} \in \widehat{\Theta} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \{\mathbb{P}\} = \widehat{\Theta}.$$

$$(3.4) \quad \{0\} \notin \Theta \quad \Rightarrow \quad \widehat{\Theta} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P} \setminus \{0\}).$$

Proof.

- (3.1) If $\emptyset = \Theta$ then any $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is vacuously Θ -Cauchy. However \emptyset is the only (again vacuously) Θ -round subset, i.e. $\{\emptyset\} = \Theta$. Conversely, if $\emptyset \in \widehat{\Theta}$ then \emptyset is Θ -Cauchy, which is only possible if $\Theta = \emptyset$.
- (3.2) If $\emptyset \in \Theta$ then \mathbb{P} has no Θ -Cauchy subsets.
- (3.3) If $\{0\} \in \Theta$ then \mathbb{P} is a Θ -round up-set and also the only possible Θ -Cauchy up-set. If $\emptyset \notin \Theta$ then \mathbb{P} is indeed Θ -Cauchy and hence $\widehat{\Theta} = \{\mathbb{P}\}$. Conversely, if $\mathbb{P} \in \widehat{\Theta}$ then \mathbb{P} is Θ -round so $\emptyset \in \Theta$ or $\{0\} \in \Theta$, by Proposition 2.6. However, \mathbb{P} is also Θ -Cauchy so $\emptyset \notin \Theta$ and hence $\{0\} \in \Theta$.

(3.4) If $\emptyset \in \Theta$ then $\widehat{\Theta} = \emptyset \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P} \setminus \{0\})$. If $\emptyset \notin \Theta$ and $\{0\} \notin \Theta$ then $\widehat{\Theta} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P} \setminus \{0\})$, by Proposition 2.6. \square

In general, the implication in (3.2) can not be reversed. Moreover, even when \mathbb{P} contains minimal Θ -Cauchy filters, there may still be no minimal Θ -Cauchy up-sets, i.e. $\widehat{\Theta} = \emptyset$, as in the following example.

Example 3.9. Define \leq on $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ by

$$(m, n) \leq (m', n') \iff m \geq m' \text{ and } (m+n = m'+n' \text{ or } (n = 1 \text{ and } m \geq m'+n')).$$

The Hasse diagram of \mathbb{P} is as follows.

$$\begin{array}{c} R_1 \quad (1, 1) \quad (1, 2) \quad (1, 3) \dots \\ \quad \quad | \quad / \quad \backslash \\ R_2 \quad (2, 1) \quad (2, 2) \dots \\ \quad \quad | \quad / \\ R_3 \quad (3, 1) \dots \\ \quad \quad \vdots \end{array}$$

This makes \mathbb{P} a (reverse) graded poset where the rank is determined by the first coordinate. So we can take $\Theta = \{R_m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ to be the decreasing rank levels

$$R_m = \{(m, n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

We claim that \mathbb{P} itself is the unique Θ -Cauchy filter. To see this, first note that \mathbb{P} is a \wedge -semilattice where

$$(m, n) \wedge (m', n') = \begin{cases} (m \vee m', n \wedge n') & \text{if } m+n = m'+n'. \\ (m+n-1, 1) & \text{if } m+n \geq m'+n'. \end{cases}$$

Given a Θ -Cauchy filter $Q \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, take any $(m, n) \in Q$. As Q is Θ -Cauchy, for any $l \geq m+n$, we have $(k, l) \in Q$, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As Q is a filter,

$$(k+l+1, 1) = (m, n) \wedge (k, l) \in Q.$$

Thus, for arbitrarily large $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(j, 1) \in Q$ and hence $(j, 1)^{\leq} \subseteq Q$, again because Q is a filter. Thus $\mathbb{P} = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} (j, 1)^{\leq} = R$, proving the claim.

However, \mathbb{P} is not Θ -round. Indeed, for any $(m, n) \in \mathbb{P}$, $(m', n+1) \not\leq (m, n)$ and hence $R_{m'} \not\leq (m, n)$, for all $m' \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus \mathbb{P} is not minimal among Θ -Cauchy up-sets, by Proposition 2.9. Indeed, \mathbb{P} has no minimal/ Θ -round Θ -Cauchy up-sets, as these would be filters, by Proposition 2.4, i.e. $\widehat{\Theta}$ is empty.

It was crucial in this example that Θ consisted of infinite subsets. Indeed, if $\emptyset \notin \Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ then taking $C = \emptyset$ in (4.2) below yields $\widehat{\Theta} \neq \emptyset$.

4. WALLMAN DUALITY

We can now reformulate Wallman's classic duality from [Wal38].

Theorem 4.1. *If $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ then $\widehat{\Theta}$ is compact. Moreover, for $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ and $C \subseteq \mathbb{P}$,*

$$(4.1) \quad \widehat{\Theta}_p \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}_q \iff p \leq_{\Theta} q.$$

$$(4.2) \quad \widehat{\Theta} \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in C} \widehat{\Theta}_c \iff C \in \Theta^{\leq}.$$

Proof. First note that, for compactness, it suffices to prove (4.2). Indeed, (4.2) implies that the covers of $\widehat{\Theta}$ of the form $(\widehat{\Theta}_c)_{c \in C}$, for $C \in \Theta^{\leq} \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$, are \subseteq -cointial in the collection of all covers consisting of open sets from $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$. In other words, every subbasic open cover has a finite subcover and hence $\widehat{\Theta}$ is compact, by the Alexander subbasis theorem.

(4.2) For \Leftarrow , take $C \in \Theta^{\leq}$, i.e. $D \leq C$, for some $D \in \Theta$. As $R \cap D \neq \emptyset$, for any Θ -Cauchy R , it follows $R \cap C \neq \emptyset$, for any Θ -Cauchy up-set R .

Conversely, say $C \notin \Theta^{\leq}$. This means $D \setminus C^{\geq} \neq \emptyset$, for all $D \in \Theta$, and hence $\mathbb{P} \setminus C^{\geq}$ is a Θ -Cauchy up-set. We claim that we can then apply the Kuratowski-Zorn lemma to obtain a minimal Θ -Cauchy up-set $R \subseteq \mathbb{P} \setminus C^{\geq}$. To see this, say we have a chain, or even a \subseteq -directed collection Φ of Θ -Cauchy up-sets. Certainly $\bigcap \Phi$ will also be an up-set. Also, as Φ is \subseteq -directed and each $C \in \Theta$ is finite, $C \cap \bigcap \Phi = \emptyset$ would imply $C \cap Q = \emptyset$, for some $Q \in \Phi$, contradicting the fact Q is Θ -Cauchy. This proves the claim, which yields $R \in \widehat{\Theta}$ with $R \cap C = \emptyset$ and hence $R \notin \bigcup_{c \in C} \widehat{\Theta}_c$. So R witnesses $\bigcup_{c \in C} \widehat{\Theta}_c \neq \widehat{\Theta}$, as required.

(4.1) The \Leftarrow part appears in Proposition 3.7. Conversely, say $p \not\leq_{\Theta} q$, so we have some $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with $S \cup \{p\} \in \Theta^{\leq}$ but $S \cup \{q\} \notin \Theta^{\leq}$. Then (4.2) yields $R \in \widehat{\Theta}$ disjoint from $D \cup \{q\}$. As R is a Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy and $D \cup \{p\} \in \Theta^{\leq}$, it follows that $p \in R$, i.e. $R \in \widehat{\Theta}_p \setminus \widehat{\Theta}_q$. \square

Remark 4.2. The careful reader might note that we used the Alexander subbasis theorem from [Ale39] in the proof of Theorem 4.1, even though this would not have been available to Wallman in [Wal38]. However, examination of [Wal38] reveals that Wallman essentially proved the same theorem in order to derive his duality. Alexander even cited [Wal38] in [Ale39], so ‘Alexander-Wallman subbasis theorem’ might be more historically accurate.

So any $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ can be concretely represented as a cointial collection of subbasic covers of the compact T_1 space $\widehat{\Theta}$ (see Proposition 3.3). Moreover, \leq on \mathbb{P} is faithfully represented as \subseteq on $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ if (and only if) $\leq = \leq_{\Theta}$. Conversely, if Θ is a cointial collection of finite subbasic covers of a compact T_1 space then taking $\leq = \subseteq$ on the subbasis \mathbb{P} , we have $\leq = \leq_{\Theta}$, by Proposition 3.6. Moreover, we then recover the original space as $\widehat{\Theta}$, by Proposition 3.5.

This shows that we do indeed have a duality between appropriate nearness posets and compact T_1 spaces or, more precisely, certain covers of these spaces. We can express this duality in a slightly more convenient form by considering all finite covers of the space rather than their cointial subfamilies. In this case, $\leq = \leq_{\Theta}$ corresponds to the following ‘admissibility’ condition on Θ .

$$\text{(Wallman Admissible)} \quad p \leq q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall C \in \Theta \ ((C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \in \Theta).$$

Let us denote the ‘finite extension’ relation by $\subseteq_{\mathcal{F}}$, i.e.

$$R \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} S \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad R \subseteq S \text{ and } S \setminus R \text{ is finite.}$$

Proposition 4.3. Θ is Wallman admissible iff Θ is $\subseteq_{\mathcal{F}}$ -closed and $\leq = \leq_{\Theta}$.

Proof. If Θ is Wallman admissible then, for any $C \in \Theta$, the definition with $p = q$ yields $C \cup \{p\} = (C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{p\} \in \Theta$. From this it follows that Θ must be $\subseteq_{\mathcal{F}}$ -closed.

Thus it suffices to show that, when Θ is $\subseteq_{\mathcal{F}}$ -closed,

$$p \leq_{\Theta} q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall C \in \Theta ((C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \in \Theta).$$

To see this, say p and q satisfy the right hand side and take $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with $S \cup \{p\} \in \Theta$. If $p \notin S$ then it follows that $S \cup \{q\} = ((S \cup \{p\}) \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \in \Theta$. While if $p \in S$ then $S \cup \{q\} \supseteq S = S \cup \{p\} \in \Theta$ so again $S \cup \{q\} \in \Theta$, as Θ is $\subseteq_{\mathcal{F}}$ -closed, i.e. $p \leq_{\Theta} q$. Conversely, if $p \leq_{\Theta} q$ then, for any $C \in \Theta$, $C \subseteq C \cup \{p\} = (C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{p\} \in \Theta$, as Θ is $\subseteq_{\mathcal{F}}$ -closed, and hence $(C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \in \Theta$. \square

Proposition 4.4. *If Θ is \subseteq -closed in $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ then Θ is \leq_{Θ} -closed in $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$.*

Proof. Take $F, G \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ with $F \leq_{\Theta} G$. Thus, for any $f \in F$, we have $g \in G$ with $f \leq_{\Theta} g$. As $(F \setminus \{f\}) \cup \{f\} = F \in \Theta$, this means $(F \setminus \{f\}) \cup \{g\} \in \Theta$. Taking $f' \in F \setminus \{f\}$, we have $g' \in G$ with $f' \leq_{\Theta} g'$ which again yields $(F \setminus \{f, f'\}) \cup \{g, g'\} \in \Theta$. As F is finite, we can continue in this way to get $G' \in \Theta$, for some $G' \subseteq G$. As Θ is \subseteq -closed in $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$, this means $G \in \Theta$, as required. \square

From Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4, we immediately have the following.

Corollary 4.5. *The following are equivalent when $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$.*

- (1) Θ is Wallman admissible.
- (2) Θ is \subseteq -closed in $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ and $\leq = \leq_{\Theta}$.
- (3) Θ is \leq -closed in $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ and $\leq = \leq_{\Theta}$.

To reformulate Wallman duality, let us call $(\mathbb{P}, \leq, \Theta)$ a *Wallman poset* if $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ is Wallman admissible. Roughly speaking, we can state the result as follows.

Theorem 4.6.

Wallman posets are dual to subbases of compact T_1 spaces.

