PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 83, No. 1, 1979

ON THE SOBRIFICATION REMAINDER ${}^sX - X$

RUDOLF-E. HOFFMANN

The topics of this paper are (1) a study of the sobrification remainder ${}^sX - X$ (hence our title), (2) a new, simple proof of the characterization of T_D-spaces Y as those spaces Y such that Y is the smallest subspace X of ${}^sY$ for which the embedding $X \hookrightarrow {}^sY$ is the universal sobrification, (3) an elegant characterization of Noetherian sober spaces. These themes are linked by the common tool by aid of which they are investigated, the so-called b-topology L. Skula [28].

Recall that a space Y is called *irreducible* iff $O_1 \cap O_2 \neq \varnothing$ for every pair of nonempty open subsets O_i of $Y(i = 1, 2)$ — sometimes, in addition, $Y \neq \varnothing$ is assumed. A space X is called *"sober"* ([3] IV 4.2.1) iff every irreducible, nonempty, closed subset M of X has a unique "generic" point m, i.e., $M = cl\{m\}$(hence $T_2 \Rightarrow$ "sober" $\Rightarrow T_0$). To every space X one associates a sober space ${}^sX$ whose elements are all irreducible, closed, nonempty subsets of X. The open sets of ${}^sX$ are all sets of the form ${}^sO: = \{M \in {}^sX \mid M \cap O \neq \varnothing\}$ for some open set O of X. The map $\chi: x \mapsto cl\{x\}$ is the *reflection morphism* for the category $\mathfrak{Top}$ of topological spaces and continuous maps into its full subcategory $\mathfrak{Sob}$ of sober spaces. *If X is a T_0-space, then χ_X is an embedding*; we shall sometimes identify X with the subspace $\chi_X[X]$ of ${}^sX$, in particular we shall write ${}^sX - X$ for a T_0-space X instead of ${}^sX - \chi_X[X]$. For further information on sober spaces see [19], [20] (3.1), [21] and some recent work of S. S. Hong [22], J. R. Isbell [23], L. D. Nel [26], L. D. Nel and R. G. Wilson [27] (to the historical survey of [21] p. 365/366 a reference to [8] II, (1) on p. 17 has to be added).

An essential tool for the investigation of sober spaces is the *b-topology* introduced by L. Skula ([28]; cf. also [11] p. 288). The b-topology associated with a space X is the topology which has $\{O \cap A \mid O$ open in X, A closed in $X\}$ as an open basis. The members of this basis are called *locally closed sets* (N. Bourbaki [6] Chap. I, §3.3). The terms *"b-dense"*, *"b-isolated"* etc. will refer to the b-topology, i.e., the topological space bX associated with a given space X; in particular, a b-dense subspace Y of X is a subspace of X which is a dense subset of bX. A subspace Y of X is b-dense, iff whenever O_1, O_2 are open subsets of X, $O_1 \neq O_2$, then $O_1 \cap Y \neq O_2 \cap Y$. In [7] G.C.L. Brümmer looks at the uniformity (canonically) associated with the *Pervin quasi-uniformity* of a topological space X; *this uniformity induces a topology which is easily seen to be the b-topology associated* *to the space* X: thus bX is uniformizable by a distinguished uniformity ([7] p. 408). We note further that bX is O-dimensional, i.e., it has an open basis of sets which are both closed and open.

Recall that a space X is T_D iff for every $x \in X$ there is an open neighborhood U of x with $U \cap cl\{x\} = \{x\}$, i.e., every point of X is locally closed. The T_D-axiom was introduced by G. Bruns [8] II p. 7 ("$T_{1/2}$") and C. E. Aull and W. J. Thron [4] p. 29. For characterizations of T_D see [21] 2.1 and, in addition, [30] 2.1 (g). As a recent application of the T_D-axiom, we note that C. C. Moore and J. Rosenberg have shown that the space of primitive ideals of the group $\mathfrak{C}^*$-algebra of a connected and locally compact group G is T_D ([25] Thm. 1). Furthermore cf. [14] (§§3.2, 3.3).

To a preordered set $(X, \leqq)$ one may associate a topological space with the same carrier set and open basis $\{U_a | a \in X\}$ with $U_a := \{y \in X | a \leqq y\}$. Such a space is called *A-discrete* (or *Alexandrov-discrete*) [1]. A topological space is A-discrete iff every union of closed sets is closed. Nowadays, A-discrete spaces are also known as *finitely generated spaces*, since they form the co-reflective hull of the class of finite spaces ([16] 22.2(4)). An A-discrete T_0-space is T_D ([8] II, p. 18, [4] p. 35). For some further information see [2].

