

## SOBRIETY VIA $\theta$ -OPEN SETS

BY

M. CALDAS, S. JAFARI and R.M LATIF

**Abstract.** SÜNDERHAUF studied the important notion of sobriety in terms of nets. In this paper, by the same token, we present and study the notion of  $\theta$ -sobriety by utilizing the notion of  $\theta$ -open sets.

**Mathematics Subject Classification 2000:** 54B05, 54C08, 54D05.

**Key words:**  $\theta$ -open,  $\theta$ -closed,  $\theta$ -compact space,  $\theta$ -sobriety.

**1. Introduction.** In 1943, FOMIN [4] (see, also [5]) introduced the notion of  $\theta$ -continuity. The notions of  $\theta$ -open subsets,  $\theta$ -closed subsets and  $\theta$ -closure were introduced by VELIČKO [11] for the purpose of studying the important class of  $H$ -closed spaces in terms of arbitrary filterbases. DICKMAN and PORTER [2], [3], JOSEPH [7] continued the work of Veličko. Recently NOIRI and JAFARI [9] have also obtained several new and interesting results related to these sets.

In what follows  $(X, \tau)$  and  $(Y, \sigma)$  (or  $X$  and  $Y$ ) denote topological spaces. Let  $A$  be a subset of  $X$ . We denote the interior and the closure of a set  $A$  by  $Int(A)$  and  $Cl(A)$ , respectively. A point  $x \in X$  is called a  $\theta$ -cluster point of  $A$  if  $A \cap Cl(U) \neq \emptyset$  for every open set  $U$  of  $X$  containing  $x$ . The set of all  $\theta$ -cluster points of  $A$  is called the  $\theta$ -closure of  $A$ . A subset  $A$  is called  $\theta$ -closed if  $A$  and its  $\theta$ -closure coincide. The complement of a  $\theta$ -closed set is called  $\theta$ -open. We denote the collection of all  $\theta$ -open sets by  $\theta(X, \tau)$ . It is shown in [8] that the collection of  $\theta$ -open sets in a space  $X$  form a topology denoted by  $\tau_\theta$ . A topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is called  $\theta$ -compact [6] if every cover of the space by  $\theta$ -open sets has a finite subcover. We denote the filter of  $\theta$ -open neighbourhoods [1] of some point  $x$  in  $X$  by  $\Omega_\theta(x)$ .

**Definition 1.** A function  $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$  is called  $\theta$ -continuous if for each  $x \in X$  and each  $V$  in  $Y$  containing  $f(x)$ , there exists an open set  $U$  in  $X$  containing  $x$  such that  $f(Cl(U)) \subset Cl(V)$ .

**Definition 2.** Two topological spaces  $(X, \tau)$  and  $(Y, \sigma)$  are  $\theta$ -homeomorphic [11] if there exists a one-to-one and onto function  $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$  such that  $f$  and  $f^{-1}$  are both  $\theta$ -continuous.

## 2. $\theta$ -sobriety

**Definition 3.** A space  $(X, \tau)$  is said to be  $\theta$ -sober if it is  $\theta$ -homeomorphic with the space of points of its frame of  $\theta$ -open sets.

Recall that the  $\theta$ -saturated set and the  $\theta$ -kernel of a set  $A$  [1] are the same, i.e.  $\bigcap \{O \in \theta(X, \tau) \mid A \subset O\}$ .

$\theta$ -sobriety implies the existence of LUB(= least upper bound) of subsets which are directed with respect to the order of  $\theta$ -specialization, i.e. if  $(X, \tau)$  is a topological space, then the order of  $\theta$ -specialization of  $X$  is defined by  $x \leq_r y \Leftrightarrow x \in Cl_\theta(\{y\})$ .

**Theorem 1.** Let  $X$  be a  $\theta$ -sober space for which finite intersection of  $\theta$ -compact  $\theta$ -saturated subsets are  $\theta$ -compact.

(1) Every cover of a  $\theta$ -compact set by  $\theta$ -open sets contains a finite sub-cover.

(2) If the intersection of  $\theta$ -compact  $\theta$ -saturated sets is contained in a  $\theta$ -open set, then the same is true for an intersection of finitely many of them.

Now we offer a new notion called  $\theta$ -observative net by which we characterize  $\theta$ -sobriety.

**Definition 4.** A net  $(x_i)_i \in I$  on a space  $X$  is  $\theta$ -observative if for all  $i \in I$  and for all  $U \in \theta(X, \tau)$  we have that  $x_i \in U$  implies that the net is eventually in the set  $U$ .

Recall that a filter base  $\mathcal{F}$  is called  $\theta$ -convergent [12] to a point  $x$  in  $X$  if for any open set  $U$  containing  $x$  there exists  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $B \subset Cl(U)$ .

