

CONVERGENCES, PRETOPOLOGIES AND PROXIMITIES INDUCED BY CAUCHY AND RIESZ SCREENS

MONIQUE CHICOURRAT (CLERMONT FERRAND)

ABSTRACT. We answer a question of Császár [12]: under which conditions a given pretopological closure or proximity can be induced by a Cauchy structure? We give a characterization for these closures and proximities using properties of convergences and nasses [14] induced by Cauchy structures. We prove also that the set of Cauchy screens inducing a given reciprocal convergence structure is a non empty interval of the set of Cauchy screens equipped with the usual inclusion order.

Key words: convergences, pretopologies, Cauchy spaces, proximities.
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 54E05, 54E15; Secondary 54E70

1. Introduction

The starting point of this paper is a question asked and investigated by Császár in [12]: under which conditions a given pretopological closure or proximity can be induced by a Cauchy screen (or Cauchy structure)?

Recall [1] that a pretopological space (X, c) is given by a set X and a **pretopological closure** c on X , that is, a mapping $c : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ from the power set of X to itself satisfying the following conditions:

- (CL1) $c(\emptyset) = \emptyset$;
- (CL2) $\forall A \in \mathcal{P}(X), A \subset c(A)$;
- (CL3) $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{P}(X), c(A \cup B) = c(A) \cup c(B)$.

It is well known that a pretopological structure on a set X can be given equivalently by a pretopological closure or a pretopological convergence or also by a family $(\mathcal{V}(x))_{x \in X}$ of filters on X , each $\mathcal{V}(x)$ being fixed at x .

Recall that a **proximity** (in the sense of [1]) on a set X is a binary symmetric relation δ on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ such that:

- (P0) $\forall A \in \mathcal{P}(X), \emptyset(\text{non-}\delta)A$ ¹
- (P1) $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{P}(X) : A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A\delta B$
- (P2) $\forall A, B, C \in \mathcal{P}(X) : A\delta(B \cup C) \Leftrightarrow A\delta B \text{ or } A\delta C$.

Such a relation induces a pretopological closure c on X defined by :

$$x \in c(A) \Leftrightarrow \{x\}\delta A.$$

¹We write $A\delta B$ for $(A, B) \in \delta$ and $A(\text{non-}\delta)B$ for $(A, B) \notin \delta$

According to the terminology of [11] a **screen** on a set X is a family \mathcal{C} of proper filters (that is, not containing \emptyset) on X such that:

$$(SC0) \quad \forall x \in X, \dot{x} \in \mathcal{C}^2$$

$$(SC1) \quad \text{for any filters } \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \mathcal{G}, \text{ if } \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G} \text{ then } \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{C}.$$

In the terminology of [15] the pair (X, \mathcal{C}) is a **filterspace**.

A screen \mathcal{C} is a **Cauchy screen** (or a **Cauchy structure** in [16] and [7]) if it satisfies the following condition:

$$(SC2) \quad \text{If } \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \mathcal{G} \text{ are members of } \mathcal{C} \text{ such that } \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}^\# \text{ then } \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G} \text{ is also in } \mathcal{C}$$

where $\mathcal{G}^\#$ denotes the set $\{A \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \forall B \in \mathcal{G}, A \cap B \neq \emptyset\}$.

The set of screens on X is equipped with the following order: a screen \mathcal{C} is **coarser than** a screen \mathcal{C}' , or \mathcal{C}' is **finer than** \mathcal{C} , if $\mathcal{C}' \subset \mathcal{C}$.

Any screen \mathcal{C} induces a convergence structure $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}}$ given by:

$$\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}} x \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x} \in \mathcal{C}$$

It also induces a proximity δ and a pretopological closure c as follows:

$$A\delta B \Leftrightarrow \exists \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}, A, B \in \mathcal{F}^\#$$

$$x \in c(A) \Leftrightarrow \exists \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}, (\{x\}, A) \in \mathcal{F}^\# \times \mathcal{F}^\#$$

where $\mathcal{F}^\#$ is defined as above.

This closure c is also the pretopological closure induced by the convergence $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}}$.

In section 4 we give an answer to Császár's question. We use the one-to-one correspondence between proximities and *nasses* of Haddad (reflexive and closed graph relations on the set of ultrafilters) and also properties concerning convergences induced by Cauchy screens.

It is known that the convergences induced by a screen are the *Kent convergences* [15] and those induced by a Cauchy screen are the *reciprocal limit structures* [7]. In section 3 we study some order properties of screens and convergences: we prove for example that those (Cauchy) screens inducing a given convergence form a non empty interval of the ordered set of (Cauchy) screens, in particular there exist a coarsest and a finest one. We study also the relationship between properties of convergences and properties of some screens inducing them.

Section 4 deals with those *nasses*, proximities and closures induced by (Cauchy) screens and uses results from section 3.

Section 2 is about notations and definitions.

² \dot{x} denotes the ultrafilter on X containing $\{x\}$.

2. Notations and basic definitions.

2.1. Filters and grills. We give here some terminology, notation and basic useful facts about filters, grills and ultrafilters. For more details, the reader may consult [19] and [20].

As in [13] a subset \mathcal{F} of $\mathcal{P}(X)$ such that $(A \in \mathcal{F}, A \subset B \Rightarrow B \in \mathcal{F})$, will be called a **semifilter** (it is a *stack* in [20],) and for any semifilter, we write

$$\mathcal{F}^\# = \{A \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \forall F \in \mathcal{F}, F \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$$

(it is denoted by $\text{sec } \mathcal{F}$ in [7]); $\mathcal{F}^\#$ is again a semifilter and $\mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{F}^\#$ is an idempotent map such that: $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G} \iff \mathcal{G}^\# \subset \mathcal{F}^\#$.

Furthermore we have for any semifilter \mathcal{F} : $A \in \mathcal{F}^\# \iff X \setminus A \notin \mathcal{F}$.

We call a **filter on X** any nonempty semifilter \mathcal{F} such that $A \cap B \in \mathcal{F}$ whenever A and B are in \mathcal{F} . A filter is **proper** if it is not equal to $\mathcal{P}(X)$ (which is to say that $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$).

We denote by $\phi(X)$ the set of proper filters on X . A filter \mathcal{F} on X is said to be **centered** (or **fixed**) if its center $\cap\{F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is not empty otherwise it is **free**, and if x is in $\cap\{F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$, we say that \mathcal{F} is **fixed at x** . An **ultrafilter** is a maximal filter.

If \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are filters on X such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}^\#$, then $\mathcal{F} \vee \mathcal{G}$ denotes the filter generated by $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$. We say that \mathcal{F} **mesh** \mathcal{G} (or **\mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} mesh**) whenever $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}^\#$.

A **filter grill** (or a **grill** for short) is a semifilter \mathcal{G} not equal to $\mathcal{P}(X)$ and for which $A \cup B \in \mathcal{G}$ if and only if A or B is in \mathcal{G} . These were introduced by Choquet in [6]. Recall that the map $\mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{F}^\#$ is a bijection between filters and grills, fixed points of which are exactly the ultrafilters on X and we have for any filter \mathcal{F} and any grill \mathcal{G} : $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$ if and only if $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{G}$ for some ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on X .

Let βX be the set of ultrafilters on X and for any $A \subset X$ let βA be the set of ultrafilters containing A . βX is equipped with the usual compact topology for which $\{\beta A : A \subset X\}$ is a base of open sets.

We write \dot{x} for the ultrafilter containing $\{x\}$. Recall that \dot{x} is an isolated point of βX and that a subset \mathbb{D} of βX is dense in βX if and only if \mathbb{D} contains all of the centered ultrafilters.

For any filter \mathcal{F} , we denote by $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ the closed set of all ultrafilters containing \mathcal{F} (or contained in $\mathcal{F}^\#$). For any filters \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , we have: $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}^\#$ if and only if $\beta(\mathcal{F}) \cap \beta(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$, in particular $A \in \mathcal{F}^\#$ if and only if $\beta A \cap \beta(\mathcal{F}) \neq \emptyset$.

For all filters \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , $\beta(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}) = \beta(\mathcal{F}) \cup \beta(\mathcal{G})$, that is, any ultrafilter containing $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$ contains \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{G} .

Recall also that there exists a bijection between closed subsets of βX and filters on X . Actually for any subset \mathbb{F} of βX and any filter \mathcal{F} , we have: $\mathcal{F} = \cap\{\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{F}\}$ if and only if $\beta(\mathcal{F}) = \overline{\mathbb{F}}$.

