

A NEW CLOSURE OPERATOR FOR NON- T_1 TOPOLOGIES

By William Dunham

1. Introduction

The concept of a generalized closed (g -closed) subset of a topological space was introduced by Norman Levine in [6] and has been discussed in papers appearing in this, and other, journals (see [1], [4], and [5]). In the short note which follows, we shall use the g -closed subsets of a space (X, \mathcal{F}) to define a new closure operator, and thus a new topology \mathcal{F}^* , on the space and shall examine some of the properties of this new topology, with emphasis on the transfer of "regularity" conditions on (X, \mathcal{F}) to "separation" conditions on (X, \mathcal{F}^*) .

2. Preliminaries

DEFINITION 2.1 (Levine [6]). In a topological space (X, \mathcal{F}) , a subset A is g -closed if $c(A) \subseteq O$ whenever $A \subseteq O \in \mathcal{F}$ (here c denotes the closure operator in (X, \mathcal{F})).

THEOREM 2.2. For each $x \in X$, either $\{x\}$ is closed or $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$ is g -closed (\mathcal{C} denotes the complement operator).

PROOF. If $\{x\}$ is not closed, then the only open superset of $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$ is X itself. Thus the closure of $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$ is contained in each of its neighborhoods and $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$ is g -closed.

THEOREM 2.3 (Levine [6]). The union of two g -closed sets is g -closed.

PROOF. The proof is immediate.

DEFINITION 2.4 (Levine [6]). A topological space is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ if every g -closed set is closed.

REMARK 2.5. Levine proves in [6] that every T_1 -space is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and every $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ space is T_0 , although neither implication is reversible. In [4] Dunham establishes the following characterization:

THEOREM 2.6. (X, \mathcal{F}) is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ iff every singleton in X is either open or closed iff every subset of X is the intersection of all open sets and all closed sets containing it.

3. The generalized closure operator

DEFINITION 3.1. For a space (X, \mathcal{F}) , let $\mathcal{D} = \{A : A \subseteq X \text{ and } A \text{ is } g\text{-closed}\}$.

DEFINITION 3.2. For any $E \subseteq X$, define $c^*(E) = \bigcap \{A : E \subseteq A \in \mathcal{D}\}$.

LEMMA 3.3. If $E \subseteq X$, then $E \subseteq c^*(E) \subseteq c(E)$.

PROOF. A closed set is g -closed.

REMARK 3.4. Both containment relations in the previous lemma may be proper. Consider $X = \{a, b, c\}$ with topology $\mathcal{F} = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{a, b\}, X\}$. Then $c^*(\{a\}) = \{a, c\}$ since the only g -closed supersets of $\{a\}$ are $\{a, c\}$ and X , while $c(\{a\}) = X$. That is, $\{a\} \subsetneq c^*(\{a\}) \subsetneq c(\{a\})$.

THEOREM 3.5. c^* is a Kuratowski closure operator on X .

PROOF. (i) $c^*(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and $E \subseteq c^*(E)$ follow from Lemma 3.3.

(ii) If $E_1 \cup E_2 \subseteq A \in \mathcal{D}$, then $E_i \subseteq A$ and so $c^*(E_i) \subseteq A$ for $i=1, 2$. Thus $c^*(E_1) \cup c^*(E_2) \subseteq \bigcap \{A : E_1 \cup E_2 \subseteq A \in \mathcal{D}\} = c^*(E_1 \cup E_2)$. Conversely, we assert that $c^*(E_1 \cup E_2) \subseteq c^*(E_1) \cup c^*(E_2)$. For, if there is an $x \in c^*(E_1 \cup E_2)$ with $x \notin c^*(E_1) \cup c^*(E_2)$, then there are g -closed sets A_1 and A_2 with $E_1 \subseteq A_1$, $E_2 \subseteq A_2$, and $x \notin A_1 \cup A_2$. But then $E_1 \cup E_2 \subseteq A_1 \cup A_2$, a g -closed set by Theorem 2.3, contradicting $x \in c^*(E_1 \cup E_2)$. We conclude that $c^*(E_1 \cup E_2) = c^*(E_1) \cup c^*(E_2)$.