**Definition 5.** A  $\theta$ -observative  $(x_i)_i \in I$  strongly  $\theta$ -converges to a point  $x$  in  $X$  if it  $\theta$ -converges to  $x$  with respect to  $\theta(X, \tau)$ , and also if it satisfies that  $x$  is an element of every  $\theta$ -open set which eventually contains the net. We denote it by  $x_i \xrightarrow{\theta} x$ .

**Lemma 1.** *If  $(x_i)_i \in I$  is a  $\theta$ -observative net on a space  $(X, \tau)$ , then  $x_i \xrightarrow{\theta} x$  if and only if  $x_i \longrightarrow x$  with respect to the  $\tau_\theta$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $x_i \xrightarrow{\theta} x$  and  $x \in A$  for some  $\theta$ -closed set  $A$ . If the net is not eventually contained in  $A$ , then it is frequently in the  $\theta$ -open set  $X - A$ . By hypothesis, the net is  $\theta$ -observative and therefore  $[x]_{\geq i} \subseteq X - A$  for some tail. Hence  $x \in X - A$  as a consequence of strong  $\theta$ -convergence. But this is a contradiction and hence the claim.

Now suppose that  $x_i \longrightarrow x$  with respect to the  $\tau_\theta$ . Then a  $\theta$ -open set which eventually contains the net but does not contain  $x$  establishes a  $\theta$ -neighbourhood  $X - U$  of  $x$  which has been forgotten by the net. Therefore strong  $\theta$ -convergence follows readily.  $\square$

Here we establish the  $\theta$ -derived filter  $\mathcal{F}(x)\mathcal{I}$  for a net  $(x_i)_i \in I$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}(x)\mathcal{I} = \{U \in \theta(X, \tau) \mid \exists i \in I \cdot [x]_{\geq i} \subseteq U\}.$$

**Definition 6.** *A filter  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \tau$  is called  $\theta$ -completely prime if for every  $O \in \mathcal{F}$  and for any family of  $\theta$ -open sets  $(O_i)_{i \in I}$  such that  $O \subseteq \bigcup_I O_i$ , then  $O_k \in \mathcal{F}$  for some  $k \in I$ .*

**Theorem 2.** *A filter derived from a  $\theta$ -observative is  $\theta$ -completely prime.*

**Proof.** Let the net  $(x_i)_i \in I$  be a  $\theta$ -observative and  $[x]_{\geq i} \subseteq \bigcup_{j \in J} U_j$  for some collection of  $\theta$ -open sets and some index  $i \in I$ . Hence  $x_i \in \bigcup_{j \in J} U_j$ . Therefore there is some  $j_0 \in J$  with  $x_j \in U_{j_0}$ . Since the net is  $\theta$ -observative, then it follows that some tail is contained in  $U_{j_0}$ . Thus the set is a filter.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.** *If  $(x_i)_i \in I$  is a  $\theta$ -observative net, then  $x_i \xrightarrow{\theta} x$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}(x)\mathcal{I} = \Omega_\theta(x)$ .*

**Proof.** Since  $(x_i)_i \in I$  strongly  $\theta$ -converges to  $x$  if and only if it is the case that  $x \in U$  is equivalent to the existence of some  $i \in I$  with  $[x]_{\geq i} \subseteq U$ .

But how can we deal with the situation where a space is  $\theta$ -sober if all its  $\theta$ -observative nets strongly  $\theta$ -converge?

In such situation, we need the following construction:

Assign to each  $\theta$ -completely prime filter  $\mathcal{F}$  a  $\theta$ -observative net such that  $\mathcal{F}(x)\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{F}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a filter of  $\theta$ -open subsets of the space  $(X, \tau)$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\theta$ -completely prime if and only if for all  $U \in \mathcal{F}$ , there exists  $x \in U$  with the property that  $x \in G$  implies  $G \in \mathcal{F}$  for every  $G \in \theta(X, \tau)$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  has this property and  $\bigcup_{j \in J} U_j \in \mathcal{F}$ . Take  $x \in \bigcup_{j \in J} U_j$  with  $x \in G \Rightarrow G \in \mathcal{F}$ . Clearly,  $x \in U_{j_0}$  for some  $j_0 \in J$ . Therefore  $U_{j_0} \in \mathcal{F}$ . This means that the filter is  $\theta$ -completely prime. Conversely, assume that  $U \in \mathcal{F}$  has not this property. It follows that for each  $x \in U$ , this is  $G_x \in \theta(X, \tau)$  with  $G_x \notin \mathcal{F}$ . Put  $U_x := G_x \cap U$ . Now we have  $U_x \notin \mathcal{F}$  for all  $x \in U$  and  $U = \bigcup_{x \in U} U_x \in \mathcal{F}$ . But this is against our hypothesis that  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\theta$ -completely prime and hence the claim.  $\square$