Finally, an **elementary filter** \mathcal{F} [11] is a filter for which $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is finite, i.e. \mathcal{F} is a finite intersection of ultrafilters. If $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \beta X$, we call the filter

$\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$ a **bi-ultrafilter**, notice that $\beta(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}) = \{\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}\}$. Any ultrafilter is a bi-ultrafilter.

2.2. Convergences. A **convergence structure** (or a **convergence**) on a set X is a relation ξ from $\phi(X)$ to X such that:

- (C0) $(\dot{x}, x) \in \xi$ for all $x \in X$,
- (C1) For all filters \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , $(\mathcal{G}, x) \in \xi$ whenever $(\mathcal{F}, x) \in \xi$ and $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$.

We will also write $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\xi} x$ or $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x$ for $(\mathcal{F}, x) \in \xi$ and we will say that \mathcal{F} **converges to** x or that x is a **limit point** of \mathcal{F} . A filter \mathcal{F} is said to be **convergent** if it admits a limit point.

A convergence ξ is **coarser than** a convergence τ (or τ is **finer than** ξ) if:

$$\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\tau} x \implies \mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\xi} x$$

and we write : $\tau \leq \xi$.

Following [15] a convergence ξ is a **Kent convergence** provided that the following is satisfied:

- (C2) If $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x$ then $\mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x} \rightarrow x$.

A convergence ξ is said to be a **limit structure** if the following is satisfied:

- (C3) if x is a limit point of the filters \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 , then $\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2$ converges to x .

A convergence ξ is **pseudotopological** [5] provided that:

- (C4) $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x \iff \forall \mathcal{U} \in \beta(\mathcal{F}), \mathcal{U} \rightarrow x$.

Given a convergence ξ one assigns to any point x of X the **neighborhood filter** $\mathcal{V}_{\xi}(x)$ (or $\mathcal{V}(x)$) of x defined by:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\xi}(x) = \cap \{\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\xi} x\}.$$

We have also $\mathcal{V}_{\xi}(x) = \cap \{\mathcal{U} \in \beta X : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow_{\xi} x\}$.

The pretopology associated to the system of neighborhood filters $(\mathcal{V}_{\xi}(x))_{x \in X}$ is the **pretopology associated to** ξ .

A convergence ξ is **pretopological** [5] provided that for all x , $\mathcal{V}_{\xi}(x) \rightarrow_{\xi} x$, or equivalently if:

- (C5) $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\xi} x \iff \mathcal{V}_{\xi}(x) \subset \mathcal{F}$

that is to say that ξ is the convergence related to its associated pretopological structure.

We have : $(C5) \Rightarrow (C4) \Rightarrow (C3) \Rightarrow (C2)$.

Recall (with the terminology of [18]) that for any convergence ξ there exists a **pseudotopological modification** $Ps\xi$ which is the finest pseudotopological convergence coarser than ξ and a **pretopological modification** $Pr\xi$ which is the finest pretopological convergence coarser than ξ . They are respectively defined by:

$$\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{Ps\xi} x \iff \forall \mathcal{U} \in \beta(\mathcal{F}), \mathcal{U} \rightarrow_{\xi} x \iff \beta(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathbb{F}_x$$

where $\mathbb{F}_x = \{\mathcal{U} \in \beta X : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow_\xi x\}$, and:

$$\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{Pr\xi} x \iff \mathcal{V}_\xi(x) \subset \mathcal{F}.$$

In other words, $Pr\xi$ is the convergence associated to the pretopology with neighborhood filters $(\mathcal{V}_\xi(x))_{x \in X}$. We have $\xi \leq Ps\xi \leq Pr\xi$.

3. Convergences and screens.

To every screen \mathcal{C} one assigns its **induced convergence** which is defined by:

$$\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}} x \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x} \in \mathcal{C}$$

Notice that any convergent filter is member of \mathcal{C} .

For any screen \mathcal{C} the neighborhood filter of a point x (with respect to the induced convergence) is given by:

$$\mathcal{V}(x) = \cap\{\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}} x\} = \cap\{\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x} \in \mathcal{C}\} = \cap\{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C} : \mathcal{F} \subset \dot{x}\}$$

According to [11] a screen \mathcal{C} is said to be **Riesz** if for all $x \in X$, $\mathcal{V}(x) \in \mathcal{C}$.

It is known that to a Cauchy screen \mathcal{C} on X one can associate an **equivalence relation** \sim on \mathcal{C} , which we call **associated to \mathcal{C}** , defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{F} \sim \mathcal{G} \iff \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Then we have:

$$\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}} x \iff \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F} \sim \dot{x}.$$

3.1. Properties of convergences induced by particular screens. Recall first the following definitions and results of [15] and [7] (propositions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2).

Definition 3.1.1. *A convergence ξ is called **symmetric** if the following is satisfied:*

(S0) *If \mathcal{F} is a convergent filter and $\mathcal{F} \subset \dot{y}$ then \mathcal{F} converges to y .*

*The convergence ξ is said to be **reciprocal** if provided some filter converges to both x and y , then a filter converges to x if and only if it converges to y .*

It is easy to see that a reciprocal convergence is symmetric.

Proposition 3.1.1. [15] *A convergence ξ is induced by a screen if and only if it is a symmetric Kent convergence. Any symmetric Kent convergence is induced by the screen of its convergent filters.*

Proposition 3.1.2. [7] *A convergence on a set X is induced by a Cauchy structure if and only if it is a reciprocal limit structure.*

Furthermore for any reciprocal limit structure ξ the screen $Conv(\xi)$ of its convergent filters is a Cauchy screen inducing ξ .

From these results we get corollaries 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 below.

Corollary 3.1.1. *A symmetric Kent convergence ξ is induced by a Cauchy screen if and only if the screen $Conv(\xi)$ of its convergent filters is a Cauchy screen.*

For a pretopological convergence it is easy to see that (S0) is equivalent to each one of properties (S1), (S1'), (S1'') given below. Closures satisfying (S1) are called **weakly separated** in [10]. Thus proposition 3.1.1 gives the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1.2. *A pretopological convergence with associated neighborhood filters $(\mathcal{V}(x))_{x \in X}$ and closure c is induced by a screen if and only if it satisfies (S0) which in turn is equivalent to each of the following properties:*

$$(S1) \quad c(\{x\}) \cap c(A) \neq \emptyset \iff x \in c(A)$$

$$(S1') \quad \mathcal{V}(x) \neq \mathcal{V}(y) \implies \exists V \in \mathcal{V}(x) : y \notin V \text{ i.e. } y \notin c(\{x\})$$

$$(S1'') \quad y \in c(\{x\}) \text{ if and only if for all } A \subset X : x \in c(A) \iff y \in c(A).$$

In particular c is symmetric in the sense of [10], i.e.

$$y \in c(\{x\}) \text{ if and only if } x \in c(\{y\}).$$

Remark and example. For any limit structure ξ , if $Conv(\xi)$ is a Cauchy screen, then ξ is not necessarily induced by a Cauchy screen. For example take a set X , x_0 and y_0 distinct points of X , and consider the convergence ξ for which each \dot{x} converges to x and $\dot{x}_0 \cap \dot{y}_0$ and \dot{x}_0 converge to y_0 , ξ is a limit structure but it is not reciprocal not even symmetric and it is easy to see that $Conv(\xi)$ is a Cauchy screen.

Remark about property (S0).

For any limit structure, property (S0) is equivalent to the following symmetry axiom of [7] (denoted by (S0) in [16]):

$$(S0') \quad \text{if } \dot{x} \rightarrow y \text{ then: } \mathcal{F} \rightarrow x \iff \mathcal{F} \rightarrow y.$$

Concerning Riesz screens we can prove the following result.

Proposition 3.1.3. *A convergence ξ is induced by a Riesz screen if and only if ξ is pretopological and symmetric. In this case $Conv(\xi)$ is a Riesz screen inducing ξ .*

Proof. If ξ is pretopological with property (S0) then by proposition 3.1.1, ξ is induced by the screen $Conv(\xi)$ of its convergent filters. Therefore the neighborhood filter at a point x for the convergence $\rightarrow_{Conv(\xi)}$ coincides with the neighborhood filter for the convergence ξ . Finally $Conv(\xi)$ is a Riesz screen since ξ is pretopological and every neighborhood filter is convergent.