I am indebted to B. Banaschewsky (Hamilton) and J. R. Isbell (Buffalo) for discussions (during the Oberwolfach meeting on category theory, August 1977) on some themes of this paper.

LEMMA 1.1. *Suppose β is a basis of the open sets of a space X, then*

$$\{U \cap cl\{x\} | x \in U \in \beta\}$$

is a basis of the b-topology associated with X.

From this easily proved lemma we immediately obtain

LEMMA 1.2. *For topological spaces X and Y holds $bX \times bY = b(X \times Y)$.*

Proof. Let τ_X and τ_Y denote the topologies of X and Y respectively, then $\{U \times V | U \in \tau_X, V \in \tau_Y\}$ is a basis for $X \times Y$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\{(U \times V) \cap (cl_X\{x\} \times cl_Y\{y\})\\ = (U \cap cl_X\{x\}) \times (V \cap cl_Y\{y\}) | U \in \tau_X, V \in \tau_Y, x \in X, y \in Y\}\end{aligned}$$

is a basis for $b(X \times Y)$ and, obviously, also for $bX \times bY$.

PROPOSITION 1.3. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of nonempty topological spaces. $b(\prod_I X_i) = \prod_I (bX_i)$ iff $K := \{i \in I | X_i$ is not indiscrete$\}$ is finite.*

Proof. For every $i \in K$, there is some $x_i \in X_i$ with $cl\{x_i\} \neq X_i$. If K is infinite, then $\prod_K cl\{x_i\} \times \prod_{I-K} X_i$ is open in $b(\prod_I X_i)$, but not open in a product topology arising from any modifications of the topologies of X_i. If K is finite, then

$$b\Big(\prod_K X_i \times \prod_{I-K} X_i\Big) = b\Big(\prod_K X_i\Big) \times \prod_{I-K} X_i = \prod_K (bX_i) \times \prod_{I-K} X_i = \prod_I bX_i$$

(via some obvious identifications).

It is shown in [20] 3.1.2 that *a sober space is the universal sobrification of every b-dense subspace via its embedding.*

THEOREM 1.4. *For a family $\{X_i\}_I$ of topological spaces holds ${}^S\prod_I X_i = \prod_I {}^SX_i$. In other words, the reflection functor ${}^S(-)\colon \mathfrak{Top} \to \mathfrak{Sob}$ preserves products.*

Proof. (i) We observe first the $\mathfrak{T}_0$-reflector $\mathfrak{Top} \to \mathfrak{T}_0$ preserves products. Recall that the canonical T_0-identification space X_0 of a space X is defined by the equivalence relation $x \approx y \Leftrightarrow cl\{x\} = cl\{y\}$.

(ii) Because of (i) we may assume now that every X_i is T_0. Since $\mathfrak{Sob}$ is reflective in $\mathfrak{Top}$, $\prod_I {}^SX_i$ is sober. Thus it suffices to show that $\prod_I X_i$ is $-$via $\prod_I \chi_{X_i}$ $-$ a b-dense subspace of $\prod_I {}^SX_i$. Suppose $(C_i)_{i\in I} \in \prod_I {}^SX_i$, then let $\prod_I {}^SU_i$ be an open neighborhood of $(C_i)_I$ with U_i open in X_i; hence $U_i = X_i$ for all but finitely many indices i. Since $U_i \cap C_i \neq \varnothing$ for every $i \in I$, we choose some $x_i \in U_i \cap C_i$, then $\chi_{X_i}(x_i) \in {}^SU_i \cap cls_{X_i}\{C_i\}$. In consequence, $\prod_I X_i$ is $-$ via $\prod_I \chi_{X_i}$ $-$ a b-dense subspace of $\prod_I {}^SX_i$.

REMARK 1.5. Let X be an infinite space with co-finite topology. ${}^SX - X$ consists of the unique element X. Let $\pi\colon X \to X$ be a permutation of X without fixed point. The equalizer of id_X and π is the inclusion of the empty space $\varnothing$ into X, whereas the equalizer of $id_{{}^SX}$ and ${}^s\pi\colon {}^SX \to {}^SX$ is the inclusion of the one-element set $\{X\} \hookrightarrow {}^SX$. *Thus ${}^S(-)\colon \mathfrak{Top} \to \mathfrak{Sob}$ does not preserve equalizers, hence is not right adjoint.*

Similarly, by two different constant selfmaps of a two point indiscrete space it is shown that *the $\mathfrak{T}_0$-reflection functor does not preserve equalizers.*