(iii) Finally, if $E \subseteq A \in \mathcal{D}$, then $c^*(E) \subseteq A$ and $c^*(c^*(E)) \subseteq A$ by definition of c^* . Hence $c^*(c^*(E)) \subseteq \bigcap \{A : E \subseteq A \in \mathcal{D}\} = c^*(E)$.

By (i)-(iii), c^* is a closure operator on X .

DEFINITION 3.6. Let \mathcal{F}^* be the topology on X generated by c^* in the usual manner. That is, $\mathcal{F}^* = \{O^* : c^*(\mathcal{C}O^*) = \mathcal{C}O^*\}$.

THEOREM 3.7. $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*$ with equality iff (X, \mathcal{F}) is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$.

PROOF. If E is \mathcal{F} -closed, $E \subseteq c^*(E) \subseteq c(E)$ implies that E is \mathcal{F}^* -closed. Thus $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*$. Further, suppose $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^*$ and let $A \subseteq X$ be g -closed in (X, \mathcal{F}) . Then $A = c^*(A)$ and so A is closed in $\mathcal{F}^* = \mathcal{F}$. Thus (X, \mathcal{F}) is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Conversely, if (X, \mathcal{F}) is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$, its closed sets and g -closed sets coincide and so $c = c^*$.

Hence $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^*$.

THEOREM 3.8. For any space (X, \mathcal{F}) , $x \neq y$ implies $c^*(x) \neq c^*(y)$.

PROOF. If $\{x\}$ is closed, $y \notin \{x\} = c\{x\} = c^*(x)$. Otherwise, $y \in \mathcal{C}\{x\}$, a g -closed set by Theorem 2.2. Thus $y \in c^*(y) \subseteq \mathcal{C}\{x\}$, and so $x \notin c^*(y)$.

REMARK 3.9. The previous result shows that (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is always T_0 . In fact, we can establish a stronger result:

THEOREM 3.10. For any space (X, \mathcal{F}) , (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$.

PROOF. If $\{x\}$ is \mathcal{F} -closed, $\{x\}$ is \mathcal{F}^* -closed as well. Otherwise, $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$ is g -closed and so $c^*(\mathcal{C}\{x\}) = \mathcal{C}\{x\}$, which implies that $\{x\}$ is \mathcal{F}^* -open. By Theorem 2.6, (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$.

REMARK 3.11. Based on the conclusion of Theorem 3.10, we shall designate \mathcal{F}^* as the " $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ extension" of \mathcal{F} . We deduce immediately:

COROLLARY 3.12. For any topology, $(\mathcal{F}^*)^* = \mathcal{F}^*$.

PROOF. (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and thus $(\mathcal{F}^*)^* = \mathcal{F}^*$ by Theorem 3.7.

4. Some properties of the $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ extension

EXAMPLE 4.1. The $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ extension process does not necessarily preserve nor reverse the inclusion of topologies. Consider $X = \{a, b\}$ with $\mathcal{F} = \{\phi, X\}$ and $\mathcal{U} = \{\phi, \{a\}, X\}$. Then \mathcal{F}^* is discrete and $\mathcal{U}^* = \mathcal{U}$ (since (X, \mathcal{U}) is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$), and thus $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ while $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*$. However, if we now let \mathcal{V} be the discrete topology on X , then $\mathcal{V}^* = \mathcal{V}$ and so $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ while $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{V}^*$.

REMARK 4.2. The difficulty encountered in the previous example results from the fact that the $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ extension of both the discrete and indiscrete topology is discrete. We characterize discreteness of (X, \mathcal{F}^*) in:

THEOREM 4.3. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (a) (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is discrete.
- (b) For each $x \in X$, $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$ is g -closed in (X, \mathcal{F}) .
- (c) If $\{x\}$ is \mathcal{F} -closed, $\{x\}$ is \mathcal{F} -open.