More precisely, any Wallman poset $(\mathbb{P}, \leq, \Theta)$ can be concretely represented as the subbasis $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ of the compact T_1 space $\widehat{\Theta}$ where \leq becomes \subseteq and Θ becomes the family of all finite covers $(\{\widehat{\Theta}_c : c \in C\})_{C \in \Theta}$ of $\widehat{\Theta}$, by Proposition 3.3, Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.3. On the other hand, if \mathbb{P} is a subbasis of a T_1 space X and $\Theta = \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ then $(\mathbb{P}, \subseteq, \Theta)$ is a Wallman poset, by Proposition 3.6. Moreover, in this case $\widehat{\Theta}$ is homeomorphic to the original space X , by Proposition 3.5.

Lastly, let us note that the order structure in Wallman duality can reduce to mere equality. So it really is the covers that are playing the pivotal role.

Example 4.7. Let $X = [0, 1]$ and let $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ consist of all sets of the form $(a, b) \cup (c, d)$ where $a \leq b < c \leq d$ and $(b - a) + (d - c) = \frac{1}{2}$. This last condition ensures that distinct elements of \mathbb{P} are incomparable, i.e. $p \subseteq q$ or $q \subseteq p$ implies $p = q$. But it is not hard to see that any open interval (e, f) with $f - e \leq \frac{1}{2}$ is of the form $p \cap q$, for some $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$. Thus \mathbb{P} is a subbasis for X .

5. NEAR SUBSETS

To go any further, we must first discuss near subsets.

Definition 5.1. We call $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ Θ -near if

$$(\Theta\text{-Near}) \quad \exists D \notin \Theta \forall s \in S (D \cup \{s\} \in \Theta).$$

If S is Θ -near then we immediately see that any $Q \subseteq S$ is again Θ -near. Likewise,

$$(5.1) \quad Q \geq S \quad \text{and} \quad S \text{ is } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-near} \quad \Rightarrow \quad Q \text{ is } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-near.}$$

In particular, this applies to points of the spectrum.

Proposition 5.2. *Every $R \in \widehat{\Theta}$ is maximal Θ^{\leq} -near.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.7, $\mathbb{P} \setminus R \notin \Theta^{\leq}$ and $(\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup \{r\} \in \Theta^{\leq}$, for all $r \in R$, so R is Θ^{\leq} -near. If $R \cup \{p\}$ were Θ^{\leq} -near, for some $p \in \mathbb{P} \setminus R$, then we would have $D \notin \Theta^{\leq}$ with $D \cup \{r\} \in \Theta^{\leq}$, for all $r \in R \cup \{p\}$. Thus $D \cap (R \cup \{p\}) = \emptyset$ and hence $D \cup \{p\} \subseteq \mathbb{P} \setminus R \notin \Theta^{\leq}$, a contradiction, proving maximality. \square

When dealing with arbitrary covers, ‘near’ just means ‘non-empty intersection’.

Proposition 5.3. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ is a T_1 family and $\Theta = \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ then, for all $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$,*

$$\bigcap S \neq \emptyset \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad S \text{ is } \Theta\text{-near}$$

Proof. For \Rightarrow , note that $\bigcap S \neq \emptyset$ means $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}_x$, for some $x \in S$. As \mathbb{P} is T_1 , $\mathbb{P}_x \in \widehat{\Theta}$ so \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -near, by Proposition 5.2, and hence $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}_x$ is also Θ -near. Conversely, if S is Θ -near then we have $D \notin \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ with $D \cup \{s\} \in \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$, for all $s \in S$. Thus $\bigcup D \neq X$ while $s \cup \bigcup D = X$, for all $s \in S$, so $\emptyset \neq X \setminus \bigcup D \subseteq \bigcap S$. \square

In particular, in the above situation every singleton $S = \{p\}$ is Θ -near, except when $p = \emptyset$. In general, we consider this as a weak kind of admissibility condition.

Definition 5.4. We call Θ *weakly admissible* if $\{p\}$ is Θ -near whenever $p^{\leq} \neq \mathbb{P}$.

Proposition 5.5. *If Θ is Wallman admissible then Θ is weakly admissible.*

Proof. Say Θ is Wallman admissible and take $p^{\leq} \neq \mathbb{P}$. So we have some $q \not\geq p$ and Wallman admissibility yields $C \in \Theta$ such that $(C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \notin \Theta$. As $C \setminus \{p\} \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} (C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\}$, Proposition 4.3 shows that $C \setminus \{p\} \notin \Theta$ and hence $\{p\}$ is Θ -near. \square

When \mathbb{P} has a minimum 0, weak admissibility specifically does not require that $\{0\}$ is Θ^{\leq} -near. Indeed, $\{0\}$ is only Θ^{\leq} -near in the somewhat trivial case of (3.3).

Proposition 5.6. *If \mathbb{P} has a minimum 0 then*

$$\{0\} \text{ is } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-near} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \{0\} \in \Theta \text{ and } \emptyset \notin \Theta.$$

Proof. By definition, $\{0\}$ is Θ^{\leq} -near iff there is some $D \notin \Theta^{\leq}$ with $D \cup \{0\} \in \Theta^{\leq}$. This implies $D = \emptyset$ – otherwise we would have $D \cup \{0\} \leq D$ and hence $D \cup \{0\} \in \Theta^{\leq}$ would imply $D \in \Theta^{\leq}$, a contradiction. Thus $\{0\}$ is Θ^{\leq} -near iff $\emptyset \notin \Theta^{\leq}$ and $\{0\} \in \Theta^{\leq}$. As $D \leq \emptyset$ iff $D = \emptyset$, $\emptyset \notin \Theta^{\leq}$ iff $\emptyset \notin \Theta$. Likewise, $D \leq \{0\}$ iff $D = \emptyset$ or $D = \{0\}$, so if $\emptyset \notin \Theta$ then $\{0\} \notin \Theta^{\leq}$ iff $\{0\} \notin \Theta$. \square

Here is another somewhat trivial situation.

Proposition 5.7. *If Θ^{\leq} is weakly admissible then*

$$\emptyset \in \Theta \text{ or } \emptyset = \Theta \quad \Rightarrow \quad |\mathbb{P}| \leq 1.$$

Proof. If $\emptyset \in \Theta$ then $\Theta^{\leq} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ so there are no Θ^{\leq} -near subsets whatsoever. If $\emptyset = \Theta$ then $\Theta^{\leq} = \emptyset$, in which case \emptyset is the only Θ^{\leq} -near subset. In either case, $\{p\}$ is not Θ^{\leq} -near for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$ so weak admissibility then implies that there are no non-zero elements, i.e. \mathbb{P} is either empty or the one-element poset $\{0\}$. \square

Under weak admissibility, any $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with a non-zero lower bound is Θ^{\leq} -near, by (5.1). For finite S , we have the following converse, at least when Θ is directed.

Proposition 5.8. *If Θ is directed and $F \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is finite then*

$$F \text{ is } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-near} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \exists p \in \mathbb{P} (F \geq p).$$

Moreover, if \mathbb{P} has a minimum 0 and $\{0\}$ is not Θ^{\leq} -near, we can take $p \neq 0$ above.

Proof. We may assume that \mathbb{P} has a minimum 0 (by adjoining 0 to \mathbb{P} if necessary). If $\emptyset \in \Theta$ then $\Theta^{\leq} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ so there are no Θ^{\leq} -near subsets whatsoever, making the result vacuously true. If $\emptyset \notin \Theta$ then, as $\{0\}$ is not Θ^{\leq} -near, Proposition 5.6 implies that $\{0\} \notin \Theta$. Now say Θ is directed and F is Θ^{\leq} -near, so we have $D \notin \Theta^{\leq}$ with $D \cup \{f\} \in \Theta^{\leq}$, for all $f \in F$. Thus we have $C \in \Theta^{\leq}$ with $C \leq D \cup \{f\}$, for all $f \in F$. Note $C \not\leq D$, as $D \notin \Theta^{\leq}$, so we have some $c \in C$ with $c \not\leq D$. As $\{0\} \notin \Theta$, $C \neq \{0\}$ so even if $D = \emptyset$, we can still replace c if necessary to ensure that $c \neq 0$. As $C \leq D \cup \{s\}$, for all $f \in F$, we must have $F \geq c$, as required. \square

To state this in a slightly nicer form, let us denote the near singletons by

$$\dot{\mathbb{P}} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : \{p\} \text{ is } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-near}\}.$$

So if we interpret $\mathbb{P} \setminus \{0\}$ just as \mathbb{P} when \mathbb{P} has no minimum then

$$\Theta \text{ is weakly admissible} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{P} \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \dot{\mathbb{P}}.$$

Corollary 5.9. *If Θ is weakly admissible and directed then*

$$F \text{ is } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-near} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists p \in \dot{\mathbb{P}} (F \geq p).$$

Proof. The \Leftarrow part is immediate, as is the \Rightarrow part if \mathbb{P} has a minimum $0 \in \dot{\mathbb{P}}$. If $0 \notin \dot{\mathbb{P}}$ or if \mathbb{P} has no minimum then the \Rightarrow part follows from Proposition 5.8. \square

However, this does not extend to infinite families, as the following example shows. It also shows that there is no general converse to Proposition 5.2 and that Proposition 5.3 does not extend to more general subfamilies of covers.

Example 5.10. Consider the strictly positive real line $X = (0, \infty)$ with its usual metric structure. Further consider the bases $\mathbb{P} = \{(x, y) : 0 \leq x < y \leq \infty\}$ and $\mathbb{P}_\epsilon = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{P} : y - x \leq \epsilon\}$ and let $\Theta = \{\mathbb{P}_\epsilon : \epsilon > 0\}$ so Θ^{\leq} is the family of uniform \mathbb{P} -covers of X . Then we see that $D = \{(n-1, n + \frac{1}{n}) : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \notin \Theta^{\leq}$ while $D \cup \{s\} \in \Theta^{\leq}$, for all $s \in S = \{(x, \infty) : 0 \leq x < \infty\}$. Thus S is Θ^{\leq} -near even though $\bigcap S = \emptyset$. In fact, S is maximal Θ^{\leq} -near, by Proposition 5.8 (because if $(x, y) \in \mathbb{P} \setminus S$ then $y \neq \infty$ so $(y, \infty) \in S$ and $(x, y) \cap (y, \infty) = \emptyset$) even though S is not Θ -Cauchy and hence $S \notin \hat{\Theta}$.

6. GENERALISED WALLMAN DUALITY

Our next goal is to extend Wallman duality to locally compact spaces.

Definition 6.1. If X has a basis of relatively compact sets, X is *locally compact*.

Remark 6.2. By a relatively compact set O , we of course mean that O has compact closure $\text{cl}(O)$. As a closed subset of a compact set is again compact, it suffices to have a subbasis or even just an open cover of relatively compact sets. In particular, any compact space is locally compact by this definition.

As is well known, when X is Hausdorff, local compactness is the same as saying each $x \in X$ has a neighbourhood base of compact sets, which is another common definition. However, even for slightly more general locally Hausdorff spaces, these two definitions are incomparable. For example, consider an ‘infinite-point compactification of \mathbb{N} ’, i.e. $X = Y \cup \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\mathcal{O}(X) = \{O \subseteq X : O \subseteq \mathbb{N} \text{ or } O \setminus Y \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Then $\{y\} \cup O$, for $O \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{N}$, forms a compact neighbourhood base of each $y \in Y$. However X is not locally compact by the above definition as the closure of any such neighbourhood contains the entirety of Y and is thus not compact. On the other hand, a compact locally Hausdorff space containing points without neighbourhood bases of compact sets is given in [Sco13].

For any $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\Theta}^S &= \{F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P}) : F \cup S \text{ is not } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-near}\}. \\ \Theta|S &= \{C \subseteq \mathbb{P} : \forall \mathcal{F}_{\Theta}^S\text{-Cauchy } D \subseteq \mathbb{P} (C \cup D \in \Theta^{\leq})\}. \end{aligned}$$

This ‘restriction’ of Θ to S represents a family of covers of the closure of $\widehat{\Theta}_S$.