Let $N = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots\}$ denote the space of natural numbers with its A-discrete topology, i.e., $\varnothing$ and $\{n, n+1, \cdots\}(n \in N)$ are open in N. Let ${}^SN$ denote the sobrification space; if we designate the unique element N of ${}^SN - N$ by ∞, then $\varnothing$ and $\{\infty\} \cup \{n, n+1, \cdots\}$ are the open sets of ${}^SN$(cf. [18] Theorem 2). For an arbitrary T_0-

space X let $N_X := ({}^sN \times {}^sX) - (\{\infty\} \times X)$ with the topology induced from ${}^sN \times {}^sX$ (X is to be considered as a subspace of ${}^sX$).

THEOREM 1.6. *For every T_0-space X holds $X \cong {}^sN_X - N_X$, i.e., every T_0-space is a sobrification remainder.*

Proof. It is sufficient to show that ${}^sN \times {}^sX$ is tne sobrification of N_X via its embedding. Thus — by the result of [20] 3.1.2 quoted above — it suffices to show that N_X is b-dense in ${}^sN \times {}^sX$. This is clear from $N \times X \subseteq N_X \subseteq {}^sN \times {}^sX = {}^s(N \times X)$, since $N \times X$ is b-dense in ${}^s(N \times X)$ by the other implication of [20] (3.1.2).

The statement of (1.6) is analogous to the fact that every completely regular T_2-space is a Stone — Čech — remainder — cf. [13] (9K6, p. 138). The proof of (1.6) above is, in some sense, even more simple, since there is no straightforward analogue of (1.4) in the case of compact. T_2-spaces. Maybe it is also worth noting that in (1.6) a *single* space ${}^sN$ of ordinals suffices — other than in [13] (8K5, p. 138).

Since every T_0-space is a sobrification remainder of some T_0-space (1.6), it may be of interest to look at the sobrification remainders of certain distinguished subclasses of the class of all T_0-spaces, e.g., T_D-spaces. When is N_X (1.6) a T_D-space?

LEMMA 1.7. (a) *If Y is a T_D-space, then ${}^sY - Y$ is sober.*
(b) *N_X is T_D iff X is both sober and T_D.*

Proof. (a) By (2.1) every element of Y is b-isolated in ${}^sY$, hence Y is b-open in ${}^sY$. Thus ${}^sY - Y$ is b-closed in ${}^sY$, hence sober.

(b) Suppose N_X is T_D, then $N \times X = N_X$, since $N \times X$ is b-dense in ${}^sN \times {}^sX$, hence in N_X (a discrete space has no proper dense subspace). In consequence, ($X = {}^sX$ and) X is T_D. If X is sober and T_D, then $N_X = N \times X$ is T_D.

REMARK 1.8. The sobrification process also gives rise to a (new?) cardinal invariant of a T_0-space X. Let

$$r_0X := X\,, \qquad u_0X := {}^sX - X\,,$$
$$u_nX := \delta(r_nX) - r_nX\,,$$
$$r_{n+1}X := \delta(u_nX) - u_nX\,.$$

Here $\delta(-)$ denotes the b-closure of $(-)$ in ${}^sX$. By [20] 3.1.2

$$u_nX \cong {}^s(r_nX) - r_nX$$

and

$$r_{n+1} X \cong {}^s(u_n X) - u_n X .$$

We observe that

$$r_{n+1} X \subseteqq r_n X \quad \text{and} \quad u_{n+1} X \subseteqq u_n X .$$

For $\aleph_0$ and, similarly, for every limit number λ we may define

$$r_\lambda X := \bigcap_{\gamma\alpha < \lambda} r_\gamma X$$

and

$$u_\lambda X := \delta(r_\lambda X) - r_\lambda X .$$

There is a smallest cardinal $\alpha \leqq \operatorname{card} X$ such that $r_{\alpha+1} X = r_\alpha X$. $Y := r_\alpha X$ has the property $r_1 Y = Y$. Such T_0-spaces Y may be called *periodic*. $Y = r_\alpha X$ is the largest b-closed periodic subspace of X. α may be called the *periodicity index* of X. (It is not difficult to describe a categorical setting in which such an index arises.)

