



Brock University

Department of Computer Science

Region-based theory of discrete spaces: A proximity approach

Ivo Düntsch and Dimiter Vakarelov
Technical Report # CS-03-04
March 2003

Brock University
Department of Computer Science
St. Catharines, Ontario
Canada L2S 3A1
www.cosc.brocku.ca

Region–based theory of discrete spaces: A proximity approach*

Ivo Düntsch[†]

Department of Computer Science
Brock University
St. Catharines, ON, Canada
duentsch@cosc.brocku.ca

Dimitar Vakarelov[†]

Department of Mathematical Logic
Sofia University
Sofia, Bulgaria
dvak@fmi.uni-sofia.bg

Abstract

We introduce Boolean proximity algebras as a generalization of Efremovič proximities which are suitable in reasoning about discrete regions. Following Stone’s representation theorem for Boolean algebras, it is shown that each such algebra is isomorphic to a substructure of a complete and atomic Boolean proximity algebra.

1 Introduction

Qualitative theories of space such as Whitehead [18], its extensions by Clarke [2], or the Region Connection Calculus [10] are based on the assumption that regions in space are infinitely divisible and that regions may be arbitrarily close. While this is certainly true when the model consists of all regions in Euclidean space – or a suitable approximating domain such as the polygonal algebras of Pratt & Schoop [9] – for applications in the physical world, where observation is limited by the precision of measurement and granularity of knowledge, it is more appropriate to allow regions which may be indivisible and which may have immediate neighbors. Such a scenario will be called *discrete*. Digital topology considers concepts such as *arc*, *connectedness* etc for various topologies on structures which are in some sense discrete, such as \mathbb{Z}^n . However, as pointed out by Smyth [11],

“Standard digital topology . . . is not topological in the strict sense, but graph–theoretic. Connectivity is taken in the usual graph sense, and analogies of the notions of arc and closed curve, and of the Jordan curve theorem etc. are developed.”

In standard topological spaces, the base elements are points, while in some discrete contexts the base elements are indivisible collections of points, sometimes called *cells*, and binary relations among such cells called *adjacency relations* [4, 5]. For such discrete spaces, Smyth [11] suggests to use generalized topological structures such as the closure spaces of Čech [1]. Galton’s approach is closer to the region based concept of space: He defines regions, contact relations among regions and their derivatives such as part–of, overlap etc. It is notable that some of the axioms of proximity spaces [8] coincide with some of the axioms of the “contact relation” given in various spatial contexts. This makes it

*Co–operation for this work was partially supported by EU COST Action 274 “Theory and Applications of Relational Structures as Knowledge Instruments” (TARSKI) and NATO Collaborative Linkage Grant PST.CLG 977641

[†]The sequence of authors is alphabetical, and equal authorship is implied

possible to explore proximity theory more deeply in the region-based theories of space. Our previous work [16, 17] can be considered as an application of the proximity approach to the study of some region-based theories of “continuous” space. In the present paper we generalize the notion of proximity space to make it applicable to discrete situations. In particular, we define the notion of *Boolean proximity algebra*, and show that each such structure has a representation as a substructure of a discrete proximity space. Just as the connection algebras of [16] can be considered as a “pointless” formulation of region-based theories of continuous spaces, Boolean proximity algebras can be considered as a “pointless” approach to the region-based theories of discrete spaces.

2 Definitions and notation

Throughout, we suppose that X is a nonempty set. If $A \subseteq X$, we write $-A$ for the set theoretic complement of A in X . If \leq is an ordering of X and $a \in X$, we let $[a] = \{b \in X : a \leq b\}$ be the principal filter and $(a) = \{b \in X : b \leq a\}$ the principal ideal generated by a .

A binary relation R on X is a subset of $X \times X$; we denote the set of all binary relations on X by $Rel(X)$. If $\langle a, b \rangle \in R$ we usually write aRb , and if aRb and bRc we write this as $aRbRc$.

If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a mapping and $M \subseteq X$, then $f[M] = \{f(m) : m \in M\}$.

Two different elements $a, b \in X$ are called *R-connected* (or just *connected*, if R is understood) if there are $c_0, \dots, c_k \in X$ such that $a = c_0, b = c_k$, and $c_0Rc_1R \dots Rc_k$. If a and b are R -connected, we denote this by $a \xrightarrow{R} b$. A subset W of X is *R-connected* (or just *connected*), if any two different elements of W are connected.

Throughout, $\langle B, +, \cdot, *, 0, 1 \rangle$ is a Boolean algebra. With some abuse of notation, we will usually identify an algebraic structure with its base set. In particular, 2^X is the Boolean algebra of all subsets of X with the usual set operations. We set $B^+ = B \setminus \{0\}$, and $Ult(B)$ is the set of all ultrafilters of B . A *representation of B* is a monomorphism e from B into a power set algebra 2^X . A representation e is called *reduced* if for all $x, y \in X, x \neq y$ there is some $b \in B$ such that $x \in e(b)$ and $y \notin e(b)$. It is called *perfect*, if for every $\mathcal{F} \in Ult(B)$ there is some $x \in X$ such that $b \in \mathcal{F} \iff x \in e(b)$ for all $b \in B$. The *Stone map* $s : B \rightarrow 2^{Ult(B)}$ is defined by $s(b) = \{\mathcal{F} \in Ult(B) : b \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

Theorem 2.1. [7, 12] *The Stone map s is a reduced and perfect representation of B . Conversely, if $e : B \rightarrow 2^X$ is a reduced and perfect representation of B , there is a unique bijection $\varphi : X \rightarrow Ult(B)$ such that $e(b) = \varphi^{-1}[s(b)]$.*

The following result is a variant of Stone’s Separation Lemma [13]:

Lemma 2.2. *If I is an ideal of B and F a filter such that $I \cap F = \emptyset$, then there is some $\mathcal{F} \in Ult(B)$ such that $F \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F} \cap I = \emptyset$.*

We will frequently use the *finite co-finite algebra* $FC(\omega)$ of the set ω of natural numbers as a source of examples. $FC(\omega)$ is the subalgebra of 2^ω consisting of all finite and all co-finite sets. The principal ultrafilters of $FC(\omega)$ are of the form $\mathcal{F}_n = \{a \subseteq \omega : n \in a\}$, and there is only one non-principal ultrafilter, namely $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \{a \subseteq \omega : a \text{ is co-finite}\}$ [see 7].

3 Proximity relations

Let X be a nonempty set and δ a binary relation between subsets of X . We call δ a *minimal proximity* or simply a *proximity* if it satisfies the following conditions for all $A, B, C \subseteq X$:

P1. $A\delta B \implies A \neq \emptyset$ and $B \neq \emptyset$.

- P2. (a) $A\delta(B \cup C) \iff A\delta B \text{ or } A\delta C$.
 (b) $(A \cup B)\delta C \iff A\delta C \text{ or } B\delta C$.

In this case, the pair $\langle X, \delta \rangle$ will be called a *proximity space*. We also consider various other types of proximity: A proximity δ is called

- a *Čech proximity* or *basic proximity*, if it satisfies
 - P3. δ is symmetric.
 - P4. $A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A\delta B$,
- a *Efremovič proximity* if it satisfies
 - P5. $A(-\delta)B \rightarrow (\exists C)[A(-\delta)C \text{ and } (-C)(-\delta)B]$,
- a *Pervin proximity* if it satisfies P4 and P5,
- a *connecting proximity* if it satisfies
 - P6. If $A \neq \emptyset$ and $-A \neq \emptyset$, then $A\delta -A$.

There are many other notions of proximity, and we invite the reader to consult the fundamental text by Naimpally & Warrack [8] for more examples. Throughout the paper, we will suppose that $\langle X, \delta \rangle$ is a proximity space, and that A, B, C, \dots , possibly indexed, are subsets of X .

The proof of the following Lemma follows immediately from P2:

Lemma 3.1. *If $A\delta B$ and $A \subseteq A_1, B \subseteq B_1$, then $A_1\delta B_1$.*

4 Discrete proximity spaces

If R is a binary relation on X , we define a binary relation δ_R on 2^X by

$$(4.1) \quad A\delta_R B \iff (\exists a \in A)(\exists b \in B)aRb.$$

There is the following general result:

Lemma 4.1. *[3, 15] $\langle X, \delta_R \rangle$ is a proximity space.*

We will call $\langle X, \delta_R \rangle$ the *discrete proximity space determined by R* . Our intended models are sets X of primitive regions or cells which are related via a given R . The term “discrete” is chosen for its mereological connotation, and should not be confused with the discrete topology on X . If R is an adjacency relation in the sense of Galton [4], then δ_R coincides with his connection relation C .

Just as in correspondence theory for modal style logics, one can ask which properties of δ_R are induced by properties of R .

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\langle X, \delta_R \rangle$ be a discrete proximity space. Then,*

1. R is symmetric $\iff \delta_R$ satisfies P3.
2. R is reflexive $\iff \delta_R$ satisfies P4.

3. R is transitive $\iff \delta_R$ satisfies P5.
 4. $\langle X, R \rangle$ is R -connected $\iff \delta_R$ satisfies P6.

Proof. 1. and 2. are obvious from the definition of δ_R .

3: “ \implies ”: Suppose that R is transitive, and let $A(-\delta_R)B$. We need to find some C such that $A(-\delta)C$ and $(-C)(-\delta)B$. Set $C = \{t \in X : (\exists s)[tRs \text{ and } s \in B]\}$. Thus, whenever $s \notin C$, then $s(-R)t$ for all $t \in B$. This shows that $-C(-\delta_R)B$. Next, assume that $A\delta_R C$; then, there are $s \in A$, $t \in C$ such that sRt . By definition of C , there is some $u \in B$ with tRu , and the transitivity of R tells us that sRu . Hence, $A\delta B$, contradicting our hypothesis.

“ \impliedby ”: Suppose that δ_R satisfies P5, sRt and tRu , and assume that $s(-R)u$. Then, $\{s\}(-\delta_R)\{u\}$, and, by P5, there is some $C \subseteq X$ such that $\{s\}(-\delta_R)C$ and $-C(-\delta_R)\{u\}$. Since $\{s\}(-\delta_R)C$, we cannot have $t \in C$. On the other hand, if $t \notin C$, then $t(-R)u$ by $-C(-\delta_R)\{u\}$, a contradiction to tRu .

4. “ \implies ”: Suppose that $\langle X, R \rangle$ is R -connected, and $A \subseteq X, A \neq \emptyset, X$. Choose some $a \in A$, $b \notin A$. Since $a \neq b$, and $\langle X, R \rangle$ is R -connected, there is a path $s_0Rs_1R\dots Rs_n$ such that $s_0 = a$ and $s_n = b$. Suppose that t is the smallest index j such that $s_j \in A$, $s_{j+1} \notin A$, and s_jRs_{j+1} . Such t exists, since $s_0 \in A$ and $s_n \notin A$. Then, s_tRs_{t+1} exhibits $A\delta_R - A$.

“ \impliedby ”: Suppose that δ_R is connecting. If X has only one element, then $\langle X, R \rangle$ is trivially R -connected. Thus, suppose that X has at least two elements. Then, $R(a) \neq \emptyset$ for all $a \in X$, since, by P6, there is some $b \in X \setminus \{a\}$ with aRb . Assume that $a, b \in X, a \neq b$, and there is no R -path from a to b . Let $A = \{c \in X : a \overset{R}{\rightarrow} c\} \cup \{a\}$. By our assumption neither A nor $-A$ are empty, and thus, there are $s \in A$, $t \in -A$ such that sRt . It follows that there is a path from some element of A to some element outside of A , which implies that there is a path from a to some element outside A . This contradicts the definition of A . \square

5 Boolean proximity algebras

Proximities were defined as binary relations between subsets of a given set, satisfying certain properties. The set of all subsets of a set form a Boolean algebra under the set theoretic operations, and one may want to generalize the notion to arbitrary Boolean algebras. This leads to the following definitions: A *Boolean proximity algebra* (BPA) is a structure $\langle B, \delta \rangle$ such that B is a Boolean algebra, and δ is a binary relation on B which satisfies the axioms analogous to P1 and P2, namely,

P'1. $a\delta b \implies a \neq 0$ and $b \neq 0$.

P'2. (a) $a\delta(b+c) \iff a\delta b$ or $a\delta c$.

(b) $(a+b)\delta c \iff a\delta c$ or $b\delta c$.

If $\langle X, \delta \rangle$ a proximity space, then $\langle 2^X, \delta \rangle$ is a BPA.

We also consider BPAs satisfying some of the following axioms:

P'3. δ is symmetric.

P'4. $a \cap b \neq 0 \implies a\delta b$,

P'5. $a(-\delta)b \implies (\exists c)[a(-\delta)c \text{ and } c^*(-\delta)b]$,

P'6. If $a \neq 0$ and $a^* \neq 0$, then $a\delta a^*$.

If δ is a proximity on B , we define $R_\delta \in \text{Rel}(\text{Ult}(B))$ by

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{F} R_\delta \mathcal{G} \iff \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} \subseteq \delta.$$

The relation R_δ is called the *canonical relation determined by δ* , and the relational system $\langle \text{Ult}(B), R_\delta \rangle$ the *canonical structure of B* .

Conversely, if $R \in \text{Rel}(\text{Ult}(B))$, we let $\delta_R \in \text{Rel}(B)$ be defined by

$$(5.2) \quad a\delta_R b \iff (\exists \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \text{Ult}(B))[a \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } b \in \mathcal{G} \text{ and } \mathcal{F} R \mathcal{G}].$$

It is easy to see that δ_R is a proximity on B .

In the sequel, we shall show that all BPAs are of the form $\langle B, \delta_R \rangle$. More precisely, we shall show that each BPS is isomorphic to a substructure of a proximity space $\langle X, \delta \rangle$. Here, a *substructure of $\langle X, \delta \rangle$* is a BPA $\langle B, \delta' \rangle$ such that B is a Boolean subalgebra of 2^X , and δ' is the restriction of δ to $B \times B$.

As a preparation we require some definitions and one Lemma. For a BPA $\langle B, \delta \rangle$ and a filter F in B , we let

$$I_l(F) = \{b \in B : (\exists a \in F)a(-\delta)b\}, \\ I_r(F) = \{a \in B : (\exists b \in F)a(-\delta)b\}.$$

Lemma 5.1. 1. $I_l(F)$ and $I_r(F)$ are ideals of B .

2. If F, G are filters of B , then

$$(5.3) \quad F \times G \subseteq \delta \iff I_l(F) \cap G = \emptyset \iff F \cap I_r(G) = \emptyset.$$

3. If F, G are filters of B such that $F \times G \subseteq \delta$, then there are $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \text{Ult}(B)$ such that $F \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, $G \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} \subseteq \delta$.

Proof. 1. This follows immediately from P'1 and P'2.

2. Let $F \times G \subseteq \delta$, and assume that $b \in I_l(F) \cap G$. Then, there is some $a \in F$ such that $a(-\delta)b$, contradicting $F \times G \subseteq \delta$.

Next, let $I_l(F) \cap G = \emptyset$, and assume that there is some $a \in F \cap I_r(G)$. Then, there is some $b \in G$ such that $a(-\delta)b$. Hence, $a \in I_l(F) \cap G$, a contradiction.

Finally, suppose that $F \cap I_r(G) = \emptyset$. Let $\langle a, b \rangle \in F \times G$, and assume that $a(-\delta)b$. Then, $a \in F \cap I_r(G)$, a contradiction.

3. Suppose that F, G are filters of B such that $F \times G \subseteq \delta$. By (5.3), this is the case if and only if $F \cap I_r(G) = \emptyset$. Since $I_r(G)$ is an ideal, by Lemma 2.1 there is some ultrafilter \mathcal{F} containing F and disjoint from $I_r(G)$. Again by (5.3), we have $\mathcal{F} \times G \subseteq \delta$, and thus, $I_l(\mathcal{F}) \cap G = \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.1 there is an ultrafilter \mathcal{G} containing G and disjoint from $I_l(\mathcal{F})$. Invoking (5.3) again, we obtain $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} \subseteq \delta$. \square

Theorem 5.2. Suppose that $\langle B, \delta \rangle$ is a BPA. Then, $\delta = \delta_{R_\delta}$, i.e.

$$(5.4) \quad a\delta b \iff (\exists \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \text{Ult}(B))[\mathcal{F} R_\delta \mathcal{G} \text{ and } a \in \mathcal{F}, b \in \mathcal{G}]$$

Proof. “ \subseteq ”: Suppose that $a\delta b$, and let F be the principal filter generated by a – i.e. $F = \{c \in B : a \leq c\}$ –, and G be the principal filter generated by b . By P2, $a\delta b$ implies $F \times G \subseteq \delta$, and Lemma 5.1(3) gives us the desired result.

“ \supseteq ”: Suppose that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \text{Ult}(B)$, $a \in \mathcal{F}$, $b \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{F} R_\delta \mathcal{G}$. By definition of R_δ , we immediately see that $a\delta b$. \square

The representation Theorem now follows:

Corollary 5.3. *Each BPA $\langle B, \delta \rangle$ is isomorphic to a substructure of a discrete proximity space.*

Proof. Suppose that $X = Ult(B)$, and let $S = R_\delta$; then, $\langle X, S \rangle$ is a discrete proximity space. Suppose that $s : B \rightarrow 2^{Ult(B)}$ is the Stone map. Since $s[B]$ is a subalgebra of 2^X isomorphic to B , all that remains to show is that $a\delta b \iff s(a)S(b)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
a\delta b &\iff a\delta_{R_\delta} b && \text{by Theorem 5.2} \\
&\iff (\exists \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in Ult(B))[a \in \mathcal{F}, b \in \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}R_\delta \mathcal{G}] && \text{by (5.2)} \\
&\iff (\exists \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in X)[\mathcal{F} \in s(a), \mathcal{G} \in s(b), \mathcal{F}S\mathcal{G}] && \text{by definition of } s \text{ and } S, \\
&\iff s(a)Ss(b) && \text{by (4.1),}
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

While we have just shown that each proximity δ on B is of the form δ_R for some $R \in Rel(Ult(B))$, it is not true that each $R \in Rel(Ult)$ is of the form R_δ . This is clear when $|B| \lesssim |Ult(B)|$, but it is also true when these cardinalities are equal: Suppose that $B = FC(\omega)$, and let $R \in Rel(Ult(B))$ be defined by $\mathcal{F}R\mathcal{G} \iff \mathcal{F}$ and \mathcal{G} are principal. Then, R is not the universal relation on $Ult(B)$. Assume that $R = R_\delta$ for some proximity δ on B . If $a, b \in B^+$ choose $n \in a, m \in b$, and let \mathcal{F} be the ultrafilter generated by $\{n\}$, and \mathcal{G} be the ultrafilter generated by $\{m\}$. Then, both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are principal, and $a \in \mathcal{F}, b \in \mathcal{G}$. Hence, $a\delta b$, and it follows that δ is the universal relation on B^+ . This implies that R_δ is the universal relation on $Ult(B)$, and shows that $R \subsetneq R_\delta$. This example can also be used to show that it is not possible to carry over the results of Theorem 4.2. Suppose that R is as above; choose two different principal ultrafilters \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} and define

$$S = R \cup \{\langle \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathcal{F} \rangle\} \cup \{\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_\infty \rangle\} \cup \{\langle \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathcal{G} \rangle\}.$$

Then, S is not reflexive, symmetric or transitive; on the other hand, δ_S is the universal relation on B^+ , since each nonzero element of B is contained in a principal ultrafilter, and thus it satisfies P'3 – P'5.

In the opposite direction, it is not true for all R that transitivity of R implies that δ_R satisfies P'5: Define R on $Ult(FC(\omega))$ by

$$R = \{\langle \mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{F}_m \rangle : n, m \in \omega \setminus \{0\}\} \cup \{\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \rangle : \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \{\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{F}_\infty\}\}.$$

Then, R is clearly transitive, but δ_R does not satisfy P'5: Consider $a = \{0\}, b = \{1\}$; then $a(-\delta)b$. Let $c \in FC(\omega)^+$. If c is co-finite, then $c \in \mathcal{F}_\infty$; hence, $\langle a, c \rangle \in \mathcal{F}_0 \times \mathcal{F}_\infty$ shows $a\delta c$. If c is finite, then c^* is co-finite. Choose some $n \in c^*$; then, $\langle c^*, b \rangle \in \mathcal{F}_n \times \mathcal{F}_1$, and it follows that $c^*\delta b$.

Thus, we have to be content with the weaker

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose that $R \in Rel(Ult(B))$. Then,*

1. *If R is symmetric, then δ_R satisfies P'3.*
2. *If R is reflexive, then δ_R satisfies P'4.*
3. *If $\langle Ult(B), R \rangle$ is R -connected then δ_R satisfies P'6.*

Proof. 1. Suppose that R is symmetric, and let $a\delta_R b$, i.e. $a \in \mathcal{F}, b \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{F}R\mathcal{G}$ for some $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in Rel(Ult(B))$. Since R is symmetric, we have $\mathcal{G}R\mathcal{F}$, which implies $b\delta_R a$.

2. Suppose that R is reflexive, and let $a \cdot b \neq 0$. Then, there is some $\mathcal{F} \in Ult(B)$ such that $a, b \in \mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{F}R\mathcal{F}$ shows that $a\delta_R b$.

3. Suppose that $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{R} \mathcal{G}$ for all $\mathcal{F} \neq \mathcal{G}$, and let $a \in B \setminus \{0, 1\}$. Then, there are $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in Ult(B)$ such that $a \in \mathcal{F}$ and $a^* \in \mathcal{G}$. By our hypothesis, we can find $\mathcal{F}_0, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n$ such that $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_n = \mathcal{G}$, and $\mathcal{F}_0 R \dots R \mathcal{F}_n$. If j is the smallest index with $a \in \mathcal{F}_j, a \notin \mathcal{F}_{j+1}$ – which exists since $a \in \mathcal{F}_0$ and $a^* \in \mathcal{F}_n$ – then $\mathcal{F}_j R \mathcal{F}_{j+1}$ shows that $a\delta_R a^*$. \square

If R is of the form R_δ , then things look brighter:

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\langle B, \delta \rangle$ be a BPA, and set $R = R_\delta$ as defined in (5.1). Then,*

1. R is symmetric $\iff \delta$ satisfies P'3.
2. R is reflexive $\iff \delta$ satisfies P'4.
3. R is transitive $\iff \delta$ satisfies P'5.

Proof. Because of Theorem 5.4, we only have to show “ \Leftarrow ” for 1. and 2.:

1. Suppose that δ satisfies P'3, and let $\mathcal{F}R\mathcal{G}$. By definition of R , we have $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} \subseteq \delta$, and P'3 tells us that $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{F} \subseteq \delta$. Thus, $\mathcal{G}R\mathcal{F}$.

2. Suppose that δ satisfies P'4, and let $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Ult}(B)$. Since \mathcal{F} is a proper filter, we have $a \cdot b \neq 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{F}$, and thus, by P'4, we have $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} \subseteq \delta$. Hence, $\mathcal{F}R\mathcal{F}$.

3. “ \Rightarrow ”: Suppose that R is transitive, and assume that there are $a, b \in B$ such that $a(-\delta)b$, and $a\delta c$ or $c^*\delta b$ for all $c \in B$. Let $I = \{c \in B : a(-\delta)c\}$, and $F = \{c \in B : c^*(-\delta)b\}$; then, I is an ideal, F is a filter, and $b \in I, a^* \in F$. If $c \in I \cap F$, then $a(-\delta)c$ and $c^*(-\delta)b$, contradicting our assumption. Thus, with Lemma 2.2, choose some ultrafilter \mathcal{F} containing F with $\mathcal{F} \cap I = \emptyset$. Our next step is to show that $[a] \times F \subseteq \delta$: Assume otherwise; then, there are $d \geq a, c \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $d(-\delta)c$, and, by P'2, we may assume $a = d$. Now, $a(-d)c$ implies $c \in I$, which contradicts $I \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$. By Lemma 5.1(3), there is some ultrafilter \mathcal{G} such that $a \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{F} \subseteq \delta$. Similarly, it is shown that $\mathcal{F} \times [b] \subseteq \delta$, so that there is some $\mathcal{H} \in \text{Ult}(B)$ containing b and $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{H} \subseteq \delta$. By the definition of R , we have $\mathcal{G}R\mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{F}R\mathcal{G}$. The transitivity of R now implies $\mathcal{G}R\mathcal{H}$, and it follows from $a \in \mathcal{G}, b \in \mathcal{H}$, along with $R = \delta_R$, that $a\delta b$. This contradicts our assumption.

“ \Leftarrow ”: Suppose that δ satisfies P'5, and let $\mathcal{F}_0R\mathcal{F}_1R\mathcal{F}_2$. Assume that $\mathcal{F}_0(-R)\mathcal{F}_2$; then, $\mathcal{F}_0 \times \mathcal{F}_2 \not\subseteq \delta$, so there are $a \in \mathcal{F}_0, b \in \mathcal{F}_2$ with $a(-\delta)b$. With P'5, choose some $c \in B$ such that $a(-\delta)c$ and $c^*(-\delta)b$. Together with the fact the $\delta = R_\delta$ by Theorem 5.2, the latter implies that $c^* \notin \mathcal{F}_1$. Since \mathcal{F}_1 is an ultrafilter, we have $c \in \mathcal{F}_1$, and it follows from $\mathcal{F}_0R\mathcal{F}_1$ that $a\delta c$, a contradiction. \square

Theorem ?? generalizes a result of [6], see also [14].

To show that P6 does not carry over, we will construct a proximity δ on $B = FC(\omega)$ which satisfies P'6, but for which R_δ is not connected. Define R on $\text{Ult}(B)$ by

$$(5.5) \quad R = \{ \langle \mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{F}_m \rangle : n, m \in \omega, |n - m| = 2 \} \cup \{ \langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F} \rangle : \mathcal{F} \in \text{Ult}(B) \}$$

Since, for example, there is no path from \mathcal{F}_0 to \mathcal{F}_1 , R is not connected. Let $\delta = R_\delta$ as defined in (5.2). Clearly, δ satisfies P'1. Thus, let $a\delta(b+c)$; then, there are $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \text{Ult}(B)$ such that $\mathcal{F}R\mathcal{G}$, and $a \in \mathcal{F}, b+c \in \mathcal{G}$. Since \mathcal{G} is an ultrafilter, we have $b \in \mathcal{G}$ or $c \in \mathcal{G}$, i.e. $a\delta b$ or $a\delta c$. The other case is analogous. Next, suppose that $a \in B \setminus \{0, 1\}$, and that a is finite. Let $m = \max a$; then, $a \in \mathcal{F}_m, m+2 \in a^*$, and hence, $a^* \in \mathcal{F}_{m+2}$ which implies $a\delta a^*$. Since R is symmetric, the case for co-finite a follows. It remains to show that $R = R_\delta$, i.e. that $\mathcal{F}R\mathcal{G} \iff \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} \subseteq \delta$. By definition, $R \subseteq R_\delta$, so, suppose that $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} \subseteq \delta$ and $\mathcal{F} \neq \mathcal{G}$. First, let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_n$. Set $b = \{n, n+2\}$ if $n = 0, 1$, and $b = \{n, n-2, n+2\}$ otherwise. Then, $b^* \notin \mathcal{F}_{n-2} \cup \mathcal{F}_n \cup \mathcal{F}_{n+2}$ which shows $\mathcal{F}_\infty \times \mathcal{F}_n \not\subseteq \delta$; similarly, $\mathcal{F}_n \times \mathcal{F}_\infty \not\subseteq \delta$. Now, let $|n - m| \neq 2$. Then, $\{n\}(-\delta)\{m\}$ and it follows that $\mathcal{F}_n \times \mathcal{F}_m \not\subseteq \delta$.

6 Outlook

Galton [5] pointed out the need to consider discrete spaces with several adjacency relations. In subsequent work, we will generalize and extend the results of the present paper by investigating proximity spaces and BPAs arising from discrete

space with an arbitrary collection $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i : i \in I\}$ of adjacency relations. We will also consider the case when \mathcal{R} is closed under various relational operators such as union, composition, and converse. In this way, we make our vocabulary more expressive and, indeed, similar to dynamic logic.

References

- [1] Čech, E. (1966). Topological spaces. London: Wiley. Revised edition by Z. Frolík and M. Katětov.
- [2] Clarke, B. L. (1981). A calculus of individuals based on ‘connection’. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, **22**, 204–218.
- [3] Deneva, A. & Vakarelov, D. (1997). Modal logics for local and global similarity relations. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, **31**, 295–304.
- [4] Galton, A. (1999). The mereotopology of discrete space. In C. Freksa & D. M. Mark (Eds.), *Spatial Information Theory, Proceedings of the International Conference COSIT '99*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 251–266. Springer–Verlag.
- [5] Galton, A. (2000). Qualitative Spatial Change. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [6] Haddad, L. (1970). Sur quelques points de topologie générale. Théorie des nasses et des tramails. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Clermont-Ferrand*, **44**, 3–80.
- [7] Koppelberg, S. (1989). General Theory of Boolean Algebras, vol. 1 of *Handbook on Boolean Algebras*. North Holland.
- [8] Naimpally, S. A. & Warrack, B. D. (1970). Proximity Spaces. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Pratt, I. & Schoop, D. (1998). A complete axiom system for polygonal mereotopology of the real plane. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, **27**, 621–658.
- [10] Randell, D. A., Cohn, A. G. & Cui, Z. (1992). Computing transitivity tables: A challenge for automated theorem provers. In D. Kapur (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Automated Deduction (CADE-11)*, vol. 607 of *LNAI*, 786–790, Saratoga Springs, NY. Springer.
- [11] Smyth, M. B. (1995). Semi-metrics, closure spaces and digital topology. *Theoretical Computer Science*, **151**, 257–276.
- [12] Stone, M. (1936). The theory of representations for Boolean algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **40**, 37–111.
- [13] Stone, M. (1937). Topological representations of distributive lattices and Brouwerian logics. *Časopis Pěst. Mat.*, **67**, 1–25.
- [14] Thron, W. (1973). Proximity structures and grills. *Math. Ann.*, **206**, 35–62.
- [15] Vakarelov, D. (1997). Proximity modal logics. In *Proceedings of the 11th Amsterdam Colloquium*, 301–308.
- [16] Vakarelov, D., Dimov, G., Düntsch, I. & Bennett, B. (2002). A proximity approach to some region-based theories of space. *J. Appl. Non-Classical Logics*, **12**, 527–529.
- [17] Vakarelov, D., Düntsch, I. & Bennett, B. (2001). A note on proximity spaces and connection based mereology. In C. Welty & B. Smith (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Formal Ontology in Information Systems (FOIS'01)*, 139–150. ACM.
- [18] Whitehead, A. N. (1929). Process and reality. New York: MacMillan.