



# Introduction to Topology -- 1

[Home Page](#) | [All Pages](#) | [Latest Revisions](#) | [Authors](#) | [Feeds](#) | [Export](#) |

This page is a detailed introduction to basic [topology](#). Starting from scratch (required background is just a basic concept of [sets](#)), and amplifying motivation from [analysis](#), it first develops standard [point-set topology](#) ([topological spaces](#)). In passing, some basics of [category theory](#) make an informal appearance, used to transparently summarize some conceptually important aspects of the theory, such as [initial](#) and [final topologies](#) and the [reflection](#) into [Hausdorff](#) and [sober topological spaces](#). The second part introduces some basics of [homotopy theory](#), mostly the [fundamental group](#), and ends with their first application to the classification of [covering spaces](#).

main page: [Introduction to Topology](#)

**this chapter:** *Introduction to Topology 1 – Point-set topology*

next chapter: [Introduction to Topology 2 -- Basic Homotopy Theory](#)

For introduction to more general and abstract [homotopy theory](#) see instead at [Introduction to Homotopy Theory](#).

## Point-set Topology

### 1. Metric spaces

Continuity

Compactness

### 2. Topological spaces

Examples

Closed subsets

### 3. Continuous functions

Examples

Homeomorphisms

### 4. Separation axioms

$T_n$  spaces

$T_n$  reflection

**Context**

**Topology**

## 5. Sober spaces

Frames of opens

Sober reflection

## 6. Compact spaces

Relation to Hausdorff spaces

Relation to quotient spaces

## 7. Universal constructions

## 8. References

The idea of [topology](#) is to study “[spaces](#)” with “[continuous functions](#)” between them. Specifically one considers [functions](#) between [sets](#) (whence “[point-set topology](#)”, see [below](#)) such that there is a concept for what it means that these functions depend continuously on their arguments, in that that their values do not “jump”. Such a concept of [continuity](#) is familiar from [analysis](#) on [metric spaces](#), (recalled [below](#)) but the definition in topology generalizes this analytic concept and renders it more foundational, generalizing the concept of [metric spaces](#) to that of [topological spaces](#). (def. [2.3](#) below).

Hence [topology](#) is the study of the [category](#) whose [objects](#) are [topological spaces](#), and whose [morphisms](#) are [continuous functions](#) (see also remark [3.3](#) below). This category is much more flexible than that of [metric spaces](#), for example it admits the construction of arbitrary [quotients](#) and [intersections](#) of spaces. Accordingly, topology underlies or informs many and diverse areas of mathematics, such as [functional analysis](#), [operator algebra](#), [manifold/scheme](#) theory, hence [algebraic geometry](#) and [differential geometry](#), and the study of [topological groups](#), [topological vector spaces](#), [local rings](#), etc.. Not the least, it gives rise to the field of [homotopy theory](#), where one considers also continuous deformations of continuous functions themselves (“[homotopies](#)”). Topology itself has many branches, such as [low-dimensional topology](#) or [topological domain theory](#).

A popular imagery for the concept of a [continuous function](#) is provided by deformations of [elastic](#) physical bodies, which may be deformed by stretching them without tearing. The canonical illustration is a continous [bijective](#) function from the [torus](#) to the surface of a coffee mug, which maps half of the torus to the handle of the coffee mug, and continuously deforms parts of the other half in order to form the actual cup. Since the [inverse function](#) to this function is itself continuous, the torus and the coffee mug, both regarded as [topological spaces](#), are “[the same](#)” for the purposes of [topology](#), one says they are [homeomorphic](#).

On the other hand, there is *no* [homeomorphism](#) from the [torus](#) to, for instance, the [sphere](#), signifying that these represent two topologically distinct spaces. Part of topology is concerned with studying [homeomorphism-invariants](#) of topological spaces which allow to detect by means of [algebraic](#) manipulations whether two topological spaces are homeomorphic (or more generally [homotopy equivalent](#)). This is called [algebraic topology](#). A basic algebraic invariant is the [fundamental group](#) of a topological space (discussed [below](#)), which measures how many ways

there are to wind loops inside a topological space.

Beware that the popular imagery of “[rubber-sheet geometry](#)” only captures part of the full scope of topology, in that it invokes spaces that *locally* still look like [metric spaces](#). But the concept of topological spaces is a good bit more general. Notably [finite topological spaces](#) are either [discrete](#) or very much unlike [metric spaces](#) (example 4.3 below), they play a role in [categorical logic](#). Also in [geometry](#) exotic topological spaces frequently arise when forming non-free [quotients](#). In order to gauge just how many of such “exotic” examples of topological spaces beyond locally [metric spaces](#) one wishes to admit in the theory, extra “[separation axioms](#)” are imposed on topological spaces (see [below](#)), and the flavour of topology as a field depends on this choice.

Among the separation axioms, the [Hausdorff space](#) axiom is most popular (see [below](#)) the weaker axiom of [soberity](#) (see [below](#)) stands out, on the one hand because this is the weakest axiom that is still naturally satisfied in applications to [algebraic geometry](#) ([schemes are sober](#)) and [computer science](#) (Vickers 89) and on the other hand because it fully realizes the strong roots that topology has in [formal logic](#): [sober topological spaces](#) are entirely characterized by the union-, intersection- and inclusion-relations (logical [conjunction](#), [disjunction](#) and [implication](#)) among their [open subsets](#) ([propositions](#)). This leads to a natural and fruitful generalization of [topology](#) to more general “purely logic-determined spaces”, called [locales](#) and in yet more generality [toposes](#) and [higher toposes](#). While the latter are beyond the scope of this introduction, their rich theory and relation to the [foundations](#) of mathematics and geometry provides an outlook on the relevance of the basic ideas of [topology](#).

In this first part we discuss the foundations of the concept of “sets equipped with topology” ([topological spaces](#)) and of [continuous functions](#) between them.

## 1. Metric spaces

The concept of continuity was made precise first in [analysis](#), in terms of [epsilon-delta analysis](#) of [open balls](#), recalled as def. 1.8 below. Then it was realized that this has a more elegant formulation in terms of the more general concept of [open sets](#), this is prop. 1.13 below. Adopting the latter as the definition leads to a more abstract concept of “continuous space”, this is the concept of [topological spaces](#), def. 2.3 below.

Here we briefly recall the relevant basic concepts from [analysis](#), as a motivation for various definitions in [topology](#). The reader who either already recalls these concepts in analysis or is content with ignoring the motivation coming from analysis should skip right away to the section [Topological spaces](#).

### Definition 1.1. (metric space)

A [metric space](#) is

1. a [set](#)  $X$  (the “underlying set”);

2. a [function](#)  $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  (the “distance function”) from the [Cartesian product](#) of the set with itself to the [non-negative real numbers](#)

such that for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :

1. (symmetry)  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$
2. ([triangle inequality](#))  $d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, z)$ .
3. (non-degeneracy)  $d(x, y) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = y$

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $(X, d)$ , be a [metric space](#). Then for every element  $x \in X$  and every  $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$  a [positive real number](#), we write

$$B_x^\circ(\epsilon) := \{y \in X \mid d(x, y) < \epsilon\}$$

for the [open ball](#) of [radius](#)  $\epsilon$  around  $x$ . Similarly we write

$$B_x(\epsilon) := \{y \in X \mid d(x, y) \leq \epsilon\}$$

for the *closed ball* of [radius](#)  $\epsilon$  around  $x$ . Finally we write

$$S_x(\epsilon) := \{y \in X \mid d(x, y) = \epsilon\}$$

for the [sphere](#) of [radius](#)  $\epsilon$  around  $x$ .

For  $\epsilon = 1$  we also speak of the *unit open/closed ball* and the *unit sphere*.

**Definition 1.3.** For  $(X, d)$  a [metric space](#) (def. 1.1) then a [subset](#)  $S \subset X$  is called a [bounded subset](#) if  $S$  is contained in some [open ball](#) (def. 1.2)

$$S \subset B_x^\circ(r)$$

around some  $x \in X$  of some [radius](#)  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ .

A key source of metric spaces are [normed vector spaces](#):

**Definition 1.4. (normed vector space)**

A [normed vector space](#) is

1. a [real vector space](#)  $V$ ;
2. a [function](#) (the [norm](#))

$$\|-\| : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

from the underlying [set](#) of  $V$  to the [real numbers](#),

such that for all  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $v, w \in V$  it holds true that

1. (linearity)  $\|cv\| = c\|v\|$ ;

2. ([triangle inequality](#))  $\|v + w\| \leq \|v\| + \|w\|$ ;

3. (non-degeneracy) if  $\|v\| = 0$  then  $v = 0$ .

**Proposition 1.5.** Every [normed vector space](#)  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$  becomes a [metric space](#) according to [def. 1.1](#) by setting

$$d(x, y) := \|x - y\|.$$

Examples of [normed vector spaces](#) ([def. 1.4](#)) and hence, via [prop. 1.5](#), of [metric spaces](#) include the following:

**Example 1.6.** For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the [Cartesian space](#)

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \{\vec{x} = (x_i)_{i=1}^n \mid x_i \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

carries a [norm](#) (the *Euclidean norm*) given by the [square root](#) of the [sum](#) of the [squares](#) of the components:

$$\|\vec{x}\| := \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i)^2}.$$

Via [prop. 1.5](#) this gives  $\mathbb{R}^n$  the structure of a [metric space](#), and as such it is called the [Euclidean space](#) of [dimension](#)  $n$ .

**Example 1.7.** More generally, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $p \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $p \geq 1$ , then the [Cartesian space](#)  $\mathbb{R}^n$  carries the [p-norm](#)

$$\|\vec{x}\|_p := \sqrt[p]{\sum_i |x_i|^p}$$


One also sets

$$\|\vec{x}\|_\infty := \max_{i \in I} |x_i|$$

and calls this the [supremum norm](#).

The graphics on the right (grabbed from Wikipedia) shows unit circles ([def. 1.2](#)) in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with respect to various [p-norms](#).

By the [Minkowski inequality](#), the [p-norm](#) generalizes to non-[finite dimensional vector spaces](#) such as [sequence spaces](#) and [Lebesgue spaces](#).



## Continuity


The following is now the fairly obvious definition of continuity for functions between metric spaces.