Theorem 6.3. *For any $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$,*

$$\text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_S) \subseteq \widehat{\Theta|S} \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}.$$

Proof. For the first \subseteq , take $R \in \text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_S)$ so, for every finite $F \subseteq R$,

$$\widehat{\Theta}_F \cap \widehat{\Theta}_S \neq \emptyset.$$

Thus we have $Q \in \widehat{\Theta}$ with $F \cup S \subseteq Q$ and hence $F \cup S$ is Θ^{\leq} -near, by Proposition 5.2. In other words, for any finite $F \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ such that $F \cup S$ is not Θ^{\leq} -near, $F \setminus R \neq \emptyset$, i.e. $\mathbb{P} \setminus R$ is \mathcal{F}_{Θ}^S -Cauchy. Thus, for any $C \in \Theta|S$, $C \cup (\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \in \Theta^{\leq}$ and hence, as R is Θ^{\leq} -Cauchy, $C \cap R \neq \emptyset$, i.e. R is $\Theta|S$ -Cauchy. Also, as R is Θ -round and $\Theta \subseteq \Theta|S$, it follows immediately that R is $\Theta|S$ -round and hence $R \in \widehat{\Theta|S}$.

For the next \subseteq , take $R \in \widehat{\Theta|S}$. We claim that $\mathbb{P} \setminus R$ is \mathcal{F}_{Θ}^S -Cauchy, which is saying that $F \cup S$ is Θ^{\leq} -near, for all finite $F \subseteq R$. To see this note that, as R is $\Theta|S$ -round, $(\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup \{f\} \in \Theta|S$, for all $f \in F \subseteq R$. If $F \cup S$ were not Θ^{\leq} -near then every \mathcal{F}_{Θ}^S -Cauchy D would contain some $f \in F$ and hence we would have $(\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup D = (\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup \{f\} \cup D \in \Theta^{\leq}$, as $(\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup \{f\} \in \Theta|S$. But this would mean $(\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \in \Theta|S$, contradicting the fact that R is $\Theta|S$ -Cauchy. This proves the claim.

As R is $\Theta|S$ -round, $\mathbb{P} \setminus R \cup \{r\} \in \Theta|S$, for every $r \in R$, and hence, by the claim,

$$\mathbb{P} \setminus R \cup \{r\} = \mathbb{P} \setminus R \cup \{r\} \cup \mathbb{P} \setminus R \in \Theta^{\leq}.$$

Thus R is Θ -round. Also, as R is $\Theta|S$ -Cauchy and $\Theta \subseteq \Theta|S$, it follows immediately that R is Θ -Cauchy and hence $R \in \widehat{\Theta}$. \square

In particular, Theorem 6.3 yields $\widehat{\Theta} = \widehat{\Theta|\emptyset}$, i.e. we can always enlarge Θ to $\Theta|\emptyset$ without affecting the spectrum. The advantage of doing this is that we can piece together covers in each $\Theta|p$ to obtain covers in $\Theta|\emptyset$, as the following result shows.

Proposition 6.4. *As long as $\Theta \neq \emptyset$,*

$$\Theta|\emptyset = \bigcap_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \Theta|p.$$

Proof. First note that, for any $Q, S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$,

$$Q \subseteq S \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{F}_\Theta^Q \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\Theta^S \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Theta|Q \subseteq \Theta|S.$$

In particular, $\Theta|\emptyset \subseteq \bigcap_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \Theta|p$. For the reverse inclusion, take $C \in \bigcap_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \Theta|p$ and $\mathcal{F}_\Theta^\emptyset$ -Cauchy D . If $D = \mathbb{P}$ then $C \cup D \in \Theta^{\leq}$, as $\Theta \neq \emptyset$. If $D \neq \mathbb{P}$ then we have $p \in \mathbb{P} \setminus D$ and D is immediately seen to be \mathcal{F}_Θ^p -Cauchy which again yields $C \cup D \in \Theta^{\leq}$, as $C \in \Theta|p$. As D was arbitrary, this shows that $C \in \Theta|\emptyset$. \square

The $\Theta \neq \emptyset$ condition here really is necessary. Indeed, if $\Theta = \emptyset$ then \emptyset is the only Θ^{\leq} -near subset so $\mathcal{F}_\Theta^\emptyset = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ while $\mathcal{F}_\Theta^p = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$. This means that \mathbb{P} is $\mathcal{F}_\Theta^\emptyset$ -Cauchy even though $\mathbb{P} \notin \Theta^{\leq}$ and hence $\Theta|\emptyset = \emptyset$. On the other hand, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$, there are no \mathcal{F}_Θ^p -Cauchy subsets because $\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta^p$, which means the defining property of $\Theta|p$ holds vacuously for arbitrary subsets, i.e. $\Theta|p = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$.

For general S , Theorem 6.3 only yields the inclusion $\widehat{\Theta|S} \subseteq \text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_S)$. For finite S , we can strengthen this to an equality under an appropriate additional assumption.

Definition 6.5. We call Θ *non-degenerate* if, for all finite $F \subseteq \mathbb{P}$,

$$\text{(Non-Degenerate)} \quad F \text{ is } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-near} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \widehat{\Theta}_F \neq \emptyset.$$

Proposition 6.6. *If Θ is non-degenerate, for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ and \mathcal{F}_Θ^F -Cauchy D ,*

$$\text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_F) = \widehat{\Theta|F} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\Theta} \setminus \text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_F) \subseteq \bigcup_{d \in D} \widehat{\Theta}_d.$$

Proof. Say we had $R \in \widehat{\Theta|F} \setminus \text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_F)$. In particular, $\widehat{\Theta} \setminus \text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_F)$ is a neighbourhood of R so we have finite $G \subseteq R$ with $\widehat{\Theta}_F \cap \widehat{\Theta}_G = \emptyset$. As Θ is non-degenerate, this means $F \cup G$ is not Θ^{\leq} -near, i.e. $G \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta^F$. Thus D must contain some $g \in G$ and hence $(\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup D = (\mathbb{P} \setminus R) \cup \{g\} \cup D \in \Theta|F$, as R is $\Theta|F$ -round and $g \in G \subseteq R$. As D was arbitrary, this means $\mathbb{P} \setminus R \in \Theta|F$, contradicting the fact that R is also $\Theta|F$ -Cauchy. Combined with Theorem 6.3, this proves the first equality.

Likewise, for the second inclusion, take any $R \in \widehat{\Theta} \setminus \text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_F)$, so we have finite $G \subseteq R$ with $\widehat{\Theta}_F \cap \widehat{\Theta}_G = \emptyset$. As Θ is non-degenerate, this implies that $F \cup G$ is not Θ^{\leq} -near, i.e. $G \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta^F$ and hence $G \cap D \neq \emptyset$ so $R \in \bigcup_{d \in D} \widehat{\Theta}_d$. \square

If Θ consists of arbitrary covers then so do its restrictions.

Proposition 6.7. *If X is a T_1 space, $\leq = \subseteq$ on a subbasis $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ and Θ is a coinital subset of $\mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ then, for all $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$,*

$$\Theta|S = \mathcal{C}_{\text{cl}(\bigcap S)}(\mathbb{P}).$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.5 we can identify X and $\widehat{\Theta}$. It then follows from Theorem 6.3 that $\Theta|S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{cl}(\bigcap S)}(\mathbb{P})$. By Proposition 5.3, Θ is non-degenerate so it follows from Proposition 6.6 that $\text{cl}(\bigcap S) \cup \bigcup D = X$, for any \mathcal{F}_Θ^S -Cauchy $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, at least if S is finite. But as Proposition 5.3 applies to infinite sets, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 6.6 yields the same result for infinite S . So $\bigcup C \cup \bigcup D = X$, for any $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{cl}(\bigcap S)}(\mathbb{P})$ and \mathcal{F}_Θ^S -Cauchy $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, and hence $C \in \Theta|S$. As C was arbitrary, this shows that $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cl}(\bigcap S)}(\mathbb{P}) \subseteq \Theta|S$. \square

Theorem 6.8. *If $\Theta|p \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ is coinitial in $\Theta|p$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$, then $\widehat{\Theta}$ is locally compact. As long as $\Theta \neq \emptyset$ too then, for all $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ and $C \subseteq \mathbb{P}$,*

$$(6.1) \quad \widehat{\Theta}_p \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}_q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p \leq_{\Theta|\emptyset} q.$$

$$(6.2) \quad \widehat{\Theta} \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in C} \widehat{\Theta}_c \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad C \in \Theta|\emptyset.$$

Proof. For all $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $\widehat{\Theta|p}$ is compact, by Theorem 4.1, and hence $\text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_p)$ is compact, by Theorem 6.3. Thus $\widehat{\Theta}$ is locally compact.

(6.2) Note that $\widehat{\Theta} \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in C} \widehat{\Theta}_c$ implies $\widehat{\Theta|p} \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in C} \widehat{\Theta}_c$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$. By (4.2), that means $C \in \bigcap_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \Theta|p = \Theta|\emptyset$, by Proposition 6.4.

(6.1) This follows immediately from (6.2), as in the proof of (4.1). \square

We can now state a natural generalisation of Wallman duality. First let us call $(\mathbb{P}, \leq, \Theta)$ a *generalised Wallman poset* if, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$,

- (1) $\Theta|p \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ is coinitial in $\Theta|p$,
- (2) $\Theta = \Theta|\emptyset$ and $\leq = \leq_{\Theta}$.

Note here that (1) is a kind of local finiteness condition, while (2) is a strengthening of Wallman admissibility, by Proposition 4.3. In summary, we have the following.

Theorem 6.9.

**Generalised Wallman posets are dual to
relatively compact subbases of locally compact T_1 spaces.**

More precisely, any generalised Wallman poset $(\mathbb{P}, \leq, \Theta)$ can be concretely represented as the subbasis $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ of the locally compact T_1 space $\widehat{\Theta}$ where \leq becomes \subseteq and Θ becomes the family of all covers $(\{\widehat{\Theta}_c : c \in C\})_{C \in \Theta}$ of $\widehat{\Theta}$, by Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 6.8. On the other hand, if \mathbb{P} is a subbasis of relatively compact subsets of a T_1 space X , $\leq = \subseteq$ on \mathbb{P} and $\Theta = \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ then $(\mathbb{P}, \leq, \Theta)$ is a generalised Wallman poset, by Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 6.7. Moreover, in this case $\widehat{\Theta}$ is homeomorphic to the original space X , by Proposition 3.5.

The drawback of this duality is that $\Theta = \Theta|\emptyset$ rules out covering families commonly considered on locally compact spaces, such as the uniform open covers on a metric space like \mathbb{R} . To include such examples, it would be better if we could weaken $\Theta = \Theta|\emptyset$ to something like $\Theta = \Theta^{\leq}$. The problem is that it is no longer clear then that Θ will be faithful or non-degenerate. However, as long as we are willing to work with bases rather than subbases, we can rectify this by placing another assumption on Θ , one that still applies to the uniform covers example. Specifically, we can assume that Θ is also directed, as we show in the next section.

Remark 6.10. Even when Θ is not directed, there is a natural directed replacement. This allows us to translate results about directed Θ into more general results, at least in theory. Here is an outline of how this would be done.

First we replace \mathbb{P} with $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ ordered by

$$F \leq^{\mathcal{F}} G \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \bigcap_{f \in F} \Theta^{\leq f} \subseteq \bigcap_{g \in G} \Theta^{\leq g}.$$

Each $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ is meant to represent the intersection of those $f \in F$. Indeed, in this ordering, each $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ is a meet of its singleton subsets, i.e. $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ would be a meet-semilattice except that reflexivity may not hold so, strictly speaking, $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$

is only a proset, not a poset. However all the same definitions apply and, if desired, one can consider the quotient poset of equivalent classes. Next, we replace Θ with

$$\Theta^{\mathcal{F}} = \{\Phi \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P}) : \forall \Phi\text{-Cauchy } C \subseteq \mathbb{P} (C \in \Theta)\}.$$

Reflexivity aside, $\Theta^{\mathcal{F}}$ is also a meet-semilattice and hence $\leq^{\mathcal{F}}$ -directed. Specifically,

$$\Phi \wedge \Psi = \{F \cup G : F \in \Phi \text{ and } G \in \Psi\}.$$

Then one can check that the spectrum remains unchanged, more precisely

$$\widehat{\Theta^{\mathcal{F}}} = \{\mathcal{F}(R) : R \in \widehat{\Theta}\}.$$

The main thing to be aware of though is that, just like $\Theta|\emptyset$,

$$\Theta^{\mathcal{F}\leq^{\mathcal{F}}} \cap \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$$

(identifying each $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with $\{\{s\} : s \in S\}$) could be strictly bigger than Θ^{\leq} .