PROOF. (a) implies (b): If (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is discrete then, for each x , $\mathcal{C}\{x\} = c^*(\mathcal{C}\{x\}) = \bigcap \{A : \mathcal{C}\{x\} \subseteq A \in \mathcal{D}\}$. It follows that $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$ is itself g -closed in (X, \mathcal{F}) .

(b) implies (c): Suppose $\{x\}$ is \mathcal{F} -closed. Then $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$ is \mathcal{F} -open and so $c(\mathcal{C}\{x\}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}\{x\}$ by assumption (b). Hence, $\{x\}$ is \mathcal{F} -open as well.

(c) implies (a): If $\{x\}$ is \mathcal{F} -closed, $\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}$ and thus $\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}^*$ by Theorem 3.7. If $\{x\}$ is not \mathcal{F} -closed, $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$ is g -closed by Theorem 2.2 and again $\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}^*$.

EXAMPLE 4.4. Let X be an uncountable set with $\mathcal{F} = \{\emptyset, X\}$. Then (X, \mathcal{F}) is compact, connected, and second axiom, while (X, \mathcal{F}^*) , being discrete by Theorem 4.3, shares none of these properties.

REMARK 4.5. The final results of this paper will show that, as we put stronger "regularity" conditions on (X, \mathcal{F}) , we induce stronger "separation" properties on (X, \mathcal{F}^*) . We first recall two definitions:

DEFINITION 4.6 (Davis [2]). (X, \mathcal{F}) is an R_0 -space if $x \in O \in \mathcal{F}$ implies $c(x) \subseteq O$ (i.e., singletons are g -closed).

DEFINITION 4.7 (see Dunham [3]). (X, \mathcal{F}) is weakly Hausdorff if $c(x) = c(y)$ whenever there is a net $S : D \rightarrow X$ with $\lim S = x$ and $\lim S = y$.

REMARK 4.8. It is proved in [3] that any regular space is weakly Hausdorff and any weakly Hausdorff space is R_0 , although neither implication is reversible.

THEOREM 4.9. If (X, \mathcal{F}) is R_0 , then (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is T_1 .

PROOF. If $x \in X$, $\{x\}$ is g -closed and so $c^*(x) = \{x\}$.

THEOREM 4.10. If (X, \mathcal{F}) is weakly Hausdorff, then (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is T_2 .

PROOF. Let $S : D \rightarrow X$ be a net such that $\lim S = x$ and $\lim S = y$ in (X, \mathcal{F}^*) . We assert that $x = y$. For, by Theorem 3.7, $\lim S = x$ and $\lim S = y$ in (X, \mathcal{F}) , a weakly Hausdorff space, and thus $c(x) = c(y)$. So, if either $\{x\}$ or $\{y\}$ is \mathcal{F} -closed, then $x = y$. If neither $\{x\}$ nor $\{y\}$ is \mathcal{F} -closed, then both $\mathcal{C}\{x\}$ and $\mathcal{C}\{y\}$ are g -closed by Theorem 2.2 and thus $\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}^*$ and $\{y\} \in \mathcal{F}^*$. But then the net S is eventually in $\{x\} \cap \{y\} \in \mathcal{F}^*$ and so $x = y$. It follows that (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is T_2 .

THEOREM 4.11. If (X, \mathcal{F}) is regular, then (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is T_3 (regular and T_1).

PROOF. Since (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$, it suffices to prove regularity. Let $x \notin F^*$, where F^* is \mathcal{F}^* -closed.

CASE 1. Suppose $\{x\}$ is \mathcal{F} -closed. Since $x \notin F^* = c^*(F^*)$, $x \notin A$ for some $A \supseteq F^*$ with A g -closed in (X, \mathcal{F}) . But then $A \subseteq \mathcal{C}\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}$ and so $c(A) \subseteq \mathcal{C}\{x\}$. Thus

$x \notin c(A)$ in the regular space (X, \mathcal{F}) , and so there are disjoint open sets O_1 and O_2 in \mathcal{F} with $x \in O_1$ and $c(A) \subseteq O_2$. Hence $x \in O_1 \in \mathcal{F}^*$ and $F^* \subseteq A \subseteq c(A) \subseteq O_2 \in \mathcal{F}^*$ with $O_1 \cap O_2 = \phi$.

CASE 2. Suppose now that $\{x\}$ is not \mathcal{F} -closed. By Theorem 2.2, $\mathcal{E}\{x\}$ is g -closed and thus $\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}^*$. We assert that $F^* \subseteq \mathcal{E}c^*(x)$ and thus choose $y \in F^*$ arbitrary. If $\{y\}$ is \mathcal{F} -closed, $x \notin \{y\}$ implies, by regularity of (X, \mathcal{F}) , that there exist O_1 and O_2 with $x \in O_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\{y\} \subseteq O_2 \in \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*$ with $O_1 \cap O_2 = \phi$, and so $y \in \mathcal{E}c^*(x)$; otherwise, if $\{y\}$ is not \mathcal{F} -closed, we have, by Theorem 2.2, $y \in \{y\} \in \mathcal{F}^*$ with $\{y\} \cap \{x\} = \phi$, and again $y \in \mathcal{E}c^*(x)$. This establishes the assertion that $F^* \subseteq \mathcal{E}c^*(x)$. But then $x \in \{x\} \in \mathcal{F}^*$ and $F^* \subseteq \mathcal{E}c^*(x) \in \mathcal{F}^*$ with $\{x\} \cap \mathcal{E}c^*(x) = \phi$.

By cases (1) and (2), (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is regular and the theorem is proved.

REMARK 4.12. We summarize the results concerning the transfer of properties from (X, \mathcal{F}) to (X, \mathcal{F}^*) in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 (X, \mathcal{F}) : & \text{regular} & \longrightarrow & \text{weakly Hausdorff} & \longrightarrow & R_0 & \longrightarrow & \text{arbitrary} \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 (X, \mathcal{F}^*) : & T_3 & \longrightarrow & T_2 & \longrightarrow & T_1 & \longrightarrow & T_{\frac{1}{2}}
 \end{array}$$

EXAMPLE 4.13. Converses of the three previous theorems fail. For if $X = \{a, b, c\}$ with $\mathcal{F} = \{\phi, \{a\}, X\}$, then (X, \mathcal{F}^*) is discrete by Theorem 4.3, while (X, \mathcal{F}) is not even R_0 since $\{a\}$ is not g -closed.

The author wishes to express his appreciation to the Research Committee of Hanover College for funding the preparation of this paper.

Department of Mathematics
 Hanover College
 Hanover, Indiana 47243
 U. S. A.

REFERENCES

[1] Agashe, P. and Levine, N. *Adjacent topologies*, J. Math Tokushima Univ., Vol. 7(1973), pp.21-35.

- [2] Davis, A.S. *Indexed systems of neighborhoods for general topological spaces*, Amer. Math Monthly, Vol.68(1961), pp.886–893.
- [3] Dunham, W. *Weakly Hausdorff spaces*, Kyungpook Math. J., Vol.15 (1975), pp.41–50.
- [4] Dunham, W. $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -*spaces*, Kyungpook Math J., Vol.17(1977), pp.161–169.
- [5] Dunham, W. and Levine, N. *Further results on generalized closed sets in topology*, Kyungpook Math. J., Vol.20 (1980)
- [6] Levine, N. *Generalized closed sets in topology*, Rendiconti del Circ Math Palermo, Vol.19(1970), pp.89–96.