**Definition 1.8. (epsilon-delta definition of continuity)**

For  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  two [metric spaces](#) (def. 1.1), then a [function](#)

$$f : X \rightarrow Y$$

is said to be *continuous at a point*  $x \in X$  if for every [positive real number](#)  $\epsilon$  there exists a [positive real number](#)  $\delta$  such that for all  $x' \in X$  that are a distance  $< \delta$  from  $x$  then their image  $f(x')$  is a distance at most  $\epsilon$  from  $f(x)$ :



$$(f \text{ continuous at } x) := \bigvee_{\substack{\epsilon \in \mathbb{R} \\ \epsilon > 0}} \left( \bigwedge_{\substack{\delta \in \mathbb{R} \\ \delta > 0}} ((d_X(x, x') < \delta) \Rightarrow (d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < \epsilon)) \right).$$

The function  $f$  is said to be *continuous* if it is continuous at every point  $x \in X$ .

### Example 1.9. ([polynomials are continuous functions](#))

Consider the [real line](#)  $\mathbb{R}$  regarded as the 1-dimensional [Euclidean space](#)  $\mathbb{R}$  from example 1.6.

For  $P \in \mathbb{R}[X]$  a [polynomial](#), then the function

$$\begin{aligned} f_P : \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ x &\mapsto P(x) \end{aligned}$$

is a [continuous function](#) in the sense of def. 1.8.

On the other hand, a [step function](#) is continuous everywhere except at the [finite number](#) of points at which it changes its value, see example 1.14 below.


We now reformulate the analytic concept of continuity from def. 1.8 in terms of the simple but important concept of [open sets](#):

### Definition 1.10. (neighbourhood and open set)

Let  $(X, d)$  be a [metric space](#) (def. 1.1). Say that

1. A [neighbourhood](#) of a point  $x \in X$  is a [subset](#)  $U_x \subset X$  which contains some [open ball](#)  $B_x^\circ(\epsilon) \subset U_x$  around  $x$  (def. 1.2).
2. An [open subset](#) of  $X$  is a [subset](#)  $U \subset X$  such that for every  $x \in U$  it also contains an [open ball](#)  $B_x^\circ(\epsilon)$  around  $x$  (def. 1.2).
3. An [open neighbourhood](#) of a point  $x \in X$  is a [neighbourhood](#)  $U_x$  of  $x$  which is also an open subset, hence equivalently this is any open subset of  $X$  that contains  $x$ .

The following picture shows a point  $x$ , some [open balls](#)  $B_i$  containing it, and two of its [neighbourhoods](#)  $U_i$ :



graphics grabbed from [Munkres 75](#)

**Example 1.11.** Notice that for  $(X, d)$  a [metric space](#), then the [empty subset](#)  $\emptyset \subset X$  is always an [open subset](#) of  $(X, d)$  according to def. [1.10](#). This is because the clause for open subsets  $U \subset X$  says that “for every point  $x \in U$  there exists...”, but since there is no  $x$  in  $U = \emptyset$ , this clause is always satisfied in this case.

Conversely, the entire set  $X$  is always an open subset of  $(X, d)$ .

### Example 1.12. (open/closed [intervals](#))

Regard the [real numbers](#)  $\mathbb{R}$  as the 1-dimensional [Euclidean space](#) (example [1.6](#)).

For  $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$  consider the following [subsets](#):

1.  $(a, b) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a < x < b\}$  (*open interval*)
2.  $(a, b] := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a < x \leq b\}$  (*half-open interval*)
3.  $[a, b) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x < b\}$  (*half-open interval*)
4.  $[a, b] := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x \leq b\}$  (*closed interval*)

The first of these is an open subset according to def. [1.10](#), the other three are not. The first one is called an [open interval](#), the last one a [closed interval](#) and the middle two are called [half-open intervals](#).

Similarly for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  one considers

1.  $(-\infty, b) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x < b\}$  (*unbounded open interval*)
2.  $(a, \infty) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a < x\}$  (*unbounded open interval*)
3.  $(-\infty, b] := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \leq b\}$  (*unbounded half-open interval*)



4.  $[a, \infty) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x\}$  (*unbounded half-open interval*)

The first two of these are open subsets, the last two are not.

For completeness we may also consider

- $(-\infty, \infty) = \mathbb{R}$
- $(a, a) = \emptyset$

which are both open, according to def. 2.3.

We may now rephrase the analytic definition of continuity entirely in terms of open subsets (def. 1.10):

**Proposition 1.13. (rephrasing continuity in terms of open sets)**

Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be two *metric space* (def. 1.1). Then a *function*  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is *continuous* in the *epsilon* sense of def. 1.8 precisely if it has the property that its *pre-images* of *open subsets* of  $Y$  (in the sense of def. 1.10) are open subsets of  $X$ :

$$(f \text{ continuous}) \Leftrightarrow ((O_Y \subset Y \text{ open}) \Rightarrow (f^{-1}(O_Y) \subset X \text{ open})).$$

**principle of continuity**

*Continuous pre-Images of open subsets are open.*

**Proof.** Observe, by direct unwinding the definitions, that the epsilon definition of continuity (def. 1.8) says equivalently in terms of *open balls* (def. 1.2) that  $f$  is continuous at  $x$  precisely if for every open ball  $B_{f(x)}^\circ(\epsilon)$  around an image point, there exists an open ball  $B_x^\circ(\delta)$  around the corresponding pre-image point which maps into it:

$$\begin{aligned} (f \text{ continuous at } x) &\Leftrightarrow \forall_{\epsilon > 0} \left( \exists_{\delta > 0} (f(B_x^\circ(\delta)) \subset B_{f(x)}^\circ(\epsilon)) \right) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall_{\epsilon > 0} \left( \exists_{\delta > 0} (B_x^\circ(\delta) \subset f^{-1}(B_{f(x)}^\circ(\epsilon))) \right) \end{aligned}$$

With this observation the proof immediate. For the record, we spell it out:

First assume that  $f$  is continuous in the epsilon sense. Then for  $O_Y \subset Y$  any *open subset* and  $x \in f^{-1}(O_Y)$  any point in the pre-image, we need to show that there exists an *open neighbourhood* of  $x$  in  $f^{-1}(O_Y)$ .

That  $O_Y$  is open in  $Y$  means by definition that there exists an *open ball*  $B_{f(x)}^\circ(\epsilon)$  in  $O_Y$  around  $f(x)$  for some radius  $\epsilon$ . By the assumption that  $f$  is continuous and using the above observation, this implies that there exists an open ball  $B_x^\circ(\delta)$  in  $X$



such that  $f(B_x^\circ(\delta)) \subset B_{f(x)}^\circ(\epsilon) \subset Y$ , hence such that  $B_x^\circ(\delta) \subset f^{-1}(B_{f(x)}^\circ(\epsilon)) \subset f^{-1}(O_Y)$ . Hence this is an open ball of the required kind.


Conversely, assume that the pre-image function  $f^{-1}$  takes open subsets to open subsets. Then for every  $x \in X$  and  $B_{f(x)}^\circ(\epsilon) \subset Y$  an [open ball](#) around its image, we need to produce an open ball  $B_x^\circ(\delta) \subset X$  around  $x$  such that  $f(B_x^\circ(\delta)) \subset B_{f(x)}^\circ(\epsilon)$ .

But by definition of open subsets,  $B_{f(x)}^\circ(\epsilon) \subset Y$  is open, and therefore by assumption on  $f$  its pre-image  $f^{-1}(B_{f(x)}^\circ(\epsilon)) \subset X$  is also an open subset of  $X$ . Again by definition of open subsets, this implies that it contains an open ball as required. ■

### Example 1.14. ([step function](#))

Consider  $\mathbb{R}$  as the 1-dimensional [Euclidean space](#) (example 1.6) and consider the [step function](#)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} &\xrightarrow{H} \mathbb{R} \\ x &\mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & | x \leq 0 \\ 1 & | x > 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$



*graphics grabbed from [Vickers 89](#)*

Consider then for  $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$  the [open interval](#)  $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ , an [open subset](#) according to example 1.12. The [preimage](#)  $H^{-1}(a, b)$  of this open subset is

$$H^{-1} : (a, b) \mapsto \begin{cases} \emptyset & | a \geq 1 \text{ or } b \leq 0 \\ \mathbb{R} & | a < 0 \text{ and } b > 1 \\ \emptyset & | a \geq 0 \text{ and } b \leq 1 \\ (0, \infty) & | 0 \leq a < 1 \text{ and } b > 1 \\ (-\infty, 0] & | a < 0 \text{ and } b \leq 1 \end{cases}.$$

By example 1.12, all except the last of these pre-images listed are open subsets.

The failure of the last of the pre-images listed to be open witnesses that the step function is not continuous at  $x = 0$ .

## Compactness

A key application of [metric spaces](#) in [analysis](#) is that they allow a formalization of what it means for an infinite [sequence](#) of elements in the metric space (def. 1.15 below) to [converge](#) to a [limit of a sequence](#) (def. 1.16). Of particular interest are therefore those metric spaces for which each sequence has a converging subsequence: the [sequentially compact metric spaces](#) (def. 1.19).

We now briefly recall these concepts from [analysis](#). Then, in the above spirit, we reformulate the epsilonic definition of sequential compactness equivalently in terms of [open subsets](#). This gives a useful definition that generalizes to [topological spaces](#), the [compact topological spaces](#) discussed further [below](#).

### Definition 1.15. ([sequence](#))

Given a [set](#)  $X$ , then a [sequence](#) of elements in  $X$  is a [function](#)

$$x_{(-)} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$$

from the [natural numbers](#) to  $X$ .

A [sub-sequence](#) of such a sequence is a sequence of the form

$$x_{\iota(-)} : \mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{x_{(-)}} X$$

for some [injection](#)  $\iota$ .

### Definition 1.16. ([convergence to limit of a sequence](#))

Let  $(X, d)$  be a [metric space](#) (def. 1.1). Then a [sequence](#)

$$x_{(-)} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$$

in the underlying set  $X$  (def. 1.15) is said to [converge](#) to a point  $x_\infty \in X$ , denoted

$$x_i \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} x_\infty$$

if for every [positive real number](#)  $\epsilon$ , there exists a [natural number](#)  $n$ , such that all elements in the sequence after the  $n$ th one have [distance](#) less than  $\epsilon$  from  $x_\infty$ .

$$\left( x_i \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} x_\infty \right) \Leftrightarrow \left( \bigvee_{\substack{\epsilon \in \mathbb{R} \\ \epsilon > 0}} \left( \bigvee_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \bigvee_{\substack{i \in \mathbb{N} \\ i > n}} d(x_i, x_\infty) \leq \epsilon \right) \right) \right).$$

Here the point  $x_\infty$  is called the [limit of the sequence](#). Often one writes  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_i$  for this point.

