

Finally, we note that the first statement of Theorem 4 (concerning isotone maps) is trivial from Theorem 1 if K has a zero define

$$f(\langle A \rangle) = \bigvee (f_{\lambda}(A_{(\lambda)}) | \lambda \in A)$$
.

f obviously satisfies all the requirements. If no $A_{(2)}$ exists, then, of course, $f(\langle A \rangle) = 0$.

References

- C. C. Chen and G. Grätzer, On the construction of complemented lattices, J. Algebra, 11 (1969), pp. 56-63.
- R. A. Dean, Free lattices generated by partially ordered sets and preserving bounds, Canad. J. Math. 16 (1964), pp. 136-148.
- [3] R. P. Dilworth, Lattices with unique complements, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 57 (1945), pp. 123-154.
- [4] B. Jónsson, Sublattices of a free lattice, Canad. J. Math. 13 (1961), pp. 256-264.
- [5] H. Lakser, Free lattices generated by partially ordered sets I, to appear.
- [6] Free lattices generated by partially ordered sets II, to appear.
- 7] Yu. I. Sorkin, Free unions of lattices, Mat. Sb. N. S. 30 (1952), pp. 677-694.
- [8] P. M. Whitman, Free lattices I, Ann. of Math. 42 (1941), pp. 325-330.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Recu par la Rédaction le 15. 8. 1969

Non-existence of certain Borel structures

by

B. V. Rao (Calcutta)

This note conceptually simplifies the proofs and extends the theorems of [1] and puts them in a more general setting.

Let (X, B) be any separable (countably generated and containing singletons) Borel space, where to avoid trivialities X is assumed to be uncountable. Sets in B are to be called Borel subsets of X. Throughout, B is fixed.

Theorem 1. For any σ -algebra Σ on X containing B, the following are equivalent:

- (i) Any one-one real Σ -measurable function on X coincides with a B-measurable function on an uncountable Borel subset of X.
- (ii) Any separable σ -algebra S on X with $B \subset S \subset \Sigma$ coincides with B on an uncountable Borel subset of X, that is, on some uncountable Borel subset of X the restrictions of B and S coincide.

Proof: Given (i), we can prove (ii) by looking at the Marczewski function associated with any countable generator for S. Conversely, given (ii), we can prove (i) by looking at the separable σ -algebra induced by the given function and B.

DEFINITION 1. A σ -algebra Σ on X containing B and satisfying any one of the above two equivalent conditions is said to be a B-Souslin σ -algebra for X (with due respect to the work done by Souslin).

DEFINITION 2. A σ -algebra Z on X is said to be B-mixing if Z contains B and any uncountable Borel subset of X contains an element of Z-B.

From the above definitions and Theorem 1, we have the following theorem, which can be easily proved by contradiction.

THEOREM 2. Let Z be any B-mixing σ -algebra on X. Let Σ be any B-Souslin σ -algebra containing Z. Then there is no separable σ -algebra on X containing Z and contained in Σ . Consequently, no separable σ -algebra containing Z can be a B-Souslin σ -algebra.

Remark 1. Throughout this paragraph let X be I the unit interval, B its usual Borel σ -algebra, Z = A the σ -algebra generated by its usual



analytic sets, and Σ the class of Lebesgue-measurable sets or sets with the Baire property. From well-known facts it is easy to verify that the conditions of the above theorem are satisfied. Consequently, Theorem 1 of [1] follows from the above theorem. It also follows that there is no separable σ -algebra on I containing A and contained in O, the class of sets with the Baire property. We believe that Theorem 2 says something more in the following sense: Fix any analytic non-Borel set A in I and let A_0 be the σ -algebra on I generated by B and all the Borel isomorphs of A. Then A_0 is also B-mixing and hence the preceding two special cases of Theorem 2 are still valid with A replaced by A_0 . However, we do not known whether A_0 is properly contained in A. We do not know whether any two analytic non-Borel subsets of I are Borel isomorphic.

The following theorem is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.

THEOREM 3. Assume the hypothesis of Theorem 2. Let U be any subset of $X \times X$ such that the vertical sections of U generate Z. Then $U \notin C \times \Sigma$. Here C is the class of all subsets of X.

Clearly, Theorem 2 of [1] is a simple special case of the above theorem.

Remark 2. Assume the setup of Remark 1. If C is a B-Souslin σ -algebra, then there is no separable σ -algebra containing A. In fact, there is no such algebra containing A_0 in that case. Thus, in particular, if one assumes the axiom of determinateness, then there is no separable σ -algebra containing A_0 on I. However, we do not know whether, conversely, the non-existence of a separable σ -algebra containing A implies that C is a B-Souslin σ -algebra.

The author is thankful to Prof. Ashok Maitra for several useful discussions and to Prof. Jan Mycielski for some useful correspondence regarding the axiom of determinateness.

Note added in proof: Regarding non-isomorphic analytic sets see A. Maitra and C. Ryll-Nardzewski in Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astr. Phy. 18 (1970) pp. 177-178.

Reference

[1] B. V. Rao, Remarks on analytic sets, Fund. Math. 66 (1970), pp. (237-239).

Reçu par la Rédaction le 7. 10. 1969

On uniform universal spaces

by

W. Kulpa (Katowice)

The aim of the paper is to prove (Theorem 2) the existence of a universal space for the class of all uniform spaces whose uniformities have a dimension not greater than n and have a base of cardinality not greater than γ , consisting of coverings of cardinality not greater than τ , where n is a finite number, γ and τ are infinite cardinal numbers. A theorem of Nagata [6] concerning a universal metrizable space of a given topological dimension may be regarded as a special case of our theorem for $\gamma = \aleph_0$.

The condition limiting the cardinalities of the coverings from the base of the uniformities is necessary, because the class of uniform spaces of a given dimension and a fixed cardinality of bases for uniformities, such that each two spaces of the class are not uniformly homeomorphic, does not form a set in general. For example, the class consisting of all discrete spaces (they have uniformities consisting of single-point-set coverings) do not form a set.

The proof of the existence of this universal space is based on Theorem 1, which presents a strenghtened form of a factorization theorem from [3].

I wish to express my gratitude to Docent J. Mioduszewski for helpful conversations during the writing of this paper.

- § 1. Preliminaries. A pseudouniformity U on set X is a family of coverings of X such that:
 - (1) U is directed with respect to star refinement,
- (2) if $P \in U$ and $P \succeq P'$, then $P' \in U$ ($P \succeq P'$ —this means that P is a refinement of P').

A subfamily B of U such that each $P' \in U$ has a refinement $P \in B$ is said to be a base of U.

If a pseudouniformity U is such that:

(3) for each distinct point x' and x'' from X there exists a $P \in U$ such that $x'' \notin \operatorname{st}(x', P)$,

then U is said to be a uniformity.