Conversely if ξ is induced by a Riesz screen \mathcal{C} , then the neighborhood filter at a point x is member of \mathcal{C} and so converges to x since it is fixed at x . This proves that ξ is pretopological. \square

It follows from propositions 3.1.2 and 3.1.3:

Corollary 3.1.3. *A convergence ξ is induced by a Riesz Cauchy screen if and only if it is pretopological and reciprocal.*

According to [11] a pretopological space with associated neighborhood filters $(\mathcal{V}(x))_{x \in X}$ is an **(S2)-pretopological space** if the following separation condition is satisfied:

$$(S2) \quad \forall x, y \in X, \quad \mathcal{V}(x) \subset \mathcal{V}(y)^\# \implies \mathcal{V}(x) = \mathcal{V}(y).$$

Notice that the condition $[\mathcal{V}(x) \subset \mathcal{V}(y)^\#]$ is equivalent to the existence of a filter converging to both x and y .

It is then easy to see that a pretopological convergence ξ , with associated neighborhood filters $(\mathcal{V}(x))_{x \in X}$, is reciprocal if and only if condition (S2) is satisfied.

Corollary 3.1.4. *A convergence ξ is induced by a Riesz Cauchy screen if and only if it is pretopological and reciprocal if and only if ξ is the convergence associated to an (S2) pretopological space.*

Finally we will characterize reciprocal pseudotopological convergences using the following definition taken from [17].

Definition 3.1.2. *A Cauchy screen \mathcal{C} is **full** if a filter \mathcal{F} is in \mathcal{C} whenever $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is contained in an equivalence class of \mathcal{C} (for the equivalence relation \sim).*

Proposition 3.1.4. *A convergence ξ is induced by a full Cauchy screen if and only if ξ is pseudotopological and reciprocal. In this case $Conv(\xi)$ is a full Cauchy screen inducing ξ .*

Proof. Let ξ be induced by some full Cauchy screen \mathcal{C} . The convergence ξ is reciprocal. We prove that it is pseudotopological. If \mathcal{F} is a filter such that every ultrafilter of $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ converges to some point x , then $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is contained in the equivalence class of \dot{x} in \mathcal{C} and then \mathcal{F} is in \mathcal{C} and is also equivalent to \dot{x} , therefore \mathcal{F} converges to x .

Conversely if ξ is pseudotopological and reciprocal then it is induced by the Cauchy screen $Conv(\xi)$. Let us see that this screen is full. Assume that for some filter \mathcal{F} , $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is contained in an equivalence class of $Conv(\xi)$. There exists a filter \mathcal{G} converging to a point x such that $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is contained in the equivalence class of \mathcal{G} which is also the equivalence class of \dot{x} . Then every member of $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ converges to x and since ξ is pseudotopological we conclude that \mathcal{F} converges also to x and \mathcal{F} is in $Conv(\xi)$. \square

3.2. Order properties for the set of screens inducing a given convergence. Recall that x is a **cluster point** for a given filter \mathcal{F} with respect to a given convergence if and only if there exists a filter \mathcal{G} containing \mathcal{F} converging to x . We introduce now the following definitions generalizing notions given by Császár in the pretopological setting (cf. [10], [12]).

Definition 3.2.1. Let ξ be a convergence on a set X . A filter \mathcal{F} is called:

- (i) ξ -**compressed** if: $\mathcal{F} \subset \dot{x} \Rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow x$;
- (ii) **strongly ξ -compressed** whenever any cluster point for \mathcal{F} is a limit point for \mathcal{F} .

We denote by $Comp(\xi)$ the set of all ξ -compressed filters and by $SComp(\xi)$ the set of all strongly ξ -compressed filters.

Remarks.

1. If ξ is the convergence induced by a pretopological closure c on X , then the c -compressed and strongly c -compressed filters of Császár are precisely the ξ -compressed and strongly ξ -compressed filters respectively.

2. A convergent filter is compressed if and only if the convergence is symmetric. Generally a convergent filter is not necessarily compressed even for a Kent convergence or a limit structure as the example given in the preceding subsection shows.

Lemma 3.2.1. The sets $Comp(\xi)$ and $SComp(\xi)$ are screens on X and we have: $SComp(\xi) \subset Comp(\xi)$.

The proof is straightforward.

Theorem 3.2.1. Let ξ be a symmetric Kent convergence on X . Denote by $Conv(\xi)$ the screen of convergent filters.

For any screen \mathcal{C} inducing a symmetric Kent convergence ξ' , we have :

- (i) $\xi \leq \xi' \Leftrightarrow Conv(\xi) \subset \mathcal{C}$
- (ii) $\xi' \leq \xi \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C} \subset Comp(\xi)$

In particular ξ is induced by any screen between $Conv(\xi)$ and $Comp(\xi)$, $Conv(\xi)$ is the finest, $Comp(\xi)$ is the coarsest.

Proof.

(i) Clearly, if $\xi \leq \xi'$ where ξ' is induced by \mathcal{C} then $Conv(\xi) \subset \mathcal{C}$. Conversely assume that $Conv(\xi) \subset \mathcal{C}$, if \mathcal{F} converges to x for ξ then $\mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x}$ converges to x since ξ satisfies (C2), so $\mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x}$ is in \mathcal{C} .

(ii) Assume that $\xi' \leq \xi$ and let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}$. If $\mathcal{F} \subset \dot{x}$ then $\mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x} \in \mathcal{C}$, therefore $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\xi'} x$ and $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\xi} x$, which proves that \mathcal{F} is ξ -compressed and that $\mathcal{C} \subset Comp(\xi)$.

Conversely assume that $\mathcal{C} \subset Comp(\xi)$. If $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\xi'} x$ then $\mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x} \in Comp(\xi)$ so $\mathcal{F} \cap \dot{x} \rightarrow_{\xi} x$ and therefore $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\xi} x$. \square

Corollary 3.2.1. Every screen inducing some pretopological symmetric convergence is a Riesz screen,

$Conv(\xi)$ is the finest, $Comp(\xi)$ is the coarsest.

The proof is clear since $Conv(\xi)$ is a Riesz screen contained in every screen inducing ξ .

Theorem 3.2.2. For all limit structure ξ , the screen $SComp(\xi)$ is a Cauchy screen.

Furthermore if ξ is reciprocal (i.e. induced by some Cauchy screen) then:

- (a) $Conv(\xi)$ and $SComp(\xi)$ are Cauchy screens such that $Conv(\xi) \subset SComp(\xi)$.
- (b) For all Cauchy screen \mathcal{C} , we have :
 \mathcal{C} induces ξ if and only if $Conv(\xi) \subset \mathcal{C} \subset SComp(\xi)$.

Proof. We check that $SComp(\xi)$ fulfills condition (SC2) of Cauchy screens.

Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} be members of $SComp(\xi)$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}^\#$ and assume that x is a cluster point of the filter $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$. Then there exists a filter and therefore an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} containing $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$ and converging to x . Since this ultrafilter contains \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{G} , x is a cluster point for \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{G} and so a limit point for this filter. Therefore the filter $\mathcal{F} \vee \mathcal{G}$ converges also to x , finally x is a cluster point and so a limit point for both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} and by property (C3), $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$ converges to x . We conclude that $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$ is in $SComp(\xi)$. Thus $SComp(\xi)$ is a Cauchy screen.

Now assume that ξ is reciprocal.

(a) $Conv(\xi) \subset SComp(\xi)$: let \mathcal{F} be a filter converging to a point x , if y is a cluster point for \mathcal{F} , then there is a filter \mathcal{G} containing \mathcal{F} and converging to y , so \mathcal{G} converges to both x and y , and since ξ is reciprocal \mathcal{F} also converges to y .

(b) By proposition 3.2.1 a Cauchy screen \mathcal{C} induces ξ if and only if $Conv(\xi) \subset \mathcal{C} \subset Comp(\xi)$.

Since $SComp(\xi) \subset Comp(\xi)$, the condition $Conv(\xi) \subset \mathcal{C} \subset SComp(\xi)$ is sufficient for \mathcal{C} to induce ξ .

Conversely, assume that a Cauchy screen \mathcal{C} induces ξ . We have to check that $\mathcal{C} \subset SComp(\xi)$. If $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}$ and x is a cluster point for \mathcal{F} then there is a filter \mathcal{G} containing \mathcal{F} and converging to x . We then have: $\mathcal{F} \sim \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G} \sim \dot{x}$ in \mathcal{C} , and so $\mathcal{F} \sim \dot{x}$ in \mathcal{C} which proves that \mathcal{F} converges to x . Finally $\mathcal{F} \in SComp(\xi)$. \square

If ξ is the convergence ξ induced by a pretopological closure c the preceding result implies the following which was proved by Császár in [12]:

Corollary 3.2.2. *If c is a pretopological closure on X then the strongly c -compressed filters constitute a Cauchy screen.*

Finally we have also:

Corollary 3.2.3. *For any reciprocal limit structure ξ , $SComp(\xi)$ is the coarsest Cauchy screen contained in $Comp(\xi)$.*

Remark. Let ξ be a convergence induced by a Cauchy screen; $Conv(\xi)$ is the finest Cauchy screen inducing ξ and $SComp(\xi)$ is the coarsest.