### Definition 1.17. ([Cauchy sequence](#))

Given a [metric space](#)  $(X, d)$  (def. 1.1), then a [sequence](#) of points in  $X$  (def. 1.15)

$$x_{(-)} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$$

is called a [Cauchy sequence](#) if for every [positive real number](#)  $\epsilon$  there exists a [natural number](#)  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the [distance](#) between any two elements of the sequence beyond the  $n$ th one is less than  $\epsilon$

$$(x_{(-)} \text{ Cauchy}) \Leftrightarrow \left( \bigvee_{\substack{\epsilon \in \mathbb{R} \\ \epsilon > 0}} \left( \bigvee_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \bigvee_{\substack{i, j \in \mathbb{N} \\ i, j > N}} d(x_i, x_j) \leq \epsilon \right) \right) \right).$$

### Definition 1.18. (**complete metric space**)

A [metric space](#)  $(X, d)$  (def. 1.1), for which every [Cauchy sequence](#) (def. 1.17) [converges](#) (def. 1.16) is called a [complete metric space](#).

A [normed vector space](#), regarded as a metric space via prop. 1.5 that is complete in this sense is called a [Banach space](#).

Finally recall the concept of [compactness](#) of [metric spaces](#) via [epsilon analysis](#):

### Definition 1.19. (**sequentially compact metric space**)

A [metric space](#)  $(X, d)$  (def. 1.1) is called [sequentially compact](#) if every [sequence](#) in  $X$  has a subsequence (def. 1.15) which [converges](#) (def. 1.16).

The key fact to translate this [epsilon](#) definition of compactness to a concept that makes sense for general [topological space](#) (below) is the following:

### Proposition 1.20. (**sequentially compact metric spaces are equivalently compact metric spaces**)

For a [metric space](#)  $(X, d)$  (def. 1.1) the following are equivalent:

1.  $X$  is [sequentially compact](#);
2. for every [set](#)  $\{U_i \subset X\}_{i \in I}$  of [open subsets](#)  $U_i$  of  $X$  (def. 1.10) which cover  $X$  in that  $X = \bigcup_{i \in I} U_i$ , then there exists a [finite subset](#)  $J \subset I$  of these open subsets which still covers  $X$  in that also  $X = \bigcup_{i \in J \subset I} U_i$ .

The **proof** of prop. 1.20 is most conveniently formulated with some of the terminology of topology in hand, which we introduce now. Therefore we postpone the proof to [below](#).

In **summary** prop. 1.13 and prop. 1.20 show that the purely combinatorial and in particular non-[epsilon](#) concept of [open subsets](#) captures a substantial part of the nature of [metric spaces](#) in [analysis](#). This motivates to reverse the logic and consider "[spaces](#)" which are *only* characterized by what counts as their open subsets. These are the [topological spaces](#) which we turn to now in def. 2.3 (or, more generally, these are the "[locales](#)", which we briefly remark on further below in remark 5.6).

## 2. Topological spaces

Due to prop. 1.13 we should pay attention to [open subsets](#) in [metric spaces](#). It turns out that the following closure property, which follow directly from the definitions, is at the heart of the concept:

**Proposition 2.1. (closure properties of open sets in a metric space)**

The collection of [open subsets](#) of a [metric space](#)  $(X, d)$  as in def. 1.10 has the following properties:

1. The [union](#) of any [set](#) of open subsets is again an open subset.
2. The [intersection](#) of any [finite number](#) of open subsets is again an open subset.

**Remark 2.2. (empty union and empty intersection)**

Notice the degenerate case of [unions](#)  $\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i$  and [intersections](#)  $\bigcap_{i \in I} U_i$  of [subsets](#)  $U_i \subset X$  for the case that they are indexed by the [empty set](#)  $I = \emptyset$ :

1. the *empty union* is the empty set itself;
2. the *empty intersection* is all of  $X$ .

(The second of these may seem less obvious than the first. We discuss the general logic behind these kinds of phenomena [below](#).)

This way prop. 2.1 is indeed compatible with the degenerate cases of examples of open subsets in example 1.11.

Proposition 2.1 motivates the following generalized definition, which abstracts away from the concept of [metric space](#) just its system of [open subsets](#):

**Definition 2.3. ([topological spaces](#))**

Given a [set](#)  $X$ , then a *topology* on  $X$  is a collection  $\tau$  of [subsets](#) of  $X$  called the [open subsets](#), hence a [subset](#) of the [power set](#)  $P(X)$

$$\tau \subset P(X)$$

such that this is closed under forming

1. finite [intersections](#);
2. arbitrary [unions](#).

In particular (by remark 2.2):

- the [empty set](#)  $\emptyset \subset X$  is in  $\tau$  (being the union of no subsets)

and

- the whole set  $X \subset X$  itself is in  $\tau$  (being the intersection of no subsets).

A set  $X$  equipped with such a [topology](#) is called a [topological space](#).

**Remark 2.4.** In the field of [topology](#) it is common to eventually simply say “[space](#)” as shorthand for “[topological space](#)”. This is especially so as further qualifiers are added, such as “Hausdorff space” (def. [4.1](#) below). But beware that there are other kinds of [spaces](#) in mathematics.

**Remark 2.5.** The simple definition of [open subsets](#) in def. [2.3](#) and the simple implementation of the *principle of continuity* below in def. [3.1](#) gives the field of [topology](#) its fundamental and universal flavor. The combinatorial nature of these definitions makes [topology](#) be closely related to [formal logic](#). This becomes more manifest still for the “[sober topological space](#)” discussed [below](#). For more on this perspective see the remark on [locales](#) below, remark [5.6](#). An introductory textbook amplifying this perspective is ([Vickers 89](#)).

Before we look at first examples [below](#), here is some common **further terminology** regarding topological spaces:

There is an evident [partial ordering](#) on the set of topologies that a given set may carry:

**Definition 2.6. ([finer/coarser topologies](#))**

Let  $X$  be a [set](#), and let  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in P(X)$  be two [topologies](#) on  $X$ , hence two choices of [open subsets](#) for  $X$ , making it a [topological space](#). If

$$\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$$

hence if every open subset of  $X$  with respect to  $\tau_1$  is also regarded as open by  $\tau_2$ , then one says that

- the topology  $\tau_2$  is [finer](#) than the topology  $\tau_1$
- the topology  $\tau_1$  is [coarser](#) than the topology  $\tau_2$ .

With any kind of [structure](#) on [sets](#), it is of interest how to “[generate](#)” such structures from a small amount of data:

**Definition 2.7. ([basis for the topology](#))**

Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#), def. [2.3](#), and let

$$\beta \subset \tau$$

be a [subset](#) of its set of [open subsets](#). We say that

1.  $\beta$  is a [basis for the topology](#)  $\tau$  if every open subset  $O \in \tau$  is a [union](#) of elements of  $\beta$ ;
2.  $\beta$  is a [sub-basis for the topology](#) if every open subset  $O \in \tau$  is a [union](#) of

[finite intersections](#) of elements of  $\beta$ .

Often it is convenient to *define* topologies by defining some (sub-)basis as in def. 2.7. Examples are the [metric topology](#) below def. 2.9, the [binary product topology](#) in def. 2.16 below, and the [compact-open topology](#) on [mapping spaces](#) below in def. 6.11. To make use of this, we need to recognize sets of open subsets that serve as the basis for some topology:

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $X$  be a set.*

1. *A collection  $\beta \subset P(X)$  of [subsets](#) of  $X$  is a [basis](#) for some topology  $\tau \subset P(X)$  (def. 2.7) precisely if*
  1. *every point of  $X$  is contained in at least one element of  $\beta$ ;*
  2. *for every two subsets  $B_1, B_2 \in \beta$  and for every point  $x \in B_1 \cap B_2$  in their intersection, then there exists a  $B \in \beta$  that contains  $x$  and is contained in the intersection:  $x \in B \subset B_1 \cap B_2$ .*
2. *A subset  $B \subset \tau$  of opens is a sub-basis for a topology  $\tau$  on  $X$  precisely if  $\tau$  is the coarsest topology (def. 2.6) which contains  $B$ .*

## Examples

We discuss here some basic examples of [topological spaces](#) (def. 2.3), to get a feeling for the scope of the concept. Topological spaces are ubiquitous in [mathematics](#), so that there are many more examples and many more classes of examples than could be listed.

First of all, our motivating example from [above](#) now reads as follows:

### Example 2.9. (metric topology)

Let  $(X, d)$  be a [metric space](#) (def. 1.1). Then the collection of its [open subsets](#) in def. 1.10 constitutes a [topology](#) on the set  $X$ , making it a [topological space](#) in the sense of def. 2.3. This is called the [metric topology](#).

The [open balls](#) in a metric space constitute a [basis of a topology](#) (def. 2.7) for the [metric topology](#).

While the example of [metric space](#) topologies (example 2.9) is the motivating example for the concept of [topological spaces](#), it is important to notice that the concept of topological spaces is considerably more general, as some of the following examples show.

The following simple example of a (metric) topological space is important for the theory:

### Example 2.10. (the [point](#))

On a [singleton](#) set  $\{1\}$  there exists a unique topology  $\tau$  making it a [topological space](#) according to def. 2.3, namely

$$\tau := \{\emptyset, \{1\}\}.$$

We write

$$* := (\{1\}, \{\emptyset, \{1\}\})$$


for this topological space and call it *the point*.

Of course this is equivalently the [metric topology](#) (example 2.9) on  $\mathbb{R}^0$ , regarded as the 0-dimensional [Euclidean space](#) (example 1.6).

**Example 2.11.** On the 2-element set  $\{0, 1\}$  there are (up to [permutation](#) of elements) three distinct topologies:

1. the [codiscrete topology](#) (def. 2.13)  $\tau = \{\emptyset, \{0, 1\}\}$ ;
2. the [discrete topology](#) (def. 2.13),  $\tau = \{\emptyset, \{0\}, \{1\}, \{0, 1\}\}$ ;
3. the [Sierpinski space](#) topology  $\tau = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{0, 1\}\}$ .