7. BASIC WALLMAN DUALITY

First we note that bases are closely related to directed Θ .

Proposition 7.1. *If Θ is directed then $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ is a basis for $\widehat{\Theta}$.*

Proof. As Θ is directed, every $R \in \widehat{\Theta}$ will be a filter, by Proposition 2.4. So if $R \in \widehat{\Theta}_p \cap \widehat{\Theta}_q$, i.e. $p, q \in R$, then we have $r \in R$ with $p, q \geq r$ and hence $R \in \widehat{\Theta}_r \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}_p \cap \widehat{\Theta}_q$, i.e. $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ is a basis. \square

Proposition 7.2. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ is a basis and $\leq = \subseteq$ on \mathbb{P} , $\mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ is directed.*

Proof. If $C, D \in \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ then, for each $x \in X$, we have $c \in C$ and $d \in D$ with $x \in c \cap d$. If \mathbb{P} is a basis then we have $p_x \in \mathbb{P}$ with $x \in p_x \subseteq c \cap d$. Thus $(p_x)_{x \in X}$ is a cover of X refining both C and D , i.e. $\mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ is directed. \square

Near subsets again play an important role, near pairs in particular.

Definition 7.3. For any $C \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ and $p \in \mathbb{P}$, the *C-star of p* is given by

$$(C\text{-star}) \quad Cp = \{c \in C : \{c, p\} \text{ is } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-near}\}.$$

This notation comes from [PP12, VIII.2.1], although there the *C-star of p* is instead defined to be $\bigvee Cp$. This is fine for frames, but our posets may not have any lattice structure so we must instead work with subsets rather than joins.

For any $p \in \mathbb{P}$, let us define

$$\Theta p = \{Cp : C \in \Theta\}.$$

This provides an alternative ‘restriction’ of Θ to p .

Proposition 7.4. *For any $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $\Theta p \subseteq \Theta|p$.*

Proof. For any $C \in \Theta$, by definition $C \setminus Cp$ consists of all those $c \in C$ such that $\{c, p\}$ is not Θ^{\leq} -near. Thus $\{\{c\} : c \in C \setminus Cp\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\Theta}^p$ and hence any \mathcal{F}_{Θ}^p -Cauchy $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ must contain $C \setminus Cp$. Thus $Cp \cup D \in \Theta^{\leq}$, for all such D , i.e. $Cp \in \Theta|p$. \square

It follows that $(\Theta p)^\leq \subseteq \Theta|p$, but this inclusion could be strict. For example, if Θ^\leq is weakly admissible and \mathbb{P} has a maximum 1 but no minimum then $\mathbb{P}1 = \mathbb{P}$ and hence $\Theta 1 = \Theta$. However $\Theta|1 = \Theta|\emptyset$ will often be bigger than Θ^\leq , e.g. if \mathbb{P} consists of all the non-empty open subsets of \mathbb{R} and Θ consists of all the uniform covers of \mathbb{R} then $\Theta|1 = \Theta|\emptyset$ will include all arbitrary covers of \mathbb{R} .

Again taking notation from [PP12, VIII.1.1], for any $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $p \subseteq X$ let

$$\begin{aligned} C * p &= \{c \in C : c \cap p \neq \emptyset\}. \\ \Theta * p &= \{C * p : C \in \Theta\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us call $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ **-coinitial* if $\mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) \subseteq (\Theta * p)^\leq$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$.

Theorem 7.5. *If $X \neq \emptyset$ is a T_1 space, $\leq = \subseteq$ on a subbasis $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ and $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ is directed and *-coinitial then X is homeomorphic to $\widehat{\Theta}$ via*

$$x \mapsto \mathbb{P}_x = \{N \in \mathbb{P} : x \in N\}.$$

It follows that \mathbb{P} is a basis and, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$,

$$(\Theta * p)^\leq = (\Theta p)^\leq = \mathcal{C}_{\text{cl}(p)}(\mathbb{P}).$$

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 3.5, we immediately see that $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}_x$ is an injective homeomorphism onto a subspace of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$, each \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -Cauchy and, for any $x \in X$, $\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}_x$ covers $X \setminus \{x\}$. So, for each $p \in \mathbb{P}_x$, $\{p\} \cup (\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}_x) \in \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$. Thus we have $C \in \Theta$ with $C * p \leq \{p\} \cup (\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}_x)$ and hence

$$\mathbb{P}_x \cap C = \mathbb{P}_x \cap C * p \leq \mathbb{P}_x \cap (\{p\} \cup (\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}_x)) = \{p\}.$$

This shows that \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -round and hence $\mathbb{P}_x \in \widehat{\Theta}$.

On the other hand, any $R \in \widehat{\Theta}$ must contain \mathbb{P}_x , for some $x \in X$. To see this, first note that, by (3.1), $R \neq \emptyset$, as $\Theta \neq \emptyset$, so we can take $r \in R$. If $\emptyset \in R$ then $R = \emptyset^\leq = \mathbb{P} \supseteq \mathbb{P}_x$, for any $x \in X$, and we are done. So we may assume $\emptyset \notin R$ and hence $R \subseteq \mathbb{P} * r$, as R is directed by Proposition 2.4. If R did not contain \mathbb{P}_x , for any $x \in X$, then we would have $\mathbb{P} \setminus R \in \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ and *-coinitiality would yield $C \in \Theta$ with $C * r \leq \mathbb{P} \setminus R$. As $R \subseteq \mathbb{P} * r$ is Θ -Cauchy, we $c \in C \cap R \subseteq C * r \leq \mathbb{P} \setminus R$, contradicting the fact that R is an up-set. This shows that $\mathbb{P}_x \subseteq R$, for some $x \in X$, and hence $R = \mathbb{P}_x$, as we already showed that $\mathbb{P}_x \in \widehat{\Theta}$, i.e.

$$\widehat{\Theta} = \{\mathbb{P}_x : x \in X\}.$$

To prove $\Theta * p = \Theta p$, it suffices to show that

$$\{p, q\} \text{ is } \Theta^\leq\text{-near} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p \cap q \neq \emptyset.$$

To see this, note that if $p \cap q \neq \emptyset$ then $p, q \in \mathbb{P}_x \in \widehat{\Theta}$ so $\{p, q\}$ is Θ^\leq -near, by Proposition 5.2. For the converse, we argue as in the proof of Proposition 5.8. Specifically, if $\{p, q\}$ is Θ^\leq -near then we have $D \notin \Theta^\leq$ with $D \cup \{p\}, D \cup \{q\} \in \Theta^\leq$. As Θ is directed, we have $C \in \Theta$ with $C \leq D \cup \{p\}$ and $C \leq D \cup \{q\}$. As $D \notin \Theta^\leq$, we know that $C \not\leq D$, i.e. we have $c \in C$ with $c \not\leq D$. As $X \neq \emptyset$, C must contain a non-empty set so we may assume that $c \neq \emptyset$. As $C \leq D \cup \{p\}$ and $C \leq D \cup \{q\}$, we have $p, q \geq c$ and hence $p \cap q \geq c \neq \emptyset$, as required.

By Proposition 7.1, \mathbb{P} is a basis (although this can also be checked directly). By the definition of topological closure, if $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ and $x \in \text{cl}(p) \cap q$ then $p \cap q \neq \emptyset$, from which it follows that $(\Theta * p)^\leq \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{cl}(p)}(\mathbb{P})$. Conversely, if $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{cl}(p)}(\mathbb{P})$ then,

as \mathbb{P} is a basis, $C \cup (\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P} * p) \in \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$. By $*$ -coinitiality, we have $D \in \Theta$ with $D * p \leq C \cup (\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P} * p)$ and hence $D * p \leq C$, i.e.

$$(\Theta * p)^\leq = \mathcal{C}_{\text{cl}(p)}(\mathbb{P}). \quad \square$$

Next we have an analog of Theorem 6.3

Proposition 7.6. *For any $p \subseteq \mathbb{P}$,*

$$\text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_p) \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}_p \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}.$$

If Θ is directed and non-degenerate then $\text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_p) = \widehat{\Theta}_p$.

Proof. For the first \subseteq , take $R \in \text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_p)$ so, for every $r \in R$,

$$\widehat{\Theta}_r \cap \widehat{\Theta}_p \neq \emptyset.$$

Thus we have $Q \in \widehat{\Theta}$ with $p, r \in Q$ and hence $\{p, r\}$ is Θ^\leq -near, by Proposition 5.2. This shows that $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}p$ and hence R is Θp -Cauchy, as R is Θ -Cauchy. Also, as R is Θ -round, it follows immediately that R is Θp -round and hence $R \in \widehat{\Theta}_p$.

For the next \subseteq , take $R \in \widehat{\Theta}_p$. As R is Θp -Cauchy, R is certainly Θ -Cauchy. As R is also Θp -round, it follows that $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}p$ and hence R is also Θ -round, i.e. $R \in \widehat{\Theta}$. Also $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}p$ means that, for all $r \in R$, $\{r, p\}$ is Θ^\leq -near and hence $\widehat{\Theta}_r \cap \widehat{\Theta}_p \neq \emptyset$, as Θ is non-degenerate. If $\Theta \neq \emptyset$ is also directed then $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ is a basis, by Proposition 7.1, so this shows that $R \in \text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_p)$, i.e. $\text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_p) = \widehat{\Theta}_p$. \square

Note that for directed Θ to non-degenerate, it suffices that $\widehat{\Theta}_p \neq \emptyset$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$ (except 0, if \mathbb{P} has a minimum 0 and $\{0\}$ is not Θ^\leq -near), by Proposition 5.8.

Let us call Θ *nearly finite* if $\Theta p \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ is coinitial in Θp , for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$.

Theorem 7.7. *If Θ is directed, weakly admissible and nearly finite then $\widehat{\Theta}$ is locally compact, Θ is non-degenerate and, for all $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$,*

$$(7.1) \quad \widehat{\Theta}_p \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}_q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p \leq_{\Theta^\leq} q.$$

Moreover, $(\{\widehat{\Theta}_c : c \in C\})_{C \in \Theta}$ is $$ -coinitial in $\mathcal{C}_{\widehat{\Theta}}(\{\widehat{\Theta}_p : p \in \mathbb{P}\})$.*

Proof. As Θ is nearly finite, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$, the spectrum of Θp is the same as the spectrum of $\Theta p \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$, which is compact, by Theorem 4.1. Thus $\text{cl}(\widehat{\Theta}_p) \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}_p$ is also compact, by Proposition 7.6. By Proposition 7.1, $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ is thus a basis of relatively compact sets so $\widehat{\Theta}$ is locally compact.

The \Leftarrow part of (7.1) appears in Proposition 3.7. Conversely, say $p \not\leq_{\Theta^\leq} q$, so we have some $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with $S \cup \{p\} \in \Theta^\leq$ but $S \cup \{q\} \notin \Theta^\leq$. We claim that $S \cup \{q\} \notin (\Theta p)^\leq$, otherwise we would have $S \cup \{q\} \cup (\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}p) \in \Theta^\leq$. As Θ is directed, we would then have $C \in \Theta$ with $C \leq S \cup \{p\}$ and $C \leq S \cup \{q\} \cup (\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}p)$. Note $C \not\leq S \cup \{q\}$, as $S \cup \{q\} \notin \Theta^\leq$, so we have $c \in C$ with $c \not\leq S \cup \{q\}$ and hence $c^\leq \neq \mathbb{P}$ and $c \leq p$, as $c \leq S \cup \{p\}$. By weak admissibility, $\{c\}$ and hence $\{c, p\}$ is Θ^\leq -near so $c \not\leq \mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}p$, contradicting $C \leq S \cup \{q\} \cup (\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}p)$, thus proving the claim. By (4.2), we have $R \in \widehat{\Theta}_p \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}$ disjoint from $S \cup \{q\}$ and hence $p \in R$, as $S \cup \{p\} \in \Theta$, i.e. $R \in \widehat{\Theta}_p \setminus \widehat{\Theta}_q$. This proves the \Rightarrow part of (7.1).