EXAMPLE 1.9. Let $\boldsymbol{R}$ denote the set of real numbers. The "left topology" on $\boldsymbol{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ has $\varnothing$, $\boldsymbol{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $\{\infty\} \cup \{x \in \boldsymbol{R} \mid r < x\} (r \in \boldsymbol{R})$ as its open sets. This space $\boldsymbol{R}^*$ is sober. Its b-dense subset $\boldsymbol{Q}$ of rational numbers is a periodic space in the induced topology. $\boldsymbol{R}^*$ is easily identified with the sobrification remainder of $(\boldsymbol{R}, \leqq)$ in its A-discrete topology: If X is T_D, then ${}^sX - X$ need not be also T_D.

2. In [9] J. R. Büchi discusses the problem of "*minimal*" *representation* of a lattice by a "*set lattice*" ([9] def. 37, Cor. 40); the case of a minimal representation of a lattice of open sets of a topological space has been investigated by G. Bruns [8] §§7, 8 who has obtained a characterization of those lattices, which admit such a minimal representation. Our result (2.1) below in part overlaps with the results of G. Bruns (cf. [8] §8, Satz 5, p. 13). The theme has been independently dealt with by D. Drake and W. J. Thron ([12], in particular Thm. 5.4). In the following we briefly rephrase part of Bruns' representation theory (and we add some information obtained in the meantime).

Let $(L, \leqq)$ denote a complete lattice. A *reduced, isomorphic, topological representation* $(\varphi; X, \Gamma)$, for short: an *r.-i.-t.-representation* of $(L, \leqq)$ consists of a T_0-space (X, Γ) — whose lattice of closed subspaces is designated by $(\Gamma, \subseteqq)$ — and a lattice-isomorphism $\varphi: (L, \leqq) \to (\Gamma, \subseteqq)$. The class of *r.-i.-t*-representations receives the following pre-order: $(\varphi; X, \Gamma) \leqq (\psi; Y, \Delta)$ iff there is an embedding e of (X, Γ) into (Y, Δ) such that

$$e^{-1}[\psi(a)] = \varphi(a)$$

for every $a \in L$. This class contains — if it is nonempty[1] — a greatest element $(\chi_L; {}^sL, {}^s\Gamma)$ with ${}^sL = \{a \mid a$ "(join-)prime" in L, i.e., $\neq 0$ and whenever $a \leqq \sup\{a_1, a_2\}$ for $a_1, a_2 \in L$, then $a \leqq a_1$ or $a \leqq a_2\}$ and ${}^s\Gamma = \{{}^sc \mid c \in L\}$ with ${}^sc := \{a \in {}^sL \mid a \leqq c\}$, and $\chi_L(c) := {}^sc$ for every $c \in L$. Every *r.-i.-t.*-representation $(\varphi; X, \Gamma)$ of $(L, \leqq)$ is equivalent to (i.e., both smaller and greater than) an *r.-i.-t.*-representation $(\psi; Y, \Delta)$ arising from (and uniquely determined by) a subspace (Y, Δ) of $({}^sL, {}^s\Gamma)$:

$$Y = \{a \in {}^sL \mid \varphi(a) \text{ is a point closure } cl_X\{x\} \text{ in } X\}$$

such that the canonical inclusion $e: (Y, \Delta) \hookrightarrow ({}^sL, {}^s\Gamma)$ gives $\psi(a) := e^{-1}[\chi_L(a)]$. *The subspaces (Y, Δ) of $({}^sL, {}^s\Gamma)$ thus obtained are easily seen to be precisely the b-dense subspaces of $({}^sL, {}^s\Gamma)$.* Thus an *r.-i.-t.*-representation of $(L, \leqq)$ is an embedding of a b-dense subspace into $({}^sL, {}^s\Gamma)$; the pre-order for *r.-i.-t.*-representations becomes the (partial) order between these inclusions[2].

Recall that a point c of a space X is "isolated" iff $\{c\}$ is open in X. *A space X is T_D iff every point of X is b-isolated, i.e., iff bX is discrete* ([7] 4.1, cf. also [27], [18] Bemerkung).

THEOREM 2.1. *Let X be a T_0-space, then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *X has a smallest b-dense subspace Y_1.*

(ii) *X has a minimal b-dense subspace Y_2.*

(iii) *X has a b-dense subspace Y_3 which satisfies T_D.*

(iv) *X has a b-dense subspace Y_4 consisting of points which are b-isolated in X.*

(v) *The set Y_5 of all b-isolated points of X is b-dense in X.*
If one (hence all) of these conditions is satisfied, then $Y_1 = Y_2 = Y_3 = Y_4 = Y_5$.

Proof. Note that the b-topology of a subspace is the induced b-topology. X is T_0, iff its b-topology is T_1 (hence T_2, etc.). Thus the questions reduce to minimality of discrete dense subspaces, and discreteness of minimal dense subspaces.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): Trivial.

(ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii): A dense subset is minimal-dense, iff it is discrete as a subspace.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (v): Suppose Z is a T_1-space, $P, Q \subseteqq Z$ dense, P is the

[1] It is nonempty iff every element of L is a join of "(join-)prime" elements [**9**] p. 157 (Th. 15), cf. [**8**] pp. 198–199.

[2] Note that the inclusions and not the b-dense subspaces themselves are to be considered as 'representative' representations, since it may happen that two different b-dense subspaces are homeomorphic, e.g., $\boldsymbol{Q}$ and $j + \boldsymbol{Q}$ in $\boldsymbol{R}^*$ for an irrational number j.

set of all isolated points of Z, $p \in P - Q$. Since P is discrete, there is an open set O of Z with $O \cap P = \{p\}$. Since Q is dense, there is some $q \in Q \cap O$. Since Z is T_1, there is an open set $V \subseteq O$ with $q \in V$, $p \notin V$, hence $V \cap P = \varnothing$ — contradiction. Thus $P \subseteq Q$.

(v) $\Rightarrow$ (iv): Trivial.

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i): A dense subspace necessarily contains all isolated points, hence $Y_4 = Y_1$.

Let $\mathfrak{O}(X)$ denote the lattice of open sets of the space X. From (2.1) one easily deduces

COROLLARY 2.2. ([8] II p. 18, [30] p. 673). *Suppose X and Y are T_D-spaces and let $\varphi: \mathfrak{O}(X) \to \mathfrak{O}(Y)$ be a lattice-isomorphism, then there is a homeomorphismf: $Y \to X$ with $f^{-1}[?] = \varphi(?): \mathfrak{O}(X) \to \mathfrak{O}(Y)$. In particular, a sober space is the sobrification space of at most one T_D-subspace.*

DEFINITION 2.3. A topological space X is called a *$\mathfrak{B}$-space* iff X is T_0 and ${}^sX \cong {}^sY$ for some T_D-space Y.

The above Theorem 2.1 describes the class of $\mathfrak{B}$-spaces X as those T_0-spaces X whose set of b-isolated points is b-dense in X.

Note that the property of a space to be a $\mathfrak{B}$-space is lattice-invariant relative to T_0. Recall that a class $\mathfrak{K}$ (resp. a "property" $\mathfrak{K}$) of topological spaces is called *lattice-invariant* (*"verwandtschaftstreu"* [24] p. 298) relative to a class $\mathfrak{L}$ of spaces with $\mathfrak{K} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}$ iff property $\mathfrak{K}$ is expressible (relative to $\mathfrak{L}$) in terms of the lattice $\mathfrak{O}(X)$ of open sets of the space X with the inclusion order, i.e., iff whenever $X \in \mathfrak{K}$, $Y \in \mathfrak{L}$, $\mathfrak{O}(X) \cong \mathfrak{O}(Y)$, then $Y \in \mathfrak{K}$. (Remember that $\mathfrak{O}(X) \cong \mathfrak{O}(Y)$ iff ${}^sX \cong {}^sY$; clearly, a property expressible in terms of $\mathfrak{O}(X)$ is also expressible in terms of the opposite lattice $\mathfrak{A}(X)$ of closed subsets of X ordered by inclusion).

We give the following explicit description of this fact. Recall that an element a of a complete lattice L is *strongly* (*join-*)*irreducible* iff $a = \sup_{i \in I} a_i$ implies $a = a_i$ for some $i \in I$.

THEOREM 2.4. *A T_0-space X is a $\mathfrak{B}$-space iff its lattice $\mathfrak{A}(X)$ of closed subsets enjoys the following property: Every element of $\mathfrak{A}(X)$ is the supremum ($\equiv$join) of strongly irreducible elements.*

Proof. (1) We note that $x \in X$ is b-isolated iff $cl\{x\}$ is strongly (join-)irreducible in $\mathfrak{A}(X)$. (Cf. [30] 2.1(g).)

(2) Suppose that there is an open neighborhood V of some $x \in X$ such that $V \cap cl\{x\}$ does not contain a b-isolated point, then the

supremum of all strongly irreducible elements of $\mathfrak{A}(X)$ which are smaller than $cl\{x\}$ is smaller than $cl\{x\} - V \in \mathfrak{A}(X)$.

In order to avoid any confusion with Büchi's theorem quoted by G. Bruns [8] I, p. 198 we note that the concept of $\mathfrak{M}$-δ-subirreducible element in a lattice L is usually different from the above concept.