**Example 2.12.** The following shows all the topologies on the 3-element set (up to [permutation](#) of elements)



graphics grabbed from [Munkres 75](#)

**Example 2.13. (discrete and co-discrete topology)**

Let  $S$  be any [set](#). Then there are always the following two extreme possibilities of equipping  $X$  with a topology  $\tau \subset P(X)$  in the sense of def. 2.3, and hence making it a [topological space](#):

1.  $\tau := P(S)$  the set of *all* open subsets;

this is called the [discrete topology](#) on  $S$ , it is the [finest topology](#) (def. 2.6) on  $X$ ,



we write  $\text{Disc}(S)$  for the resulting topological space;

2.  $\tau := \{\emptyset, S\}$  the set containing only the [empty](#) subset of  $S$  and all of  $S$  itself;

this is called the [codiscrete topology](#) on  $S$ , it is the [coarsest topology](#) (def. 2.6) on  $X$

we write  $\text{CoDisc}(S)$  for the resulting topological space.

The reason for this terminology is best seen when considering [continuous functions](#) into or out of these (co-)discrete topological spaces, we come to this in example 3.14 below.

**Example 2.14.** Given a [set](#)  $X$ , then the [cofinite topology](#) or *finite complement topology* on  $X$  is the [topology](#) (def. 2.3) whose [open subsets](#) are precisely

1. all [cofinite subsets](#)  $S \subset X$  (i.e. those such that the [complement](#)  $X \setminus S$  is a [finite set](#));
2. the [empty set](#).

If  $X$  is itself a [finite set](#) (but not otherwise) then the cofinite topology on  $X$  coincides with the [discrete topology](#) on  $X$  (example 2.13).

**Example 2.15.** For  $\{(X_i, \tau_i)\}_{i \in I}$  a [set](#) of topological spaces, then their [disjoint union](#)

$$\bigsqcup_{i \in I} (X_i, \tau_i)$$

is the topological space whose underlying set is the [disjoint union](#) of the underlying sets of the summand spaces, and whose open subsets are precisely the disjoint unions of the open subsets of the summand spaces.


In particular, for  $I$  any index set, then the disjoint union

$$\bigsqcup_{i \in I} *$$

of  $I$  copies of the [point](#) (example 2.10) is equivalently the [discrete topological space](#) (example 2.13) on that index set.

**Example 2.16. ([binary product topological space](#))**

For  $(X_1, \tau_1)$  and  $(X_2, \tau_2)$  two [topological spaces](#), then their [product topological space](#) has as underlying set the [Cartesian product](#)  $X_1 \times X_2$  of the corresponding two underlying sets, and its topology is generated from the [basis](#) (def. 2.7) given by the Cartesian products  $U_1 \times U_2$  of the opens  $U_i \in \tau_i$ .



graphics grabbed from [Munkres 75](#)

Beware that for non-[finite](#) products, the descriptions of the product topology is not as simple. This we turn to below in example 7.7, after introducing the general concept of [limits](#) in the [category of topological spaces](#).

### Example 2.17. ([subspace topology](#))

Let  $(X, \tau_X)$  be a [topological space](#), and let  $S \subset X$  be a [subset](#) of the underlying set. Then the corresponding [topological subspace](#) has  $S$  as its underlying set, and its open subsets are those subsets of  $S$  which arise as restrictions of open subsets of  $X$ .

$$(U_S \subset S \text{ open}) \Leftrightarrow \left( \exists_{U_X \in \tau_X} U_S = U_X \cap S \right).$$


(This is also called the [initial topology](#) of the inclusion map.)

Notice that this makes the inclusion function

$$(S, \tau_S) \hookrightarrow (X, \tau_X)$$

a [continuous function](#).

The picture on the right shows two open subsets inside the [square](#), regarded as a [topological subspace](#) of the [plane](#)  $\mathbb{R}^2$ :



*graphics grabbed from [Munkres 75](#)*

### Example 2.18. ([quotient topological space](#))

Let  $(X, \tau_X)$  be a [topological space](#) (def. 2.3) and let

$$R_\sim \subset X \times X$$

be an [equivalence relation](#) on its underlying set. Then the [quotient topological space](#) has

- as underlying set the [quotient set](#)  $X_\sim$ , hence the set of [equivalence classes](#),

and

- a subset  $O \subset X_\sim$  is declared to be an [open subset](#) precisely if its [preimage](#)  $\pi^{-1}(O)$  under the canonical [projection map](#)

$$\pi: X \rightarrow X_\sim$$

is open in  $X$ .


This is also called the [final topology](#) of the projection  $\pi$ .

Often one considers this with input datum not the equivalence relation, but any [surjection](#)

$$\pi : X \longrightarrow Y$$

of sets. Of course this identifies  $Y = X / \sim$  with  $(x_1 \sim x_2) \Leftrightarrow (\pi(x_1) = \pi(x_2))$ . Hence the *quotient topology* on the codomain set of a function out of any topological space has as open subsets those whose pre-images are open.

To see that this indeed does define a topology on  $X / \sim$  it is sufficient to observe that taking pre-images commutes with taking unions and with taking intersections.



The above picture shows on the left the [square](#) (a [topological subspace](#) of the [plane](#)), then in the middle the resulting [quotient topological space](#) obtained by identifying two opposite sides (the [cylinder](#)), and on the right the further quotient obtained by identifying the remaining sides (the [torus](#)).

*graphics grabbed from [Munkres 75](#)*

Sometimes it is useful to recognize topological quotient projections via [saturated subsets](#) (essentially another term for pre-images of underlying sets):

### Definition 2.19. ([saturated subset](#))

Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a [function](#) of [sets](#). Then a [subset](#)  $S \subset X$  is called an *[f-saturated subset](#)* (or just *saturated subset*, if  $f$  is understood) if  $S$  is the [pre-image](#) of its [image](#):

$$(S \subset X \text{ f-saturated}) \Leftrightarrow (S = f^{-1}(f(S))) .$$

Here  $f^{-1}(f(S))$  is also called the *f-saturation* of  $S$ .

### Example 2.20. (pre-images are saturated subsets)

For  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  any [function](#) of [sets](#), and  $S_Y \subset Y$  any [subset](#) of  $Y$ , then the [pre-image](#)  $f^{-1}(S_Y) \subset X$  is an *[f-saturated subset](#)* of  $X$  (def. 2.19).

Observe that:

**Lemma 2.21.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a [function](#). Then a [subset](#)  $S \subset X$  is *f-saturated* (def. 2.19) precisely if its [complement](#)  $X \setminus S$  is so.*

**Proposition 2.22.** A [continuous function](#)

$$f : (X, \tau_X) \longrightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$$

whose underlying function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is [surjective](#) exhibits  $\tau_Y$  as the corresponding [quotient topology](#) (def. 2.18) precisely if  $f$  sends open and  $f$ -[saturated subsets](#) in  $X$  (def. 2.19) to open subsets of  $Y$ . By lemma 2.21 this is the case precisely if it sends closed and  $f$ -saturated subsets to closed subsets.

### Example 2.23. ([image factorization](#))

Let  $f : (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$  be a [continuous function](#).

Write  $f(X) \subset Y$  for the [image](#) of  $f$  on underlying sets, and consider the resulting factorization of  $f$  through  $f(X)$  on underlying sets:

$$f : X \xrightarrow{\text{surjective}} f(X) \xrightarrow{\text{injective}} Y .$$

There are the following two ways to topologize the [image](#)  $f(X)$  such as to make this a sequence of two continuous functions:

1. By example 2.17  $f(X)$  inherits a [subspace topology](#) from  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  which makes the inclusion  $f(X) \rightarrow Y$  a [continuous function](#).

Observe that this also makes  $X \rightarrow f(X)$  a continuous function: An open subset of  $f(X)$  in this case is of the form  $U_Y \cap f(X)$  for  $U_Y \in \tau_Y$ , and  $f^{-1}(U_Y \cap f(X)) = f^{-1}(U_Y)$ , which is open in  $X$  since  $f$  is continuous.

2. By example 2.18  $f(X)$  inherits a [quotient topology](#) from  $(X, \tau_X)$  which makes the surjection  $X \rightarrow f(X)$  a [continuous function](#).

Observe that this also makes  $f(X) \rightarrow Y$  a continuous function: The preimage under this map of an open subset  $U_Y \in \tau_Y$  is the restriction  $U_Y \cap f(X)$ , and the pre-image of that under  $X \rightarrow f(X)$  is  $f^{-1}(U_Y)$ , as before, which is open since  $f$  is continuous, and therefore  $U_Y \cap f(X)$  is open in the quotient topology.

These constructions of [discrete topological spaces](#), [quotient topological spaces](#), [topological subspaces](#) and of [product topological spaces](#) are simple examples of [limits](#) and of [colimits](#) of topological spaces. The [category Top](#) of topological spaces has the convenient property that *all* [limits](#) and [colimits](#) (over [small diagrams](#)) exist in it. We discuss this below in [Universal constructions](#)

## Closed subsets

The [complements](#) of [open subsets](#) in a [topological space](#) are called [closed subsets](#) (def. 2.24 below). This simple definition indeed captures the concept of closure in the [analytic](#) sense of [convergence](#) of [sequences](#) (prop. 2.27 below). Of particular interest for the theory of topological spaces in the discussion of [separation axioms below](#) are those closed subsets which are “[irreducible](#)” (def. 2.28 below). These happen to be equivalently the “[frame](#) homomorphisms” (def. 2.31) to the [frame of](#)

[opens](#) of the point (prop. 2.34 below).

### Definition 2.24. ([closed subsets](#))


Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#) (def. 2.3). Then a [subset](#)  $S$  of  $X$  is called a [closed subset](#) if its [complement](#)  $X \setminus S$  is an [open subset](#):

$$S \subset X \text{ is closed} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X \setminus S \text{ is open} .$$

graphics grabbed from [Vickers 89](#)



open



closed



neither

If a [singleton](#) subset  $\{x\} \subset X$  is closed, one says that  $x$  is a *closed point* of  $X$ .

Given any subset  $S \subset X$ , then is [topological closure](#)  $\text{Cl}(S)$  is the smallest closed subset containing  $S$ .