Let \mathcal{C} be a Cauchy screen inducing a convergence ξ' .

We have: $\xi \leq \xi' \Leftrightarrow Conv(\xi) \subset \mathcal{C}$, but it is false that: $\xi' \leq \xi \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C} \subset SComp(\xi)$.

In the example below, we construct reciprocal (actually separated) pretopological convergences ξ and ξ' , which are induced by the Cauchy screens of their strongly compressed filters and such that $\xi' \leq \xi$ and $SComp(\xi') \not\subset SComp(\xi)$.

Example. Consider the usual convergence ξ' on the set of reals \mathbb{R} , and then take non convergent (distinct) ultrafilters \mathcal{U}_0 and \mathcal{U}_1 containing respectively the non compact subsets $] - \infty, 0]$ and $[0, +\infty[$. In particular, these ultrafilters do not contain any neighborhood filter for ξ' .

Now take the pretopological convergence ξ for which $\mathcal{V}_\xi(x) = \mathcal{V}_{\xi'}(x)$ if x is neither 0 nor 1, and $\mathcal{V}_\xi(0) = \mathcal{V}_{\xi'}(0) \cap \mathcal{U}_0$, $\mathcal{V}_\xi(1) = \mathcal{V}_{\xi'}(1) \cap \mathcal{U}_1$.

Each of these pretopological convergences is a limit structure on \mathbb{R} , ξ' is reciprocal and actually separated, i.e. $x \neq y \implies \mathcal{V}_{\xi'}(x) \not\subset \mathcal{V}_{\xi'}(y)^\#$.

The convergence ξ is also separated and thus reciprocal. To prove this, we use the following equivalence for filters \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} : $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}^\#$ if and only if $\beta(\mathcal{F}) \cap \beta(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$. Since any ultrafilter containing the intersection of two filters contains necessarily one of them (property recalled in section 2) we have: $\beta(\mathcal{V}_\xi(0)) = \beta(\mathcal{V}_{\xi'}(0)) \cup \{\mathcal{U}_0\}$ and $\beta(\mathcal{V}_\xi(1)) = \beta(\mathcal{V}_{\xi'}(1)) \cup \{\mathcal{U}_1\}$. Of course if x is in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $\beta(\mathcal{V}_\xi(x)) = \beta(\mathcal{V}_{\xi'}(x))$. For any distinct points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta(\mathcal{V}_{\xi'}(x)) \cap \beta(\mathcal{V}_{\xi'}(y)) = \emptyset$ and each one of \mathcal{U}_0 and \mathcal{U}_1 does not contain any neighborhood filter for ξ' . Finally with $\mathcal{U}_0 \neq \mathcal{U}_1$, we check that if x, y are distinct points, then $\beta(\mathcal{V}_\xi(x)) \cap \beta(\mathcal{V}_\xi(y)) = \emptyset$, which proves that ξ is separated.

Therefore each one of ξ' and ξ is induced by the Cauchy screen of its strongly compressed filters.

Let \mathcal{F}_0 be the bi-ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}_0 \cap \mathcal{U}_1$, with respect to ξ' , \mathcal{F}_0 is not convergent and has no cluster point since the only ultrafilters containing \mathcal{F}_0 are \mathcal{U}_0 and \mathcal{U}_1 and they do not converge for ξ' . Therefore \mathcal{F}_0 is a strongly ξ' -compressed filter.

With respect to ξ , 0 and 1 are cluster points for \mathcal{F}_0 since \mathcal{U}_0 and \mathcal{U}_1 converge to 0 and 1 respectively. Furthermore $\mathcal{U}_i \notin \beta(\mathcal{V}_\xi(j))$ for $\{i, j\} = \{0, 1\}$, therefore \mathcal{F}_0 does not contain $\mathcal{V}_\xi(j)$ either and does not converge to j for ξ . So \mathcal{F}_0 is not strongly ξ -compressed. Finally $SComp(\xi')$ is not contained in $SComp(\xi)$.

We complete our study with the following result.

Proposition 3.2.1. *For all reciprocal pseudotopological convergence ξ , the Cauchy screens $Conv(\xi)$ and $SComp(\xi)$ are full.*

Proof. It has already been shown that $Conv(\xi)$ is full. We check now that $SComp(\xi)$ is full.

Assume that for some filter \mathcal{F} , $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is contained in an equivalence class of $SComp(\xi)$. If x is a cluster point for \mathcal{F} then some member \mathcal{U} of $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ converges to x . Therefore \mathcal{U} and so every member of $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is in the equivalence class of \dot{x} , that is, every ultrafilter containing \mathcal{F} converges to x and

then \mathcal{F} converges also to x since ξ is pseudotopological. We conclude that \mathcal{F} is in $SComp(\xi)$. \square

4. Pretopological closures and proximities induced by Cauchy screens

A proximity δ on a set X induces a pretopological closure c on X defined by :

$$x \in c(A) \Leftrightarrow \{x\}\delta A$$

and the neighborhood filter of a point x is given by:

$$\mathcal{V}_\delta(x) = \delta(\{x\})^\# \quad \text{where} \quad \delta(\{x\}) = \{A \subset X : \{x\}\delta A\}.$$

A screen \mathcal{C} induces a proximity δ and a pretopological closure c as defined in the introduction.

This closure c is also the associated closure of the pretopological structure induced by the convergence $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}}$ since for all $x \in X$ the neighborhood filters at x coincide. Actually the neighborhood filter of x related to $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}}$ is:

$$\mathcal{V}(x) = \cap\{\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F} \subset \dot{x}\}$$

and we have:

$$\delta(\{x\}) = \cup\{\mathcal{F}^\# : \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F} \subset \dot{x}\} = \mathcal{V}(x)^\#$$

therefore $\mathcal{V}(x) = \delta(\{x\})^\#$ and then $\mathcal{V}(x) = \mathcal{V}_\delta(x)$.

In [12], Császár asked for a characterization of those pretopological closures and those proximities induced by Cauchy screens. We give an answer to both questions.

4.1. Proximities and screens. If a screen \mathcal{C} induces a proximity δ then every member \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{C} is such that $\mathcal{F}^\# \times \mathcal{F}^\# \subset \delta$, that is, $\mathcal{F}^\#$ is a δ -**clan** in the sense of Thron [20], or equivalently, \mathcal{F} is a δ -**compressed filter** in the sense of [10].

For every proximity δ the set \mathcal{C}_δ of δ -compressed filters is a screen and it is known that δ is induced by \mathcal{C}_δ (indeed it is the coarsest one): for all subsets A and B of X , $A\delta B$ if and only if there exists a δ -clan containing A and B . Thron [20] gave a short proof for this result using basic properties of grills, filters and ultrafilters. Thus every proximity is induced by a screen.

We call a **Riesz proximity** (or **RI-proximity**, [3]) on X any proximity δ for which there exists a pretopological closure space (Y, φ) containing X as a dense subset and such that we have: $A\delta B$ if and only if $\varphi(A) \cap \varphi(B) \neq \emptyset$. These proximities have been studied and characterized in [2], [3], [10].

Theorem 4.1.1. *The proximities induced by a Riesz screen are precisely the Riesz proximities.*

Proof. It is known (see [2], [10], [3]) that a proximity δ is a Riesz proximity if and only if one of the equivalent following conditions is true (c denotes the pretopological closure induced by δ):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(RI)} \quad & \forall A, B \in \mathcal{P}(X), c(A) \cap c(B) \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A\delta B \\ \text{(RI')} \quad & \forall x \in X, \delta(\{x\}) \times \delta(\{x\}) \subset \delta, \end{aligned}$$

which means that for all $x \in X$, $\mathcal{V}_\delta(x)$ is δ -compressed. Then if δ is a Riesz proximity the screen \mathcal{C}_δ of δ -compressed filters is a Riesz screen since it induces δ and $\mathcal{V}_\delta(x)$ is also the neighborhood filter at x related to $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}_\delta}$. Conversely let δ be a proximity induced by a Riesz screen \mathcal{C} . Then for all $x \in X$, the neighborhood filter $\mathcal{V}(x)$ is in \mathcal{C} and so is compressed for the proximity δ . Thus δ is a Riesz proximity since $\mathcal{V}(x) = \mathcal{V}_\delta(x)$. \square

We obtain a characterization for those proximities induced by some Cauchy screen using the following notion of [14].

Definition 4.1.1. *A nasse on X is a reflexive and closed graph relation on βX .*

The following facts were proved in [14]:

1. there is a bijection between proximities (or dually the **topogeneous orders** of Császár [8]) on X and the so-called **nasses** of Haddad. For any proximity δ with associated nasse Δ , we have

$$(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \in \Delta \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \subset \delta \quad \text{and} \quad A\delta B \Leftrightarrow (\beta A \times \beta B) \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset.$$

We recover here Thron's result which says that the screen of δ -compressed filters induces δ . Actually if $A\delta B$ then there is a pair $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \in (\beta A \times \beta B) \cap \Delta$. It follows that A and B are members of $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V}$ and from $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \in \Delta$ we get that $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V}$ is a δ -clan (i.e. $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$ is δ -compressed).

2. Recall that an **Efrěmoviř-proximity** (or **EF-proximity** for short) is a proximity δ on a set X with the following separation property: for all A, B in $\mathcal{P}(X)$,

$$A(\text{non-}\delta)B \implies \exists C \in \mathcal{P}(X) : A(\text{non-}\delta)C \text{ and } (X \setminus C)(\text{non-}\delta)B.$$

For any proximity the converse implication is true, as one can easily see.

A proximity δ is an EF-proximity if and only if its nasse Δ is an equivalence relation.

We will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1.2. *Let δ be a proximity on X .*

1. δ is induced by a screen \mathcal{C} if and only if its associated nasse is the closure in $(\beta X)^2$ of the relation $\Theta_{\mathcal{C}} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}} \beta(\mathcal{F}) \times \beta(\mathcal{F})$ on βX induced by \mathcal{C} .

2. δ is induced by a Cauchy screen if and only if its associated nasse Δ is the closure in $(\beta X)^2$ of a transitive and symmetric relation on βX if and only if Δ is the closure in $(\beta X)^2$ of an equivalence relation on βX .

Notations. Any family \mathcal{B} of filters on X induces a relation $\Theta_{\mathcal{B}}$ on βX defined by:

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{B}} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}} \beta(\mathcal{F}) \times \beta(\mathcal{F}).$$

If \mathcal{C} is the set of all filters containing a member of \mathcal{B} , we then have $\Theta_{\mathcal{B}} = \Theta_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \in \Theta_{\mathcal{C}}$ if and only if $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}$.

This defines a relation on βX which is clearly symmetric and reflexive with domain

$$\mathbb{D} = \mathcal{C} \cap \beta X = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}} \beta(\mathcal{F})$$

Since \mathcal{C} and \mathbb{D} contain exactly the same ultrafilters, we get:

\mathcal{C} is a screen if and only if \mathbb{D} contains all of the centered ultrafilters, that is, if and only if \mathbb{D} is dense in βX .

Note that **if \mathcal{C} is a Cauchy screen then** the relation $\Theta_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the restriction on $\mathbb{D} = \mathcal{C} \cap \beta X$ of the equivalence relation \sim associated to \mathcal{C} (recalled in the beginning of section 3), and therefore **$\Theta_{\mathcal{C}}$ is an equivalence relation on \mathbb{D} .**

Now to an arbitrary relation Θ on βX let us associate the family of filters \mathcal{C}_{Θ} on X defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\Theta} = \{\mathcal{F} \in \phi(X) : \beta(\mathcal{F}) \times \beta(\mathcal{F}) \subset \Theta\}$$

and let \mathcal{C}_{Θ}^b be the screen of the bi-ultrafilters of \mathcal{C}_{Θ} .

Theorem 4.1.3. *A relation Θ is induced by some screen \mathcal{C} (in the sense that $\Theta = \Theta_{\mathcal{C}}$) if and only if Θ is a symmetric and reflexive relation on a dense subset of βX .*

Furthermore, if Θ is such a relation with dense domain \mathbb{D} then Θ is induced by any screen between \mathcal{C}_{Θ}^b and \mathcal{C}_{Θ} , \mathcal{C}_{Θ} is the coarsest one inducing Θ , \mathcal{C}_{Θ}^b is the finest one.

Proof. For any symmetric and reflexive relation Θ on a dense subset \mathbb{D} of βX , \mathbb{D} contains all centered ultrafilters and it is straightforward that \mathcal{C}_{Θ} and \mathcal{C}_{Θ}^b are screens on X inducing Θ . Furthermore any screen inducing Θ is clearly contained in \mathcal{C}_{Θ} , and it contains \mathcal{C}_{Θ}^b since if \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are ultrafilters such that $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$ is in \mathcal{C}_{Θ}^b then $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is in Θ and there exists $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} are both in $\beta(\mathcal{F})$, so $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$ is also in \mathcal{C} . \square

Theorem 4.1.4. *For all relations Θ on βX the following are equivalent:*

1. Θ is induced by a Cauchy screen.
2. Θ is an equivalence relation on its domain and its domain is a dense subset of βX .

3. \mathcal{C}_Θ is a Cauchy screen.

4. The screen \mathcal{C}_Θ^e of elementary filters of \mathcal{C}_Θ is a Cauchy screen.

In case one of the above conditions holds then, among the Cauchy screens inducing Θ , \mathcal{C}_Θ is the coarsest and \mathcal{C}_Θ^e is the finest.

Proof. 1. \Rightarrow 2. has already been observed.

Now we prove: 2. \Rightarrow 3. Assume that Θ is an equivalence relation on a dense domain \mathbb{D} of βX .

The screen \mathcal{C}_Θ is the coarsest screen inducing Θ , we check that it is a Cauchy screen.

Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}^\#$. The sets $\beta(\mathcal{F})^2$ and $\beta(\mathcal{G})^2$ are subsets of Θ and $\beta(\mathcal{F}) \cap \beta(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$. Since Θ is transitive, it follows that $\beta(\mathcal{F}) \times \beta(\mathcal{G}) \subset \Theta$ and $\beta(\mathcal{G}) \times \beta(\mathcal{F}) \subset \Theta$, and finally $\beta(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G})^2 = (\beta(\mathcal{F}) \cup \beta(\mathcal{G}))^2 \subset \Theta$, and $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta$.

Next we prove: 3. \Rightarrow 4. Assume that \mathcal{C}_Θ is a Cauchy screen. Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta^e$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}^\#$, then \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} are elementary and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$ is in \mathcal{C}_Θ and it is again elementary, i.e. $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta^e$. This proves that the screen \mathcal{C}_Θ^e is Cauchy.

Finally 4. \Rightarrow 1. is clear since the screen \mathcal{C}_Θ^e is between \mathcal{C}_Θ and \mathcal{C}_Θ^b , which proves that \mathcal{C}_Θ^e induces Θ . by the preceding theorem.

Assume now that one of the conditions 1. to 4. is true. We prove that \mathcal{C}_Θ^e is the finest Cauchy screen inducing Θ .

Let \mathcal{C} be a Cauchy screen inducing also Θ , note first that $\mathbb{D} = \mathcal{C} \cap \beta X = \mathcal{C}_\Theta^e \cap \beta X$.

Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta^e$, \mathcal{F} is the intersection of a finite number of ultrafilters, say $\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_n$. Each $(\mathcal{U}_i, \mathcal{U}_j)$ is in Θ and therefore $\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j$ is a member of \mathcal{C} . In particular each \mathcal{U}_i and $\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_{i+1}$ are members of \mathcal{C} . Finally, since \mathcal{C} is a Cauchy screen, by finite induction we prove that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{U}_i$ is again member of \mathcal{C} , so $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}$. \square

Now we can prove Theorem 4.1.2.

Proof of Theorem 4.1.2.

1. Let δ be a proximity and \mathcal{C} be a screen on X . We have:

δ is induced by $\mathcal{C} \Leftrightarrow [A\delta B \Leftrightarrow \exists \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C} : A, B \in \mathcal{F}^\#]$

$\Leftrightarrow [A\delta B \Leftrightarrow \exists \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C} : (\beta A \times \beta B) \cap (\beta(\mathcal{F}))^2 \neq \emptyset] \Leftrightarrow [A\delta B \Leftrightarrow (\beta A \times \beta B) \cap \Theta_{\mathcal{C}} \neq \emptyset]$

Since $\{\beta A \times \beta B : A, B \in \mathcal{P}(X)\}$ is a base for the open sets of the product topology on $(\beta X)^2$, we have finally:

δ is induced by $\mathcal{C} \Leftrightarrow [A\delta B \Leftrightarrow (\beta A \times \beta B) \cap \overline{\Theta_{\mathcal{C}}} \neq \emptyset]$

which is to say that $\overline{\Theta_{\mathcal{C}}}$ is the nasse associated to δ .

2. Note that a nasse Δ is always reflexive and therefore if Θ is a symmetric and transitive relation on βX which is dense in Δ then

$$\Theta' = \Theta \cup \{(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}) : \mathcal{U} \in \beta X\}$$

is an equivalence relation on βX which is again dense in Δ .

Now the second part of the theorem follows from the first part and theorem 4.1.4. \square

Actually from theorem 4.1.2 and theorem 4.1.4 we get the following result. Recall that a Cauchy screen \mathcal{C} is **totally bounded** ([7]) if every ultrafilter is a Cauchy filter.

Theorem 4.1.5. *A proximity induced by a Cauchy screen is also induced by a totally bounded and full Cauchy screen.*

Proof. According to theorem 4.1.2 let Θ be an equivalence relation on βX which is dense in the nasse Δ of a proximity δ induced by a Cauchy screen. The Cauchy screen $\mathcal{C}_\Theta = \{\mathcal{F} : \beta(\mathcal{F}) \times \beta(\mathcal{F}) \subset \Theta\}$ induces δ and is clearly totally bounded since Θ is reflexive on βX . Furthermore if \mathcal{F} is a filter such that $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is contained in an equivalence class of \mathcal{C}_Θ for \sim then $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is contained in an equivalence class for Θ since Θ is the restriction of \sim to βX . Thus $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}_\Theta$, which proves finally that \mathcal{C}_Θ is a full and totally bounded Cauchy screen inducing Θ and therefore the proximity δ . \square

We give now some corollaries. The first one recovers in particular Thron's result: any proximity is induced by the screen of its compressed filters. We recall the following result.

Proposition 4.1.1. [4] *For any proximity δ with associated nasse Δ , a filter \mathcal{F} is δ -compressed if and only if $\beta(\mathcal{F}) \times \beta(\mathcal{F}) \subset \Delta$.*

Corollary 4.1.1. *Any proximity δ is induced by the screen \mathcal{C}_δ of δ -compressed filters and also by the screens \mathcal{C}_δ^b and \mathcal{C}_δ^e consisting of bi-ultrafilters and elementary filters respectively of \mathcal{C}_δ .*

Proof. Let Δ be the nasse associated to a proximity δ . The nasse Δ is a symmetric and reflexive relation on βX , therefore using theorem 4.1.3, $\Delta = \Theta_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta} = \Theta_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta^b} = \Theta_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta^e}$ where $\mathcal{C}_\Delta = \{\mathcal{F} : \beta(\mathcal{F}) \times \beta(\mathcal{F}) \subset \Delta\}$ and \mathcal{C}_Δ^b and \mathcal{C}_Δ^e are the screens consisting of bi-ultrafilters and elementary filters respectively of \mathcal{C}_δ .

It follows from the preceding proposition that \mathcal{C}_Δ is also the screen \mathcal{C}_δ of all δ -compressed filters. Finally theorem 4.1.2 implies that the proximity δ is induced by the screens \mathcal{C}_δ , \mathcal{C}_δ^b and \mathcal{C}_δ^e . \square

Theorem 4.1.4 and Haddad's characterization of EF-proximities imply also the following result which was proved by Császár in [12].

Corollary 4.1.2. *For any proximity δ , the screen \mathcal{C}_δ is Cauchy if and only if \mathcal{C}_δ^e is also Cauchy if and only if δ is an EF-proximity,*

Proof. Let Δ be the nasse associated to δ . The screen \mathcal{C}_Δ is again \mathcal{C}_δ . Therefore since a proximity δ is an EF-proximity if and only if its nasse Δ is an equivalence relation on βX ([14]), we get from theorem 4.1.4 that the

screen \mathcal{C}_δ is Cauchy if and only if \mathcal{C}_δ^e is also Cauchy if and only if Δ is an equivalence relation and thus if and only if δ is an EF-proximity. \square

Remarks.

1. For any proximity δ the screen \mathcal{C}_δ is the coarsest screen inducing δ , generally a finest one fails to exist ([12], example 3.18, p.212).

2. Of course if δ is an EF-proximity then \mathcal{C}_δ is the coarsest Cauchy screen inducing δ . Császár [12] gave examples of proximities and closures induced by Cauchy screens for which neither a coarsest nor a finest compatible Cauchy screen exists.

Actually in the next subsection we show that for any RE-proximity δ which is not an EF-proximity, there does not exist a coarsest Cauchy screen inducing δ .

3. It follows from corollaries 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 that a proximity induced by a Cauchy screen and which is not an EF-proximity is induced by screens which are not Cauchy, indeed \mathcal{C}_δ is one of them.

We conclude this section with the following result. This result can be found also in [12] where it is proved directly that a proximity induced by a Cauchy screen satisfies property (RI).

Proposition 4.1.2. *A proximity induced by a Cauchy screen is a Riesz proximity.*

Proof. It was proved in [3] that a proximity δ is a Riesz proximity if and only if its nasse is the closure of $\Theta \circ \Theta^-$ for some relation Θ on βX . From theorem 4.1.2 a proximity induced by a Cauchy screen is a Riesz proximity since its nasse is the closure of an equivalence relation Θ and we have $\Theta = \Theta \circ \Theta^-$. \square

4.2. About RE-proximities. An **RE-proximity** on X is a proximity δ for which there exists a regular topological closure space (Y, φ) , Y containing a copy of X and such that we have: $A\delta B$ if and only if $\varphi(A) \cap \varphi(B) \neq \emptyset$. For basic properties and results concerning RE-proximities, the reader may consult [9], [4].

It is known that to any proximity δ on X one can associate a *topogeneous order* (in the sense of Császár) γ on X defined by:

$$\forall A, B \in \mathcal{P}(X) \quad A\gamma B \quad \text{if and only if} \quad A(\text{non-}\delta)(X \setminus B).$$

For any filter \mathcal{F} on X the set $\gamma(\mathcal{F})$ consisting of subsets B of X such that $A\gamma B$ for some $A \in \mathcal{F}$ is a filter on X and the inclusion $\gamma(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{F}$ is always true. If $x \in X$, the filter $\gamma(\dot{x})$ is simply denoted by $\gamma(x)$.

Definition 4.2.1. *Given a proximity δ on X , a filter \mathcal{F} on X for which $\mathcal{F} = \gamma(\mathcal{F})$ is a δ -round filter (or a γ -round filter).*

Round filters were introduced in [9] using a somewhat different notation.

As in [4], let δ be a proximity with associated nasse Δ and let

$$\mathbb{D}(\Delta) = \{\mathcal{U} \in \beta X : \Delta(\mathcal{U})^2 \subset \Delta \text{ and } \Delta(\Delta(\mathcal{U})) \subset \Delta(\mathcal{U})\}.$$

It is called the **equivalence domain of Δ** .

The restriction Δ' of Δ to the set $\mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ is the **equivalence kernel of Δ** . It is an equivalence relation on $\mathbb{D}(\Delta)$.

Theorem 4.2.1. *The equivalence relation Δ' on $\mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ is induced by the set \mathcal{B} of δ -round and compressed filters in the sense that $\Delta' = \Theta_{\mathcal{B}} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}} \beta(\mathcal{F}) \times \beta(\mathcal{F})$.*

Furthermore the equivalence classes of Δ' are exactly the sets $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ for $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}$.

Consequently, the set \mathcal{C}_{rd} of all filters containing a member of \mathcal{B} satisfies the condition (SC2) of Cauchy screens and we have also $\Delta' = \Theta_{\mathcal{C}_{rd}}$.

Proof. From [4] we have the following:

1. the equivalence classes of Δ' are exactly the sets $\Delta(\mathcal{U})$ for $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{D}(\Delta)$, which are also the sets $\beta(\gamma(\mathcal{U}))$.
2. $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ if and only if $\gamma(\mathcal{U}) \in \mathcal{B}$.
3. $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}$ if and only if $\mathcal{F} = \gamma(\mathcal{U})$, or equivalently $\beta(\mathcal{F}) = \Delta(\mathcal{U})$, for some $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{D}(\Delta)$.

It follows that $\mathcal{B} = \{\gamma(\mathcal{U}) : \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{D}(\Delta)\}$ and that the equivalence classes of Δ' are the sets $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ for $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}$.

Since equivalence classes are disjoint or equal, for any members \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 of \mathcal{B} such that $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2^\#$, we have $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2$.

