

## $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -SPACES

By William Dunham

### 1. Introduction

Levine [4] defines a subset of a topological space to be generalized closed (g-closed) if its closure is contained in each of its neighborhoods, and he shows that g-closed sets possess many of the familiar and important properties of closed sets. Of some interest, then, are the  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -spaces — the spaces in which the closed sets and the g-closed sets coincide. This paper examines such spaces, furnishing characterizations independent of the notion of g-closed sets; investigating their behavior with respect to subspaces, transformations, and products; and providing structure theorems for minimal and maximal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topologies on a given set.

### 2. Definitions and characterizations

DEFINITION 2.1. (Levine, [4]) In a topological space  $X$ ,  $A \subset X$  is *g-closed* if  $c(A) \subset O$  when  $A \subset O$  and  $O$  is open, where “ $c$ ” denotes the closure operator.

DEFINITION 2.2. (Levine, [4])  $X$  is a  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -space iff every g-closed subset of  $X$  is closed.

DEFINITION 2.3. (Thron, [5])  $X$  is a  $T_D$ -space iff the derived set of each singleton is closed.

DEFINITION 2.4.  $X$  is a *door space* iff each subset of  $X$  is either open or closed. (See Kelley, [3])

THEOREM 2.5.  $X$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  iff for each  $x \in X$ , either  $\{x\}$  is open or  $\{x\}$  is closed.

PROOF. Necessity: Suppose  $X$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and for some  $x \in X$ ,  $\{x\}$  is not closed. Since  $X$  is the only neighborhood of  $\complement\{x\}$  (“ $\complement$ ” denotes the complement operator),  $\complement\{x\}$  is g-closed and thus closed. Hence  $\{x\}$  is open.

Sufficiency: Let  $A \subset X$  be g-closed with  $x \in c(A)$ . If  $\{x\}$  is open,  $\phi \neq \{x\} \cap A$ . Otherwise  $\{x\}$  is closed and  $\phi \neq c(x) \cap A = \{x\} \cap A$  by Levine [4], Theorem 2.2. In either case  $x \in A$  and so  $A$  is closed.

COROLLARY 2.6.  $X$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  iff every subset of  $X$  is the intersection of all open sets and all closed sets containing it.

PROOF. Necessity: Let  $X$  be  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  with  $B \subset X$  arbitrary. Then  $B = \bigcap \{C\{x\} : x \notin B\}$ , an intersection of open and closed sets by Theorem 2.5. The result follows.

Sufficiency: For each  $x \in X$ ,  $C\{x\}$  is the intersection of all open sets and all closed sets containing it. Thus  $C\{x\}$  is either open or closed and  $X$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

COROLLARY 2.7. (a) [4, Theorem 5.3]: A  $T_1$ -space is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$

(b) A door space is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

PROOF. Both results follow from Theorem 2.5.

EXAMPLE 2.8. Neither implication in the previous corollary is reversible. For if  $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$  and  $\mathcal{S} = \{\phi, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{a, b, d\}, X\}$ , then  $(X, \mathcal{S})$  is a  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -space by Theorem 2.5. But  $(X, \mathcal{S})$  is not  $T_1$  since  $\{a\}$  is not closed, nor is it a door space, since  $\{a, c\}$  is neither open nor closed.

THEOREM 2.9. If  $X$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ , then  $X$  is  $T_D$  (and thus  $T_0$ ).

PROOF. For  $x \in X$ ,  $\{x\}$  is either open or closed. If  $\{x\}$  is open,  $\{x\}' = c(x) \setminus \{x\}$  is closed, while if  $\{x\}$  is closed,  $\{x\}' = \phi$ .

EXAMPLE 2.10. A  $T_D$ -space need not be  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ . For, if  $X = \{a, b, c\}$  and  $\mathcal{S} = \{\phi, \{a\}, \{a, b\}, X\}$ , then  $(X, \mathcal{S})$  is not  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  since  $\{b\}$  is neither open nor closed. But  $(X, \mathcal{S})$  is  $T_D$  since  $\{a\}' = \{b, c\}$ ,  $\{b\}' = \{c\}$ , and  $\{c\}' = \phi$ , all of which are closed.

### 3. Subspaces and transformations

THEOREM 3.1. If  $X$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  with  $Y \subset X$ , then  $Y$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

PROOF. For  $y \in Y$ ,  $\{y\}$  is either  $X$ -open or  $X$ -closed, and thus  $\{y\}$  is either  $Y$ -open or  $Y$ -closed.

EXAMPLE 3.2. Before considering conditions under which the image of a  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -space is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ , we introduce the following example: Let  $X = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$  be the natural numbers with topology  $\mathcal{S} = \{\phi, \{1\}\} \cup \{U : 1 \in U \text{ and } cU \text{ is finite}\}$ , and let  $Y = \{a, b, c\}$  with topology  $\mathcal{V} = \{\phi, \{a\}, Y\}$ . Define  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  by

$$\begin{aligned} f(1) &= a \\ f(2n) &= b \text{ for } n=1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

$$f(2n+1)=c \text{ for } n=1, 2, \dots$$

Then  $f$  is continuous, open, and onto. But by Theorem 2.5,  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  while  $(Y, \mathcal{V})$  is not.

**THEOREM 3.3.** *If  $X$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous, closed, and onto, then  $Y$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $B \subset Y$  be  $g$ -closed. By Levine [4], Theorem 6.3,  $f^{-1}[B]$  is  $g$ -closed and thus closed in  $X$ . Hence  $B = f[f^{-1}[B]]$  is closed in  $Y$ , and  $Y$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

**THEOREM 3.4.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be an open, onto map (not necessarily continuous) such that for each  $y \in Y$ ,  $f^{-1}[\{y\}]$  is a finite set. Then  $(Y, \mathcal{U})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .*

**PROOF.** We shall use Theorem 2.5. Let  $y \in Y$ . By hypothesis,  $f^{-1}[\{y\}] = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ . If, for some  $i$ ,  $\{x_i\} \in \mathcal{F}$  then  $\{y\} = \{f(x_i)\} \in \mathcal{U}$  since  $f$  is open. Otherwise,  $\mathcal{C}\{x_i\} \in \mathcal{F}$  for all  $i=1, 2, \dots, n$  and thus  $\mathcal{C}\{y\} = f[\mathcal{C}\{x_1\} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{C}\{x_n\}] \in \mathcal{U}$ . It follows that  $(Y, \mathcal{U})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

**COROLLARY 3.5.** *The homeomorphic image of a  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -space is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .*

#### 4. Products

**THEOREM 4.1.** *Let  $X = \times \{X_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$ . Then if  $X$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ ,  $X_\alpha$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  for all  $\alpha \in \Delta$ .*

**PROOF.**  $X$  contains a subspace homeomorphic to  $X_\alpha$ . Use Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.5.

**REMARK 4.2.** In contrast to the  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$ , and  $T_2$  separation axioms, the converse of Theorem 4.1 is false. See Levine [4], Example 7.4. In order to derive necessary and sufficient conditions under which a product space is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ , we distinguish two cases — when the product is infinite (that is, when there are an infinite number of non-singleton factors) and when the product is finite. We begin with a simple lemma:

**LEMMA 4.3** *Let  $X = \times \{X_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$  where  $\Delta$  is infinite. Then  $X$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  iff  $X$  is  $T_1$ .*

PROOF. The sufficiency is Corollary 2.7 (a). To prove necessity, let  $x \in X$  and note that  $\{x\}$  is not open in the product topology since there are infinitely many non-singleton factors in  $X$ . By Theorem 2.5,  $\{x\}$  is closed and  $X$  is  $T_1$ .

THEOREM 4.4. *Let  $X = \times \{X_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$  where  $\Delta$  is infinite. Then  $X$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  iff  $X_\alpha$  is  $T_1$  for all  $\alpha \in \Delta$ .*

PROOF. Apply the previous lemma and the fact that a product space is  $T_1$  iff each factor is  $T_1$ .

REMARK 4.5. Theorem 4.4 shows that the distinction between  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $T_1$  vanishes in infinite product spaces. A different situation exists in the case of finite products, where we can relax the  $T_1$  condition on one of the factors if we put severe restrictions upon the others:

THEOREM 4.6. *Let  $(X, \mathcal{F}) = \times \{(X_i, \mathcal{F}_i) : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Then  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  iff one of the following conditions holds:*

(a)  $(X_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$  is  $T_1$  for all  $i$ .

or

(b) For some  $k$ ,  $(X_k, \mathcal{F}_k)$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  but not  $T_1$ , while  $(X_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$  is discrete for all  $i \neq k$ .

PROOF. Necessity: Suppose  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and (a) does not hold. Then for some  $k$ ,  $(X_k, \mathcal{F}_k)$  is not  $T_1$ , although  $(X_k, \mathcal{F}_k)$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  by Theorem 4.1. Fix  $i \neq k$ . We assert  $(X_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$  is discrete. For otherwise, there is an  $x_i \in X_i$  such that  $\{x_i\} \notin \mathcal{F}_i$ . Moreover, for some  $x_k \in X_k$ ,  $\{x_k\}$  is not  $\mathcal{F}_k$ -closed. Define  $x^* \in X$  by

$$\begin{aligned} x^*(k) &= x_k \\ x^*(i) &= x_i \\ x^*(j) &\in X_j \text{ arbitrary for } j \neq k, i. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\{x^*\} \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $P_i[\{x^*\}] = \{x_i\} \in \mathcal{F}_i$ , a contradiction; and if  $\{x^*\}$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -closed, then  $\{x_k\}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_k$ -closed, again a contradiction. By Theorem 2.5 we conclude  $(X_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$  is discrete.

Sufficiency: If (a) holds,  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is  $T_1$  and thus  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ . If (b) holds, then for some  $k$ ,  $(X_k, \mathcal{F}_k)$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  but not  $T_1$ , while  $(X_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$  is discrete for  $i \neq k$ . Let  $x \in X$ . If  $\{x(k)\} \in \mathcal{F}_k$ , then  $\{x\} = \{\times \{x(j) : 1 \leq j \leq n\}\} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Otherwise  $\{x(k)\}$  is

$\mathcal{F}_k$ -closed and thus  $\{x\}$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -closed. Hence  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

**5. The  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  property and the lattice of topologies**

**THEOREM 5.1.** *If  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}$ , then  $(X, \mathcal{U})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .*

**PROOF.** For  $x \in X$ , either  $\{x\} \in \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}$  or  $\mathcal{C}\{x\} \in \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}$ .

**EXAMPLE 5.2.** The  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  property is not transferred to coarser topologies nor even to infima. For, if  $X = \{a, b\}$  with  $\mathcal{F} = \{\phi, \{a\}, X\}$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \{\phi, \{b\}, X\}$ , then  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  and  $(X, \mathcal{U})$  are  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  while  $(X, \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{U})$  is not. However, we can prove:

**THEOREM 5.3.** *If  $(X_\alpha, \mathcal{F}_\alpha)$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  for all  $\alpha \in \Delta$ , and if  $\{\mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$  is a totally ordered family with respect to inclusion, then  $(X, \cap \{\mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $x \in X$  and suppose  $\{x\} \notin \cap \{\mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$ . Then  $\{x\} \notin \mathcal{F}_\beta$  for some  $\beta \in \Delta$  and so  $\mathcal{C}\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$ . We assert that  $\mathcal{C}\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha \in \Delta$ . For if  $\alpha \in \Delta$  and  $\mathcal{F}_\beta \subset \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ , then  $\mathcal{C}\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ . Otherwise, by total ordering,  $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{F}_\beta$  and if  $\mathcal{C}\{x\} \notin \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ , then  $\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{F}_\beta$ , a contradiction. Thus  $\mathcal{C}\{x\} \in \cap \{\mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$  and so  $(X, \cap \{\mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

**COROLLARY 5.4.** *For  $\mathcal{F}$  any topology on  $X$ , there is a topology  $\mathcal{U}$  on  $X$  such that:*

- (a)  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}$
- (b)  $(X, \mathcal{U})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

and

- (c) *If  $(X, \mathcal{V})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  for  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$ , then  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U}$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $\alpha = \{\mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$  be the indexed family of all  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topologies on  $X$  finer than  $\mathcal{F}$ . We note that  $\alpha \neq \phi$  since the discrete topology is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Moreover, if  $\{\mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta^*\}$  is a subset of  $\alpha$  totally ordered with respect to inclusion, then  $\mathcal{F}^* = \cap \{\mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta^*\}$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  with  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}^*$ . Thus  $\mathcal{F}^* \in \alpha$  and by Zorn's Lemma,  $\alpha$  contains a minimal element  $\mathcal{U}$  which satisfies properties (a)-(c) above.

**6. Minimal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topologies**

**REMARK 6.1.** Letting  $\mathcal{F}$  be the indiscrete topology in Corollary 5.4, we see that on any set  $X$  there is at least one topology minimal with respect to the

property of being  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

We shall determine the structure of such topologies, although the cases where  $X$  is infinite and  $X$  is finite must be treated separately. Some lemmas are necessary:

LEMMA 6.2. *Suppose  $X$  contains more than one point and  $\mathcal{F}$  is the discrete topology on  $X$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is not a minimal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topology on  $X$ .*

PROOF. Fix  $x \neq y$  in  $X$  and define the  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topology  $\mathcal{U} = \{U: U = \emptyset \text{ or } x \in U\} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}$ .

