

MATH4341 Topology – Notes #3

Viswanath Ramakrishna*

September 23, 2006

5 General Topological Sets

Definition 5.1. Let X be any set. A **topology** τ on X is a family of subsets of X with the following properties: i) $X \in \tau$; ii) $\emptyset \in \tau$; iii) if $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$ is in τ , then so is $\bigcup_{\alpha \in I} U_\alpha$; iv) If U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n is a finite collection of members of τ , then $\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i$ is also in τ .

We may occasionally write (X, τ) for a topological space.

Example 5.2. i) Any metric space with τ as the topology generated by its metric. If (X, τ) , for a topological space, is such that τ is the topology generated by some metric d on X , then (X, τ) is said to be **metrizable**.

ii) Let X be any set and $\tau = \mathcal{P}(X) = \{\text{all subsets of } X\} =$ the powerset of X . Then (X, τ) is a topological space, and τ is said to be the **discrete topology** on X . Evidently, (X, τ) is metrizable.

iii) Let X be any set. The **indiscrete topology** on X is given by $\tau = \{\emptyset, X\}$.

iv) Let $X = \{a, b\}$. Take $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}\}$. Verify (X, τ) is a topological space. This is the **Sierpinski or two-point connected set**.

v) Let X be any set, and let $\tau = \{A \subseteq X : A = \emptyset \text{ or } X \setminus A \text{ is finite}\}$. Show that τ is indeed a topology (recall \emptyset is, by convention, finite). This is the **co-finite topology** on X .

vi) Let X be a non-empty set. Let $p \in X$ be a priori specified point. Then $\tau = \{\emptyset\} \cup \{A \subseteq X : p \in A\}$ is called a **particular point topology**.

vii) Let X and p be as above. Let $\tau = \{X\} \cup \{A \subseteq X : p \notin A\}$. This is called an **extended point topology**.

Definition 5.3. ¹ Let (X, τ) be a topological space. Any member of τ is said to be an **open subset** of X .

Definition 5.4 (Interior of a Set). Let (X, τ) be a topological space, and let $A \subseteq X$. The **interior** of A is by definition $\bigcup U$ over all subsets U of X satisfying i) U is open, and ii) $U \subseteq A$.

Obviously, $\text{int } A$ is the *largest* open set contained in A . Clearly, since arbitrary unions of open sets are open, $\text{int } A$ is open for all subsets $A \subseteq X$. Further A is open if and only if $\text{int } A = A$.

Definition 5.5 (Neighbourhood of a point x). Let (X, τ) be a topological space, and let $x \in X$. Any subset $A \subseteq X$ with $x \in \text{int } A$ is called a **neighborhood of x** (“nbhd”).

Definition 5.6 (Closed sets). Let (X, τ) be a topological space. A subset $K \subseteq X$ is closed if $X \setminus K$ is open, i.e., if $X \setminus K \in \tau$.

*Scribed by Matthew R. Dempsey

¹Reader be warned, herein I diverge from the numbering in Ramakrishna’s handouts.

Exercise 5.7. i) ϕ is closed; ii) X is closed; iii) If K_1, K_2, \dots, K_e are a finite number of closed sets, then $K_1 \cup K_2 \cup \dots \cup K_e$ is also closed; iv) If $\{K_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a family of closed sets, then so is $\bigcap_{i \in I} K_i$.

Definition 5.8. Let X be a topological space, and let $A \subseteq X$. A point $x \in X$ is a **cluster point of A** if every neighborhood U of x is such that $(U \cap A) \setminus \{x\} \neq \phi$. The **derived set of A** , denoted A' , is the set of all cluster points of X .

Remark 5.9. Since $\text{int } B$ is open for all $B \subseteq X$, we see that $x \in X$ is a cluster point of A if and only if every open set C containing x satisfies $C \cap A \setminus \{x\} \neq \phi$. Indeed, if x is a cluster point per Definition 5.8, then since the open set C is a neighborhood of x , we must have $C \cap A \setminus \{x\} \neq \phi$. Conversely, let $x \in X$ be such that for every open set C containing x we have $C \cap A \setminus \{x\} \neq \phi$. Let U be a neighborhood of x . Thus $x \in \text{int } U$. But $\text{int } U$ is open. So we must have $(\text{int } U) \cap A \setminus \{x\} \neq \phi$. Since $\text{int } U \subseteq U$, this implies $U \cap A \setminus \{x\} \neq \phi$, i.e., that x is a cluster point per Definition 5.8.

Definition 5.10. The **closure** of a set A is given by $\bigcap F$ where F is closed and $F \supseteq A$. The closure of A is denoted \bar{A} .

Remark 5.11. Since arbitrary intersection of closed sets are closed, it is evident that \bar{A} is closed for any $A \subseteq X$. Further, \bar{A} is the smallest closed set containing A .

Theorem 5.12 (Alternative characterizations of closure). i) $x \in \bar{A}$ if and only if every neighborhood U of x intersects A in a non-empty fashion; ii) $\bar{A} = A \cup A'$.

Proof. i) Let $x \in \bar{A}$, per Definition 5.10. Let U be a neighborhood of x . If $U \cap A = \phi$, then $X \setminus \text{int } U$ is a closed set, and $A \subseteq X \setminus \text{int } U$. (Indeed, $U \cap A = \phi$ implies $A \subseteq X \setminus U$. Since $\text{int } U \subseteq U$, we must have $A \subseteq X \setminus \text{int } U$.) But then $\bar{A} \subseteq X \setminus \text{int } U$ since \bar{A} is the intersection of all closed sets containing A . But then $x \in \bar{A} \cap \text{int } U$, which contradicts $U \cap A = \phi$. So we must have $U \cap A \neq \phi$.

Conversely, let every neighborhood of x intersect A . Suppose $x \notin \bar{A}$ per Definition 5.10. So there is at least one closed set F with $A \subseteq F$ but $x \notin F$. Then $x \in X \setminus F$. But $X \setminus F$ is open and in particular a neighborhood of x . However, $A \subseteq F$ implies $X \setminus F \cap A = \phi$ —a contradiction to every neighborhood of x intersecting A . So indeed $x \in \bar{A}$.

ii) Suppose $x \in A \cup A'$. Then, by the definition of cluster points, every neighborhood of x intersects A . Thus, by i) $x \in \bar{A}$. Conversely, let $x \in \bar{A}$. If $x \in A$, then clearly $x \in A \cup A'$. Let $x \notin A$. Let U be a neighborhood of x . By i) $U \cap A \neq \phi$. But $x \notin A$. So $U \cap A \setminus \{x\} \neq \phi$. So $x \in A'$. So $\bar{A} \subseteq A \cup A'$. Hence $\bar{A} = A \cup A'$. \square

What is the generalization of open balls to general topological spaces? The following is one:

Definition 5.13. Let (X, τ) be a topological space. A **base** for τ is a subcollection $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \tau$, such that every member of τ is a union of some members of \mathcal{B} .

Remark 5.14. It is evident that \mathcal{B} is a base for (X, τ) provided \mathcal{B} is a collection of open sets with the following property: $U \subseteq X$ is open if and only if for all $x \in U$, there exists some $B_x \in \mathcal{B}$ with $x \in B_x \subseteq U$.

Example 5.15. i) τ itself is a base for (X, τ) ;

ii) If X is a metric space, then $\mathcal{B} = \{B(x, \epsilon) : x \in X, \epsilon > 0\}$ is a base;

iii) $X = \mathbf{R}$ with the Euclidean topology has $\mathcal{B} = \{(a, b) : a, b \in \mathbf{Q}\}$ as a base;

iv) One can specify a topology by just specifying a base for it. For instance, let $X = \mathbf{R}$ and let $\mathcal{B} = \{(a, b) : a, b \in \mathbf{Q}\} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \mathbf{Q}\}$. Then the open sets of this topology are $\tau = \{U \cup J : U \text{ is open in the usual topology of } \mathbf{R}, \text{ and } J \subseteq X \setminus \mathbf{Q}\}$. The real line \mathbf{R} , under this topology, is said to be the **Michael line**, and we occasionally write \mathbf{R} as \mathbf{R}_M to remind ourselves that this \mathbf{R} is without the Euclidean topology. (We could also allow (a, b) with $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$ or $a, b \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \mathbf{Q}$ in the first half of this basis.)

Note (a, b) with $a, b \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \mathbf{Q}$ is both open and closed in this topology. It is open, since (a, b) is an open interval, and all open intervals are open in \mathbf{R}_M . It is closed since $\mathbf{R}_M \setminus (a, b) = (-\infty, a] \cup [b, \infty)$ and $(-\infty, a] = (-\infty, a) \cup \{a\}$ and $[b, \infty) = \{b\} \cup (b, \infty)$, i.e., $\mathbf{R}_M \setminus (a, b)$ is the union of four open sets. Thus $\mathbf{R}_M \setminus (a, b)$ is open, and so (a, b) is closed.

When is a collection of subsets of X a base for *some* topology on X ? The following theorem provides an answer:

Theorem 5.16. *A family \mathcal{B} of subsets of X is a base for some topology on X if and only if: i) $\bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B = X$, and ii) if $U, V \in \mathcal{B}$ and $x \in U \cap V$, then there exists $W \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $x \in W \subseteq U \cap V$.*

Example 5.17. ² i) Let (X, d) be a metric space. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{B(x, \epsilon) : x \in X, \epsilon > 0\}$. Clearly $X = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B$. If $B(x, \epsilon_1) \cap B(y, \epsilon_2) \neq \emptyset$ and $z \in B(x, \epsilon_1) \cap B(y, \epsilon_2)$, let $\eta = \min\{\epsilon_1 - d(x, z), \epsilon_2 - d(y, z)\}$. Thus $\eta > 0$. Consider $B(z, \eta)$. Clearly $B(z, \eta) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $z \in B(z, \eta)$. Now $B(z, \eta) \subseteq B(x, \epsilon_1) \cap B(y, \epsilon_2)$. Indeed, if $w \in B(z, \eta)$, then $d(w, x) \leq d(w, z) + d(z, x) < \eta + d(z, x) < \epsilon_1 - d(x, z) + d(z, x) = \epsilon_1$. So $w \in B(x, \epsilon_1)$. Similarly, $d(w, y) \leq d(w, z) + d(z, y) < \eta + d(z, y) < \epsilon_2 - d(y, z) + d(z, y) = \epsilon_2$. So $w \in B(y, \epsilon_2)$, and thus $B(z, \eta) \subseteq B(x, \epsilon_1) \cap B(y, \epsilon_2)$.

ii) Let $X = \mathbf{R}$ and let $\mathcal{B} = \{[a, b) : a < b\}$. Clearly \mathcal{B} satisfies both requirements of Theorem 5.14, so it is a base for some topology on X . \mathbf{R} with this topology is called the **Sorgenfrey line** and is sometimes denoted \mathbf{R}_S .

Remark 5.18. Theorem 5.14 can also be used to determine if a given \mathcal{B} is a base for an *a priori* specified topology τ . We would, then, also require the elements of \mathcal{B} to be open sets in τ .

Definition 5.19. i) (Neighborhood basis) Let (X, τ) be a topological space, and let $x \in X$. A **neighborhood base** at x is a collection \mathcal{B}_x of neighborhoods of x , such that if U is a neighborhood of x , then there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}_x$ with $B \subseteq U$.

ii) (Local base) A **local base** is a neighborhood base, all of whose members are open neighborhoods.

Remark 5.20. i) Every local base is a neighborhood base. ii) If \mathcal{B}_x is a neighborhood base, then $\{\text{int } B : B \in \mathcal{B}_x\}$ is a local base at x . iii) If \mathcal{B}_x is a local base for all $x \in X$, then $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{x \in X} \mathcal{B}_x$ is a base for X . iv) If \mathcal{B} is a base for X , then for all $x \in X$, $\mathcal{B}_x = \{B \in \mathcal{B} : x \in B\}$ is a local base at x .

Interlude. We now present, mostly without proofs, the notions of countability and separability.

Definition 5.21. i) If (X, τ) has a countable neighborhood base at each $x \in X$, we say X is **first countable**. ii) If (X, τ) has a countable base, we say X is **second countable**.

(In the above definition, what is meant is each member of the said base is countable.)

²I diverge again from the handouts numbering here.

Remark 5.22. In Definition 5.19, we could replace “neighborhood base” by “local base”. (Why? See Remark 4.18-i and -ii.)

Exercise 5.23. Show a second countable space is first countable. (Use Remark 4.18-iv.)

Exercise 5.24. i) \mathbf{R}_M is first countable but not second countable. ii) An uncountable space with the co-finite topology is not first countable.

Definition 5.25 (Separability). Topological space (X, τ) is said to be **separable** if X has a countable dense set.

Example 5.26. i) \mathbf{R} is separable since \mathbf{Q} is dense in \mathbf{R} ;

ii) \mathbf{R}_S is also separable since \mathbf{Q} is dense in the Sorgenfrey line. (Why? Indeed every open set in \mathbf{R}_S is a union of intervals of the form $[a, b)$, and each such interval intersects \mathbf{Q} .)

iii) \mathbf{R}_M is not separable, since any dense subset of \mathbf{R}_M must contain all irrationals, and thus must be uncountable. Indeed, each $x \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \mathbf{Q}$ is open in the topology of \mathbf{R}_M , and thus a dense set must “intersect” each $x \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \mathbf{Q}$, i.e., contain each $x \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \mathbf{Q}$.

Next we summarize relations between I and II countability and separability.

Theorem 5.27. i) Every II countable space is separable. ii) The converse is not true. The Sorgenfrey line is separable but not II countable. iii) Every separable metric space is II countable.

Definition 5.28. i) A collection of subsets of X , such that X is the union of the members of this collection, is said to be a **cover** of X . ii) A cover whose members are open is said to be an **open cover** of X . iii) If U is a cover and $V \subseteq U$ is also a cover, we say V is a **subcover** of X .

Definition 5.29 (Lindelöf space). If (X, τ) is such that every open cover of X has a countable subcover, we say X is a **Lindelöf space**.

Theorem 5.30. Let X be a metric space. Then the following are equivalent: i) X is II countable; ii) X is separable; iii) X is Lindelöf.