From this it follows that the set \mathcal{C}_{rd} satisfies condition (SC2): for any members \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 of \mathcal{C}_{rd} such that $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2^\#$ we have $\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}$. \square

Theorem 4.2.2. *Let δ be any proximity on X and \mathcal{C}_{rd} the set of filters containing a δ -round and compressed filter. The set \mathcal{C}_{rd} is a Cauchy screen if and only if for every x in X , $\gamma(x)$ is a δ -round and compressed filter if and only if $\mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ is dense in βX . And then \mathcal{C}_{rd} is a full Cauchy screen.*

Proof. From $\Delta' = \Theta_{\mathcal{C}_{rd}}$, we have that \mathcal{C}_{rd} is a screen (i.e. it contains every centered ultrafilter) if and only if the domain $\mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ of Δ' contains every centered ultrafilter, that is, if and only if $\mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ is dense in βX .

As it was recalled in the proof of the preceding proposition, an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on X is in $\mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ if and only if $\gamma(\mathcal{U})$ is in \mathcal{B} [4]. Finally \mathcal{C}_{rd} is a screen if and only if for every x in X , $\gamma(x)$ is a δ -round and compressed filter. And then it is a Cauchy screen. Let us prove that it is also full.

Assume that for some filter \mathcal{F} , $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is contained in an equivalence class of \mathcal{C}_{rd} . The relation $\Theta_{\mathcal{C}_{rd}} = \Delta'$ is the restriction on $\mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ of the relation \sim on $\mathcal{C}_{rd} \cap \beta X$. Therefore $\beta(\mathcal{F})$ is contained in an equivalence class of Δ' , that is a set $\beta(\mathcal{G})$ for some δ -round and compressed filter \mathcal{G} . This inclusion gives $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and finally $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}$. \square

Since every centered ultrafilter is isolated in βX , the closure $\overline{\Delta'}$ of Δ' in βX is a nasse (that is, reflexive) on βX if and only if $\mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ is dense in βX . According to [4], under this condition, the proximity $\mathcal{R}(\delta)$ associated to $\overline{\Delta'}$ is an RE-proximity. It follows from the above discussion and theorem 4.1.2 that this proximity is induced by the Cauchy screen \mathcal{C}_{rd} .

We have the following characterization from [4]: δ is an RE-proximity if and only if its nasse Δ is the closure in $(\beta X)^2$ of its equivalence kernel Δ' if and only if $\mathcal{R}(\delta) = \delta$. In particular if δ is an RE-proximity $\mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ is dense in βX and δ is induced by the Cauchy screen \mathcal{C}_{rd} . Finally \mathcal{C}_{rd} is a screen inducing the proximity δ if and only if δ is an RE-proximity.

So we have the following proposition:

Theorem 4.2.3. *An arbitrary RE-proximity δ is always induced by a full Cauchy screen, namely the screen \mathcal{C}_{rd} generated by the set of δ -round and compressed filters. Consequently the same is true of arbitrary RC or EF-proximities.*

A preregular system of filters of Császár [9] generates a Cauchy screen inducing an RE-proximity. We give another equivalent definition.

Consider a family \mathcal{B} of filters such that:

$$(PSF1) \quad \forall x \in X, \quad \exists \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}, \quad \mathcal{F} \subset \dot{x}.$$

We associate to \mathcal{B} a proximity $\delta_{\mathcal{B}}$ or δ for short, on X defined by:

$$A\delta_{\mathcal{B}}B \text{ if and only if there exists } \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B} \text{ such that } A, B \in \mathcal{F}^{\#}.$$

Notice that if \mathcal{C} is the screen generated by \mathcal{B} , that is the set of all filters containing some member of \mathcal{B} , then $\delta_{\mathcal{C}} = \delta_{\mathcal{B}}$ and \mathcal{C} satisfies (PSF1) if and only if \mathcal{B} does, if and only if \mathcal{C} contains all centered ultrafilters.

The *topogeneous order* γ associated to δ is defined by:

$$[A\gamma B] \text{ if and only if } [\forall \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{B}, A \in \mathcal{F}^{\#} \Rightarrow B \in \mathcal{F}].$$

The family \mathcal{B} is a **preregular system of filters** in the sense of [9] if and only if :

$$(PSF2) \quad \text{every } \mathcal{F} \text{ in } \mathcal{B} \text{ is } \delta\text{-round,}$$

that is, for any A in some \mathcal{F} in \mathcal{B} , there exists a $B \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $B\gamma A$.

It was proved in [9] that a proximity δ is an RE-proximity if and only if δ is $\delta_{\mathcal{B}}$ for some preregular system of filters \mathcal{B} .

Now it follows easily from these definitions that if \mathcal{B} is a preregular system of filters on X , then \mathcal{B} is a subset of the set of δ -round and compressed filters and then again, as shown in the proof of theorem 4.2.1: for all $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2^{\#}$ we have $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2$. Therefore the screen \mathcal{C} generated by \mathcal{B} is a Cauchy screen on X .

Finally we have the following result:

Proposition 4.2.1. *If δ is an RE-proximity which is not an EF-proximity then a coarsest Cauchy screen inducing δ does not exist.*

Proof. Let Δ be the nasse associated to δ and Δ' be its equivalence kernel which is dense in Δ . Δ is not an equivalence relation on βX and $\mathbb{D}(\Delta) \neq \beta X$. It is easy to check that there exist three different ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$ in $\beta X \setminus \mathbb{D}(\Delta)$ such that $\mathcal{U}\Delta\mathcal{V}\Delta\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{U}(\text{non-}\Delta)\mathcal{W}$. Therefore one can see that the relations $\Delta_1 = \Delta' \cup \beta(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V})^2 \cup \{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}), \mathcal{X} \in \beta X\}$ (recall that $\beta(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}) = \{\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}\}$) and $\Delta_2 = \Delta' \cup \beta(\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{V})^2 \cup \{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}), \mathcal{X} \in \beta X\}$ are equivalence relations on βX which are dense again in Δ' .

Let \mathcal{C}_{rd} be the screen generated by the δ -round and compressed filters and consider the following screens $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{rd} \cup \beta X$, $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{C} \cup \{\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \mathcal{C} \cup \{\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{V}\}$. Since \mathcal{C}_{rd} is Cauchy and full it is easy to see that \mathcal{C} is actually a totally bounded and full Cauchy screen as well as \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 (because $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$ are not in \mathcal{C}_{rd}). These screens induce δ again since $\Theta_{\mathcal{C}_1} = \Delta_1$ and $\Theta_{\mathcal{C}_2} = \Delta_2$ which are dense in the nasse Δ .

Finally there does not exist a Cauchy screen inducing δ and containing both \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 because any Cauchy screen containing them should contain also $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{W}$ also since the filters $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{W}$ mesh, and then $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{W}$ would be δ -compressed and $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{W})$ would be in Δ which is not the case. \square

From the preceding proof one can extract the following observation:

Corollary 4.2.1. *Among the full and/or totally bounded Cauchy screens inducing a given RE-proximity which is not EF, a coarsest one does not exist.*

4.3. Pretopological closures induced by a screen. The pretopological closure c on X induced by a screen \mathcal{C} is defined by:

$$(*) \quad x \in c(A) \text{ if and only if there exists } \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C} \text{ such that } (\{x\}, A) \in \mathcal{F}^\# \times \mathcal{F}^\#.$$

It is the closure associated to the proximity δ induced by \mathcal{C} : $x \in c(A)$ if and only if $\{x\}\delta A$.

As it was observed at the beginning of this section, the pretopological closure induced by \mathcal{C} is also the closure associated to the pretopological modification of the convergence $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}}$ induced by \mathcal{C} .

We will use the two points of view to study the closures induced by Cauchy screens.

Theorem 4.3.1. *For a pretopological closure c the following are equivalent:*

- (i) c is induced by a screen
- (ii) c is induced by a proximity
- (iii) c is symmetric, i.e. $\forall x, y \in X, y \in c(\{x\}) \Leftrightarrow x \in c(\{y\})$

Proof. Since every proximity is induced by a screen, we get easily that (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii).

Furthermore it is clear that a closure c induced by a proximity (or a screen) is symmetric.

Conversely assume that c is symmetric, then take the proximity π defined by:

$$A\pi B \quad \text{if} \quad A \cap c(B) \neq \emptyset \text{ or } c(A) \cap B \neq \emptyset.$$

By the symmetry axiom on c , if $c(\{x\}) \cap B \neq \emptyset$ then $x \in c(B)$. Therefore if $\{x\}\pi B$ then $x \in c(B)$ and so c is induced by the proximity π . \square

Remark. If δ is a proximity inducing c , then $A\delta B$ provided $A \cap c(B) \neq \emptyset$ and it is easy to see that π is the smallest proximity inducing c when c is symmetric.