LEMMA 6.3. *Let  $X$  be finite with  $(X, \mathcal{U}) T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Suppose there is a  $c \in X$  such that  $\{c\}$  is closed and  $\{x \in X: \{x\} \in \mathcal{U}\} \subset \{c\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is discrete.*

PROOF.  $\{c\}$  is closed, and for  $x \neq c$ ,  $\{x\} \notin \mathcal{U}$  and thus  $\{x\}$  is closed by Theorem 2.5. It follows that  $(X, \mathcal{U})$  is  $T_1$  and thus discrete.

LEMMA 6.4. *Let  $X \neq \emptyset$  with  $A \subset X$  and define  $\mathcal{U} = \{U: U \subset A, \text{ or } A \subset U \text{ and } \mathcal{C}U \text{ is finite}\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is a  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topology on  $X$ .*

PROOF. Apply Theorem 2.5.

LEMMA 6.5. *Suppose  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is a minimal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -space where  $X$  contains more than one point. Define*

$$A = \{x: \{x\} \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \mathcal{C}\{x\} \notin \mathcal{F}\}$$

$$B = \{x: \{x\} \notin \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \mathcal{C}\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

$$C = \{x: \{x\} \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \mathcal{C}\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

Then:

(a)  $X = A \cup B \cup C$

(b)  $B \neq \emptyset$

and

(c)  $C = \emptyset$

PROOF.

(a) This is a restatement of Theorem 2.5.

(b) If  $B = \emptyset$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  is discrete, contradicting Lemma 6.2.

(c) Suppose  $c \in C$  and let  $A^* = (A \cup C) \setminus \{c\}$ .

Defining  $\mathcal{U} = \{U: U \subset A^*, \text{ or } A^* \subset U \text{ and } \mathcal{C}U \text{ is finite}\}$ , we conclude from Lemma 6.4 that  $(X, \mathcal{U})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and assert that  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{F}$ . For, if  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $U \subset A^*$ , then  $U = \cup \{\{x\}: x \in A^* \cap U\} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Alternately, if  $U \not\subset A^*$ , then  $A^* \subset U$  with  $\mathcal{C}U = \{x_1, \dots,$

$x_n$ . But for each  $i$ ,  $x_i \notin A^*$  and thus either  $x_i = c$  or  $\{x_i\} \notin \mathcal{F}$ . In either case,  $\{x_i\}$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -closed and so  $U = \bigcap \{\mathcal{C}\{x_i\} : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{F}$  and, by minimality,  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{F}$ . Since  $\{c\} \in \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{U}$ , either  $\{c\} \subset A^*$  or  $A^* \subset \{c\}$  with  $\mathcal{C}\{c\}$  finite. The first possibility is dismissed by the definition of  $A^*$ . In the second case, we conclude  $X$  is finite and  $A^* = \phi$ . Thus  $\{x : \{x\} \in \mathcal{U}\} = \{x : \{x\} \in \mathcal{F}\} = A \cup \mathcal{C}\{c\}$ . By Lemma 6.3,  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{F}$  is discrete, contradicting Lemma 6.2. We thus reject the original hypothesis that  $C \neq \phi$ .

**THEOREM 6.6.** *Suppose  $X$  is an infinite set. Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is a minimal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topology on  $X$  iff there is an  $A \subsetneq X$  such that  $\mathcal{F} = \{O : O \subset A, \text{ or } A \subset O \text{ and } \mathcal{C}O \text{ is finite}\}$ .*

**PROOF.** Necessity: Suppose  $\mathcal{F}$  is minimal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and define  $A$  and  $B$  as in Lemma 6.5. Then  $X = A \cup B$  with  $A \subsetneq X$ . Define  $\mathcal{U} = \{O : O \subset A, \text{ or } A \subset O \text{ and } \mathcal{C}O \text{ is finite}\}$ . Then  $(X, \mathcal{U})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  by Lemma 6.4 and we need only show  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{U}$ . But, if  $O \in \mathcal{U}$ , either  $O \subset A$  or  $A \subset O$  with  $\mathcal{C}O$  finite. In the first case,  $O \in \mathcal{F}$  clearly. Otherwise,  $\mathcal{C}O = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  with  $x_i \in B$  for all  $i$ , proving  $O = \bigcap \{\mathcal{C}\{x_i\} : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{F}$ , and by minimality it follows that  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{F}$ .