EXAMPLE 2.5. (a) An infinite power $\prod_I S$ of the Sierpinki space S ($\{0, 1\}$ with open sets $\emptyset$, $\{1\}$, $\{0, 1\}$) is not T_D (cf. [7] p. 408, [18] Thm. 1), but it is a $\mathfrak{B}$-space, since its subspace of b-isolated points $\{(x_i)_I \mid x_i \in \{0, 1\}, \{i \in I \mid x_i \neq 0\}$ is finite$\}$ is b-dense in $\prod_I S$. We note in passing that this subspace is even A-discrete. A general criterion, when a space contains a b-dense A-discrete subspace, will be given elsewhere ("*Topological spaces admitting a dual*", in: Categorical Topology Springer Lecture Notes in Math., **719** (1978), 157–166).

(b) $\boldsymbol{R}^*$ (1.9), does not contain any b-isolated point, hence $\boldsymbol{R}^*$ is not the sobrification of any T_D-space. Of course, the same holds for every T_0-space containing a b-dense periodic subspace. (cf. 1.8).

One readily observes that a point $(x_i)_I$ of a product space $\prod_I X_i$ is b-isolated iff it satisfies (1) and (2):

(1) The set $K := \{i \in I \mid \{x_i\}$ is not closed in $X_i\}$ is finite.

(2) For every $i \in I$, x_i is b-isolated in X_i.

For the formulation of (2.6) below we need the following property:

(*) For every point x of a space X there is a closed point $y \in X$(i.e., $cl\{y\} = y$) with $y \in cl\{x\}$.

THEOREM 2.6. *$\prod_I X_i$ with topological spaces $X_i \neq \emptyset (i \in I)$ is a $\mathfrak{B}$-space, iff conditions* (i) *and* (ii) *are satisfied:*

(i) *Every X_i is a $\mathfrak{B}$-space*

(ii) *$K := \{i \in I \mid X_i$ does not satisfy property* (*)$\}$ *is finite.*

Proof. Since a finite product of T_D-spaces is T_D, a finite product of $\mathfrak{B}$-spaces is a $\mathfrak{B}$-space by (1.2). Suppose $\prod_I X_i$ is a product of $\mathfrak{B}$-spaces X_i satisfying (*), let $(x_i) \in \prod_I X_i$ and let $\prod_I U_i$ be a neighborhood of (x_i) in $\prod_I X_i$ with U_i open in X_i; hence $L := \{i \in I \mid U_i \neq X_i\}$ is finite. For every $i \in L$ let y_i denote a b-isolated point of X_i contained in $U_i \cap cl\{x_i\}$; for $i \in I - L$ let y_i denote a closed point contained in $cl_{X_i}\{x_i\}$. By the remark preceding the theorem, $(y_i)_I$ is a b-isolated point of $\prod_I X_i$ contained in $(\prod_I U_i) \cap cl_{\Pi_I X_i}\{(x_i)_I\}$. — Conditions (i) and (ii) are easily seen (by similar considerations) to be necessary.

REMARK 2.7. A space X may be called a $\mathfrak{B}^*$-space iff it is a $\mathfrak{B}$-space satisfying condition (*). Since (*) is productive, so is the class of $\mathfrak{B}^*$-spaces by (2.6), hence it is the greatest productive class of $\mathfrak{B}$-spaces. Of course, every T_1-spaces is a $\mathfrak{B}^*$-space. However, a $\mathfrak{B}^*$-space satisfying T_D need not be T_1.

LEMMA 2.8. *Every finite T_0-space is a $\mathfrak{B}^*$-space. An A-discrete T_0-space is a $\mathfrak{B}^*$-space iff every element — in terms of the associated pre-order — has a lower bound which is a minimal element.*

Proof. A finite T_0-space, and moreover ([8, 4]) an A-discrete T_0-space is T_D, hence a $\mathfrak{B}$-space.

LEMMA 2.9. *The class of $\mathfrak{B}^*$-spaces is lattice-invariant relative to T_0.*

Proof. Property (*) may be rephrased in $\mathfrak{A}(X)$: Every (nonempty) irreducible element is minorized by an atom.

REMARK 2.10. We note that the class of sober $\mathfrak{B}^*$-spaces is productive, but not reflective in $\mathfrak{Top}$, since there are sober spaces which are not $\mathfrak{B}$-spaces — cf. (2.5b) and [19] 1.3.