Now we give a new appropriate construction. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $\theta$ -completely prime filter of  $\theta$ -open sets on  $(X, \tau)$ . Take  $\mathcal{F}$  with reserved set inclusion as order to be the index set of our net. If  $U \in \mathcal{F}$ , pick  $x_U \in U$  with the property that  $x_U \in G$  implies  $G \in \mathcal{F}$ . This is possible by the above Theorem. A net established in this way is called a  $\theta$ -derived net from the filter.

**Lemma 2.** *A  $\theta$ -derived net from a  $\theta$ -completely prime filter is  $\theta$ -observative.*

**Proof.** Let  $U \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $x_u \in G$ . Then  $G \in \mathcal{F}$  by choice of  $x_U$ . If  $V \subseteq G$ , then  $x_v \in V \subseteq G$ . Hence  $[x]_{\geq i} \subseteq G$ . Therefore the net is  $\theta$ -observative.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.** *Every  $\theta$ -completely prime filter equals the  $\theta$ -derived filter of any of its  $\theta$ -derived nets.*

**Proof.** Clearly,  $[x]_{\geq i} \subseteq U$  for  $U \in \mathcal{F}$ . Thus  $U \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \mathcal{F}(x)\mathcal{U}$ . Conversely,  $U \in \mathcal{F}(x)\mathcal{U} \Rightarrow [x]_{\geq i} \subseteq U$  for some  $G \in \mathcal{F}$ . Therefore,  $x_U \in U$  which implies that  $U \in \mathcal{F}$  by choice of  $x_G$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.** *A topological space is  $\theta$ -sober if and only if every  $\theta$ -observative net strongly  $\theta$ -converges to a unique point.*

**Proof.** Obvious.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

1. CALDAS, M.; JAFARI, S.; NOIRI, T. – *Weak separation axioms via Veličko's  $\theta$ -open sets and  $\theta$ -closure operator*, Seminário Brasileiro de Análise, Instituto de Matemática Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niterói, 56 (2002), 657–663.
2. DICKMAN, R.F., JR.; PORTER, J.R. –  *$\theta$ -closed subsets of Hausdorff spaces*, Pacific J. Math., 59 (1975), 407–415.

3. DICKMAN, R.F., JR.; PORTER, J.R. –  *$\theta$ -perfect and  $\theta$ -absolutely closed functions*, Illinois J. Math., 21 (1977), 42–60.
4. FOMIN, S. – *Extensions of topological spaces*, Ann. of Math., 44 (1943), 471–480.
5. ILIADIS, S.; FOMIN, S. – *The method of concentric systems in the theory of topological spaces*, (Russian) Uspehi Mat. Nauk, 21 (1966), 47–76.
6. JAFARI, S. – *Some properties of quasi  $\theta$ -continuous functions*, Far East J. Math. Sci., 6 (1998), 689–696.
7. JOSEPH, J.E. –  *$\theta$ -closure and  $\theta$ -subclosed graphs*, Math. Chronicle, 8 (1979), 99–117.
8. LONG, P.E.; HERRINGTON, L.L. – *The  $T_\theta$ -topology and faintly continuous functions*, Kyungpook Math. J., 22 (1982), 7–14.
9. NOIRI, T.; JAFARI, S. – *Properties of  $(\theta, s)$ -continuous functions*, Proceedings of the Janos Bolyai Mathematical Society 8th International Topology Conference (Gyula, 1998), Topology Appl., 123 (2002), 167–179.
10. SÜNDERHAUF, P. – *Sobriety in terms of nets*, Appl. Categ. Structures, 8 (2000), 649–653.
11. VELIČKO, N.V. – *H-closed topological spaces*, (Russian) Mat. Sb. (N.S.), 70 (1966), 98–112.
12. VELIČKO, N.V. – *On extension of mappings of topological spaces*, Amer. Math. Soc. Trans., 92 (1970), 41–47.

Received: 30.V.2008

*Departamento de Matemática Aplicada,  
Universidade Federal Fluminense,  
Rua Mario Santos Braga, s/n, 24020-140, Niterói, RJ,  
BRASIL  
gmamccs@vm.uff.br*

*College of Vestsjaelland South,  
Herrestaede 11, 4200 Slagelse,  
DENMARK  
jafari@stofanet.dk*

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics,  
King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals,  
Dhahran 31261,  
SAUDI ARABIA  
raja@kfupm.edu.sa*