### Definition 2.25. ([topological interior](#))

Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#) (def. 2.3) and let  $S \subset X$  be a [subset](#). Then the [topological interior](#) of  $S$  is the largest [open subset](#)  $\text{Int}(S) \in \tau$  still contained in  $S$ ,  $\text{Int}(S) \subset S \subset X$ :

$$\text{Int}(S) := \bigcup_{\substack{U \in \tau \\ U \subset S}} U .$$

**Lemma 2.26.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#) (def. \ref{TopologicalSpaces}) and let  $S \subset X$  be a [subset](#). Then the [topological interior](#) of  $S$  (def. 2.25) equals the [complement](#) of the [topological closure](#)  $\text{Cl}(X \setminus S)$  of the complement of  $S$ :

$$\text{Int}(S) = X \setminus \text{Cl}(X \setminus S) .$$

**Proof.** By taking [complements](#) once more, the statement is equivalent to

$$X \setminus \text{Int}(S) = \text{Cl}(X \setminus S) .$$

Now we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} X \setminus \text{Int}(S) &= X \setminus \left( \bigcup_{\substack{U \text{ open} \\ U \subset S}} U \right) \\ &= \bigcap_{U \subset S} X \setminus U \\ &= \bigcap_{\substack{C \text{ closed} \\ C \supset X \setminus S}} C \\ &= \text{Cl}(X \setminus S) \end{aligned}$$

■

### Proposition 2.27. (*convergence in closed subspaces*)

Let  $(X, d)$  be a [metric space](#) (def. 1.1), regarded as a [topological space](#) via example 2.9, and let  $V \subset X$  be a [subset](#). Then the following are equivalent:

1.  $V \subset X$  is a [closed subspace](#) according to def. 2.24.
2. For every [sequence](#)  $x_i \in V \subset X$  (def. 1.15) with elements in  $V$ , which [converges](#) as a sequence in  $X$  (def. 1.16) it also converges in  $V$ .

**Proof.** First assume that  $V \subset X$  is closed and that  $x_i \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} x_\infty$  for some  $x_\infty \in X$ . We need to show that then  $x_\infty \in V$ . Suppose it were not, then  $x_\infty \in X \setminus V$ . Since by definition this [complement](#)  $X \setminus V$  is an [open subset](#), it follows that there exists a [real number](#)  $\epsilon > 0$  such that the [open ball](#) around  $x$  of radius  $\epsilon$  is still contained in the complement:  $B_x^\circ(\epsilon) \subset X \setminus V$ . But since the sequence is assumed to converge in  $X$ , this means that there exists  $N_\epsilon$  such that all  $x_{i > N_\epsilon}$  are in  $B_x^\circ(\epsilon)$ , hence in  $X \setminus V$ . This contradicts the assumption that all  $x_i$  are in  $V$ , and hence we have [proved by contradiction](#) that  $x_\infty \in V$ .

Conversely, assume that for all sequences in  $V$  that converge to some  $x_\infty \in X$  then  $x_\infty \in V \subset W$ . We need to show that then  $V$  is closed, hence that  $X \setminus V \subset X$  is an open subset, hence that for every  $x \in X \setminus V$  we may find a real number  $\epsilon > 0$  such that the [open ball](#)  $B_x^\circ(\epsilon)$  around  $x$  of radius  $\epsilon$  is still contained in  $X \setminus V$ . Suppose on the contrary that such  $\epsilon$  did not exist. This would mean that for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \geq 1$  then the [intersection](#)  $B_x^\circ(1/k) \cap V$  is [non-empty](#). Hence then we could choose points  $x_k \in B_x^\circ(1/k) \cap V$  in these intersections. These would form a sequence which clearly converges to the original  $x$ , and so by assumption we would conclude that  $x \in V$ , which violates the assumption that  $x \in X \setminus V$ . Hence we [proved by contradiction](#)  $X \setminus V$  is in fact open. ■

A special role in the theory is played by the “irreducible” closed subspaces:

### Definition 2.28. ([irreducible closed subspace](#))

A [closed subset](#)  $S \subset X$  (def. 2.24) of a [topological space](#)  $X$  is called [irreducible](#) if it is [non-empty](#) and not the [union](#) of two closed proper (i.e. smaller) subsets. In other words,  $S$  is irreducible if whenever  $S_1, S_2 \subset X$  are two [closed subspace](#) such that

$$S = S_1 \cup S_2$$

then  $S_1 = S$  or  $S_2 = S$ .

**Example 2.29.** For  $x \in X$  a [point](#) inside a [topological space](#), then the [closure](#)  $\text{Cl}(\{x\})$  of the [singleton subset](#)  $\{x\} \subset X$  is [irreducible](#) (def. 2.28).

Sometimes it is useful to re-express the condition of irreducibility of closed subspace in terms of complementary open subsets:

### Proposition 2.30. ([irreducible closed subsets in terms of prime open subsets](#))

Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space, and let  $P \in \tau \subset P(X)$  be a proper open subset, so that the complement  $F := X \setminus P$  is an inhabited closed subspace. Then  $F$  is irreducible in the sense of def. 2.28 precisely if whenever  $U_1, U_2 \in \tau$  are open subsets with  $U_1 \cap U_2 \subset P$  then  $U_1 \subset P$  or  $U_2 \subset P$ :

$$(X \setminus P \text{ irreducible}) \Leftrightarrow \left( \forall_{U_1, U_2 \in \tau} ((U_1 \cap U_2 \subset P) \Rightarrow (U_1 \subset P \text{ or } U_2 \subset P)) \right)$$

**Proof.** Every closed subset  $F_i \subset F$  may be exhibited as the complement

$$F_i = F \setminus U_i$$

for some open subset  $U_i \in \tau$ . Observe that under this identification the condition that  $U_1 \cap U_2 \subset P$  is equivalent to the condition that  $F_1 \cup F_2 = F$ , because it is equivalent to the equation labeled  $(*)$  in the following sequence of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 \cup F_2 &= (F \setminus U_1) \cup (F \setminus U_2) \\ &= (X \setminus (P \cup U_1)) \cup (X \setminus (P \cup U_2)) \\ &= X \setminus (P \cup (U_1 \cap U_2)) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} X \setminus P \\ &= F \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the condition that  $U_i \subset P$  is equivalent to the condition that  $F_i = F$ , because it is equivalent to the equality  $(*)$  in the following sequence of equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} F_i &= F \setminus U_i \\ &= X \setminus (P \cup U_i) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} X \setminus P \\ &= F \end{aligned}$$

Under these equivalences, the two conditions are manifestly the same. ■

We will consider yet another equivalent characterization of irreducible closed subsets. Stating this requires the following concept of “frame” homomorphism, the natural kind of homomorphisms between topological spaces if we were to forget the underlying set of points of a topological space, and only remember the set  $\tau_X$  with its finite intersections and arbitrary unions:

### Definition 2.31. (frame homomorphisms)

Let  $(X, \tau_X)$  and  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  be topological spaces (def. 2.3). Then a function

$$\tau_X \leftarrow \tau_Y : \phi$$

between their sets of open subsets is called a frame homomorphism if it preserves

1. arbitrary unions;



## 2. [finite intersections](#).

In other words,  $\phi$  is a frame homomorphism if

1. for every [set](#)  $I$  and every  $I$ -indexed set  $\{U_i \in \tau_Y\}_{i \in I}$  of elements of  $\tau_Y$ , then

$$\phi\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i\right) = \bigcup_{i \in I} \phi(U_i) \in \tau_X,$$

2. for every [finite set](#)  $J$  and every  $J$ -indexed set  $\{U_j \in \tau_Y\}$  of elements in  $\tau_Y$ , then

$$\phi\left(\bigcap_{j \in J} U_j\right) = \bigcap_{j \in J} \phi(U_j) \in \tau_X.$$

**Remark 2.32.** A [frame homomorphism](#)  $\phi$  as in def. [2.31](#) necessarily also preserves inclusions in that

- for every inclusion  $U_1 \subset U_2$  with  $U_1, U_2 \in \tau_Y \subset P(Y)$  then

$$\phi(U_1) \subset \phi(U_2) \in \tau_X.$$

This is because inclusions are witnessed by unions

$$(U_1 \subset U_2) \Leftrightarrow (U_1 \cup U_2 = U_2)$$

and by finite intersections:

$$(U_1 \subset U_2) \Leftrightarrow (U_1 \cap U_2 = U_1).$$

**Example 2.33.** For

$$f : (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$$

a [continuous function](#), then its function of [pre-images](#)

$$\tau_X \leftarrow \tau_Y : f^{-1}$$

is a frame homomorphism according to def. [2.31](#).

For the following recall from example [2.10](#) the [point](#) topological space

$$* = (\{1\}, \tau_* = \{\emptyset, \{1\}\}).$$

**Proposition 2.34. (*irreducible closed subsets are equivalently frame homomorphisms to frame of opens of the point*)**

For  $(X, \tau)$  a [topological space](#), then there is a [bijection](#) between the [irreducible closed subspaces](#) of  $(X, \tau)$  (def. [2.28](#)) and the [frame homomorphisms](#) from  $\tau_X$  to  $\tau_*$ , given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Frame}}(\tau_X, \tau_*) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \mathrm{IrrClSub}(X) \\ \phi & \mapsto & X \setminus U_\emptyset(\phi) \end{array}$$

where  $U_\emptyset(\phi)$  is the [union](#) of all elements  $U \in \tau_x$  such that  $\phi(U) = \emptyset$ :

$$U_\emptyset(\phi) := \bigcup_{\substack{U \in \tau_X \\ \phi(U) = \emptyset}} U.$$

See also ([Johnstone 82, II 1.3](#)).

**Proof.** First we need to show that the function is well defined in that given a frame homomorphism  $\phi: \tau_X \rightarrow \tau_*$  then  $X \setminus U_\emptyset(\phi)$  is indeed an irreducible closed subspace.

To that end observe that:

(\*) *If there are two elements  $U_1, U_2 \in \tau_X$  with  $U_1 \cap U_2 \subset U_\emptyset(\phi)$  then  $U_1 \subset U_\emptyset(\phi)$  or  $U_2 \subset U_\emptyset(\phi)$ .*

This is because

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(U_1 \cap U_2) &= \phi(U_1) \cap \phi(U_2) \\ &\subset \phi(U_\emptyset) \\ &= \emptyset \end{aligned},$$

(where the first equality holds because  $\phi$  preserves finite intersections by def. [2.31](#), the inclusion holds because  $\phi$  respects inclusions by remark [2.32](#), and the second equality holds because  $\phi$  preserves arbitrary unions by def. [2.31](#)). But in  $\tau_* = \{\emptyset, \{1\}\}$  the intersection of two open subsets is empty precisely if at least one of them is empty, hence  $\phi(U_1) = \emptyset$  or  $\phi(U_2) = \emptyset$ . But this means that  $U_1 \subset U_\emptyset(\phi)$  or  $U_2 \subset U_\emptyset(\phi)$ , as claimed.

Now according to prop. [2.30](#) the condition (\*) identifies the [complement](#)  $X \setminus U_\emptyset(\phi)$  as an [irreducible closed subspace](#) of  $(X, \tau)$ .

Conversely, given an irreducible closed subset  $X \setminus U_0$ , define  $\phi$  by

$$\phi: U \mapsto \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } U \subset U_0 \\ \{1\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

This does preserve

### 1. arbitrary unions

because  $\phi(\bigcup_i U_i) = \{0\}$  precisely if  $\bigcup_i U_i \subset U_0$  which is the case precisely if all  $U_i \subset U_0$ , which means that all  $\phi(U_i) = \emptyset$  and  $\bigcup_i \emptyset = \emptyset$ ;

while  $\phi(\bigcup_i U_i) = \{1\}$  as soon as one of the  $U_i$  is not contained in  $U_0$ , which means that one of the  $\phi(U_i) = \{1\}$  which means that  $\bigcup_i \phi(U_i) = \{1\}$ ;

### 2. finite intersections,

because if  $U_1 \cap U_2 \in U_0$ , then by  $(*)$   $U_1 \in U_0$  or  $U_2 \in U_0$ , whence  $\phi(U_1) = \emptyset$  or  $\phi(U_2) = \emptyset$ , whence with  $\phi(U_1 \cap U_2) = \emptyset$  also  $\phi(U_1) \cap \phi(U_2) = \emptyset$ ;

while if  $U_1 \cap U_2$  is not contained in  $U_0$  then neither  $U_1$  nor  $U_2$  is contained in  $U_0$  and hence with  $\phi(U_1 \cap U_2) = \{1\}$  also  $\phi(U_1) \cap \phi(U_2) = \{1\} \cap \{1\} = \{1\}$ .

Hence this is indeed a frame homomorphism  $\tau_X \rightarrow \tau_*$ .

Clearly these two operations are inverse to each other. ■

### 3. Continuous functions

With the concept of [topological spaces](#) (def. 2.3) it is now immediate to formally implement in abstract generality the statement of prop. 1.13:

#### principle of continuity

*Continuous pre-Images of open subsets are open.*

#### Definition 3.1. (continuous function)

A [continuous function](#) between [topological spaces](#) (def. 2.3)

$$f: (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$$

is a [function](#) between the underlying sets,

$$f: X \rightarrow Y$$

such that [pre-images](#) under  $f$  of open subsets of  $Y$  are open subsets of  $X$ .

We may equivalently state this in terms of [closed subsets](#):

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $(X_1, \tau_X)$  and  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  be two [topological spaces](#) (def. 2.3). Then a [function](#)*

$$f: X \rightarrow Y$$

*between the underlying [sets](#) is [continuous](#) in the sense of def. 3.1 precisely if [pre-images](#) under  $f$  of [closed subsets](#) of  $Y$  (def. 2.24) are closed subsets of  $X$ .*

**Proof.** Taking [pre-images](#) commutes with taking [complements](#). ■

#### Remark 3.3. (the category of topological spaces)

For  $X_1, X_2, X_3$  three [topological spaces](#) and for

$$X_1 \xrightarrow{f} X_2 \quad \text{and} \quad X_2 \xrightarrow{g} X_3$$

two [continuous functions](#) (def. 3.1) then their [composition](#)

$$f_2 \circ f_1 : X_1 \xrightarrow{f} X_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} X_3$$

is clearly itself again a continuous function from  $X_1$  to  $X_3$ . Moreover, this composition operation is clearly associative, in that for

$$X_1 \xrightarrow{f} X_2 \quad \text{and} \quad X_2 \xrightarrow{g} X_3 \quad \text{and} \quad X_3 \xrightarrow{h} X_4$$

three continuous functions, then

$$f_3 \circ (f_2 \circ f_1) = (f_3 \circ f_2) \circ f_1 : X_1 \rightarrow X_3 .$$

Finally, the composition operation is also clearly unital, in that for each topological space  $X$  there exists the identity function  $\text{id}_X : X \rightarrow X$  and for  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  any continuous function then


$$\text{id}_{X_2} \circ f = f = f \circ \text{id}_{X_1} .$$

One summarizes this situation by saying that:

1. topological spaces constitute the objects
2. continuous functions constitute the morphisms (homomorphisms)

of a category, called the category of topological spaces ("Top" for short).

It is useful to depict collections of objects with morphisms between them by diagrams, like this one:



graphics grabbed from Lawvere-Schanuel 09.

Beware that in general a continuous function itself (as opposed to its pre-image function) neither preserves open subsets, nor closed subsets:

**Example 3.4.** Regard the real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$  as the 1-dimensional Euclidean space (def. 1.6) equipped with the metric topology (def. 2.9). For  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  the constant function

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\text{const}_a} & \mathbb{R} \\ x & \mapsto & a \end{array}$$

maps every open subset  $U \subset \mathbb{R}$  to the singleton set  $\{a\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ , which is not open.

**Example 3.5.** Write  $\text{Disc}(\mathbb{R})$  for the set of [real numbers](#) equipped with its [discrete topology](#) (def. 2.13) and  $\mathbb{R}$  for the set of [real numbers](#) equipped with its [Euclidean metric topology](#) (def. 1.6, def. 2.9). Then the [identity function](#) on the underlying sets

$$\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}} : \text{Disc}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is a [continuous function](#) (see also example 3.14). A [singleton subset](#)  $\{a\} \in \text{Disc}(\mathbb{R})$  is open, but regarded as a subset  $\{a\} \in \mathbb{R}$  it is not open.

**Example 3.6.** Regard the set of [real numbers](#)  $\mathbb{R}$  equipped with its [Euclidean metric topology](#) (def. 1.6, def. 2.9). The [exponential function](#)

$$\exp(-) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

maps all of  $\mathbb{R}$  (which is a closed subset  $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \setminus \emptyset$ ) to the [half-open interval](#)  $(0, \infty] \subset \mathbb{R}$ , which is not closed.

Those continuous function that do happen to preserve open or closed subsets get a special name:

**Definition 3.7. ([open maps](#) and [closed maps](#))**

A [continuous function](#)  $f : (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$  (def. 3.1) is called

- an [open map](#) if the [image](#) under  $f$  of an [open subset](#) of  $X$  is an open subset of  $Y$ ;
- a [closed map](#) if the [image](#) under  $f$  of a [closed subset](#) of  $X$  (def. 2.24) is a closed subset of  $Y$ .

**Example 3.8.** For  $(X_1, \tau_{X_1})$  and  $(X_2, \tau_{X_2})$  two [topological spaces](#), then the projection maps

$$\pi_i : (X_1 \times X_2, \tau_{X_1 \times X_2}) \rightarrow (X_i, \tau_{X_i})$$

out of their [product topological space](#) (def. 2.16) are [open maps](#) (def. 3.7).

Below in prop. 6.17 we find a large supply of [closed maps](#).

**Lemma 3.9. ([saturated open neighbourhoods of saturated closed subsets under closed maps](#))**

Let

1.  $f : (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$  be a [closed map](#) (def. 3.7);
2.  $C \subset X$  be a [closed subset](#) of  $X$  (def. 2.24) which is [f-saturated](#) (def. 2.22);
3.  $U \supset C$  an [open subset](#) containing  $C$ ;

then there exists a smaller open subset  $V$  still containing  $C$

$$U \supset V \supset C$$

and such that  $V$  is  $f$ -[saturated](#).

**Proof.** We claim that the [complement](#) of  $X$  by the  $f$ -saturation (def. [2.19](#)) of the complement of  $X$  by  $U$

$$V := X \setminus (f^{-1}(f(X \setminus U)))$$

has the desired properties. To see this, observe first that

1. the [complement](#)  $X \setminus U$  is closed, since  $U$  is assumed to be open;
2. hence the image  $f(X \setminus U)$  is closed, since  $f$  is assumed to be a closed map;
3. hence the pre-image  $f^{-1}(f(X \setminus U))$  is closed, since  $f$  is continuous (using prop. [3.2](#)), therefore its complement  $V$  is indeed open;
4. this pre-image  $f^{-1}(f(X \setminus U))$  is saturated (example [2.20](#)) and hence also its complement  $V$  is saturated, by lemma [2.21](#).

Therefore it now only remains to see that  $U \supset V \supset C$ .

The inclusion  $U \supset V$  means equivalently that  $f^{-1}(f(X \setminus U)) \supset X \setminus U$ , which is clearly the case.

The inclusion  $V \supset C$  means that  $f^{-1}(f(X \setminus U)) \cap C = \emptyset$ . Since  $C$  is saturated by assumption, this means that  $f^{-1}(f(X \setminus U)) \cap f^{-1}(f(C)) = \emptyset$ . This in turn holds precisely if  $f(X \setminus U) \cap f(C) = \emptyset$ . Since  $C$  is saturated, this holds precisely if  $X \setminus U \cap C = \emptyset$ , and this is true by the assumption that  $U \supset C$ . ■

## Examples

We discuss some basic examples of [continuous functions](#) (def. [3.1](#)) between [topological spaces](#) (def. [2.3](#)).

**Example 3.10.** For  $(X, \tau)$  any topological space, then there is a unique continuous function

$$X \rightarrow *$$

from  $X$  to the [point](#) (def. [2.10](#)).

**Remark 3.11.** In the language of [category theory](#) (remark [3.3](#)), example [3.10](#) says that the point  $*$  is the [terminal object](#) in the [category Top](#) of topological spaces.

**Example 3.12.** For  $(X, \tau)$  a [topological space](#) then for  $x \in X$  any element of the underlying set, there is a unique continuous function

$$* \rightarrow X$$

from the [point](#) (def. 2.10), whose image in  $X$  is that element. Hence there is a [natural bijection](#)

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Top}}(*, (X, \tau)) \simeq X$$

between the continuous functions from the point to any topological space, and the underlying set of that topological space.

**Definition 3.13.** A [continuous function](#)  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  (def. 3.1) is called [locally constant](#) if every point  $x \in X$  has a [neighbourhood](#) on which the function is constant.

