$\Gamma \leqslant T$ as $\bigwedge_{S\in\Gamma} S \leqslant T$. If the embedding preserves order and if the lattice is distributive, then all necessary inequalities become true. (Distributivity is needed because of clause (c).) Hence, the sublattice $\overline{P}$ of $\mathfrak{W}$ generated by P is the completely free distributive lattice on P. We have thus shown that all free distributive lattices are, up to isomorphism, sublattices of $\mathfrak{W}$. We have also shown that an inequality $S \leqslant T$ holds in the completely free distributive lattice on P iff $\{S\} \leqslant T$ is necessary.

As in § 2, we can generalize Theorem 8 by permitting infinitary, say $\varkappa$-ary, lattice operations. The required extension of the definition of necessary is obvious; for example, (c) is replaced by

(c′) If $\{S_i\} \cup \Gamma \leqslant U$ is necessary for every $i \in I$, then so is $\{\bigvee_{i\in I} S_i\} \cup \Gamma \leqslant U$.

We then have order-isomorphic embeddings of P into $\mathfrak{W}$ such that, if S and T are terms built up from P by applying the lattice operations to $\varkappa$ or fewer terms at a time, then $S \lesssim T$ in $\mathfrak{W}$ only if $\{S\} \leqslant T$ is necessary.

Interpreting inequalities as above, we find that the necessary ones are true for any embedding of P into a $\varkappa^+$-complete lattice satisfying the generalized distributive law

$$(\bigvee_{i\in I} S_i) \wedge T \leqslant \bigvee_{i\in I} (S_i \wedge T).$$

(The converse inequality always holds.) Since $\mathfrak{W}$ is Brouwerian, it satisfies this generalized distributive law, and so do all its $\varkappa^+$-complete sublattices. It follows that, for any P and $\varkappa$, the completely free, $\varkappa^+$-complete, generalized-distributive lattice on P can be $\varkappa^+$-completely embedded into $\mathfrak{W}$, and satisfies $S \leqslant T$ iff $\{S\} \leqslant T$ is necessary.

References

[1] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice theory*, AMS Colloquium Publications 25 (1948).
[2] D. Gale and F. M. Stewart, *Infinite games with perfect information*, Contributions to the Theory of Games, Vol. 2, Annals of Math. Studies 28 (1953).
[3] J. Mycielski, *On the axiom of determinateness*, Fund. Math. 53 (1963), pp. 205–224.
[4] P. Whitman, *Free lattices*, Annals of Math. 42 (1941), pp. 325–330.

Reçu par la Rédaction le 6. 9. 1971

A geometric form of the axiom of choice

by

J. L. Bell (London) and **D. H. Fremlin** (Cambridge)

Consider the following well-known result from the theory of normed linear spaces ([2], p. 80, 4(b)):

(∗) the unit ball of the (continuous) dual of a normed linear space over the reals has an extreme point.

The standard proof of (∗) uses the axiom of choice (AC); thus the implication AC→(∗) can be proved in set theory. In this paper we show that this implication can be reversed, so that (∗) is actually *equivalent* to the axiom of choice. From this we derive various corollaries, for example: the conjunction of the Boolean prime ideal theorem and the Krein-Milman theorem implies the axiom of choice, and the Krein-Milman theorem is not derivable from the Boolean prime ideal theorem.

1. Preliminaries. Throughout this paper we shall assume that all linear spaces we consider have the real number field, $\boldsymbol{R}$, as their underlying field of scalars.

DEFINITION. Let L be a linear topological space. A subset A of L is said to be *quasicompact* if whenever $\mathcal{F}$ is a family of closed convex subsets of L such that $\{F\cap A\colon F\in\mathcal{F}\}$ has the finite intersection property, then $\bigcap\{F\cap A\colon F\in\mathcal{F}\}\neq\emptyset$. An element $a\in A$ is called an *extreme point* of A if $x, y\in A$ and $a=\frac{1}{2}(x+y)$ imply $a=x=y$.

Now consider the following propositions:

(BPI) Every Boolean algebra contains a prime ideal.

(HB) Let M be a linear subspace of a linear space L and let p be a sublinear functional on L (that is, $p(x+y)\leqslant p(x)+p(y)$ for all $x, y\in L$ and $p(\alpha x)=\alpha p(x)$ for all $0\leqslant\alpha\in R$ and all $x\in L$). If f is a linear functional on M such that $f(x)\leqslant p(x)$ for all $x\in M$, then f can be extended to a linear functional g on L such that $g(x)\leqslant p(x)$ for all $x\in L$.