REMARK 2.11. A T_0-space X is called a *Jacobson space*[3] ([10] 0.2.8.1) iff its subset of closed points is b-dense in X – cf. also [24] 5.7 (p. 311). Every Jacobson space is a $\mathfrak{B}^*$-space; S is a $\mathfrak{B}^*$-space, but not a Jacobson space. The proof of 2.6 shows that a product of nonempty topological spaces is a Jacobson space iff so is every coordinate space. Also the characterization Theorem 2.1 has an analogue; the following conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) are pairwise equivalent for a T_0-space X:

(a) X is a Jacobson space;
(b) X has a b-dense subspace which satisfies T_1;
(c) X has a b-dense subspace consisting of closed points of X;
(d) there is T_1-space Y with ${}^{s}X \cong {}^{s}Y$.

A Jacobson space is a $\mathfrak{B}$-space all of whose b-isolated points are closed points, i.e., a $\mathfrak{B}$-space satisfying the property $\mathfrak{L}^*$ of [30] p. 675: *Every strongly irreducible element of $\mathfrak{A}(X)$ is an atom*[4]. Thus 2.4 with "strongly irreducible" replaced by "atom" characterizes Jacobson spaces.

3. Since for a space X, bX is uniformizable, i.e., completely

[3] We observe that in [**10**] (0.2.8.1) the requirement of the T_0-property is omitted.

[4] Recall from [**21**] p. 374 that $T_0 + \mathfrak{L}^{**}$ ([**30**] p. 675) = sober + T_1. Furthermore, we observe that sober + $T_D = T_0$ + "every irreducible element of $\boldsymbol{A}(X)$ is strongly irreducible".

regular, it is natural to ask: When is bX a compact T_2-space? The answer is essentially based upon a result of M. Hochster [17] (Thm. 1, p. 45).

Recall that a space X is said to be *Noetherian* (N. Bourbaki, [5] II, 4.2, p. 123) iff every ascending chain of open subsets is eventually stationary, i.e., iff every open subspace is quasi-compact (for a detailed study see [29]). — A Noetherian sober space is sometimes called a *Zariski space* ([15] 3.17, p. 93).

THEOREM 3.1. *A topological space X is both Noetherian and sober iff bX is a compact T_2-space.*

Proof. (i) Suppose that bX is compact and Hausdorff, and let V be open in X. Then bV is a closed subspace of bX, hence bV is quasi-compact. Since V is coarser than bV, V is also quasi-compact. — Now let C be an irreducible, closed, nonempty subspace of X. $\mathfrak{D} := \{V \cap C \mid V \text{ open in } X, V \cap C \neq \varnothing\}$ is a family of b-closed subsets of X with the property that every finite subfamily has a nonempty intersection. Since bC is closed in bX, hence compact, there is an element $x \in \bigcap \mathfrak{D}$, hence $C = cl\{x\}$. Since bX is T_2, X is T_0.

(ii) Suppose that X is a Zariski space, then, of course, X is a "spectral space" in the sense of M. Hochster, and the b-topology coincides with M. Hochster's *"patch topology"* ([17] p. 45, p. 52), thus [17] (Theorem 1, p. 45) applies.

A space is called *quasi-sober* [22] (2.1) iff every irreducible, closed, nonempty subset has *at least one* generic point (cf. also [20] 2.6).

COROLLARY 3.2. *bX is quasi-compact, iff X is a quasi-sober Noetherian space.*

Proof. Suppose bX is quasi-compact. Then the T_0-identification space $(bX)_0 = b(X_0)$ is compact and T_2, hence X_0 is a Zariski space (3.1), i.e., $\mathfrak{D}(X) \cong \mathfrak{D}(X_0)$ is "Noetherian" and X is quasi-sober ([22] 2.2). — The other implication is established by reversing these conclusions.

Note that the A-discrete space N above is both Noetherian and T_0, but not sober, hence bN is not quasi-compact.

NOTE ADDED IN PROOF. The space ${}^{S}N$ appearing in 1.6 above was characterized in [18] Theorem 2. By the aid of this result (and 2.1 above!), we obtain an interesting characterization of the space

N of natural numbers in in A-discrete topology: *Up to a homeomorphism N is the only T_0-space M which enjoys the following properties*:

(i) *M (is a T_D-space which) is not sober.*

(ii) *Whenever X is a T_0-space which fails to be T_D, then there exists a continuous surjective map $f: X \to {}^sM$.*

Proof. By 2.1 above, ${}^sM$ cannot be a T_D-space, since $M \neq {}^sM$. Thus, by [18] Theorem 2, ${}^sM$ is homeomorphic to ${}^sN$. Now—by 2.1 above—M is either homeomorphic to N or to ${}^sN$ $(=N \cup \{\infty\})$. By (i), N is homeomorphic to M.

