

Fu Gui Shi

A new form of fuzzy α -compactness

Mathematica Bohemica, Vol. 131 (2006), No. 1, 15–28

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/134081>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 2006

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

A NEW FORM OF FUZZY α -COMPACTNESS

FU-GUI SHI, Beijing

(Received February 9, 2005)

Abstract. A new form of α -compactness is introduced in L -topological spaces by α -open L -sets and their inequality where L is a complete de Morgan algebra. It doesn't rely on the structure of the basis lattice L . It can also be characterized by means of α -closed L -sets and their inequality. When L is a completely distributive de Morgan algebra, its many characterizations are presented and the relations between it and the other types of compactness are discussed. Countable α -compactness and the α -Lindelöf property are also researched.

Keywords: L -topology, compactness, α -compactness, countable α -compactness, α -Lindelöf property, α -irresolute map, α -continuous map

MSC 2000: 54A40, 54D35

1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of α -open sets was introduced in [13]. The concept of α -compactness for topological spaces was discussed in [12], and it was generalized to $[0, 1]$ -topological spaces by Thakur, Saraf and Jabalpur [18]. The definition in [18] is based on Chang's compactness which is not a good extension of ordinary compactness.

In [1], Aygün presented a new form of α -compactness which is based on Kudri's compactness [7] which is equivalent to strong compactness in [9], [19].

The concepts of SR-compactness and near SR-compactness were introduced by S. G. Li, S. Z. Bai and N. Li in terms of strongly semiopen L -sets [4], [8]. In fact, a strongly semiopen L -set is exactly an α -open set in the sense of [14]. Thus both SR-compactness and near SR-compactness are extensions of α -compactness. Moreover, the notion of SR-compactness was based on N-compactness and the notion of near

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (10371079) and the Basic Research Foundation of Beijing Institute of Technology.

SR-compactness was based on strong fuzzy compactness. This implies that near SR-compactness is equivalent to α -compactness in [1] when the basis lattice L is a complete distributive de Morgan algebra.

In [15], [16], a new definition of fuzzy compactness was presented in L -topological spaces by means of open L -sets and their inequality where L is a complete de Morgan algebra. This new definition doesn't depend on the structure of L . When L is completely distributive, it is equivalent to the notion of fuzzy compactness in [9], [10], [19].

In this paper, following the lines of [15], [16], we will introduce a new form of α -compactness in L -topological spaces by means of α -open L -sets and their inequality. This new form of α -compactness has many characterizations if L is completely distributive. Moreover, we will compare our α -compactness with other types of α -compactness.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper $(L, \vee, \wedge, ')$ is a complete de Morgan algebra, X is a non-empty set. L^X is the set of all L -fuzzy sets (or L -sets for short) on X . The smallest element and the largest element in L^X are denoted by χ_\emptyset and χ_X . We often don't distinguish a crisp subset A of X and its character function χ_A .

An element a in L is called a prime element if $a \geq b \wedge c$ implies $a \geq b$ or $a \geq c$. An element a in L is called co-prime if a' is prime [6]. The set of non-unit prime elements in L is denoted by $P(L)$. The set of non-zero co-prime elements in L is denoted by $M(L)$.

The binary relation \prec in L is defined as follows: for $a, b \in L$, $a \prec b$ if and only if for every subset $D \subseteq L$, the relation $b \leq \sup D$ always implies the existence of $d \in D$ with $a \leq d$ [5]. In a completely distributive de Morgan algebra L , each element b is a sup of $\{a \in L; a \prec b\}$. A set $\{a \in L; a \prec b\}$ is called the greatest minimal family of b in the sense of [9], [19], denoted by $\beta(b)$, and $\beta^*(b) = \beta(b) \cap M(L)$. Moreover, for $b \in L$, we define $\alpha(b) = \{a \in L; a' \prec b'\}$ and $\alpha^*(b) = \alpha(b) \cap P(L)$.

For $a \in L$ and $A \in L^X$ we use the following notations from [17].

$$\begin{aligned} A_{[a]} &= \{x \in X; A(x) \geq a\}, & A^{(a)} &= \{x \in X; A(x) \not\leq a\}, \\ A_{(a)} &= \{x \in X; a \in \beta(A(x))\}. \end{aligned}$$

An L -topological space (or L -space for short) is a pair (X, \mathcal{T}) , where \mathcal{T} is a subfamily of L^X which contains χ_\emptyset , χ_X and is closed for any suprema and finite infima. \mathcal{T} is called an L -topology on X . Members of \mathcal{T} are called open L -sets and their complements are called closed L -sets.

Definition 2.1 ([9], [19]). An L -space (X, \mathcal{T}) is called weakly induced if $\forall a \in L, \forall A \in \mathcal{T}$, it follows that $A^{(a)} \in [\mathcal{T}]$, where $[\mathcal{T}]$ denotes the topology formed by all crisp sets in \mathcal{T} .

Definition 2.2 ([9], [19]). For a topological space (X, τ) , let $\omega_L(\tau)$ denote the family of all lower semi-continuous maps from (X, τ) to L , i.e., $\omega_L(\tau) = \{A \in L^X; A^{(a)} \in \tau, a \in L\}$. Then $\omega_L(\tau)$ is an L -topology on X ; in this case, $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ is called topologically generated by (X, τ) . A topologically generated L -space is also called an induced L -space.

It is obvious that $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ is weakly induced.

For a subfamily $\Phi \subseteq L^X$, $2^{(\Phi)}$ denotes the set of all finite subfamilies of Φ and $2^{[\Phi]}$ denotes the set of all countable subfamilies of Φ .

Definition 2.3 ([15], [16]). Let (X, \mathcal{T}) be an L -space. $G \in L^X$ is called (countably) compact if for every (countable) family $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, it follows that

$$\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{U}} A(x) \right) \leq \bigvee_{\mathcal{V} \in 2^{[\mathcal{U}]}} \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{V}} A(x) \right).$$

Definition 2.4 ([16]). Let (X, \mathcal{T}) be an L -space. $G \in L^X$ is said to have the Lindelöf property if for every family $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, it follows that

$$\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{U}} A(x) \right) \leq \bigvee_{\mathcal{V} \in 2^{[\mathcal{U}]}} \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{V}} A(x) \right).$$

Lemma 2.5 ([16]). Let L be a complete Heyting algebra, let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a map and $f_L^-: L^X \rightarrow L^Y$ the extension of f . Then for any family $\mathcal{P} \subseteq L^Y$, we have

$$\bigvee_{y \in Y} \left(f_L^-(G)(y) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P}} B(y) \right) = \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P}} f_L^-(B)(x) \right),$$

where $f_L^-: L^X \rightarrow L^Y$ and $f_L^-: L^Y \rightarrow L^X$ are defined as follows:

$$f_L^-(G)(y) = \bigvee_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} G(x), \quad f_L^-(B) = B \circ f.$$

The notion of an α -open set was introduced by Njåstad in [13] and generalized to $[0, 1]$ -topological spaces by Shahana in [14]. Analogously we can generalize it to L -fuzzy setting as follows:

Definition 2.6 ([14]). An L -set G in an L -space (X, \mathcal{T}) is called α -open if $G \leq \text{int}(\text{cl}(\text{int}(G)))$. G is called α -closed if G' is α -open.

Definition 2.7 ([18]). Let (X, \mathcal{T}_1) and (Y, \mathcal{T}_2) be two L -spaces. A map $f: (X, \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is called α -continuous if $f_L^-(G)$ is α -open in (X, \mathcal{T}_1) for every open L -set G in (Y, \mathcal{T}_2) .

It can be seen that an α -continuous map was also said to be strongly semi-continuous in [14].

Definition 2.8 ([18]). Let (X, \mathcal{T}_1) and (Y, \mathcal{T}_2) be two L -spaces. A map $f: (X, \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is called α -irresolute if $f_L^-(G)$ is α -open in (X, \mathcal{T}_1) for every α -open L -set G in (Y, \mathcal{T}_2) .

3. DEFINITION AND CHARACTERIZATIONS OF α -COMPACTNESS

Definition 3.1. Let (X, \mathcal{T}) be an L -space. $G \in L^X$ is called (countably) α -compact if for every (countable) family \mathcal{U} of α -open L -sets, it follows that

$$\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{U}} A(x) \right) \leq \bigvee_{\mathcal{V} \in 2^{[\mathcal{U}]}} \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{V}} A(x) \right).$$

Definition 3.2. Let (X, \mathcal{T}) be an L -space. $G \in L^X$ is said to have the α -Lindelöf property (or be an α -Lindelöf L -set) if for every family \mathcal{U} of α -open L -sets, it follows that

$$\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{U}} A(x) \right) \leq \bigvee_{\mathcal{V} \in 2^{[\mathcal{U}]}} \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{V}} A(x) \right).$$

Obviously we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3. *α -compactness implies countable α -compactness and the α -Lindelöf property. Moreover, an L -set having the α -Lindelöf property is α -compact if and only if it is countably α -compact.*

Since an open L -set is α -open, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.4. *α -compactness implies compactness, countable α -compactness implies countable compactness, and the α -Lindelöf property implies the Lindelöf property.*

From Definition 3.1 and Definition 3.2 we can obtain the following two theorems by simply using complements.

Theorem 3.5. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be an L -space. $G \in L^X$ is (countably) α -compact if and only if for every (countable) family \mathcal{B} of α -closed L -sets, it follows that

$$\bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B(x) \right) \geq \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{[\mathcal{B}]}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(x) \right).$$

Theorem 3.6. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be an L -space. $G \in L^X$ has the α -Lindelöf property if and only if for every family \mathcal{B} of α -closed L -sets, it follows that

$$\bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B(x) \right) \geq \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{[\mathcal{B}]}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(x) \right).$$

In order to present characterizations of α -compactness, countable α -compactness and the α -Lindelöf property, we generalize the notions of an a -shading and an a - R -neighborhood family in [15], [16] as follows:

Definition 3.7. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be an L -space, $a \in L \setminus \{1\}$ and $G \in L^X$. A family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq L^X$ is said to be

- (1) an a -shading of G if for any $x \in X$, $\left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A(x) \right) \not\leq a$.
- (2) a strong a -shading of G if $\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A(x) \right) \not\leq a$.
- (3) an a -remote family of G if for any $x \in X$, $\left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P}} B(x) \right) \not\geq a$.
- (4) a strong a -remote family of G if $\bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P}} B(x) \right) \not\geq a$.

It is obvious that a strong a -shading of G is an a -shading of G , a strong a -remote family of G is an a -remote family of G , and \mathcal{P} is a strong a -remote family of G if and only if \mathcal{P}' is a strong a' -shading of G . Moreover, a closed a -remote family is exactly an a -remote neighborhood family and a closed strong a -remote family is exactly an a^- -remote neighborhood family in the sense of [19].

Definition 3.8. Let $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$ and $G \in L^X$. A subfamily \mathcal{A} of L^X is said to have a weak a -nonempty intersection in G if $\bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A(x) \right) \geq a$. \mathcal{A} is said to have the finite (countable) weak a -intersection property in G if every finite (countable) subfamily \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{A} has a weak a -nonempty intersection in G .

Definition 3.9. Let $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$ and $G \in L^X$. A subfamily \mathcal{A} of L^X is said to be a weak a -filter relative to G if any finite intersection of members in \mathcal{A} is weak a -nonempty in G . A subfamily \mathcal{B} of L^X is said to be a weak a -filterbase relative to G if

$$\{A \in L^X; \text{ there exists } B \in \mathcal{B} \text{ such that } B \leq A\}$$

is a weak a -filter relative to G .

From Definition 3.1, Definition 3.2, Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.6 we immediately obtain the following two results.

Theorem 3.10. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be an L -space and $G \in L^X$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) G is (countably) α -compact.
- (2) For any $a \in L \setminus \{1\}$, each (countable) α -open strong a -shading \mathcal{U} of G has a finite subfamily which is a strong a -shading of G .
- (3) For any $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$, each (countable) α -closed strong a -remote family \mathcal{P} of G has a finite subfamily which is a strong a -remote family of G .
- (4) For any $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$, each (countable) family of α -closed L -sets which has the finite weak a -intersection property in G has a weak a -nonempty intersection in G .
- (5) For each $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$, every α -closed (countable) weak a -filterbase relative to G has a weak a -nonempty intersection in G .

Theorem 3.11. *Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be an L -space and $G \in L^X$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) G has the α -Lindelöf property.
- (2) For any $a \in L \setminus \{1\}$, each α -open strong a -shading \mathcal{U} of G has a countable subfamily which is a strong a -shading of G .
- (3) For any $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$, each α -closed strong a -remote family \mathcal{P} of G has a countable subfamily which is a strong a -remote family of G .
- (4) For any $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$, each family of α -closed L -sets which has the countable weak a -intersection property in G has a weak a -nonempty intersection in G .

4. PROPERTIES OF (COUNTABLE) α -COMPACTNESS

Theorem 4.1. *Let L be a complete Heyting algebra. If both G and H are (countably) α -compact, then $G \vee H$ is (countably) α -compact.*

Proof. For any (countable) family \mathcal{P} of α -closed L -sets, we have by Theorem 3.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigvee_{x \in X} \left((G \vee H)(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P}} B(x) \right) \\ &= \left\{ \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P}} B(x) \right) \right\} \vee \left\{ \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(H(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P}} B(x) \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \left\{ \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{(\mathcal{P})}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(x) \right) \right\} \vee \left\{ \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{(\mathcal{P})}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(H(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(x) \right) \right\} \\
&= \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{(\mathcal{P})}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left((G \vee H)(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(x) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $G \vee H$ is (countably) α -compact. \square

Analogously we have the following result.

Theorem 4.2. *Let L be a complete Heyting algebra. If both G and H have the α -Lindelöf property, then so does $G \vee H$.*

Theorem 4.3. *If G is (countably) α -compact and H is α -closed, then $G \wedge H$ is (countably) α -compact.*

Proof. For any (countable) family \mathcal{P} of α -closed L -sets, we have by Theorem 3.5 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bigvee_{x \in X} \left((G \wedge H)(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P}} B(x) \right) \\
&= \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P} \cup \{H\}} B(x) \right) \geq \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{(\mathcal{P} \cup \{H\})}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(x) \right) \\
&= \left\{ \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{(\mathcal{P})}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(x) \right) \right\} \wedge \left\{ \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{(\mathcal{P})}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge H(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(x) \right) \right\} \\
&= \left\{ \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{(\mathcal{P})}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge H(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(x) \right) \right\} \\
&= \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{(\mathcal{P})}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left((G \wedge H)(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(x) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $G \wedge H$ is (countably) α -compact. \square

Analogously we have the following result.

Theorem 4.4. *If G has the α -Lindelöf property and H is α -closed, then $G \wedge H$ has the α -Lindelöf property.*

Theorem 4.5. *Let L be a complete Heyting algebra and let $f: (X, \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{T}_2)$ be an α -irresolute map. If G is an α -compact (or a countably α -compact, an α -Lindelöf) L -set in (X, \mathcal{T}_1) , then so is $f_L^-(G)$ in (Y, \mathcal{T}_2) .*

Proof. We only prove that the theorem is true for α -compactness. Suppose that \mathcal{P} is a family of α -closed L -sets in (Y, \mathcal{T}_2) . Then by Lemma 2.5 and α -compactness of G we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee_{y \in Y} \left(f_L^-(G)(y) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P}} B(y) \right) &= \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{P}} f_L^-(B)(x) \right) \\ &\geq \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{(\mathcal{P})}} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left(G(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} f_L^-(B)(x) \right) = \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in 2^{(\mathcal{P})}} \bigvee_{y \in Y} \left(f_L^-(G)(y) \wedge \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B(y) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $f_L^-(G)$ is α -compact. □

Analogously we have the following result.

Theorem 4.6. *Let L be a complete Heyting algebra and let $f: (X, \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{T}_2)$ be an α -continuous map. If G is an α -compact (a countably α -compact, an α -Lindelöf) L -set in (X, \mathcal{T}_1) , then $f_L^-(G)$ is a compact (countably compact, Lindelöf) L -set in (Y, \mathcal{T}_2) .*

Definition 4.7. Let (X, \mathcal{T}_1) and (Y, \mathcal{T}_2) be two L -spaces. A map $f: (X, \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is called strongly α -irresolute if $f_L^-(G)$ is open in (X, \mathcal{T}_1) for every α -open L -set G in (Y, \mathcal{T}_2) .

It is obvious that a strongly α -irresolute map is α -irresolute and continuous.

Analogously we have the following result.

Theorem 4.8. *Let L be a complete Heyting algebra and let $f: (X, \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{T}_2)$ be a strongly α -irresolute map. If G is a compact (countably compact, Lindelöf) L -set in (X, \mathcal{T}_1) , then $f_L^-(G)$ is an α -compact (a countably α -compact, an α -Lindelöf) L -set in (Y, \mathcal{T}_2) .*

5. FURTHER CHARACTERIZATIONS OF α -COMPACTNESS AND GOODNESS

In this section we assume that L is a completely distributive de Morgan algebra.

Now we generalize the notions of a β_a -open cover and a Q_a -open cover [16] as follows:

Definition 5.1. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be an L -space, $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$ and $G \in L^X$. A family $\mathcal{U} \subseteq L^X$ is called a β_a -cover of G if for any $x \in X$, it follows that $a \in \beta(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{U}} A(x))$. \mathcal{U} is called a strong β_a -cover of G if $a \in \beta\left(\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{U}} A(x)\right)\right)$.

Definition 5.2. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be an L -space, $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$ and $G \in L^X$. A family $\mathcal{U} \subseteq L^X$ is called a Q_a -cover of G if for any $x \in X$, it follows that $G'(x) \vee \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{U}} A(x) \geq a$.

It is obvious that a strong β_a -cover of G is a β_a -cover of G , and a β_a -cover of G is a Q_a -cover of G .

Analogously to the proof of Theorem 2.9 in [16] we can obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 5.3. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be an L -space and $G \in L^X$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.

- (1) G is α -compact.
- (2) For any $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$ (or $a \in M(L)$), each α -closed strong a -remote family of G has a finite subfamily which is an a -remote (a strong a -remote) family of G .
- (3) For any $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$ (or $a \in M(L)$) and any α -closed strong a -remote family \mathcal{P} of G , there exist a finite subfamily \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{P} and $b \in \beta(a)$ (or $b \in \beta^*(a)$) such that \mathcal{F} is a (strong) b -remote family of G .
- (4) For any $a \in L \setminus \{1\}$ (or $a \in P(L)$), each α -open strong a -shading of G has a finite subfamily which is an a -shading (a strong a -shading) of G .
- (5) For any $a \in L \setminus \{1\}$ (or $a \in P(L)$) and any α -open strong a -shading \mathcal{U} of G , there exist a finite subfamily \mathcal{V} of \mathcal{U} and $b \in \alpha(a)$ (or $b \in \alpha^*(a)$) such that \mathcal{V} is a (strong) b -shading of G .
- (6) For any $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$ (or $a \in M(L)$), each α -open strong β_a -cover of G has a finite subfamily which is a (strong) β_a -cover of G .
- (7) For any $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$ (or $a \in M(L)$) and any α -open strong β_a -cover \mathcal{U} of G , there exist a finite subfamily \mathcal{V} of \mathcal{U} and $b \in L$ (or $b \in M(L)$) with $a \in \beta(b)$ such that \mathcal{V} is a (strong) β_b -cover of G .
- (8) For any $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$ (or $a \in M(L)$) and any $b \in \beta(a) \setminus \{0\}$, each α -open Q_a -cover of G has a finite subfamily which is a Q_b -cover of G .
- (9) For any $a \in L \setminus \{0\}$ (or $a \in M(L)$) and any $b \in \beta(a) \setminus \{0\}$ (or $b \in \beta^*(a)$), each α -open Q_a -cover of G has a finite subfamily which is a (strong) β_b -cover of G .

Analogously we also can present characterizations of countable α -compactness and the α -Lindelöf property.

Now we consider the goodness of α -compactness.

For $a \in L$ and a crisp subset $D \subset X$, we define $a \wedge D$ and $a \vee D$ as follows:

$$(a \wedge D)(x) = \begin{cases} a, & x \in D; \\ 0, & x \notin D. \end{cases} \quad (a \vee D)(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in D; \\ a, & x \notin D. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 5.4 ([17]). *For an L -set $A \in L^X$, the following facts are true.*

- (1) $A = \bigvee_{a \in L} (a \wedge A_{(a)}) = \bigvee_{a \in L} (a \wedge A_{[a]})$.
- (2) $A = \bigwedge_{a \in L} (a \vee A^{(a)}) = \bigwedge_{a \in L} (a \vee A^{[a]})$.

Theorem 5.5 [17]. *Let $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ be the L -space topologically generated by (X, τ) and $A \in L^X$. Then the following facts hold.*

- (1) $\text{cl}(A) = \bigvee_{a \in L} (a \wedge (A_{(a)})^-) = \bigvee_{a \in L} (a \wedge (A_{[a]})^-)$;
- (2) $\text{cl}(A)_{(a)} \subset (A_{(a)})^- \subset (A_{[a]})^- \subset \text{cl}(A)_{[a]}$;
- (3) $\text{cl}(A) = \bigwedge_{a \in L} (a \vee (A^{(a)})^-) = \bigwedge_{a \in L} (a \vee (A^{[a]})^-)$;
- (4) $\text{cl}(A)^{(a)} \subset (A^{(a)})^- \subset (A^{[a]})^- \subset \text{cl}(A)^{[a]}$;
- (5) $\text{int}(A) = \bigvee_{a \in L} (a \wedge (A_{(a)})^\circ) = \bigvee_{a \in L} (a \wedge (A_{[a]})^\circ)$;
- (6) $\text{int}(A)_{(a)} \subset (A_{(a)})^\circ \subset (A_{[a]})^\circ \subset \text{int}(A)_{[a]}$;
- (7) $\text{int}(A) = \bigwedge_{a \in L} (a \vee (A^{(a)})^\circ) = \bigwedge_{a \in L} (a \vee (A^{[a]})^\circ)$;
- (8) $\text{int}(A)^{(a)} \subset (A^{(a)})^\circ \subset (A^{[a]})^\circ \subset \text{int}(A)^{[a]}$, where $(A_{(a)})^-$ and $(A_{(a)})^\circ$ denote respectively the closure and the interior of $A_{(a)}$ in (X, τ) and so on, $\text{cl}(A)$ and $\text{int}(A)$ denote respectively the closure and the interior of A in $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ be generated topologically by (X, τ) . If A is an α -open set in (X, τ) , then χ_A is an α -open L -set in $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$. If B is an α -open L -set in $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$, then $B_{(a)}$ is an α -open set in (X, τ) for every $a \in L$.*

Proof. If A is an α -open set in (X, τ) , then $A \subseteq ((A^\circ)^-)^\circ$. Thus we have

$$\chi_A \leq \chi_{((A^\circ)^-)^\circ} = \text{int}(\chi_{(A^\circ)^-}) = \text{int}(\text{cl}(\chi_{A^\circ})) = \text{int}(\text{cl}(\text{int}(\chi_A))).$$

This shows that χ_A is α -open in $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$.

If B is an α -open L -set in $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$, then $B \leq \text{int}(\text{cl}(\text{int}(B)))$. From Theorem 5.5 we have

$$B_{(a)} \subseteq \text{int}(\text{cl}(\text{int}(B)))_{(a)} \subseteq (\text{cl}(\text{int}(B)))_{(a)}^\circ \subseteq ((\text{int}(B)_{(a)})^-)^\circ \subseteq (((B_{(a)})^\circ)^-)^\circ.$$

This shows that $B_{(a)}$ is an α -open set in (X, τ) . □

The next two theorems show that α -compactness, countable α -compactness and the α -Lindelöf property are good extensions.

Theorem 5.7. *Let $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ be generated topologically by (X, τ) . Then $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ is (countably) α -compact if and only if (X, τ) is (countably) α -compact.*

Proof. (Necessity) Let \mathcal{A} be an α -open cover (a countable α -open cover) of (X, τ) . Then $\{\chi_A; A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is a family of α -open L -sets in $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ with $\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \chi_A(x) \right) = 1$. From (countable) α -compactness of $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ we know that

$$1 \geq \bigvee_{\mathcal{V} \in 2^{(\mathcal{A})}} \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{V}} \chi_A(x) \right) \geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \chi_A(x) \right) = 1.$$

This implies that there exists $\mathcal{V} \in 2^{(\mathcal{A})}$ such that $\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{V}} \chi_A(x) \right) = 1$. Hence \mathcal{V} is a cover of (X, τ) . Therefore (X, τ) is (countably) α -compact.

(Sufficiency) Let \mathcal{U} be a (countable) family of α -open L -sets in $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ and let $\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{U}} B(x) \right) = a$. If $a = 0$, then we obviously have

$$\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{U}} B(x) \right) \leq \bigvee_{\mathcal{V} \in 2^{(\mathcal{U})}} \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{V}} B(x) \right).$$

Now we suppose that $a \neq 0$. In this case, for any $b \in \beta(a) \setminus \{0\}$ we have

$$b \in \beta \left(\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{U}} B(x) \right) \right) \subseteq \bigcap_{x \in X} \beta \left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{U}} B(x) \right) = \bigcap_{x \in X} \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{U}} \beta(B(x)).$$

By Lemma 5.6 this implies that $\{B(b); B \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is an α -open cover of (X, τ) . From (countable) α -compactness of (X, τ) we know that there exists $\mathcal{V} \in 2^{(\mathcal{U})}$ such that $\{B(b); B \in \mathcal{V}\}$ is a cover of (X, τ) . Hence $b \leq \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{V}} B(x) \right)$. Further we have

$$b \leq \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{V}} B(x) \right) \leq \bigvee_{\mathcal{V} \in 2^{(\mathcal{U})}} \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{V}} B(x) \right).$$

This implies that

$$\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{U}} B(x) \right) = a = \bigvee \{b; b \in \beta(a)\} \leq \bigvee_{\mathcal{V} \in 2^{(\mathcal{U})}} \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{V}} B(x) \right).$$

Therefore $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ is (countably) α -compact. □

Analogously we have the following result.

Theorem 5.8. *Let $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ be generated topologically by (X, τ) . Then $(X, \omega_L(\tau))$ has the α -Lindelöf property if and only if (X, τ) has the α -Lindelöf property.*

6. THE RELATIONS OF α -COMPACTNESS AND OTHER TYPES OF COMPACTNESS

In this section we assume that L is again completely distributive.

Based on Kudri's compactness in [7], Aygün presented a definition of α -compactness in [1]. Since Kudri's compactness is equivalent to strong compactness in [9], [19], we shall also refer to Aygün's α -compactness as α -strong compactness. The following is its equivalent form.

Definition 6.1. Let (X, \mathcal{S}) be an L -space. $G \in L^X$ is said to be α -strongly compact if for any $a \in P(L)$, each α -open a -shading of G has a finite subfamily which is an a -shading of G .

In [4], [8], Bai and Li et al. introduced the notions of SR-compactness and near SR-compactness by means of strongly semiopen L -sets. In fact, a strongly semiopen L -set is equivalent to an α -open L -set. This implies that both SR-compactness and near SR-compactness are extensions of α -compactness in general topology. Their equivalent forms can be stated as follows:

Definition 6.2 ([4]). Let (X, \mathcal{S}) be an L -space. $G \in L^X$ is said to be SR-compact (we shall call it α -N-compact) if for each $a \in M(L)$, every α -closed a -remote family of G has a finite subfamily which is a strong a -remote family of G .

Definition 6.3 ([8]). Let (X, \mathcal{S}) be an L -space. $G \in L^X$ is said to be near SR-compact if for each $a \in M(L)$, every α -closed a -remote family of G has a finite subfamily which is an a -remote family of G .

It is obvious that Definition 6.3 is equivalent to Definition 6.1.

From Theorem 5.3 we easily obtain the following result.

Theorem 6.4. *For an L -set G in an L -space, the following implications hold.*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \alpha\text{-N-compactness} & \Rightarrow & \alpha\text{-strong compactness} & \Rightarrow & \alpha\text{-compactness} \\
 \Downarrow & & \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\
 N\text{-compactness} & \Rightarrow & \text{strong compactness} & \Rightarrow & \text{compactness}
 \end{array}$$

Notice that none of the above implications is invertible. We only present a counterexample which is α -compact but not α -strongly compact. The other examples can be found in [8], [9], [19] and in general topology.

Example 6.5. Take $Y = \mathbb{N}$. For all $n \in Y$, define $B_n \in [0, 1]^Y$ as follows:

$$B_n(y) = \begin{cases} (n+1)^{-1}, & y = n; \\ 0, & y \neq n. \end{cases}$$

Let \mathcal{T} be the $[0, 1]$ -topology generated by the subbase $\mathcal{B} = \{B_n; n \in Y\}$. Obviously $\{B_n; n \in Y\}$ is an open 0-shading of χ_Y , but $\{B_n; n \in Y\}$ has no finite subfamily which is an open 0-shading of χ_Y . Therefore (Y, \mathcal{T}) is not strongly compact, of course it is not α -strongly compact either.