**Example 3.14.** Let  $S$  be a [set](#) and let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#). Recall from example 2.13

1. the [discrete topological space](#)  $\mathrm{Disc}(S)$ ;
2. the [co-discrete topological space](#)  $\mathrm{CoDisc}(S)$

on the underlying set  $S$ . Then [continuous functions](#) (def. 3.1) into/out of these satisfy:

1. every [function](#) (of sets)  $\mathrm{Disc}(S) \rightarrow X$  out of a discrete space is [continuous](#);
2. every [function](#) (of sets)  $X \rightarrow \mathrm{CoDisc}(S)$  into a codiscrete space is [continuous](#).

Also:

- every [continuous function](#)  $(X, \tau) \rightarrow \mathrm{Disc}(S)$  into a discrete space is [locally constant](#) (def. 3.13).

**Example 3.15.** For  $X$  a [set](#), its [diagonal](#)  $\Delta_X$  is the [function](#)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\Delta_X} & X \times X \\ x & \mapsto & (x, x) \end{array} .$$

For  $(X, \tau)$  a [topological space](#), then the diagonal is a [continuous function](#) to the [product topological space](#) (def. 2.16) of  $X$  with itself.

$$\Delta_X : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X \times X, \tau_{X \times X}) .$$

To see this, it is sufficient to see that the [preimages](#) of [basic opens](#)  $U_1 \times U_2$  in  $\tau_{X \times X}$  are in  $\tau_X$ . But these pre-images are the [intersections](#)  $U_1 \cap U_2 \subset X$ , which are open by the axioms on the topology  $\tau_X$ .

## Homeomorphisms

With the [objects](#) ([topological spaces](#)) and the [morphisms](#) ([continuous functions](#)) of the [category Top](#) thus defined (remark 3.3), we obtain the concept of “sameness” in topology. To make this precise, one says that a [morphism](#)



$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y$$

in a [category](#) is an [isomorphism](#) if there exists a morphism going the other way around

$$X \xleftarrow{g} Y$$

which is an [inverse](#) in the sense that

$$f \circ g = \text{id}_Y \quad \text{and} \quad g \circ f = \text{id}_X .$$

Since such  $g$  is unique if it exists, one often writes " $f^{-1}$ " for this [inverse morphism](#). However, in the context of [topology](#) then  $f^{-1}$  usually refers to the [pre-image](#) function of a given [function](#)  $f$ , and in these notes we will stick to this usage.

### Definition 3.16. (homeomorphisms)

An [isomorphism](#) in the [category Top](#) of [topological spaces](#) with [continuous functions](#) between them is called a [homeomorphism](#).

Hence a [homeomorphism](#) is a [continuous function](#)


$$f : (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$$

such that there exists a [continuous function](#) the other way around

$$(X, \tau_X) \leftarrow (Y, \tau_Y) : g$$

such that their [composites](#) are the [identity functions](#) on  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively:

$$f \circ g = \text{id}_Y \quad \text{and} \quad g \circ f = \text{id}_X .$$



graphics grabbed from [Munkres 75](#)

**Remark 3.17.** If  $f : (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$  is a [homeomorphism](#) (def. 3.16) with inverse continuous function  $g$ , then of course also  $g$  is a homeomorphism, with inverse continuous function  $f$ .

The underlying function of sets  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  of a homeomorphism  $f$  is necessarily a [bijection](#).

But beware that not every [continuous function](#) which is [bijective](#) on underlying

sets is a homeomorphism. While an inverse  $g$  will exist on the level of functions of sets, this inverse may fail to be continuous:

**Example 3.18.** Consider the [continuous function](#)

$$\begin{aligned} [0, 2\pi) &\longrightarrow S^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \\ t &\longmapsto (\cos(t), \sin(t)) \end{aligned}$$

from the [half-open interval](#) (def. 1.12) to the unit circle  $S^1 := S_0(1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  (def. 1.2), regarded as a [topological subspace](#) (def. 2.17) of the [Euclidean plane](#) (def. 1.6).

The underlying function of sets of  $f$  is a [bijection](#). The [inverse function](#) of sets however fails to be continuous at  $(1, 0) \in S^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ . Hence this  $f$  is *not* a [homeomorphism](#).

Indeed, below we see that the two topological spaces  $[0, 2\pi)$  and  $S^1$  are distinguished by topological invariants and hence not homeomorphic. For example  $S^1$  is a [compact topological space](#) (def. 6.4) while  $[0, 2\pi)$  is not, and  $S^1$  has a non-trivial [fundamental group](#), while that of  $[0, 2\pi)$  is trivial (def. [\ref{FundamentalGroup}](#)).

Below in example 6.22 we discuss a criterion under which continuous bijections are homeomorphisms after all.

**Example 3.19. (open interval homeomorphic to the real line)**

Regard the [real line](#) as the 1-dimensional [Euclidean space](#) (example 1.6).

The open [interval](#)  $(-1, 1)$  (def. 1.12) is [homeomorphic](#) to all of the [real line](#)

$$(0, 1) \underset{\text{homeo}}{\simeq} \mathbb{R}^1.$$

An [inverse](#) pair of [continuous functions](#) is for instance given by

$$\begin{aligned} f : \mathbb{R}^1 &\longrightarrow (-1, +1) \\ x &\longmapsto \frac{x}{\sqrt{1+x^2}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1} : (-1, +1) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^1 \\ x &\longmapsto \frac{x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Generally, every [open ball](#) in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (def. 1.2) is [homeomorphic](#) to all of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Example 3.20. (interval glued at endpoints is homeomorphic to the circle)**

As topological spaces, the [closed interval](#)  $[0, 1]$  (def. 1.12) with its two endpoints identified is [homeomorphic](#) (def. 3.16) to the standard [circle](#):

$$[0, 1]_{/(0 \sim 1)} \underset{\text{homeo}}{\simeq} S^1.$$

More in detail: let

$$S^1 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$$

be the unit [circle](#) in the [plane](#)

$$S^1 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2, x^2 + y^2 = 1\}$$

equipped with the [subspace topology](#) (example 2.17) of the plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , which itself equipped with its standard [metric topology](#) (example 2.9).

Moreover, let

$$[0, 1]_{/(0 \sim 1)}$$

be the [quotient topological space](#) (example 2.18) obtained from the [interval](#)  $[0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^1$  with its [subspace topology](#) by applying the [equivalence relation](#) which identifies the two endpoints (and nothing else).

Consider then the function

$$f : [0, 1] \rightarrow S^1$$

given by

$$t \mapsto (\cos(t), \sin(t)).$$

This has the property that  $f(0) = f(1)$ , so that it descends to the [quotient topological space](#)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [0, 1] & \rightarrow & [0, 1]_{/(0 \sim 1)} \\ f \searrow & & \downarrow \tilde{f} \\ & & S^1 \end{array}.$$


We claim that  $\tilde{f}$  is a [homeomorphism](#) (definition 3.16).

First of all it is immediate that  $\tilde{f}$  is a [continuous function](#). This follows immediately from the fact that  $f$  is a [continuous function](#) and by definition of the [quotient topology](#) (example 2.18).


So we need to check that  $\tilde{f}$  has a continuous inverse function. Clearly the restriction of  $f$  itself to the open interval  $(0, 1)$  has a continuous inverse. It fails to have a continuous inverse on  $[0, 1)$  and on  $(0, 1]$  and fails to have an inverse at all on  $[0, 1]$ , due to the fact that  $f(0) = f(1)$ . But the relation quotiented out in  $[0, 1]_{/(0 \sim 1)}$  is exactly such as to fix this failure.

Similarly:

The [square](#)  $[0, 1]^2$  with two of its sides identified is the [cylinder](#), and with also the other two sides identified is the [torus](#):



If the sides are identified with opposite orientation, the result is the [Möbius strip](#):



*graphics grabbed from [Lawson 03](#)*

Important examples of pairs of spaces that are *not* homeomorphic include the following:

**Theorem 3.21. ([topological invariance of dimension](#))**

For  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  but  $n_1 \neq n_2$ , then the [Cartesian spaces](#)  $\mathbb{R}^{n_1}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{n_2}$  are not [homeomorphic](#).

More generally, an [open set](#) in  $\mathbb{R}^{n_1}$  is never homeomorphic to an open set in  $\mathbb{R}^{n_2}$  if  $n_1 \neq n_2$ .

The proof of theorem 3.21 is surprisingly hard, given how obvious the statement seems intuitively. It requires tools from a field called [algebraic topology](#) (notably [Brouwer's fixed point theorem](#)).

We showcase some basic tools of [algebraic topology](#) now and demonstrate the nature of their usage by proving two very simple special cases of the [topological invariance of dimension](#) (prop.

`\ref{TopologicalInvarianceOfDimensionFirstSimpleCase}` and prop.

`\ref{topologicalInvarianceOfDimensionSecondSimpleCase}` below).

**Example 3.22. (homeomorphism classes of surfaces)**

The [2-sphere](#)  $S^2 = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1\}$  is *not* [homeomorphic](#) to the

[torus](#)  $T^2 = S^1 \times S^1$ .

Generally the [homeomorphism](#) class of a [closed orientable surface](#) is determined by the number of “holes” it has, its [genus](#).


## 4. Separation axioms

The plain definition of [topological space](#) happens to allow examples where distinct points or distinct subsets of the underlying set of a topological space appear as as more-or-less unseparable as seen by the topology on that set. In many applications one wants to exclude at least some of such degenerate examples from the discussion. The relevant conditions to be imposed on top of the plain [axioms](#) of a [topological space](#) are hence known as [separation axioms](#).

These axioms are all of the form of saying that two subsets (of certain forms) in the topological space are ‘separated’ from each other in one sense if they are ‘separated’ in a (generally) weaker sense. For example the weakest axiom (called  $T_0$ ) demands that if two points are distinct as elements of the underlying set of points, then there exists at least one [open subset](#) that contains one but not the other.

In this fashion one may impose a hierarchy of stronger axioms. For example demanding that given two distinct points, then each of them is contained in some open subset not containing the other ( $T_1$ ) or that such a pair of open subsets around two distinct points may in addition be chosen to be disjoint ( $T_2$ ). This last condition,  $T_2$ , also called the [Hausdorff condition](#) is the most common among all separation axioms. Often in [topology](#), this axiom is considered by default.

However, there are respectable areas of mathematics that involve topological spaces where the Hausdorff axiom fails, but a weaker axiom is still satisfied, called [soberity](#). This is the case notably in [algebraic geometry](#) ([schemes are sober](#)) and in [computer science](#) (Vickers 89). These [sober topological spaces](#) are singled out by the fact that they are entirely characterized by their [partially ordered sets of open subsets](#) and may hence be understood independently from their underlying sets of points.