If Θ is weakly admissible but $\{p\}$ is not Θ^\leq -near, for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$, then $|\mathbb{P}| \leq 1$ and non-degeneracy amounts to showing $\widehat{\Theta} \neq \emptyset$ if $\emptyset \notin \Theta$, which again follows from (4.2). Otherwise, to verify non-degeneracy it suffices to consider non-empty finite Θ^\leq -near $F \subseteq \mathbb{P}$. So we have $S \notin \Theta^\leq$ such that, for all $f \in F$, $S \cup \{f\} \in \Theta^\leq$. Fixing

$f \in F$, we again see that $S \notin (\Theta f)^{\leq}$ so (4.2) yields $R \in \widehat{\Theta}f \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}$ disjoint from S and hence with $F \subseteq R$, as required.

By non-degeneracy and Proposition 5.2,

$$\{p, q\} \text{ is } \Theta^{\leq}\text{-near} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \widehat{\Theta}_p \cap \widehat{\Theta}_q \neq \emptyset.$$

It follows that $(\{\widehat{\Theta}_c : c \in C\})_{C \in \Theta}$ is $*$ -cointial in $\mathcal{C}_{\widehat{\Theta}}(\{\widehat{\Theta}_p : p \in \mathbb{P}\})$, as (4.2) shows that $(\{\widehat{\Theta}_c : c \in C\})_{C \in \Theta_q}$ is cointial in $\mathcal{C}_{\widehat{\Theta}_q}(\{\widehat{\Theta}_{q_p} : p \in \mathbb{P}\})$. \square

To obtain a precise duality, we need the following extra observation.

Proposition 7.8. *If Θ is a weakly admissible filter and $p^{\leq} \neq \mathbb{P}$ then $\emptyset \notin \Theta p$.*

Proof. Take any $C \in \Theta$ and non-zero $p \in \mathbb{P}$. By weak admissibility, we have $D \notin \Theta$ with $D \cup \{p\} \in \Theta$. As Θ is directed, we have $E \in \Theta$ with $E \leq C$ and $E \leq D \cup \{p\}$. As $D \notin \Theta = \Theta^{\leq}$, we have $e \in E$ with $e \not\leq D$ and hence $e \leq p$. If we had $E = \{0\}$ and hence $D = \emptyset$ then all subsets would be Θ -near so $e \leq C = Cp$ and, in particular, $Cp \neq \emptyset$. If $E \neq \{0\}$ then we can take e to be non-zero and hence $\{e\}$ is Θ -near, by weak admissibility, so $e \leq Cp$ and again $Cp \neq \emptyset$. \square

We can now state an extension of Wallman duality for bases as follows.

Theorem 7.9.

Abstract nearly finite proper Wallman admissible filters $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ are dual to concrete $*$ -cointial filters $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ where $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ is a basis of relatively compact sets on a locally compact T_1 space $X \neq \emptyset$.

More precisely, if Θ is a nearly finite Wallman admissible filter then Θ can be concretely represented as the basis $(\widehat{\Theta}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ of relatively compact sets on the locally compact T_1 space $\widehat{\Theta}$ where \leq becomes \subseteq and Θ becomes the $*$ -cointial family of covers $(\{\widehat{\Theta}_c : c \in C\})_{C \in \Theta}$ of $\widehat{\Theta}$, by Proposition 3.3, Proposition 4.3, Proposition 5.5 and Theorem 7.7. Moreover, if $|\mathbb{P}| \geq 2$ then we have non-zero $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\emptyset \notin \Theta p$, by Proposition 7.8, and hence $\emptyset \neq \widehat{\Theta}p \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}$, again by (4.1) and Proposition 7.6. As Θ is proper, i.e. $\Theta \neq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$, the only other possibility is $\mathbb{P} = \{0\}$ and $\Theta = \{\{0\}\} = \widehat{\Theta}$, again showing that $\widehat{\Theta} \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, if \mathbb{P} is a basis of relatively compact sets on a T_1 space $X \neq \emptyset$ and $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ is a $*$ -cointial filter then Θ is nearly finite and Wallman admissible and $\widehat{\Theta}$ is homeomorphic to the original space X , by Theorem 7.5.

8. ORDER COVERS

We wish to compare Wallman admissibility with a slightly stronger notion due to Picado and Pultr. To define a version of this that applies to general posets, not just frames, we first examine an order theoretic analog of a cover.

Definition 8.1. We call $C \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ a \leq -cover if, for all $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$,

$$(\leq\text{-Cover}) \quad p \leq q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p^{\geq} \cap C^{\geq} \subseteq q^{\geq}.$$

We denote the collection of all \leq -covers by

$$\mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P}) = \{C \subseteq \mathbb{P} : C \text{ is a } \leq\text{-cover.}\}$$

Note that the \Rightarrow part of the definition actually holds for arbitrary C . So C is a \leq -cover iff the \Leftarrow part holds which, more explicitly, means that, for all $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$,

$$(\leq\text{-Cover}') \quad p \not\leq q \quad \Rightarrow \quad \exists c \in C \exists r \in \mathbb{P} (p, c \geq r \not\leq q).$$

When \mathbb{P} is a frame, i.e. a complete lattice in which finite meets distribute over arbitrary joins (see [PP12]), \leq -covers are the same as \bigvee -covers.

Proposition 8.2. *If \mathbb{P} is a frame then $\mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P}) = \{C \subseteq \mathbb{P} : \bigvee C = 1\}$.*

Proof. If $\bigvee C = 1$ and $p \geq \bigcap C \geq q \geq$ then $p = p \wedge \bigvee C = \bigvee_{c \in C} p \wedge c \leq q$ so C is a \leq -cover. Conversely, if C is a \leq -cover, $1 \geq \bigcap C \geq (\bigvee C) \geq$ implies $1 \leq \bigvee C$. \square

In particular, Proposition 8.2 applies to spatial frames, i.e. if $\mathbb{P} = \mathcal{O}(X)$, for some space X , then $C \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a \subseteq -cover iff $\bigcup C = X$. So \subseteq -covers are X -covers in the usual sense. In fact, here \mathbb{P} does not have to consist of all open subsets.

Definition 8.3. We call $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ a T_D family if

$$(T_D) \quad \forall x \in X \exists O, N \in \mathbb{P} (O \setminus N = \{x\}).$$

Note that $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is a T_D family iff X is a T_D space in the sense of [PP12, I.2.1].

Proposition 8.4. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ then*

$$(8.1) \quad \mathbb{P} \text{ is a basis} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\subseteq}(\mathbb{P}).$$

$$(8.2) \quad \mathbb{P} \text{ is } T_D \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) \supseteq \mathcal{C}_{\subseteq}(\mathbb{P}).$$

Proof.

- (8.1) Say $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ is a basis for X , $\bigcup C = X$ and we have some $O, N \in \mathbb{P}$ with $O \supseteq \bigcap C \supseteq N \supseteq$. For every $x \in O$, we have some $M \in C$ with $x \in M$. As \mathbb{P} is a basis, we have some $P \in \mathbb{P}$ with $O, M \supseteq P \ni x$. By assumption, $x \in P \subseteq N$. As x was arbitrary, $O \subseteq N$ and hence C is a \subseteq -cover.
- (8.2) If we had $\bigcup C \neq X$ then we could take some $x \in X \setminus \bigcup C$. If \mathbb{P} is also T_D then we have some $O, N \in \mathbb{P}$ with $O \setminus N = \{x\}$. Then $O \supseteq \bigcap C \supseteq N \supseteq$, as $x \notin \bigcup C$, even though $O \not\subseteq N$, showing that C could not be a \subseteq -cover. \square

So for T_D bases, spatial covers and order covers are the same thing. The only drawback here is that T_D bases tend to have rather large cardinality.

Proposition 8.5. *If X is a compact T_1 space with a T_D basis \mathbb{P} then $|\mathbb{P}| \geq |X|$.*

Proof. If \mathbb{P} is finite then so is X , and the only finite T_1 spaces are discrete. So in this case any basis must contain all the singletons and hence $|\mathbb{P}| \geq |X|$. If \mathbb{P} is infinite then we can take the closure under finite unions without changing $|\mathbb{P}|$. As \mathbb{P} is T_D , for any $x \in X$, we have $O, N \in \mathbb{P}$ with $O \setminus N = \{x\}$. As $X \setminus O$ is closed and hence compact and X is T_1 with basis \mathbb{P} , we can cover $X \setminus O$ with finite $F \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ which do not contain x . Thus $N \cup \bigcup F = X \setminus \{x\} \in \mathbb{P}$, as we took the closure under finite unions. But this means $|\mathbb{P}| \geq |\{X \setminus \{x\} : x \in X\}| \geq |X|$. \square

Here is another simple observation about covers.

Proposition 8.6. *$\{p\} \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ iff p is a maximum of \mathbb{P} .*

Proof. If p is a maximum of \mathbb{P} then $q \leq r$ iff $q \geq \bigcap p \geq = q \geq \subseteq r \geq$ so $\{p\} \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$. Otherwise, we have $q \not\leq p$ even though $q \geq \bigcap p \geq \subseteq p \geq$, so $\{p\} \notin \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$. \square

In particular, if \mathbb{P} has a minimum 0 then the only way we could have $\{0\} \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ is if 0 is also a maximum and hence the only element of \mathbb{P} , i.e.

$$(8.3) \quad \{0\} \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P}) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{P} = \{0\}.$$

Whenever Θ can be faithfully represented as a family of basic open covers, like in Theorem 7.7 above, it follows that $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$, by (8.1). In fact, this applies more generally to any Wallman admissible filter.

Proposition 8.7. *If Θ is a Wallman admissible filter then $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$.*

Proof. If $p \not\leq q$ then, as Θ is Wallman admissible, we have $C \in \Theta$ such that $(C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \notin \Theta$. For any $D \in \Theta$, we have $E \in \Theta$ with $E \leq C$ and $E \leq D$, as Θ is a directed. As $(C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \notin \Theta = \Theta^{\leq}$, we must have $e \in E$ with $e \not\leq (C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\}$. As $e \leq C$, this implies $e \leq p$. As $e \leq D$, we thus have $d \in D$ with $p, d \geq e \not\leq q$. Thus $D \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ and hence $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$. \square

9. PICADO-PULTR ADMISSIBILITY

We define Picado-Pultr admissibility of Θ just like (Wallman Admissible), except that we replace the last Θ with $\mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$, i.e.

$$(\text{Picado-Pultr Admissible}) \quad p \leq q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall C \in \Theta ((C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})).$$

Proposition 9.1. *If Θ is Picado-Pultr admissible then $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$.*

Proof. If $\mathbb{P} = \emptyset$ or $\mathbb{P} = \{0\}$ then $\mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}) \supseteq \Theta$. If $\mathbb{P} \geq 2$ then $\emptyset \notin \Theta$ – otherwise (Picado-Pultr Admissible) with $p = q$ and $C = \emptyset$ would yield $\{p\} \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ and hence, by Proposition 8.6, p would a maximum of \mathbb{P} , for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$, a contradiction. Thus, for any $C \in \Theta$, we can apply (Picado-Pultr Admissible) with $p = q \in C$ to show that $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$, i.e. $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$. \square

Corollary 9.2. *If Θ is an up-set then*

$$(\text{Picado-Pultr Admissible}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad (\text{Wallman Admissible}).$$

Proof. If Θ is an up-set, the \Rightarrow part of (Wallman Admissible) is immediate. If Θ is also Picado-Pultr admissible then the \Leftarrow part of (Wallman Admissible) follows from the \Leftarrow part of (Picado-Pultr Admissible), by Proposition 9.1. \square

The original admissibility condition defining weak nearness frames in [PP12, VIII.4.2] involves general sublocales. In [PP12, Corollary VIII.4.2.2], an equivalent condition is given in terms of open and closed sublocales, which we now show is equivalent to (Picado-Pultr Admissible). Following the notation there for frame \mathbb{P} , we denote the closed and open sublocales defined by $p \in \mathbb{P}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{c}(p) &= p^{\leq} \quad \text{and} \\ \mathfrak{o}(p) &= \{p \rightarrow q : q \in \mathbb{P}\} = \{q \in \mathbb{P} : p \rightarrow q = q\}. \end{aligned}$$

These are considered as elements within the co-frame $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{P})$ of all sublocales.

Theorem 9.3. *When \mathbb{P} is a frame and Θ is an up-set, Θ is Picado-Pultr admissible iff $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ and, for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and $Q = \{q \in \mathbb{P} : \exists C \in \Theta (C \setminus q^{\geq} \leq p)\}$,*

$$(9.1) \quad \mathfrak{o}(p) = \bigvee_{q \in Q} \mathfrak{c}(q).$$

Proof. Note that $q \leq q'$ implies $C \setminus q'^{\geq} \subseteq C \setminus q^{\geq}$, and hence $q \in Q$ implies $\mathfrak{c}(q) = q^{\leq} \subseteq Q$. By [PP12, III.3.3.2], a join of sublocales consists of all the meets of elements in the sublocales. Thus (9.1) is saying that

$$(9.2) \quad r = p \rightarrow r \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists R \subseteq Q (r = \bigwedge R).$$

Say Θ satisfies (9.1) and take $q \not\leq p$. Then $1 \neq p \rightarrow q \in \mathfrak{o}(p)$. By (9.2), we have $R \subseteq Q$ with $1 \neq p \rightarrow q = \bigwedge R$. In particular, we have $q' \in R \subseteq Q$ such that $p \rightarrow q \leq q' \neq 1$. Taking $C \in \Theta$ with $C \setminus q'^{\geq} \leq p$, we have $C \leq \{p, q'\} \in \Theta$, as Θ is an up-set. But $(\{p, q'\} \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} = \{q, q'\} \leq q' \neq 1$ so $(\{p, q'\} \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \notin \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$. This verifies the \Leftarrow part of (Picado-Pultr Admissible). But if $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ and Θ is an up-set then the \Rightarrow part of (Picado-Pultr Admissible) is immediate.

Conversely, say Θ is Picado-Pultr admissible so $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$, by Proposition 9.1. For the \Leftarrow part of (9.2), take $q \in Q$, so we have $C \in \Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ with $C \setminus q^{\geq} \leq p$ and hence

$$1 = \bigvee C \leq q \vee \bigvee (C \setminus q^{\geq}) \leq q \vee p.$$

Thus $q = (q \vee p) \wedge (p \rightarrow q) = p \rightarrow q$, by [PP12, III.3.1.1(H8)]. Consequently, for any $R \subseteq Q$, $p \rightarrow (\bigwedge R) = \bigwedge_{r \in R} (p \rightarrow r) = \bigwedge R$, by [PP12, III.3.1], as required.

For the \Rightarrow part of (9.2), take any $r = p \rightarrow r$ and let

$$r' = \bigwedge (Q \cap r^{\geq}).$$

Certainly $r \leq r'$, what we need to show is $r' \leq r$. If we had $r' \not\leq r$ then we would also have $r' \wedge p \not\leq r$ (otherwise $r' \wedge p \leq r$ would imply $r' \leq p \rightarrow r = r$). By (Picado-Pultr Admissible), we would then have $C \in \Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ with

$$(9.3) \quad r \vee \bigvee (C \setminus \{r' \wedge p\}) \neq 1.$$

Taking $q = r \vee \bigvee (C \setminus \{r' \wedge p\}) \geq r$, we have $C \setminus q^{\geq} \subseteq \{r' \wedge p\} \leq p$ so $q \in Q$. Thus $r' \leq q$ so $q = r' \vee q \geq r' \vee \bigvee (C \setminus \{r' \wedge p\}) \geq \bigvee C = 1$, contradicting (9.3). \square

We finish with a discussion of ‘compatibility’, which gives motivation for Picado-Pultr admissibility. First, for $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$, recall that $C_x = \{c \in C : x \in c\}$ so

$$\mathcal{O}(X)_x^{\subseteq} = \{N : x \in O \in \mathcal{O}(X) \text{ and } O \subseteq N \subseteq X\}.$$

Also recall that a *neighbourhood base* at $x \in X$ is a \subseteq -coinitial subset $\mathcal{O}(X)_x^{\subseteq}$.

Definition 9.4. We say $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is *compatible* with the topology of X if every $x \in X$ has $(\bigcup_{C \in \Theta} C_x)_{C \in \Theta}$ as a neighbourhood base.

Remark 9.5. Again we are following the terminology of [CH00, Definition 1.1 (b)] and [Mor89, Definition 1.13] (while Morita instead says that Θ ‘agrees with the topology’ of X in [Mor51]). We also note in passing that when $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}(X))$ is countable and compatible it is sometimes called a ‘development’.

Compatibility is closely related to roundness, as the following result shows.

Proposition 9.6. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ then $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ is compatible with the topology of X if and only if \mathbb{P} is a basis, $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ and \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -round, for each $x \in X$.*

Proof. If Θ is compatible with X then, for any $C \in \Theta$ and $x \in X$, $\bigcup C_x \in \mathcal{O}(X)_x$ so $C_x \neq \emptyset$, i.e. C covers X . Also, whenever $x \in O \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, \subseteq -coinitiality in $\mathcal{O}(X)_x$ means we have some $C \in \Theta$ with $x \in \bigcup C_x \subseteq O$. In particular, we have some

$N \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with $x \in N \subseteq O$. As O was arbitrary, \mathbb{P} (and even $\bigcup \Theta$) is a basis for X . Moreover, taking $O \in \mathbb{P}_x$ shows that \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -round.

Conversely, say \mathbb{P} is a basis of X , each $C \in \Theta$ covers X and \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -round, for each $x \in X$. As each $C \in \Theta$ covers X , for each $x \in X$, $C_x \neq \emptyset$ and hence $\bigcup C_x \in \mathcal{O}(X)_x$. As \mathbb{P} is a basis, for each $x \in X$ and $O \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, we have some $N \in \mathbb{P}$ with $x \in N \subseteq O$. As \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -round, we have some $C \in \Theta$ such that $x \in \bigcup C_x \subseteq N \subseteq O$ and hence Θ is compatible with X . \square

Thus, for any basis $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ and $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$, compatibility is precisely what is necessary to ensure that $\mathbb{P}_x \in \widehat{\Theta}$, for each $x \in X$. This means that $\widehat{\Theta}$ can be considered as an ‘extension’ or ‘completion’ of X .

It also follows from Theorem 7.5 and Proposition 9.6 that any $*$ -cointial directed $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ is compatible. In fact, directedness is unnecessary.

Proposition 9.7. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ is a basis of a T_1 space X and $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ is $*$ -cointial then Θ is compatible with the topology of X .*

Proof. By Proposition 9.6, it suffices to show that, for any $x \in X$, \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -round. As X is T_1 , for any $p \in \mathbb{P}_x$ we have $C \in \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ with $C \cap \mathbb{P}_x = \{p\}$. By $*$ -cointiality, we have $D \in \Theta$ with $D \cap \mathbb{P}_x \subseteq D * p \cap \mathbb{P}_x \leq C \cap \mathbb{P}_x = \{p\}$, as required. \square

Intuitively, Picado-Pultr admissibility should correspond to topological compatibility. Under suitable conditions, this is indeed the case.

Proposition 9.8. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ is T_D and Θ is an up-set then Θ is compatible with X if and only if \mathbb{P} is a basis and $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ is Picado-Pultr admissible.*

Proof. If Θ is compatible with X then \mathbb{P} is a basis, $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ and each \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -round, by Proposition 9.6. Now take $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ with $p \not\subseteq q$, so we have $x \in p \setminus q$. As \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -round and Θ is an up-set, we have $C \in \Theta$ with $C_x = \{p\}$. So $x \notin q \cup \bigcup (C \setminus \{p\})$ so $C \notin \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) \supseteq \mathcal{C}_{\subseteq}(\mathbb{P})$, by (8.2), i.e. Θ is Picado-Pultr admissible.

Conversely, say \mathbb{P} is a basis, $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ and Θ is Picado-Pultr admissible. Whenever $x \in O \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, we have $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ with $p \setminus q = \{x\}$, as \mathbb{P} is T_D . As \mathbb{P} is basis, we can replace p if necessary to make $p \subseteq O$. As Θ is Picado-Pultr admissible, we have $C \in \Theta$ such that $(C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \notin \mathcal{C}_{\subseteq}(\mathbb{P}) \supseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$, by (8.1). As $p \setminus q = \{x\}$, this implies $C_x = \{p\}$, showing that Θ is compatible with X . \square

For Wallman admissibility, however, we do not need T_D .

Proposition 9.9. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ then any up-set $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ that is compatible with X is necessarily Wallman admissible.*

Proof. If $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ is compatible with X then each \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -round, by Proposition 9.6. Now take $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ with $p \not\subseteq q$, so we have $x \in p \setminus q$. As \mathbb{P}_x is Θ -round and Θ is an up-set, we have $C \in \Theta$ with $C_x = \{p\}$. Thus $x \notin q \cup \bigcup (C \setminus \{p\})$ so $(C \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} \notin \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) \supseteq \Theta$, i.e. Θ is Wallman admissible. \square

10. UNIFORMLY BELOW

The ‘uniformly below’ relation from [PP12, VIII.2.3] plays an important role when dealing with metric spaces and more general T_3 spaces(= T_1 regular spaces, i.e. where each point has a neighbourhood base of closed sets).

Definition 10.1. The *uniformly below* relation \triangleleft (or \triangleleft_Θ) on \mathbb{P} is given by

$$\text{(Uniformly Below)} \quad p \triangleleft q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists C \in \Theta (Cp \leq q).$$

From (5.1), we immediately see that \triangleleft is auxiliary to \leq , i.e.

$$\text{(Auxiliary)} \quad p \leq p' \triangleleft q' \leq q \quad \Rightarrow \quad p \triangleleft q.$$

In particular, if $\triangleleft \subseteq \leq$ then we immediately see that \triangleleft is transitive. Transitivity also follows immediately when Θ is directed.

Proposition 10.2. *If Θ is directed then \triangleleft is transitive.*

Proof. If $p \triangleleft q \triangleleft r$ then we have $C, D \in \Theta$ with $Cp \leq q$ and $Dq \leq r$. As Θ is directed, we have $E \in \Theta$ with $E \leq C$ and $E \leq D$. Thus $Ep \leq Cp \leq q$ and $Eq \leq Dq \leq r$ and hence $Ep \subseteq Eq \leq r$, i.e. $p \triangleleft r$. \square

As in [Ern91], we define the *lower preorder* \trianglelefteq on \mathbb{P} by

$$p \trianglelefteq q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p^\triangleright \subseteq q^\triangleright.$$

From (Auxiliary), we immediately see that \trianglelefteq is weaker than \leq , i.e.

$$(\leq \subseteq \trianglelefteq) \quad p \leq q \quad \Rightarrow \quad p \trianglelefteq q.$$

We will be particularly interested in Θ for which the converse also holds, i.e. $\leq = \trianglelefteq$.

Proposition 10.3. *If Θ is directed and $\leq = \trianglelefteq$ then $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$.*

Proof. Say Θ is directed and $\leq = \trianglelefteq$ and take $C \in \Theta$. If $p \not\leq q$ then we have $s \triangleleft p$ with $s \not\leq q$. Thus we have $D \in \Theta$ with $Ds \leq p$. As Θ is directed, we have $E \in \Theta$ with $E \leq C$ and $E \leq D$. Thus $Es \leq p$ but $Es \not\leq q$, as $s \not\leq q$, i.e. we have $e \in Es \leq p$ with $e \not\leq q$. We also have $c \in C$ with $e \leq c$, as $E \leq C$. Thus $r = e$ witnesses (\leq -Cover') so $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$. \square

When $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$, weak admissibility means \triangleleft is weaker than \leq .

Proposition 10.4. *If $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ then*

$$\Theta^{\leq} \text{ is weakly admissible} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \triangleleft \subseteq \leq.$$

Proof. If Θ^{\leq} is not weakly admissible then we have $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $p \not\leq q$ and $\{p\}$ is not Θ^{\leq} -near. This means $\mathbb{P}p = \emptyset \leq q$ so $p \triangleleft q$ and hence $\triangleleft \not\subseteq \leq$.

Conversely, if $C \in \Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ and $p \not\leq q$ then, by (\leq -Cover'), we have $c \in C$ and $r \in \mathbb{P}$ with $p, c \geq r \not\leq q$. If Θ^{\leq} is also weakly admissible then $\{r\}$ is Θ^{\leq} -near so $c \in Cp \not\leq q$. As C was arbitrary, this shows $p \not\leq q$ implies $p \not\triangleleft q$, i.e. $\triangleleft \subseteq \leq$. \square

As in [PP12, VIII.2.4], we call Θ *admissible* if, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$,

$$\text{(Admissible)} \quad p = \bigvee p^\triangleright.$$

In particular, this yields $p^\triangleleft \leq p$, i.e. $\triangleleft \subseteq \leq$. If $p \trianglelefteq q$, i.e. $p^\triangleright \subseteq q^\triangleright$, it also yields $p = \bigvee p^\triangleright \leq \bigvee q^\triangleright = q$, i.e. $\trianglelefteq \subseteq \leq$. In other words,

$$(10.1) \quad \text{(Admissible)} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \triangleleft \subseteq \leq = \trianglelefteq.$$

If Θ is also directed then Proposition 10.3 yields $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$.

Remark 10.5. Together with Proposition 8.2, this shows that the assumption in [PP12, VIII.2.6] that a nearness must consist of covers is actually superfluous. Indeed, while Cp is defined differently in [PP12] as $\{c \in C : c \wedge p \neq 0\}$, the proof of Proposition 10.3 still applies to show that, if Θ is directed and admissible,

$$\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P}) = \{C \subseteq \mathbb{P} : \bigvee C = 1\}.$$

For filters, (Admissible) strengthens (Picado-Pultr Admissible).

Proposition 10.6. *If Θ is a admissible filter then Θ is Picado-Pultr admissible.*

Proof. As just mentioned above, $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$. As Θ is also an up-set, we immediately see that the \Rightarrow part of (Picado-Pultr Admissible) holds.

Conversely, say $p \not\leq q$ and hence, by (Admissible), we have some $r \triangleleft p$ with $r \not\leq q$. So we have $C \in \Theta$ with $Cr \leq p$. By Proposition 10.4, Θ is weakly admissible, which means that no element of $C \setminus Cr$ shares a non-zero lower bound with r . Letting $D = (C \setminus Cr) \cup \{p\} \in \Theta$ and $E = (D \setminus \{p\}) \cup \{q\} = (C \setminus Cr) \cup \{q\}$, this means that $r \geq \cap E \geq q \geq$, even though $r \not\leq q$, showing that $E \notin \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$, thus verifying the \Leftarrow part of (Picado-Pultr Admissible). \square

Under admissibility, covers can always be ‘shrunk’.

Proposition 10.7. *If Θ is admissible and $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ then $C^\triangleright \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$.*

Proof. If $p \not\leq q$ then we have $c \in C$ and $r \in \mathbb{P}$ with $p, c \geq r \not\leq q$. By admissibility, we then have $s \triangleleft r$ with $s \not\leq q$. By (Auxiliary), $s \triangleleft c$, i.e. $s \in C^\triangleright$, and $s \leq p$, as $\triangleleft \subseteq \leq$, and hence $p, s \geq s \not\leq q$, as required. \square

Next we note \triangleleft -regular subsets (i.e. $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ with $R \subseteq R^\triangleleft$) are related to Θ -round subsets, at least when they are linked like in [Kun11, Definition III.3.56].

Definition 10.8. We call $S \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ *linked* if $\{p, q\}$ is Θ^{\leq} -near, for all $p, q \in S$.

Proposition 10.9. *Any \triangleleft -regular linked $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is Θ -round.*

Proof. For any $r \in R$, \triangleleft -regularity yields $q \in R$ with $q \triangleleft r$, so we have $C \in \Theta$ with $Cq \leq r$. As R is linked, $R \cap C \subseteq Cq \leq r$, verifying that R is Θ -round. \square

Theorem 10.10. *If Θ is countable, directed and admissible then Θ is faithful.*

Proof. Say $p \not\leq q$. By (Admissible), we have some $r \triangleleft p$ with $r \not\leq q$. For any $C \in \Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ (see (10.1) and Proposition 10.3), (\leq -Cover’) yields $c \in C$ and $p_1 \in \mathbb{P}$ with $r, c \geq p_1 \not\leq q$. Applying the same argument to each $C \in \Theta$ we obtain $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $R = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} p_n^{\leq}$ is Θ -Cauchy and $p \triangleright p_j \triangleright p_k \not\leq q$, for all $j \leq k$. Thus $R \in \widehat{\Theta}_p \setminus \widehat{\Theta}_q$, by Proposition 10.4 Proposition 10.9, as required. \square

Note the above proof shows that, even if we restricted to the \triangleleft -regular elements of $\widehat{\Theta}$, we would still get a faithful representation. One might wonder if all elements of $\widehat{\Theta}$ are necessarily \triangleleft -regular. The following example shows that this need not be the case, even when $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ is countable, directed and admissible.

Example 10.11. Take $Y, Z \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $Y \setminus Z, Z \setminus Y$ and $Y \cap Z$ are all infinite. Let $X = \mathbb{N} \cup \{y, z\}$ be the space with basis

$$\mathbb{P} = \{\{n\} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{\{y\} \cup Y' : Y' \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} Y\} \cup \{\{z\} \cup Z' : Z' \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} Z\}.$$

Note X is compact so if we let $\Theta = \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ then $\widehat{\Theta} = \{\mathbb{P}_x : x \in X\}$, by Proposition 3.5. However, as $Y \cap Z$ is infinite, $\mathbb{P}_y \cup \mathbb{P}_z$ is linked which means neither \mathbb{P}_y nor \mathbb{P}_z are \triangleleft -regular and

$$p \triangleleft q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists n \in \mathbb{N} (p = \{n\} \subseteq q).$$

Still, \mathbb{P} and hence Θ is countable and also directed and even admissible, as $Y \setminus Z$ and $Z \setminus Y$ are infinite.

However, we can avoid this situation by placing some degree of regularity on Θ , as we discuss in the next section.

But before moving on, we consider the following notion from [Wil72] and how it relates to compatibility, regularity and admissibility.

Definition 10.12. We call $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ *locally uniform* if

$$\forall x \in X \forall C \in \Theta \exists D \in \Theta \left(\bigcup (D * \bigcup D_x) \subseteq \bigcup C_x \right).$$

Proposition 10.13. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ then $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ is locally uniform and compatible with X iff $(\bigcup (C * \bigcup C_x))_{C \in \Theta}$ is a neighbourhood base at each $x \in X$.*

Proof. If Θ is compatible with X then, whenever $x \in O \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, we have $C \in \Theta$ with $x \in C_x \subseteq O$. If Θ is also locally uniform then we have $D \in \Theta$ with $x \in \bigcup (D * \bigcup D_x) \subseteq \bigcup C_x \subseteq O$, showing that these sets do indeed form a neighbourhood base at X . Conversely, if $(\bigcup (D * \bigcup D_x))_{D \in \Theta}$ forms a neighbourhood base at x then so too do the smaller neighbourhoods $(\bigcup D_x)_{D \in \Theta}$, so Θ is compatible with X . Moreover, for any $C \in \Theta$, $\bigcup C_x$ is a neighbourhood of x so by assumption we have some $D \in \Theta$ with $\bigcup (D * \bigcup D_x) \subseteq \bigcup C_x$, i.e. Θ is also locally uniform. \square

Proposition 10.14. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ and Θ is compatible with X and directed then*

$$\Theta \text{ is locally uniform} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall x \in X (\mathbb{P}_x \text{ is } \triangleleft\text{-regular}).$$

Proof. If $X = \emptyset$ then the result is vacuously true. Otherwise $C * p = Cp$, for all $C \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ and $p \in \mathbb{P}$, as Θ is compatible with X and directed – see Proposition 5.8 and Proposition 9.6. Also, \mathbb{P} is a basis so, whenever $x \in O \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, we have $p \in \mathbb{P}$ with $x \in p \subseteq O$. If \mathbb{P}_x is \triangleleft -regular then we have $q, r \in \mathbb{P}_x$ and $C, D \in \Theta$ with $Cq \leq p$ and $Dr \leq q$. As Θ is directed, we have $E \in \Theta$ with $E \leq C$ and $E \leq D$ so $E_x \subseteq Er \leq Dr \leq q$ and hence $E * \bigcup E_x \subseteq Eq \leq Cq \leq p$. This shows that Θ is locally uniform, by Proposition 10.13. Conversely, if Θ is locally uniform and $p \in \mathbb{P}_x$ then, by Proposition 10.13, we have $C \in \Theta$ such that $\bigcup (C * \bigcup C_x) \subseteq p$. So, for any $q \in C_x$, $Cq \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in C_x} Cc = C * \bigcup C_x \subseteq p$, i.e. $q \triangleleft p$ so \mathbb{P}_x is \triangleleft -regular. \square

Proposition 10.15. *If $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$, $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ is compatible with the topology of X and \mathbb{P}_x is \triangleleft -regular, for each $x \in X$, then Θ is admissible.*

Proof. If $p \not\leq q$ then we have $x \in X$ with $\mathbb{P}_x \in p \setminus q$. By Proposition 5.2 and Proposition 9.6, for any $C \in \Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$, we have $c \in C_x \subseteq Cp$ and hence $c \not\leq q$, i.e. $p \not\triangleleft q$. Thus $\bigcup p^\triangleright \subseteq p$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$, while the reverse inclusion follows from the fact that each \mathbb{P}_x is \triangleleft -regular, i.e. $p = \bigcup p^\triangleright = \bigvee p^\triangleright$ so Θ is admissible. \square

11. STAR-REGULARITY

Definition 11.1. We call Θ *star-regular* if

$$\text{(Star-Regular)} \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{P} \forall C \in \Theta \exists D \in \Theta (Dp \triangleleft C).$$

Note that if \mathbb{P} has a maximum 1, e.g. if \mathbb{P} is a frame, and Θ is weakly admissible then $D1 = D$ or $D \setminus \{0\}$ so star-regularity reduces to \triangleleft -regularity, i.e. $\Theta \subseteq \Theta^\triangleleft$. Indeed, we could just consider \triangleleft -regularity, but we felt it worth pointing out that star-regularity suffices for the main results. Moreover, star-regularity arises naturally from $*$ -cointiality, at least for T_3 spaces.

Proposition 11.2. *If \mathbb{P} is a basis of a T_3 space X then*

$$\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P}) \text{ is } *\text{-cointial} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Theta \text{ is star-regular.}$$

Proof. By the proof of Theorem 7.5, $(\Theta * p)^\leq = (\Theta p)^\leq = \mathcal{C}_{\text{cl}(p)}(X)$ and hence

$$p \triangleleft q \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \text{cl}(p) \subseteq q.$$

Thus, as Θ is regular, for any $C \in \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$, we have $D \in \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ with $D \triangleleft C$. By $*$ -cointiality, for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$, we have $E \in \Theta$ with $Ep \leq Dp \triangleleft C$, as required. \square

Proposition 11.3. *If Θ is star-regular and directed then*

$$(\text{Admissible}) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \leq = \trianglelefteq.$$

Proof. The \Rightarrow part was already observed in (10.1). Conversely, if $\leq = \trianglelefteq$ then, as \triangleleft is transitive, by Proposition 10.2, we have $\triangleleft \subseteq \trianglelefteq = \leq$, i.e. $p^\triangleright \leq p$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$. So, by the definition of suprema and the $\leq = \trianglelefteq$ assumption, we just need to show

$$p^\triangleright \leq q \quad \Rightarrow \quad p \trianglelefteq q.$$

So say $p^\triangleright \leq q$ and take $r \triangleleft p$, so we have $C \in \Theta$ such that $Cr \leq p$. As Θ is star-regular, we have $D \in \Theta$ such that $Dr \triangleleft C$ and hence $Dr \triangleleft Cr \leq p$. By (Auxiliary), $Dr \triangleleft p$ and hence $Dr \subseteq p^\triangleright \leq q$ so $r \triangleleft q$. As r was arbitrary, this shows that $p \trianglelefteq q$, as required. \square

Recall that $\dot{\mathbb{P}} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : \{p\} \text{ is } \Theta^\leq\text{-near}\}$.

Theorem 11.4. *If Θ is star-regular, directed and $\triangleleft \subseteq \leq$ then*

$$(11.1) \quad \widehat{\Theta} = \{R \subseteq \dot{\mathbb{P}} : R \text{ is a } \Theta\text{-Cauchy } \triangleleft\text{-filter}\}.$$

Consequently, if Θ is also countable then $\widehat{\Theta}$ is completely metrisable.