Now we prove that (Y, \mathcal{T}) is α -compact. It is easy to check that if A is an α -open L -set in (Y, \mathcal{T}) and $A \neq \chi_Y$, then $A \leq \bigvee_{n \in Y} B_n$.

For each $a \in [0, 1)$, suppose that \mathcal{U} is an α -open strong a -shading of χ_Y . If $\chi_Y \in \mathcal{U}$, then $\{\chi_Y\}$ is a strong a -shading of χ_Y . Now we suppose that $\chi_Y \notin \mathcal{U}$. Then \mathcal{U} is not a strong a -shading of χ_Y since $\bigwedge_{y \in Y} \left(\bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{U}} A(y) \right) \leq \bigwedge_{y \in Y} \left(\bigvee_{n \in Y} B_n(y) \right) = 0$.

This shows that (Y, \mathcal{T}) is α -compact.

References

- [1] *H. Aygün*: α -compactness in L -fuzzy topological spaces. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* *116* (2000), 317–324. [Zbl 0990.54009](#)
- [2] *K. K. Azad*: On fuzzy semicontinuity, fuzzy almost continuity and fuzzy weak continuity. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* *82* (1981), 14–32. [Zbl 0511.54006](#)
- [3] *S. Z. Bai*: Fuzzy strongly semiopen sets and fuzzy strong semicontinuity. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* *52* (1992), 345–351. [Zbl 0795.54009](#)
- [4] *S. Z. Bai*: The SR-compactness in L -fuzzy topological spaces. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* *87* (1997), 219–225. [Zbl 0912.54009](#)
- [5] *P. Dwinger*: Characterization of the complete homomorphic images of a completely distributive complete lattice. I. *Indagationes Mathematicae (Proceedings)* *85* (1982), 403–414. [Zbl 0503.06012](#)
- [6] *G. Gierz, et al.*: *A Compendium of Continuous Lattices*. Springer, Berlin, 1980. [Zbl 0452.06001](#)
- [7] *S. R. T. Kudri*: Compactness in L -fuzzy topological spaces. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* *67* (1994), 329–336. [Zbl 0842.54011](#)
- [8] *S. G. Li, S. Z. Bai, N. Li*: The near SR-compactness axiom in L -topological spaces. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* *147* (2004), 307–316. [Zbl pre02118382](#)
- [9] *Y. M. Liu, M. K. Luo*: *Fuzzy Topology*. World Scientific, Singapore, 1997. [Zbl 0906.54006](#)
- [10] *R. Lowen*: A comparison of different compactness notions in fuzzy topological spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* *64* (1978), 446–454. [Zbl 0381.54004](#)
- [11] *S. N. Maheshwari, S. S. Thakur*: On α -irresolute mappings. *Tamkang J. Math.* *11* (1981), 209–214. [Zbl 0485.54009](#)
- [12] *S. N. Maheshwari, S. S. Thakur*: On α -compact spaces. *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sinica* *13* (1985), 341–347. [Zbl 0591.54015](#)
- [13] *O. Njåstad*: On some classes of nearly open sets. *Pacific J. Math.* *15* (1965), 961–970. [Zbl 0137.41903](#)

- [14] *A. S. B. Shahana*: On fuzzy strong semicontinuity and fuzzy precontinuity. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* *44* (1991), 303–308. [Zbl 0753.54001](#)
- [15] *F.-G. Shi*: Fuzzy compactness in L -topological spaces. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, submitted.
- [16] *F.-G. Shi*: Countable compactness and the Lindelöf property of L -fuzzy sets. *Iran. J. Fuzzy Syst.* *1* (2004), 79–88.
- [17] *F.-G. Shi*: Theory of L_β -nested sets and L_α -nested and their applications. *Fuzzy Systems and Mathematics* *4* (1995), 65–72. (In Chinese.)
- [18] *S. S. Thakur, R. K. Saraf*: α -compact fuzzy topological spaces. *Math. Bohem.* *120* (1995), 299–303. [Zbl 0841.54005](#)
- [19] *G. J. Wang*: Theory of L -fuzzy Topological Spaces. Shanxi Normal University Press, Xian, 1988. (In Chinese.)

Author's address: Fu-Gui Shi, Beijing Institute of Technology, Department of Mathematics, Beijing 100081, P.R. China, e-mail: fuguishi@bit.edu.cn or f.g.shi@263.net.