(KM) A compact convex subset of a locally convex Hausdorff linear topological space always has an extreme point.

(SKM) A quasicompact convex subset of a locally convex Hausdorff linear topological space always has an extreme point.

(AL) For any normed linear space L, the unit ball of the continuous dual L^* of L is quasicompact in the weak *-topology for L^*.

BPI is the well-known *Boolean prime ideal theorem*. HB *is the Hahn-Banach theorem*. KM and SKM are versions of the *Krein-Milman theorem*. Finally, AL is a weak version of *Alaoglu's theorem*, see [4].

For any propositions P and Q, we write $P \Rightarrow Q$ (resp. $P \not\Rightarrow Q$) for "the implication $P \to Q$ is provable (resp. is not provable) in Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory without the axiom of choice". We also write $P \Leftrightarrow Q$ for ($P \Rightarrow Q$ and $Q \Rightarrow P$).

THEOREM 1.1. [4] HB $\Longleftrightarrow$ AL.

THEOREM 1.2. BPI & KM $\Rightarrow$ (*).

Proof. By [5], BPI is equivalent to the Tychonoff theorem for compact Hausdorff spaces. But this latter result implies in the usual way that the unit ball of the dual of a normed space is weak*-compact and KM implies that it has an extreme point. (*) follows.

THEOREM 1.3. AL & SKM $\Rightarrow$ (*).

Proof. By AL the unit ball of the dual of a normed space is quasicompact; SKM then implies that it has an extreme point. Hence (*).

COROLLARY 1.4. HB & SKM $\Rightarrow$ (*).

Proof. By 1.1 and 1.3.

2. The main result and its consequences. We now prove

THEOREM 2.1. (*) $\Rightarrow$ AC.

Proof. Let $\{A_i : i \in I\}$ be a family of non-empty sets; we may assume without loss of generality that the A_i are *disjoint*. Let $A = \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$, and define

$$K = \Big\{x \in \boldsymbol{R}^A:\ \sup_{i \in I} \sum_{t \in A_i} |x(t)| \leqslant 1\Big\},$$

$$L = \Big\{x \in \boldsymbol{R}^A:\ \sup_{i \in I} \sum_{t \in A_i} |x(t)| < \infty\Big\},$$

$$E = \{x \in \boldsymbol{R}^A:\ \forall \varepsilon > 0 [\{t \in A:\ |x(t)| > \varepsilon\} \text{ is finite}] \text{ and } \sum_{i \in I} \sup_{t \in A_i} |x(t)| < \infty\}.$$

Then L and E are normed linear spaces with norms defined by:

$$\|x\|_L = \sup_{i \in I} \sum_{t \in A_i} |x(t)| \quad \text{for} \quad x \in L,$$

$$\|y\|_E = \sum_{i \in I} \sup_{t \in A_i} |y(t)| \quad \text{for} \quad y \in E.$$

Also K is the unit ball of L. But L is isometrically isomorphic to the dual E^* of E (see, e.g., [2], p. 31, 11(b)), and therefore K may be regarded as the unit ball of E^*. By (*), K has an extreme point e. We claim that for each $i \in I$ there is a *unique* $t \in A_i$ for which $e(t) \neq 0$.

For suppose first that there is $i_0 \in I$ such that $e(t) = 0$ for all $t \in A_{i_0}$. Choose $v \in A_{i_0}$ and define $y, z \in K$ by

$$y(v) = 1, \quad z(v) = -1,$$
$$y(t) = z(t) = e(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in A \setminus \{v\}.$$

Then clearly $e = \frac{1}{2}(y+z)$ and $y \neq e \neq z$, contradicting the extremeness of e.

Now suppose that there is $i_0 \in I$ and two distinct members u, v of A_{i_0} such that $e(u) \neq 0$ and $e(v) \neq 0$. Define $y, z \in \boldsymbol{R}^A$ by

$$\begin{aligned} y(u) &= e(u)(1+|e(v)|), \\ y(v) &= e(v)(1-|e(u)|), \\ z(u) &= e(u)(1-|e(v)|), \\ z(v) &= e(v)(1+|e(u)|), \\ z(t) &= y(t) = e(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in A \setminus \{u, v\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $y, z \in K$, $y \neq e \neq z$ and $e = \frac{1}{2}(y+z)$, again contradicting the assumption that e is an extreme point of K.

Thus the claim is proved. We can now define a choice function g for the family $\{A_i : i \in I\}$ by letting $g(i)$ be the unique $t \in A_i$ for which $e(t) \neq 0$. The axiom of choice follows.

COROLLARY 2.2. (*) $\Longleftrightarrow$ AC.

COROLLARY 2.3. BPI & KM $\Rightarrow$ AC.

Proof. By 2.2 and 1.2.

COROLLARY 2.4. *If* ZF *is consistent, then* BPI $\not\Rightarrow$ KM.

Proof. This follows from 2.3 and the fact [3] that, if ZF is consistent, then BPI $\not\Rightarrow$ AC.

COROLLARY 2.5. HB & SKM $\Rightarrow$ AC.

Proof. By 2.2 and 1.4.

Corollary 2.4 improves a result of [1], where it was shown that HB & SKM $\Rightarrow$ BPI.

We conclude the paper with some open problems. Is it true that

HB $\Rightarrow$ BPI?, or

KM $\Rightarrow$ BPI?, or

SKM $\Leftrightarrow$ KM?

Postscript (January 12, 1972). After this paper was submitted, we received a preprint of a review of [1] by W. A. J. Luxemburg in which the results of the present paper are arrived at independently. Corollary 2.3 has also been proved independently by Peter Renz. We have also been informed by Professor Luxemburg that D. Pincus has recently answered the first two of our open problems in the negative.

References

[1] J. L. Bell and F. Jellett, *On the relationship between the Boolean prime ideal theorem and two principles in functional analysis*, Bull. de l'Acad. Pol. des Sci., Ser. math., astr. et phys. 19 (1971), pp. 191–194.

[2] M. M. Day, *Normed Linear Spaces*, Berlin 1962.

[3] J. D. Halpern and A. Lévy, *The Boolean prime ideal theorem does not imply the axiom of choice*, AMS Proc. in Axiomatic Set Theory (1971), pp. 83–134.

[4] W. A. J. Luxemburg, *Reduced powers of the real number system*, in: Applications of model theory to algebra, analysis and probability, New York 1969.

[5] J. Rubin and D. Scott, *Some topological theorems equivalent to the Boolean prime ideal theorem*, Bull. Am. Math. Soc. 60 (1954), p. 389.

THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE
CHURCHILL COLLEGE, Cambridge

Reçu par la Rédaction le 21. 9. 1971

Extending maps from dense subspaces

by

L. Rudolf (Gdańsk)

The main result of the present paper is a generalization of the Tajmanov theorem, which claims that a continuous map $f\colon X\to Y$ of a space X into a compact Hausdorff space Y can be extended by a continuous map $*f\colon *X\to Y$ onto an extension $*X$ of X iff for each pair of closed disjoint subsets A and A' of Y we have $\mathrm{Cl}_{*X}f^{-1}(A)\cap\mathrm{Cl}_{*X}f^{-1}(A')=\emptyset$ (see [3]). Certain results generalizing this theorem were obtained in [2] and [11]. The main theorem of [2] affords a description of the greatest subset X_f lying between X and $*X$, onto which a given continuous map $f\colon X\to Y$ can be continuously extended, which however is external and rather complicated and needs complete regularity of all spaces in question. Meanwhile, the generalization of the Tajmanov theorem given in [11], which depends on replacing the compact space Y in it by an H-closed Urysohn space, the closed sets A and A' by regularly closed ones and the continuity of $*f$ by θ-continuity, is an immediate consequence of the Tajmanov theorem since H-closed Urysohn spaces are known to be exactly those which have a compact minimalization [6] (the minimalization of a Hausdorff topology $\mathcal{T}$ on X is the Hausdorff topology $\mu\mathcal{T}$ on X generated by regularly open sets of $\mathcal{T}$; the identity $(X,\mu\mathcal{T})\to(X,\mathcal{T})$ is θ-continuous). Besides, the cardinal disadvantage of the quoted results (and so far as I know, these are the strongest ones towards generalization of the Tajmanov theorem) is that they are useless in the theory of H-closed spaces, since genuine difficulties appear in this theory when the spaces are not only non-regular (a regular H-closed space is compact [1]) but also non-Urysohn ones since just then they do not admit a contraction to a compact Hausdorff space [6].

In looking for a generalization of the Tajmanov theorem, it seems simplest to give an answer to the following question: under which conditions has a map $f\colon X\to Y$ a continuous extension $*f\colon *X\to Y$ on a certain extension $*X$ of X? It is, however, hopeless to expect the existence of a continuous extension $*f$ in this general situation, particularly in the case where $*X$ is compact and $\mathrm{Cl}_Y f(X)$ is not compact, which may happen