Proof. We first claim that, for any $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$,

$$(11.2) \quad R \text{ is linked and } \Theta\text{-Cauchy} \quad \Rightarrow \quad R^\triangleleft \in \widehat{\Theta}.$$

To see this, first take any $s \in R^\triangleleft$, so we have $r \in R$ with $r \triangleleft s$, which means we have $D \in \Theta$ with $Dr \leq s$. As R is linked and hence R^\leq is linked and $\triangleleft \subseteq \leq$,

$$D \cap R^\triangleleft \subseteq D \cap R^\leq \subseteq Dr \leq s,$$

showing that R^\triangleleft is Θ -round.

As Θ is directed, $\Theta \neq \emptyset$ (actually, (11.2) holds even when $\Theta = \emptyset$, as this implies \emptyset is both the only linked subset and the only point of the spectrum). As R is Θ -Cauchy, $R \neq \emptyset$ so we have $r \in R$. For any $C \in \Theta$, the star-regularity of Θ yields $D \in \Theta$ with $Dr \triangleleft C$. As R is Θ -Cauchy and linked, $\emptyset \neq D \cap R \subseteq Dr \triangleleft C$ and hence $R^\triangleleft \cap C \neq \emptyset$, i.e. R^\triangleleft is Θ -Cauchy. By (Auxiliary), R^\triangleleft is also \leq -closed so $R^\triangleleft \in \widehat{\Theta}$, thus proving (11.2).

To prove (11.1), note that if $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a \triangleleft -filter then R is \triangleleft -regular and \triangleleft -closed, and hence \leq -closed, by (Auxiliary). Also, R is \triangleleft -directed and hence directed, as $\triangleleft \subseteq \leq$, so if $R \subseteq \dot{\mathbb{P}}$ too then R is linked. Thus R is Θ -round, by Proposition 10.9,

and if R is also Θ -Cauchy then $R \in \widehat{\Theta}$. Conversely, every $R \in \widehat{\Theta}$ is Θ^{\leq} -near, by Proposition 5.2, and hence linked and therefore also contained in $\dot{\mathbb{P}}$. Thus (11.2) yields $R = R^{\leq} \supseteq R^{\triangleleft} \in \widehat{\Theta}$ and hence $R = R^{\triangleleft}$, by Proposition 2.9, i.e. R is \triangleleft -regular and hence a \triangleleft -filter, again by (Auxiliary) and $\triangleleft \subseteq \leq$, proving (11.1).

So, whenever $r \in R \in \widehat{\Theta}$, we have $s \in R$ with $s \triangleleft r$. This means we have $C \in \Theta$ with $Cs \leq r$ and hence, by Proposition 5.2,

$$\bigcup \{ \widehat{\Theta}_c : c \in C \text{ and } \widehat{\Theta}_c \cap \widehat{\Theta}_s \neq \emptyset \} \subseteq \bigcup \{ \widehat{\Theta}_c : c \in Cs \} \subseteq \widehat{\Theta}_r.$$

If Θ is also countable then so is $\Theta' = \{ \{ \widehat{\Theta}_c : c \in C \} : C \in \Theta \}$ and hence these covers of $\widehat{\Theta}$ satisfy the required conditions of the Arhangelskii-Stone metrisation theorem (see [CM98]), i.e. $\widehat{\Theta}$ is metrisable. Moreover, every Θ' -Cauchy filter in $\{ \widehat{\Theta}_p : p \in \dot{\mathbb{P}} \}$ must be of the form $\{ \widehat{\Theta}_r : r \in R \}$, for some linked Θ -Cauchy R , which converges to $R^{\triangleleft} \in \widehat{\Theta}$, by (11.2). So $\widehat{\Theta}$ is Čech-complete and hence completely metrisable. \square

Even if Θ is not (locally) regular, it can often be ‘regularised’. First define

$$\Theta' = \{ C^{\triangleright} : C \in \Theta \}.$$

Setting $\Theta^1 = \Theta$ and $\Theta^{n+1} = (\Theta^n)'$ we define the *regularisation* of Θ by

$$\Theta^{\mathbb{R}} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Theta^n.$$

By definition, $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ is \triangleleft -regular. Also $|\Theta| = |\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}|$, as long as Θ is infinite.

Theorem 11.5. *If Θ is admissible and directed then so is $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ and*

$$\widehat{\Theta}^{\mathbb{R}} = \{ R \subseteq \dot{\mathbb{P}} : R \text{ is a } \Theta\text{-Cauchy } \triangleleft\text{-filter} \}.$$

If Θ is countable then again $\widehat{\Theta}^{\mathbb{R}}$ is completely metrisable.

Proof. By (Auxiliary), $C \leq D$ implies $C^{\triangleright} \subseteq D^{\triangleright}$. As Θ is directed, this implies that Θ' and hence $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ is \subseteq -directed and, in particular, directed.

By Proposition 10.6, Θ^{\leq} is Picado-Pultr admissible. By Proposition 10.7, $\Theta^{\leq} \subseteq \Theta'^{\leq} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$ so Θ'^{\leq} is also Picado-Pultr admissible. In particular, Θ'^{\leq} is weakly admissible so $\triangleleft_{\Theta'} \subseteq \leq$, by Proposition 10.4. Also, as $\Theta, \Theta' \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq}(\mathbb{P})$, the only way $\{0\}$ could be Θ^{\leq} -near or Θ'^{\leq} -near is if $\mathbb{P} = \{0\}$, by Proposition 5.6 and (8.3), in which case $\Theta = \Theta'$. So $\dot{\mathbb{P}}$ is the same with respect to Θ and Θ' , and hence the same goes for finite near subsets and hence stars, by Corollary 5.9. Thus, as $\Theta^{\leq} \subseteq \Theta'^{\leq}$,

$$p^{\triangleright} \subseteq p^{\triangleright \Theta'} \leq p = \bigvee p^{\triangleright}$$

and hence $p = \bigvee p^{\triangleright \Theta'}$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$, i.e. Θ' is admissible. By induction, the same is true of Θ^n , for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and hence of $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$. In particular, $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ is admissible.

Now say $R \subseteq \dot{\mathbb{P}}$ is a Θ -Cauchy \triangleleft -filter. As R is \triangleleft -regular and Θ -Cauchy, R must be Θ' -Cauchy and by induction it follows that R is $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ -Cauchy. As $\triangleleft \subseteq \leq$, $R \subseteq \dot{\mathbb{P}}$ is directed and hence linked. Thus R is Θ -round, by Proposition 10.9, and hence $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ -round, as $\Theta \subseteq \Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$, so $R \in \widehat{\Theta}^{\mathbb{R}}$.

Conversely, if $R \in \widehat{\Theta}^{\mathbb{R}}$ then R is $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ -Cauchy and hence Θ -Cauchy, as $\Theta \subseteq \Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$. As R is $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ -round, for any $r \in R$, we have $C \in \Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ with $C \cap R \leq r$. As R is $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ -Cauchy, we have some $s \in C^{\triangleright} \cap R \triangleleft C \cap R \leq r$ and hence $s \triangleleft r$, showing that R is \triangleleft -regular. As $\Theta^{\mathbb{R}}$ is directed, R is also directed, by Proposition 2.4, and hence a \triangleleft -filter, by (Auxiliary).

If Θ is countable then so is Θ^R . Also, Θ^R is \triangleleft -regular and hence \triangleleft_{Θ^R} -regular, as $\Theta \subseteq \Theta^R$ so $\triangleleft \subseteq \triangleleft_{\Theta^R}$ (as stars are the same relative to Θ and Θ^R). Thus $\widehat{\Theta^R}$ is completely metrisable, by Theorem 11.4. \square

Let us call a concrete filter of covers $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ *complete* if every Θ -Cauchy \triangleleft -filter $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ converges to some $x \in X$, i.e. $\mathbb{P}_x \subseteq R$. Then we can state our duality for completely metrisable spaces as follows.

Theorem 11.6.

Abstract countable admissible filters $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P})$ are dual to concrete countable complete locally uniform compatible filters $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ where $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ is a basis of a completely metrisable space X .

More precisely, if Θ is a countable admissible filter then Θ can be concretely represented as the basis $(\widehat{\Theta^R}_p)_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ of the completely metrisable space $\widehat{\Theta^R}$ where \leq becomes \subseteq and Θ becomes the complete locally uniform compatible family of covers $(\{\widehat{\Theta^R}_c : c \in C\})_{C \in \Theta}$ of $\widehat{\Theta^R}$, by Proposition 9.6, Proposition 10.14, Theorem 10.10 and Theorem 11.5. Conversely, if $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X(\mathbb{P})$ is a locally uniform compatible filter then Θ is admissible, by Proposition 10.15. If Θ is also complete then by definition (and Theorem 11.5),

$$\widehat{\Theta^R} = \{R \subseteq \dot{\mathbb{P}} : R \text{ is a } \Theta\text{-Cauchy } \triangleleft\text{-filter}\} = \{\mathbb{P}_x : x \in X\},$$

showing that $\widehat{\Theta^R}$ is homeomorphic to the original space X .

REFERENCES

- [Ale39] James Waddell Alexander. Ordered sets, complexes and the problem of compactification. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 25(6):296–298, 1939. doi:10.1073/pnas.25.6.296.
- [BHH98] H. L. Bentley, H. Herrlich, and M. Hušek. The historical development of uniform, proximal, and nearness concepts in topology. In *Handbook of the history of general topology, Vol. 2 (San Antonio, TX, 1993)*, volume 2 of *Hist. Topol.*, pages 577–629. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1998.
- [BS18a] Tristan Bice and Charles Starling. General non-commutative locally compact locally Hausdorff Stone duality, 2018. arXiv:1803.00394.
- [BS18b] Tristan Bice and Charles Starling. Hausdorff tight groupoids generalized, 2018. arXiv:1809.08578.
- [CH00] P. J. Collins and C. A. Hendrie. On strict extensions of nearness spaces. *Appl. Categ. Structures*, 8(3):435–446, 2000. Dedicated to Professor H. Herrlich on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. doi:10.1023/A:1008614929530.
- [CM98] P. J. Collins and K. Morita. Coverings versus entourages. *Topology Appl.*, 82(1-3):125–130, 1998. Special volume in memory of Kiiti Morita. doi:10.1016/S0166-8641(97)00054-0.
- [DT18] Wojciech Dębski and E. D. Tymchatyn. Cell structures and topologically complete spaces. *Topology Appl.*, 239:293–307, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.topol.2018.02.020.
- [Ern91] M. Ern . The ABC of order and topology. *Category Theory at Work*, 18:57–83, 1991. URL: <http://www.heldermann.de/R&E/RAE18/ctw05.pdf>.
- [Har71] Douglas Harris. *Structures in topology*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1971. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 115.
- [Kun11] Kenneth Kunen. *Set theory*, volume 34 of *Studies in Logic (London)*. College Publications, London, 2011.
- [Mor51] Kiiti Morita. On the simple extension of a space with respect to a uniformity. I-IV. *Proc. Japan Acad.*, 27:65–72,130–137,166–171,632–636, 1951. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.pja/1195571517>.
- [Mor89] Kiiti Morita. Extensions of mappings. I. In *Topics in general topology*, volume 41 of *North-Holland Math. Library*, pages 1–39. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989. doi:10.1016/S0924-6509(08)70147-8.
- [PP12] Jorge Picado and Aleš Pultr. *Frames and locales: Topology without points*. Frontiers in Mathematics. Birkh user/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2012. doi:10.1007/978-3-0348-0154-6.
- [Sco13] Brian M. Scott. Compact and locally Hausdorff, but not locally compact. Mathematics Stack Exchange, 2013. URL: <https://math.stackexchange.com/q/337657>.
- [Tuk40] John W. Tukey. *Convergence and Uniformity in Topology*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, no. 2. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1940.
- [Wal38] Henry Wallman. Lattices and topological spaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 39(1):112–126, 1938. doi:10.2307/1968717.
- [Wil72] James Williams. Locally uniform spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 168:435–469, 1972. doi:10.2307/1996185.