Sufficiency: If  $\mathcal{F} = \{O : O \subset A, \text{ or } A \subset O \text{ and } \mathcal{C}O \text{ is finite}\}$  for some  $A \subsetneq X$ , then  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and we must show minimality. Suppose  $(X, \mathcal{U})$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  with  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{F}$ . Define  $A^* \subset X$  by  $A^* = \{x : \{x\} \in \mathcal{U}\}$ . We assert that  $A = A^*$ . For, if  $x \in A^*$ ,  $\{x\} \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{F}$  and thus either  $\{x\} \subset A$  or  $A \subset \{x\}$  with  $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$  finite. The latter possibility is dismissed since  $X$  is infinite. Thus  $x \in A$  and  $A^* \subset A$ . Conversely, suppose  $x \in A$  but  $x \notin A^*$ . Then  $\{x\} \notin \mathcal{U}$  and so  $\mathcal{C}\{x\} \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{F}$ . Consequently, either  $\mathcal{C}\{x\} \subset A$  or  $A \subset \mathcal{C}\{x\}$ . In the first case,  $X = \{x\} \cup \mathcal{C}\{x\} \subset A \subsetneq X$ , while in the second case,  $x \in A \subset \mathcal{C}\{x\}$  and both are contradictions. We conclude  $A = A^*$ . But now, for  $O \in \mathcal{F}$ , if  $O \subset A$ , then  $O \subset A^*$  implies  $O \in \mathcal{U}$ . Otherwise,  $A \subset O$  with  $\mathcal{C}O = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ . Then for each  $i$ ,  $\{x_i\} \notin A = A^*$  and so  $\mathcal{C}\{x_i\} \in \mathcal{U}$ , implying  $O \in \mathcal{U}$ . Thus  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}$  and it follows that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a minimal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topology.

**REMARK 6.7.** The previous result shows that the minimal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topologies are composed of some "very small" open sets (the subsets of  $A$ ) and some "very large" ones (supersets of  $A$  with finite complements). A similar result for finite  $X$  requires only a minor modification:

**THEOREM 6.8.** *Suppose  $X$  is a finite set containing more than one point. Then*

$\mathcal{T}$  is a minimal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topology on  $X$  iff there is an  $\phi \neq A \subsetneq X$  such that  $\mathcal{T} = \{O: O \subset A \text{ or } A \subset O\}$ .

PROOF. Necessity: Again define  $A$  and  $B$  as in Lemma 6.5 and note that if  $A = \phi$ ,  $\mathcal{T}$  is cofinite and thus discrete, a contradiction. The remainder of the necessary condition follows exactly as in Theorem 6.6.

Sufficiency: Suppose that for some  $\phi \neq A \subsetneq X$ ,  $\mathcal{T} = \{O: O \subset A \text{ or } A \subset O\}$ . As in the previous theorem, let  $(X, \mathcal{U})$  be  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  with  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{T}$  and define  $A^* = \{x: \{x\} \in \mathcal{U}\}$ . We assert  $A^* \subset A$ . For if  $x \in A^*$ ,  $\{x\} \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{T}$  and thus either  $\{x\} \subset A$  or  $\phi \neq A \subset \{x\}$ . In either case,  $x \in A$  and so  $A^* \subset A$ . We now prove  $A \subset A^*$  and the minimality of  $\mathcal{T}$  exactly as in Theorem 6.6.

COROLLARY 6.9. *If  $\mathcal{T}$  is a minimal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topology on  $X$ , then  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is compact and connected.*

PROOF. The result follows directly from the two previous theorems.

### 7. Maximal $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ topologies

REMARK. 7.1. Fröhlich [1] defines an ultratopology to be a maximal, non-discrete topology and derives a structure theorem for ultratopologies which is used by Girhinny [2] to prove that each ultratopology is a door space (see Definition 2.4). We can thus prove:

THEOREM 7.2.  *$\mathcal{T}$  is a maximal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topology on  $X$  iff  $\mathcal{T}$  is an ultratopology.*

PROOF. Necessity: If  $\mathcal{T}$  is maximal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\mathcal{T} \subsetneq \mathcal{U}$ , then  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  by Theorem 5.1, and thus  $\mathcal{U}$  is discrete.

Sufficiency: If  $\mathcal{T}$  is an ultratopology, then  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is a door space and is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  by Corollary 2.7. Hence  $\mathcal{T}$  is a maximal  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  topology on  $X$ .

Hanover College

### REFERENCES

- [1] Fröhlich, O., *Das Halbordnungssystem der Topologischen Räume auf einer Menge*, Mathematische Annalen, Vol. 156 (1964), pp. 79-95.
- [2] Girhinny, J., *Minimal and Maximal Topologies*, McMaster Mathematical Report



No. 32 (1970).

- [3] Kelley, J., *General Topology*. Van Nostrand, New York, 1955.
- [4] Levine, N., *Generalized Closed Sets in Topology*, Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo, Vol. 19 (1970), pp.89-96.
- [5] Thron, W., *Topological Structures*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1966.