REFERENCES

1. P. S. Alexandrov, *Diskrete Räume*, Math. Sb., **2** (1937), 501-519.
2. Susan J. Andima and W. J. Thron, *Order-induced topological properties*, Pacific J. Math., **75** (1978), 297-318.
3. M. Artin, A. Grothendieck and J. Verdier. *Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas*, Lect. Notes in Math., **269**, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer 1972 (rev. ed. of SGA 4, 1962/63).
4. C. E. Aull and W. J. Thron, *Separation axioms between T_0 and T_1*, Indag. Math., **24** (1963), 26-37.
5. N. Bourbaki, *Algèbre Commutative* (Chap. 2: *Localisation*), Paris: Hermann 1961.
6. ———, *General Topology* (engl. transl.), Paris: Hermann 1966.
7. G. C. L. Brümmer, *Initial quasi-uniformities*, Indag. Math., **31** (1969), 403-409.
8. G. Bruns, *Darstellungen und Erweiterungen geordneter Mengen* I., II., J. reine angew. Math., **209** (1962), 167-200 and, resp. **210** (1962), 1-23 (Habilitationsschrift Mainz 1960).
9. J. R. Büchi, *Representations of complete lattices by sets*, Portugaliae Math., **11** (1952), 151-167.
10. J. Dieudonné and A. Grothendieck, *Eléments de géométrie algébrique*, Berlin: Springer 1971.
11. C. H. Dowker and D. Papert, *Quotient frames and subspaces*, Proc. London Math. Soc., (3) **16** (1966), 275-296.
12. D. Drake and W. J. Thron, *On the representations of an abstract lattice as the family of closed sets of a topological space*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **120** (1965), 57-71.
13. L. Gillman and M. Jerison, *Rings of Continuous Functions*, New York, Heidelberg: Springer 1976 (2nd print).
14. L. M. Gluskin, B. M. Schein, L. B. Šneperman and J. S. Yaroker, *Addendum to a survey of semigroups of continuous self-maps*, Semigroup Forum, **14** (1977), 95-125.
15. R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, New York—Heidelberg—Berlin: Springer 1977.
16. H. Herrlich, *Topologische Reflexionen und Coreflexionen*, Springer Lecture Notes in Math., **78** (1968).
17. M. Hochster, *Prime ideal structure in commutative rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **142** (1969), 43-60.
18. R.-E. Hoffmann, *Bemerkungen über T_D-Räume*, Manuscripta Math., **12** (1974), 195-196.
19. ———, *Charakterisierung nüchterner Räume*, Manuscripta Math., **15** (1975), 185-191.
20. ———, *Topological functors admitting generalized Cauchy-completions*, in Cate-

gorical Topology, Proc. of the conf. held at Mannheim 1975 ed. E. Binz and H. Herrlich, pp. 286–344, Lect. Notes in Math., **540**, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer 1976.

21. ———, *Irreducible filters and sober spaces*, Manuscripta Math., **22** (1977), 365-380.

22. S. S. Hong, *Extensive subcategories of the category of T_0-spaces*, Canad. J. Math., **27** (1975), 311-318.

23. J. R. Isbell, *Function spaces and adjoints*, Math. Scand., **36** (1975), 317–339.

24. H. J. Kowalsky, *Verbandstheoretische Kennzeichnung topologischer Räume*, Math. Nachr., **21** (1960), 297-318.

25. C. C. Moore and J. Rosenberg, *Groups with T_1 primitive ideal spaces*, J. Functional Analysis, **22** (1976), 204–224.

26. L. D. Nel. *Lattices of lower semi-continuous functions and associated topological spaces*, Pacific J. Math., **40** (1972), 667-673.

27. L. D. Nel and R. G. Wilson, *Epireflections in the category of T_0-spaces*, Fund. Math., **75** (1972), 69–74.

28. L. Skula, *On a reflective subcategory of the category of all topological spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **142** (1969), 37-41.

29. A. H. Stone, *Hereditarily compact spaces*, Amer. J. Math., **82** (1960), 900-916.

30. W. J. Thron, *Lattice-equivalence of topological spaces*, Duke Math. J., **29** (1962), 671-679.

Reseived March 13, 1978 and in revised form November 29, 1978.

UNIVERSITÄT BREMEN
FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK
D-2800 BREMEN
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY