

POINTFREE PSEUDOCOMPACTNESS REVISITED

THEMBA DUBE AND PHETHIWE MATUTU

ABSTRACT. We give several internal and external characterizations of pseudocompactness in frames which extend (and transcend) analogous characterizations in topological spaces. In the case of internal characterizations we do not make reference (explicitly or implicitly) to the reals.

1. Introduction

In the context of pointfree topology, the notion of pseudocompactness first appeared in 1991 in Baboolal and Banaschewski [1] where the authors state that their adopted definition (not making use of homomorphisms from the frame of opens of the reals) is an internal characterization which was established by C. Gilmour. Subsequent to that, Banaschewski and Pultr [7] gave some characterizations within the category of completely regular frames in 1993. Further characterizations within the class of completely regular frames were obtained by Marcus [12], Walters-Wayland [18] who showed, amongst other things, that a completely regular frame is pseudocompact if and only if it admits only precompact uniformities, and by Hlongwa [9] who compared pseudocompactness to other weaker forms of compactness; namely, feeble compactness and countable compactness.

The first extensive characterizations in arbitrary frames appeared in Banaschewski and Gilmour [4]. Our aim in this paper is to establish a number of internal and also external characterizations of pseudocompactness for general frames. We remark that some of these are pointfree extensions of analogous characterizations in topological spaces that were given by Stephenson [16].

What distinguishes our proofs in the case of internal characterizations from those of Stephenson is that, whereas he uses “external” artifacts (maps into the reals) in certain instances, all our proofs are “internal” in the sense that they use only things residing within the frames in question.

We record our deep indebtedness to Dona Strauss for helpful discussions (with the second-named author) pertaining constructions of homomorphisms from the frame of opens of the reals.

2. Preliminaries

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 06D22, 54D20.

Key words and phrases. frame, pseudocompact, paracompact, countably compact.

In this section we recall a few definitions that we shall need and refer to Johnstone [11] for general background on frames. For a more algebraic treatment of this engaging subject, see Pultr [14].

A *frame* is a complete lattice L in which the distributive law

$$a \wedge \bigvee S = \bigvee \{a \wedge x \mid x \in S\}$$

holds for all $a \in L$ and all $S \subseteq L$. We denote the top element and the bottom element of a frame by 1_L and 0_L respectively; omitting the subscript if no confusion may arise. The frame of open subsets of a topological space X will be denoted by $\mathfrak{O}X$.

A *cover* C of a frame is a subset with $\bigvee C = 1$. A cover C *refines* a cover D if for each $c \in C$ there exists $d \in D$ such that $c \leq d$. A subset S of a frame is *locally finite* if there is a cover C such that each element of C meets only finitely many elements of S . In this case we say C *finitizes* S . A frame is *paracompact* (resp. *countably paracompact*) if each cover (resp. each countable cover) has a locally finite refinement. It is *compact* (resp. *countably compact*) if each cover (resp. each countable cover) has a finite subcover.

A frame L is *regular* if, for each $a \in L$, $a = \bigvee \{x \in L \mid x \prec a\}$, where $x \prec a$ means that there exists $s \in L$ such that $x \wedge s = 0$ and $s \vee a = 1$. This is equivalent to $x^* \vee a = 1$ for the *pseudocomplement* $x^* = \bigvee \{w \in L \mid w \wedge x = 0\}$ of the element x . It is *completely regular* if, for each $a \in L$, $a = \bigvee \{x \in L \mid x \prec\prec a\}$ where $x \prec\prec a$ means that there is a scale $(c_q \mid q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1])$ such that $x = c_0$, $a = c_1$ and $c_q \prec c_p$ whenever $q < p$. It is *normal* if whenever $a \vee b = 1$, then there are elements u and v such that $u \wedge v = 0$, $u \vee a = v \vee b = 1$. An element x of a frame is *dense* if $x^* = 0$.

A *frame homomorphism* is a map between frames that preserves finite meets, including the top element, and arbitrary joins, including the bottom element. A frame homomorphism is *dense* if it maps only the bottom to the bottom. A *quotient* of a frame L is a frame M that admits an onto frame homomorphism $L \rightarrow M$.

A *cozero element* of a frame L is an element of the form $\varphi(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ for some frame homomorphism $\varphi : \mathfrak{O}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow L$. The set of all cozero elements of L is called the *cozero part* of L and is denoted by $\text{Coz}(L)$. We remark that, in the definition of cozero elements, $\mathfrak{O}\mathbb{R}$ can be replaced by the *frame of reals* $\mathfrak{L}\mathbb{R}$ which is generated by the ordered pairs (p, q) of rational numbers $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$ subject to the relations:

- (i) $(p, q) \wedge (s, t) = (p \vee s, q \wedge t)$
- (ii) $(p, q) \vee (s, t) = (p, t)$ whenever $p \leq s < q \leq t$

$$(iii) (p, q) = \bigvee \{(s, t) \mid p < s < t < q\}$$

$$(iv) 1_{\mathfrak{R}} = \bigvee \{(p, q) \mid p, q \in \mathbb{Q}\}.$$

Thus defined, without classical reals, the external facts we use stay in the pointfree context too.

A useful characterization is that $a \in \text{Coz}(L)$ if and only if $a = \bigvee a_n$ where $a_k \prec\prec a_{k+1}$ for each k . For further properties of the cozero part of a frame see [2] or [4].

3. External characterizations

We start our study by recalling that for a frame L , a frame homomorphism $h : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow L$ is said to be *bounded* if there exist $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $h(p, q) = 1_L$. The frame is then called *pseudocompact* in case all frame homomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \rightarrow L$ are bounded. Quite clearly, every subframe of a pseudocompact frame is pseudocompact.

We shall frequently use the following result from [4].

Proposition 3.1. *The following are equivalent for any frame L :*

- (1) L is pseudocompact.
- (2) Any sequence $a_1 \prec\prec a_2 \prec\prec \dots$ such that $\bigvee a_n = 1_L$ in L terminates; that is, $a_k = 1_L$ for some k .
- (3) The σ -frame $\text{Coz}(L)$ is compact.

Next we collect some properties of the kinds of frames we shall use in characterizing pseudocompact frames externally.

Lemma 3.2. *A normal paracompact frame is pseudocompact iff it is countably compact.*

Proof. Obviously any countably compact frame is pseudocompact. Conversely, let $\{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ be a countable cover of a normal paracompact frame L . By [8] (the corollary on p.97) there are elements b_n such that $b_n \prec a_n$ for each n and $\bigvee b_n = 1_L$. Now by normality we have that $b_n \prec\prec a_n$, and therefore there are cozero elements c_n such that $b_n \prec c_n \prec a_n$ for each n . Thus $\{c_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a cover of the σ -frame $\text{Coz}(L)$. By pseudocompactness there are finitely many c_n that have join 1_L , and so there are finitely many a_n that cover L . ■

In view of the fact that Boolean frames are normal and paracompact (the latter proved in [17], Proposition 6), we immediately obtain the following fact.

Corollary 3.3. *A Boolean frame is pseudocompact iff it is countably compact.*

For a background on metrizable frames, which we refer to in the next result, we recommend Pultr [13].

Lemma 3.4. *A metrizable frame is compact iff it is countably compact.*

Proof. The one implication is trivial. Conversely, let M be a metrizable frame which is countably compact. Then, as was shown by Sun [17], M is paracompact. Being a regular frame that is paracompact and pseudocompact, M is compact ([7], Corollary 1). ■

We now give some external characterizations of pseudocompactness.

Proposition 3.5. *The following are equivalent for any frame L :*

- (1) *L is pseudocompact.*
- (2) *If $h : M \rightarrow L$ is a one-to-one frame homomorphism, then M is pseudocompact.*
- (3) *If $h : M \rightarrow L$ is a one-to-one frame homomorphism with M normal and paracompact, then M is countably compact.*
- (4) *For every metrizable frame M , if $h : M \rightarrow L$ is a one-to-one frame homomorphism, then M is compact.*
- (5) *For any composition $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow M \rightarrow L$ of frame homomorphisms where the first map is onto and the second one-to-one, M is compact.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Let $a_1 \prec\prec a_2 \prec\prec \dots$ in M with $\bigvee a_n = 1_M$. Then $h(a_1) \prec\prec h(a_2) \prec\prec \dots$ in L , and $\bigvee h(a_n) = 1_L$. Since L is pseudocompact, there exists an index k such that $h(a_k) = 1_L$. Since h is one-one, $a_k = 1_M$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). Follows from Lemma 3.2.

(3) \Rightarrow (4). Metrizable frames are regular and paracompact, and therefore normal by Proposition 3.4 in [15]. So the result follows from Lemma 3.4.

(4) \Rightarrow (5). This is so since $\mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R}$ is metrizable and quotients of metrizable frames are metrizable.

(5) \Rightarrow (1). Let $f : \mathcal{O}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow L$ be a frame homomorphism. Consider the factorization $\mathcal{O}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow f[\mathcal{O}\mathbb{R}] \rightarrow L$ where the first map maps as f (and is therefore onto) and the second map is the inclusion. The hypothesis says $f[\mathcal{O}\mathbb{R}]$ is compact. Now $\{f(-n, n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a cover of $f[\mathcal{O}\mathbb{R}]$; so by compactness there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(-k, k) = 1_L$. Thus L is pseudocompact. ■

4. Internal characterizations

A filter base F in a frame L is called *completely regular* if for each $x \in F$ there exists $y \in F$ such that $y \prec\prec x$. As in spaces we say a filter base F *clusters* if $\bigvee\{x^* \mid x \in F\} \neq 1$. A cover C is *co-completely regular* if for each $c \in C$ there exists $d \in C$ such that $c \prec\prec d$. We shall say a subset S of $\text{Coz}(L)$ is *locally finite in $\text{Coz}(L)$* if it is finitized by a cover of $\text{Coz}(L)$; that is, if it is finitized by a countable cover of L consisting of cozero elements.

Proposition 4.1. *The following are equivalent for any frame L :*

- (1) L is pseudocompact.
- (2) Every subset of $\text{Coz}(L)$ which is locally finite in $\text{Coz}(L)$ is finite.
- (3) Every countable completely regular filter base in L clusters.
- (4) Every countable co-completely regular cover of L has a finite subcover.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). If not, there is a countably infinite set $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots\} \subseteq \text{Coz}(L)$ which is locally finite in $\text{Coz} L$ and consisting of nonzero elements. Let C be a cover of $\text{Coz}(L)$ that finitizes B . Now define elements a_n , for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as follows:

$$a_n = \bigvee\{x \in C \mid x \wedge b_k = 0 \text{ for all } k \geq n\}.$$

Then we clearly have that $a_n \leq a_{n+1}$ for each n , and each a_n is in $\text{Coz}(L)$ because it is a join of countably many cozero elements. Furthermore, if $c \in C$ then $c \leq a_k$ for some k since c meets only finitely many elements of B . Thus $A = \{a_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a cover of $\text{Coz}(L)$. Since $\text{Coz}(L)$ is compact, A has a finite subcover. This implies that $a_k = 1_L$ for some k ; whence $b_k = 0$ since

$b_k = b_k \wedge \bigvee \{x \in C \mid x \wedge b_i = 0 \text{ for all } i \geq k\} \leq \bigvee \{b_k \wedge x \mid x \wedge b_k = 0\}$. This contradiction proves the result.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). Let $F = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ be a completely regular filter base in L . For each n let $y_n = x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_n$ and note that $y_n \neq 0$ since F is a filter base, and $y_n \geq y_{n+1}$. Now let $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Find x_{n_1}, \dots, x_{n_q} in F such that $x_{n_1} \prec\prec x_1, \dots, x_{n_q} \prec\prec x_q$. Then $x_{n_1} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{n_q} \prec\prec x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_q = y_q$. If we let $m = \max\{n_1, \dots, n_q\}$, then $y_m = x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_m \leq x_{n_1} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{n_q} \prec\prec y_q$; so that $y_m \prec\prec y_q$. We can therefore extract a subsequence $(y_{m_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ from (y_n) such that $y_{m_k} \leq y_k$ for each k and

$$\dots y_{m_2} \prec\prec y_{m_1} \prec\prec y_1.$$

Thus there are cozero elements c_1, c_2, \dots and cozero elements d_1, d_2, \dots such that

$$\dots y_{m_k} \prec c_k \prec y_{m_{k-1}} \prec \dots \prec y_{m_2} \prec c_2 \prec y_{m_1} \prec c_1 \prec y_1$$

and

$$y_1^* \prec d_1 \prec y_{m_1}^* \prec d_2 \prec y_{m_2}^* \prec \dots \prec y_{m_{k-1}}^* \prec d_k \prec y_{m_k}^* \dots$$

Since $y_n \leq x_n$ for each n , we have $x_n^* \leq y_n^*$ for each n . Hence if we can show that $\bigvee y_n^* \neq 1_L$ we shall be done. Suppose, by way of contradiction, that $\bigvee y_n^* = 1_L$. Then $D = \{d_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a cover of $\text{Coz}(L)$. We claim that it finitizes $C = \{c_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Given any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ choose $n(k)$ and $l(k)$ in \mathbb{N} such that $d_k \prec y_{n(k)}^*$ and $c_{l(k)} \prec y_{n(k)}$. Since the sequence (c_n) decreases and $y_{n(k)}^* \wedge y_{n(k)} = 0$, it follows that d_k has nonzero meet with at most $c_1, \dots, c_{l(k)-1}$. This shows that the set C is locally finite in $\text{Coz}(L)$ and is therefore finite by the hypothesis. Say $C = \{c_{p_1}, \dots, c_{p_s}\}$ with $c_{p_1} \geq \dots \geq c_{p_s}$. Now

$$\bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{N}} c_i^* \geq \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{N}} y_{m_i}^* = \bigvee_{n \in \mathbb{N}} y_n^* = 1_L.$$

But $\bigvee c_i^* = c_{p_s}^*$; so $c_{p_s}^* = 1_L$, which implies that $c_{p_s} = 0$ and hence $y_k = 0$ for some k . This is a contradiction.

(3) \Rightarrow (4). If not, there is a countable co-completely regular cover C which has no finite subcover. Let $G = \{\bigwedge x^*(x \in F) \mid F \text{ is a finite subset of } C\}$. We claim that G is a filter base. Let c_1, \dots, c_m be finitely many elements of C . We need only show that $c_1^* \wedge \dots \wedge c_m^* \neq 0$. If this meet were 0, then for d_1, \dots, d_m in C with $c_i \prec\prec d_i$ we would have $c_1 \vee \dots \vee c_m \prec\prec d_1 \vee \dots \vee d_m$, whence $(c_1 \vee \dots \vee c_m)^* \vee (d_1 \vee \dots \vee d_m) = 1_L$ and therefore $d_1 \vee \dots \vee d_m = 1_L$ since $(c_1 \vee \dots \vee c_m)^* = c_1^* \wedge \dots \wedge c_m^* = 0$. But then this would mean C has a finite subcover. Now let $g = x_1^* \wedge \dots \wedge x_m^*$ be an arbitrary element of G . Pick $y_i \in C$ such that $x_i \prec\prec y_i$ for each i . Then $y_i^* \prec\prec x_i^*$ for each

i. Thus $y_1^* \wedge \cdots \wedge y_m^*$ is an element of G which is completely below g . Therefore G is a completely regular filter base which is countable. But now we have a contradiction since, for each $c \in C$, c^* is in G and hence

$$\bigvee_{x \in G} x^* \geq \bigvee_{c \in C} c^{**} = 1_L,$$

contradicting the hypothesis.

(4) \Rightarrow (1). Let (a_n) be a sequence such that $a_1 \prec\prec a_2 \prec\prec \cdots$ and $\bigvee a_n = 1_L$. Then $\{a_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a countable co-completely regular cover. So there exist integers $n_1 < \cdots < n_k$ such that $a_{n_1} \vee \cdots \vee a_{n_k} = 1_L$. This implies that $a_{n_k} = 1_L$. ■

Recall that a frame is *almost compact* if every cover has a finite subset the join of which is dense. Hong [10] has shown that a frame is almost compact if and only if every filter in it clusters. Now if a filter base does not cluster, then the filter it generates also does not cluster. From the characterization above we therefore have the following result.

Corollary 4.2. *Every almost compact frame is pseudocompact.*

An element x of a frame is called *regular* in case $x = x^{**}$. Note that regular elements are precisely those that are pseudocomplements. The *semi-regularization* of a frame L is the subframe L_s generated by the regular elements of L .

Corollary 4.3. *A frame is pseudocompact iff its semi-regularization is pseudocompact.*

Proof. Let L be a frame with a pseudocompact semi-regularization, and let F be a countable completely regular filter base in L . The set $G = \{x^{**} \mid x \in F\}$ is easily checked to be a filter base in L_s in light of the identity $a^{**} \wedge b^{**} = (a \wedge b)^{**}$. Now if $x \prec y$ in L and t is an element of L witnessing this fact, then $x^{**} \wedge t^{**} = 0$ and $t^{**} \vee y^{**} = 1$; whence $x^{**} \prec y^{**}$ in L_s . Thus, for any z and w in L , if $z \prec\prec w$ then $z^{**} \prec\prec w^{**}$ in L_s . So G is a countable completely regular filter base in L_s . Denote by $()^\circledast$ the pseudocomplementation in L_s . Therefore $\bigvee \{g^\circledast \mid g \in G\} \neq 1_{L_s} = 1_L$. Now, for any $a \in L_s$, we clearly have $a^\circledast \leq a^*$. On the other hand, in view of the fact that $x \wedge y = 0$ if and only if $x^{**} \wedge y = 0$, we have that $a^* \leq \bigvee \{x^{**} \mid x \in L \text{ and } x \wedge a = 0\} \leq a^\circledast$. Consequently, $\bigvee \{x^* \mid x \in F\} = \bigvee \{g^* \mid g \in G\}$ because of the identity $u^* = u^{***}$. Thus L is

pseudocompact. ■

Remark. We have chosen to establish the foregoing result in the rather longwinded manner we did because, being an internal characterization, we wanted to prove it without reference to the reals. In fact this result follows from the following observation: If L is a frame and M a subframe of L such that $Im(h) \subseteq M$ for each frame homomorphism $h : \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow L$, then L is pseudocompact if and only if M is. Indeed, given any frame homomorphism $f : \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow L$, let $\tilde{f} : \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ map as f . Then the boundedness of \tilde{f} clearly implies that of f . Now if we let L_c be the subframe of L generated by $Coz(L)$, then we have $L_c \subseteq L_s$ because every cozero element is a join of regular elements as $x \prec\prec a$ implies $x^{**} \leq a$. Furthermore, the image of any frame homomorphism $\mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow L$ is contained in L_c since all elements of $\mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R}$ are cozero and frame homomorphisms preserve cozero elements. Consequently we have that *a frame L is pseudocompact iff L_s is pseudocompact iff L_c is pseudocompact.*

Banaschewski [3] calls a frame M a *singly-generated extension* of a frame L if L is a subframe of M and there is an element $c \in M$ such that $L \cup \{c\}$ generates M . Such an element is called a *generator* of M over L . He goes on to show that in such a case every element of M is expressible as $x = x_1 \vee (x_2 \wedge c)$ with $x_1 \leq x_2$ in L . Furthermore, if c is dense, then the pseudocomplement of x in M coincides with the pseudocomplement of x_2 in L . Therefore, if $x \prec y$ in M then $x^* \vee y = 1_M$ implies that $x_2^\# \vee y_2 = 1_L$ since $y \leq y_2$, where $()^\#$ denotes pseudocomplementation in L . Consequently, if $x \prec\prec y$ in M then $x_2 \prec\prec y_2$ in L .

Now seeing that “extension” in frames has subsequently been used differently (namely, M is an extension of L if there is a dense onto frame homomorphism $M \rightarrow L$), we prefer to say M is a singly-generated *expansion* of L if the above holds. This latter nomenclature of course comes from topology.

Corollary 4.4. *Let M be a singly-generated expansion of L with a dense generator. Then M is pseudocompact iff L is pseudocompact.*

Proof. Only one implication needs to be proved. So let L be pseudocompact and c be a dense generator of M over L . Let C be a countable co-completely regular cover of M . Using the

notation of the discussion above, for each $x \in C$ choose any x_2 and put $\tilde{C} = \{x_2 \mid x \in C\}$. Since $x \leq x_2$ for each x , we have that \tilde{C} is countable cover of L which is co-completely regular in view of what we observed above and the fact that C is co-completely regular. Therefore \tilde{C} has a finite subcover, say, D . Now for each $d \in D$ find y_d in C such that, for some $u \leq d$ in L , $u \vee (d \wedge c) \prec\prec y_d$. This is possible since C is co-completely regular. But now this implies that $(u \vee (d \wedge c))^* \vee y_d = 1_M$; whence $d^\# \vee y_d = 1_M$ by the Banaschewski result mentioned above. Thus $d \leq y_d$; and consequently $\{y_d \mid d \in D\}$ is a finite subcover extracted from C . ■

5. Other properties

In their extension of the concept of C -embedded subspaces to pointfree topology, Ball and Walters-Wayland [2] say an onto frame homomorphism $h : L \rightarrow M$ is a C -quotient map in case for every frame homomorphism $g : \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$, there is a frame homomorphism $f : \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow L$ such that $h \circ f = g$.

Proposition 5.1. *If L is a pseudocompact frame then L admits no C -quotient map $L \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. If not, let $h : L \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{N}$ be a C -quotient map. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $b_n = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then each b_n is a cozero element of $\mathfrak{D}\mathbb{N}$ since $\mathfrak{D}\mathbb{N}$ is Boolean. Furthermore

$$b_1 \prec\prec b_2 \prec\prec \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \bigvee b_n = 1_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbb{N}}.$$

Thus, in the language of [2], $B = \{b_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a cozero tower in $\mathfrak{D}\mathbb{N}$. So by Theorem 7.2.7 (6) in [2] there is a cozero tower S in L such that $h[S]$ refines B . Since L is pseudocompact and S is an increasing sequence of cozero elements each completely below the next, there exists $s \in S$ such that $s = 1_L$. So $1_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbb{N}} = h(s) \leq b_m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies that $b_m = 1_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbb{N}}$; which is false. ■

Proposition 5.2. *Let L be a frame with the property that for all $a, b \in \text{Coz}(L)$ with $a \vee b = 1_L$, $\uparrow a$ or $\uparrow b$ is compact. Then L is pseudocompact.*

Proof. Suppose, by way of contradiction, that there is an unbounded frame homomorphism $h : \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow L$. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, if $h(x, t) = 0_L$ for all $x < t$ and $h(t, z) = 0_L$ for all $z > t$,

then $h(t, \infty) = h(-\infty, t) = 0_L$; whence $h(-\infty, t+1) = h(t-1, \infty) = 1_L$ since $1_L = h(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, t+1) \cup (t, \infty)$, and similarly for the other case. So we may assume that for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $s > t$ such that $h(t, s) \neq 0_L$. A similar argument holds if we assume that for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $s < t$ such that $h(s, t) \neq 0_L$. Now fix $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and choose an increasing sequence $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ inductively in \mathbb{R} as follows: $t_1 = q$, and, with t_n having been chosen, choose t_{n+1} such that $h(t_n + 1, t_{n+1}) \neq 0_L$. Next define elements a and b in L by

$$a = h((-\infty, q+1) \cup \bigcup_{n \text{ even}} (t_n, t_{n+1} + 1)) \quad \text{and} \quad b = h(\bigcup_{n \text{ odd}} (t_n, t_{n+1} + 1)).$$

Then a and b are cozero elements of L satisfying $a \vee b = 1_L$. We show that neither $\uparrow a$ nor $\uparrow b$ is compact. To see that $\uparrow a$ is not compact, consider the set $C = \{a \vee h(-\infty, t_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Clearly C is a cover of the frame $\uparrow a$. However, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \vee \bigvee_{m \leq n} h(-\infty, t_m) \neq 1_L$ because for any odd integer $r > n$ we have

$$h(t_r + 1, t_{r+1}) \wedge (a \vee h(\bigcup_{m \leq n} (-\infty, t_m))) = 0_L$$

whilst $h(t_r + 1, t_{r+1}) \neq 0_L$. Similarly, $\uparrow b$ is not compact; and we thus have a contradiction. ■

In [6] Banaschewski and Gilmour say a dense onto frame homomorphism $h : M \rightarrow L$ is a *one-point extension* of L if there is a maximal element $s \in M$ such that h induces an isomorphism $\downarrow s \rightarrow L$. They then prove that if $\bigvee : R\mathfrak{I}(\text{Coz}(L)) \rightarrow L$ is a one-point extension of L , where $R\mathfrak{I}(\text{Coz}(L))$ is the frame of regular ideals of $\text{Coz}(L)$, then L satisfies the hypothesis in the preceding proposition. We consequently have:

Corollary 5.3. *If the Stone-Čech compactification of a completely regular frame is a one-point extension, then the frame is pseudocompact.*

Hlongwa [9] has shown that if x is a regular element of a pseudocompact completely regular frame, then $\uparrow x^*$ is pseudocompact. In a general case we have the following result.

Proposition 5.4. *Let L be a pseudocompact frame and $a \in L$ be such that $\uparrow(a \vee a^*)$ is pseudocompact. Then $\uparrow a^*$ is pseudocompact.*

Proof. Let $h : \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \uparrow a^*$ be a frame homomorphism and let $g : \uparrow a^* \rightarrow \uparrow(a \vee a^*)$ be the frame homomorphism $x \rightsquigarrow x \vee a$. Because $\uparrow(a \vee a^*)$ is pseudocompact, the composite $g \circ h : \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \uparrow(a \vee a^*)$ is bounded and therefore there exists $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $1_L = g(h(-r, r)) = h(-r, r) \vee a$. Now define a map $f : \mathfrak{D}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow L$ by

$$f(U) = h(r, \infty) \wedge h(U) \wedge a \text{ if } r \notin U, \text{ and } f(U) = h(-r, r) \vee h(U) \text{ otherwise.}$$

One checks easily that f is a frame homomorphism. Since L is pseudocompact there exists $s > r$ in \mathbb{R} such that $f(-s, s) = 1_L$. Since $r \in (-s, s)$, we have that $1_L = f(-s, s) = h(-r, r) \vee h(-s, s) = h(-s, s)$. Therefore h is bounded as required. ■

We end by proving the “countable” version of the Banaschewski-Pultr [7] result that we cited in the proof of Lemma 3.4.; namely, a completely regular frame is compact if and only if it is paracompact and pseudocompact. Hlongwa [9] has shown that a completely regular frame is pseudocompact if and only if every countable cover has a finite subset with a dense join. The latter is a pointfree enunciation of a property of topological spaces known to be equivalent to feeble compactness, which in turn is equivalent to pseudocompactness in the category of completely regular spaces.

Proposition 5.5. *A completely regular frame is countably compact iff it is pseudocompact and countably paracompact.*

Proof. The forward implication is immediate. Conversely, let L be pseudocompact and countably paracompact and $A = \{a_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a countable cover. For each n let $b_n = a_1 \vee \cdots \vee a_n$, and note that the b_n form an increasing cover of L . By countable paracompactness there is a cover $\{c_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $c_n \prec b_n$ for each n ([8], Proposition 7). In light of the fact that if $x \prec u$ and $y \prec v$ then $x \vee y \prec u \vee v$, we may assume that the c_n increase because the b_n increase. Now pick k such that $(c_1 \vee \cdots \vee c_k)^* = 0$. This implies that $c_k^* = 0$, and therefore $b_k = 1$. Thus A has a finite subcover. ■

Acknowledgment

Thanks are due to the referee for useful remarks. The second-named author expresses her gratitude for financial assistance from Rhodes University and the National Research Foundation of South Africa.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Baboolal and B. Banaschewski, Compactification and local connectedness of frames, *J. Pure Appl. Alg.* **70** (1991), 3-16.
- [2] R.N. Ball and J. Walters-Wayland, C- and C*-quotients in pointfree topology, *Dissertationes Mathematicae (Rozprawy Mat.)*, Vol. 412, (2002).
- [3] B. Banaschewski, Singly generated frame extensions, *J. Pure Appl. Alg.* **83** (1992), 1-21.
- [4] B. Banaschewski and C. Gilmour, Pseudocompactness and the cozero part of a frame, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.* **37**(3) (1996), 577-587.
- [5] B. Banaschewski and C. Gilmour, Realcompactness and the cozero part of a frame, *Appl. Cat. Struct.* **9** (2001), 395-417.
- [6] B. Banaschewski and C. Gilmour, Cozero bases of frames, *J. Pure Appl. Alg.* **157** (2001), 1-22.
- [7] B. Banaschewski and A. Pultr, Paracompactness revisited, *Appl. Cat. Struct.* **1** (1993), 181-190.
- [8] C.H. Dowker and D. Strauss, Paracompact frames and closed maps, *Sympos. Math.* **16** (1975), 93-116.
- [9] H.N. Hlongwa, *Regular-closed frames and proximities in frames* (Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Durban-Westville, South Africa, 2004.)
- [10] S.S. Hong, Convergence in frames, *Kyungpook Math. J.* **35** (1995), 85-91.
- [11] P.T. Johnstone, Stone Spaces, *Cambridge Univ. Press*, Cambridge 1982.
- [12] N. Marcus, *Realcompactifications of frames*, (M.Sc. dissertation, Univ. of Cape Town, South Africa, 1994.)
- [13] A. Pultr, *Remarks on metrizable locales*, Proc. 12th Winter School, Suppl. ai Rend. del Circ. Matem. di Palermo, Serie II **6** (1984), 247-258.
- [14] A. Pultr, *Frames*, in: Handbook of Algebra (Ed. M. Hazewinkel), Vol. **3**, Elsevier Science B.V. (2003), 791-857.
- [15] A. Pultr and J. Úlehla, Notes on characterization of paracompact frames, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae* **32** 2(1989), 377-384
- [16] R.M. Stephenson Jr., Pseudocompact spaces, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **134** (1968), 437-448.
- [17] S.H. Sun, On paracompact locales and metric locales, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae* **30** (1989), 101-107.
- [18] J.L. Walters-Wayland, *Completeness and nearly fine uniform frames*, (Ph.D. thesis, Univ. Catholique de Louvain, Belgium, 1996.)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA, P.O. BOX 329, 0003 UNISA, SOUTH AFRICA.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RHODES UNIVERSITY, GRAHAMSTOWN 6140, SOUTH AFRICA.

E-mail address: `dubeta@unisa.ac.za`

E-mail address: `P.Matutu@ru.ac.za`