Theorem 4.3.2. *For a pretopological closure c the following are equivalent:*

- (i) c is induced by a Riesz screen
- (ii) c is induced by a Riesz proximity
- (iii) c satisfies condition (S1) (or equivalently conditions (S1'), (S1'') of corollary 3.1.2):

$$(S1) \quad \forall x \in X, \forall A \in \mathcal{P}(X), \quad c(\{x\}) \cap c(A) \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow x \in c(A)$$

Proof. Since a proximity is induced by a Riesz screen if and only if it is a Riesz proximity, it is clear that (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii).

By condition (RI) for a Riesz proximity (in the preceding subsection) the condition (S1) is clearly necessary for c to be induced by a Riesz proximity.

Conversely assume that (S1) is true, then take the proximity π defined by: $A\pi B$ if and only if $c(A) \cap c(B) \neq \emptyset$. This proximity is clearly a Riesz proximity and by condition (S1), c is induced by π . \square

Remark. If δ is a Riesz proximity inducing c , we have that $c(A) \cap c(B) \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A\delta B$ and finally when (S1) is true, π is the smallest Riesz proximity inducing c .

To characterize closures induced by Cauchy screens we use the convergence point of view. We get from proposition 3.1.2 that:

Proposition 4.3.1. *A pretopological closure is induced by a Cauchy screen \mathcal{C} if and only if it is the closure associated to the pretopological modification of a reciprocal limit structure (namely the convergence $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{C}}$).*

Theorem 4.3.3. *For a pretopological closure c with associated neighborhood filters $(\mathcal{V}_x)_{x \in X}$, the following are equivalent :*

- (i) c is induced by a Cauchy screen,
- (ii) c is (the closure associated to) the pretopological modification of a reciprocal pseudotopology,
- (iii) there exists a family $(\mathbb{F}_x)_{x \in X}$ of subsets of βX satisfying the following condition:

$$(S) \quad \forall x, y \in X, \quad \mathcal{V}_x = \bigcap \{ \mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{F}_x \} \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathbb{F}_x \cap \mathbb{F}_y \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \mathbb{F}_x = \mathbb{F}_y].$$

We prove first the following propositions.

Proposition 4.3.2. *Let ξ be any pseudotopological convergence on X and for any $x \in X$, write $\mathbb{F}_x = \{\mathcal{U} \in \beta X : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow x\}$. The convergence ξ is reciprocal if and only if :*

$$\forall x, y \in X, \quad \mathbb{F}_x \cap \mathbb{F}_y \neq \emptyset \implies \mathbb{F}_x = \mathbb{F}_y.$$

In particular a pretopological convergence ξ with associated neighborhood filters $(\mathcal{V}(x))_{x \in X}$, is reciprocal if and only if the separation condition (S2) of Császár is satisfied (see subsection 3.1).

Proof. The first part is straightforward since the convergence is given by: $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x$ if and only if $\beta(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathbb{F}_x$.

In the pretopological case, one has to note that $\mathbb{F}_x = \beta(\mathcal{V}(x))$ for every x , and therefore that $[\mathcal{V}(x) \text{ mesh } \mathcal{V}(y) \iff \mathbb{F}_x \cap \mathbb{F}_y \neq \emptyset]$ and $[\mathcal{V}(x) = \mathcal{V}(y) \iff \mathbb{F}_x = \mathbb{F}_y]$. \square

Proposition 4.3.3. *If ξ is a reciprocal convergence then so is its pseudotopological modification.*

Proof. The pseudotopological modification of ξ is given by:

$$\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x \text{ if and only if } \beta(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathbb{F}_x$$

where $\mathbb{F}_x = \{\mathcal{U} \in \beta X : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow_{\xi} x\}$. Notice that an ultrafilter converges to a point x for ξ if and only if it converges to x for the pseudotopological modification. We then have $\mathbb{F}_x = \{\mathcal{U} \in \beta X : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow x\}$ and therefore using proposition 4.3.2, if ξ is reciprocal then so is its pseudotopological modification. \square

Proof of theorem 4.3.3.

With proposition 4.3.3, (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) is clear since a convergence and its pseudotopological modification have the same pretopological modification.

(ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) :

Let ξ be a reciprocal pseudotopology inducing c and take $\mathbb{F}_x = \{\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow_{\xi} x\}$. We clearly have $\mathcal{V}_x = \cap\{\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\xi} x\} = \cap\{\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{F}_x\}$ and since ξ is reciprocal, using proposition 4.3.2, we get condition (S).

Conversely assume that there exists a family $(\mathbb{F}_x)_{x \in X}$ satisfying condition (S) and define a convergence ξ as follows: $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow_{\xi} x$ if $\beta(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathbb{F}_x$.

Let us check that it is indeed a convergence.

The condition $\mathcal{V}_x = \cap\{\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{F}_x\}$ means that $\beta(\mathcal{V}_x)$ is the closure in βX of \mathbb{F}_x . Since $\dot{x} \in \beta(\mathcal{V}_x)$ and $\{\dot{x}\}$ is open in βX , we have $\dot{x} \in \mathbb{F}_x$. Therefore ξ is a convergence and it is pseudotopological since for any ultrafilter \mathcal{U} , $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow_{\xi} x$ if and only if $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{F}_x$. Now from condition (S), ξ is also reciprocal and c is the closure associated to the pretopological modification of ξ . \square

Finally theorem 4.3.3 with proposition 3.1.3 yield the following result from [12]:

Corollary 4.3.1. *A pretopological closure is induced by a Riesz Cauchy screen if and only if it is the closure of an (S2)-pretopological space.*

REFERENCES

- [1] E. ČECH, *Topological spaces*, revised edition by Z. Frolík and M. Katětov, Academia, Prague, 1966.
- [2] K. C. CHATTOPADHYAY, *Nearnesses, extensions of closure spaces and a problem of F. Riesz concerning proximities*, Indian J. Math., Vol. 30, 187-212 (1988).
- [3] M. CHICOURRAT, *Extensions de proximités et de prétopologies dans l'ensemble des ultrafiltres*, Acta Math. Hungar., Vol. 77(3), 263-174 (1997).
- [4] M. CHICOURRAT, *RE-proximities as fixed points of an operator on pseudo proximities*, Topology Appl., 104, 39-51 (2000).
- [5] G. CHOQUET, *Convergences*, Ann. Univ. Grenoble, 23, 57-112 (1947-48).
- [6] G. CHOQUET, *Sur les notions de grille et de filtre*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, 224, 171-173 (1947).
- [7] E. LOWEN-COLEBUNDERS, *Function classes of Cauchy continuous maps*, New York-Basel, 1989.
- [8] Á. CSÁSZÁR, *Fondements de la topologie générale*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1960.
- [9] Á. CSÁSZÁR, *RE-proximities*, Acta Math. Hungar., Vol. 47 (1-2), 201-221 (1986).
- [10] Á. CSÁSZÁR, *Extensions of closure and proximity spaces*, Acta Math. Hungar., Vol. 55 (3-4), 285-300 (1990).
- [11] Á. CSÁSZÁR, *Simultaneous extensions of Cauchy structures*, Acta Math. Hungar., Vol. 65 (4), 365-377 (1994).
- [12] Á. CSÁSZÁR, *Cauchy structures in closure and proximity spaces*, Acta Math. Hungar., Vol. 66(3), 201-215 (1995).
- [13] S. DOLECKI AND G. H. GRECO, *Cyrtologies of convergences, I*, Math. Nachr., 126, 327-348 (1986).
- [14] L. HADDAD, *Sur quelques points de topologie générale. Théorie des nasses et des tramails*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Clermont-Ferrand, 44(7), 3-80 (1970).
- [15] G. PREUSS, *Semiform convergence spaces*, Math. Japonica, 41 (3), 465-491 (1995).
- [16] J.F. RAMALEY AND O. WYLER, *Cauchy spaces*, I, II, Math. Ann., 187, 175-186, 187-199 (1970).
- [17] E. E. REED, *Completions of Uniform convergence spaces*, Math. Ann., 194, 83-108 (1971).
- [18] G.D. RICHARDSON AND D.C. KENT, *Probabilistic convergence spaces*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. (Series A), 61, 400-420 (1996).
- [19] J. SCHMIDT, *Beiträge zur Filtertheorie*, I, Math. Nachr., 7, 359-378 (1952); II, Math. Nachr., 10, 197-237 (1953).
- [20] W. J. THRON, *Proximity structures and grills*, Math. Ann., 206, 35-62 (1973).

CLERMONT UNIVERSITÉ, UNIVERSITÉ BLAISE PASCAL, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES,
 BP 10448, F-63000 CLERMONT FERRAND
 CNRS, UMR 6620, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES, F-63177 AUBIÈRE
 E-MAIL : MONIQUE.CHICOURRAT@MATH.UNIV-BPCLERMONT.FR