All separation axioms are satisfied by [metric spaces](#) (def. 1.1), from whom the concept of topological space was originally abstracted [above](#). Hence imposing some of them may also be understood as gauging just how far one allows topological spaces to generalize away from metric spaces

## $T_n$ spaces

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#) (def. 2.3).

For  $x \neq y \in X$  any two points in the underlying set of  $X$  which are not [equal](#) as elements of this set, consider the following [propositions](#):



- **(T0)** There exists a [neighbourhood](#) of one of the two points which does not contain the other point.
- **(T1)** There exist [neighbourhoods](#) of both points which do not contain the other point.
- **(T2)** There exists [neighbourhoods](#) of both points which do not intersect each other.

graphics grabbed from [Vickers 89](#)

The topological space  $X$  is called a  $T_n$ -topological space or just  $T_n$ -space, for short, if it satisfies condition  $T_n$  above for all pairs of distinct points.

A  $T_0$ -topological space is also called a [Kolmogorov space](#).

A  $T_2$ -topological space is also called a [Hausdorff topological space](#).

Notice that these propositions evidently imply each other as

$$T_2 \Rightarrow T_1 \Rightarrow T_0 .$$

For definiteness, we re-state these conditions formally. Write  $x, y \in X$  for points in  $X$ , write  $U_x, U_y \in \tau$  for open [neighbourhoods](#) of these points. Then:

- **(T0)**  $\forall_{x \neq y} \left( \left( \exists_{U_y} (\{x\} \cap U_y = \emptyset) \right) \vee \left( \exists_{U_x} (U_x \cap \{y\} = \emptyset) \right) \right)$
- **((T1))**  $\forall_{x \neq y} \left( \exists_{U_x, U_y} ((\{x\} \cap U_y = \emptyset) \wedge (U_x \cap \{y\} = \emptyset)) \right)$
- **(T2)**  $\forall_{x \neq y} \left( \exists_{U_x, U_y} (U_x \cap U_y = \emptyset) \right)$

### Example 4.2. (metric spaces are Hausdorff)

Every [metric space](#) (def 1.1), regarded as a [topological space](#) via its [metric topology](#) (def. 2.9) is a [Hausdorff topological space](#) (def. 4.1).

### Example 4.3. (finite $T_1$ -spaces are discrete)

For a [finite topological space](#)  $(X, \tau)$ , hence one for which the underlying set  $X$  is a

[finite set](#), the following are equivalent:

1.  $(X, \tau)$  is  $T_1$  (def. [4.1](#));
2.  $(X, \tau)$  is a [discrete topological space](#) (def. [2.13](#))

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#) satisfying the  $T_i$  [separation axiom](#) according to def. [4.1](#). Then also every [topological subspace](#)  $S \subset X$  (def. [2.17](#)) satisfies  $T_i$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $x, y \in S \subset X$  be two distinct points. We need to construct various open neighbourhoods of these in  $S$  not containing the other point and possibly (for  $T_2$ ) not intersecting each other. Now by assumptions that the ambient space  $(X, \tau)$  satisfies the given axiom, there exist open neighbourhoods with the analogous properties in  $X$ . By the nature of the subspace topology, their restriction to  $S$  are still open, and clearly still satisfy these properties. ■

## Separation in terms of topological closures

The conditions  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  have the following equivalent form in terms of [topological closures](#) (def. [2.24](#)):

**Proposition 4.5.** ( $T_0$  in terms of topological closures)

A [topological space](#)  $(X, \tau)$  is  $T_0$  (def. [4.1](#)) precisely if the function  $\text{Cl}(\{-\})$  from the underlying set of  $X$  to the set of [irreducible closed subsets](#) of  $X$  (def. [2.28](#), which is well defined according to example [2.29](#)), is [injective](#):

$$\text{Cl}(\{-\}) : X \hookrightarrow \text{IrrClSub}(X)$$

**Proof.** Assume first that  $X$  is  $T_0$ . Then we need to show that if  $x, y \in X$  are such that  $\text{Cl}(\{x\}) = \text{Cl}(\{y\})$  then  $x = y$ . Hence assume that  $\text{Cl}(\{x\}) = \text{Cl}(\{y\})$ . Since the closure of a point is the [complements](#) of the union of the open subsets not containing the point, this means that the union of open subsets that do not contain  $x$  is the same as the union of open subsets that do not contain  $y$ . Hence every open subset that does not contain  $x$  also does not contain  $y$ , and vice versa. By  $T_0$  this is not the case when  $x \neq y$ , hence it follows that  $x = y$ .

Conversely, assume that if  $x, y \in X$  are such that  $\text{Cl}\{x\} = \text{Cl}\{y\}$  then  $x = y$ . We need to show that if  $x \neq y$  then there exists an open neighbourhood around one of the two points not containing the other. Hence assume that  $x \neq y$ . By assumption it follows that  $\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \neq \text{Cl}(\{y\})$ . Since the closure of a point is the [complements](#) of the union of the open subsets not containing the point, this means that there must be at least one open subset which contains  $x$  but not  $y$ , or vice versa. By definition this means that  $(X, \tau)$  is  $T_0$ . ■

**Proposition 4.6.** ( $T_1$  in terms of topological closures)



A [topological space](#)  $(X, \tau)$  is  $T_1$  (def. 4.1) precisely if all its points are [closed points](#) (def. 2.24).

**Proof.** Assume first that  $(X, \tau)$  is  $T_1$ . We need to show that for every point  $x \in X$  we have  $\text{Cl}(\{x\}) = \{x\}$ . Since the closure of a point is the [complement](#) of the union of all open subsets not containing this point, this is the case precisely if the union of all open subsets not containing  $x$  is  $X \setminus \{x\}$ , hence if every point  $y \neq x$  is member of at least one open subset not containing  $x$ . This is true by  $T_1$ .

Conversely, assume that for all  $x \in X$  then  $\text{Cl}(\{x\}) = \{x\}$ . Then for  $x \neq y \in X$  two distinct points we need to produce an open subset of  $y$  that does not contain  $x$ . But as before, since  $\text{Cl}(\{x\})$  is the complement of the union of all open subsets that do not contain  $x$ , and the assumption  $\text{Cl}\{x\} = \{x\}$  means that  $y$  is member of one of these open subsets that do not contain  $x$ . ■

### Proposition 4.7. ( $T_2$ in terms of topological closures)

A [topological space](#)  $(X, \tau_X)$  is  $T_2$  = [Hausdorff](#) (def. 4.1) precisely if the [diagonal function](#)  $\Delta_X: (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (X \times X, \tau_{X \times X})$  (example 3.15) is a [closed map](#) (def. 3.7).

**Proof.** If  $(X, \tau_X)$  is Hausdorff, then by definition for every pair of distinct points  $x \neq y \in X$  there exists open neighbourhoods  $U_x, U_y \in \tau_X$  such that  $U_x \cap U_y = \emptyset$ . In terms of the [product topology](#) (example 2.16) this means that every point  $(x, y) \in X \times X$  which is not on the diagonal has an open neighbourhood  $U_x \times U_y$  which still does not contain the diagonal. By definition, this means that in fact every [subset](#) of the diagonal is a [closed subset](#) of  $X \times X$ , hence in particular those that are in the image under  $\Delta_X$  of closed subsets of  $X$ . Hence  $\Delta_X$  is a closed map.

Conversely, if  $\Delta_X$  is a closed map, then the full diagonal (i.e. the image of  $X$  under  $\Delta_X$ ) is closed in  $X \times X$ , and hence this means that every points  $(x, y) \in X \times X$  not on the diagonal has an open neighbourhood  $U_x \times U_y$  not containing the diagonal, i.e. such that  $U_x \cap U_y = \emptyset$ . Hence  $X$  is Hausdorff. ■

### Further separation axioms

Clearly one may and does consider further variants of the separation axioms  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  from def. 4.1.

**Definition 4.8.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be [topological space](#) (def. 4.1).

Consider the following conditions

- **(T3)**  $(X, \tau)$  is  $T_1$  (def. 4.1) and for  $x \in X$  a point and  $C \subset X$  a [closed subset](#) (def. 2.24) not containing  $x$ , then there exist disjoint [open neighbourhoods](#)  $U_x \supset \{x\}$  and  $U_C \supset C$ .
- **(T4)**  $(X, \tau)$  is  $T_1$  (def. 4.1) and for  $C_1, C_2 \subset X$  disjoint [closed subsets](#) (def.

2.24) then there exist disjoint open neighbourhoods  $U_{C_i} \supset C_i$ .

If  $(X, \tau)$  satisfies  $T_3$  it is said to be a  $T_3$ -space also called a regular Hausdorff topological space.

If  $(X, \tau)$  satisfies  $T_4$  it is to be a  $T_4$ -space also called a normal Hausdorff topological space.

Observe that:

**Proposition 4.9.** *The separation axioms imply each other as*

$$T_4 \Rightarrow T_3 \Rightarrow T_2 \Rightarrow T_1 \Rightarrow T_0 .$$

**Proof.** The implications

$$T_2 \Rightarrow T_1 \Rightarrow T_0$$

and

$$T_4 \Rightarrow T_3$$

are immediate from the definitions. The remaining implication  $T_3 \Rightarrow T_2$  follows with prop. 4.6. ■

Hence instead of saying “ $X$  is  $T_1$  and ...” one could just as well phrase the conditions  $T_3$  and  $T_4$  as “ $X$  is  $T_2$  and ...”, which would render the proof of prop. 4.9 even more trivial.

In summary:

**the main Separation Axioms**

number	name	statement	reformulation
$T_0$	<u>Kolmogorov</u>	given two distinct points, at least one of them has an open neighbourhood not containing the other point	every irreducible closed subset is the closure of at most one point
$T_1$		given two distinct points, both have an open neighbourhood not containing the other point	all points are closed
$T_2$	<u>Hausdorff</u>	given two distinct points, they have disjoint open neighbourhoods	the diagonal is a closed map
$T_3$	<u>regular Hausdorff</u>	all points are closed; and given two disjoint closed subsets, at least one of them has an open neighbourhood disjoint from the other closed subset	
$T_4$	<u>normal Hausdorff</u>	all points are closed; and given two disjoint closed subsets, both of them have open neighbourhoods	

number	name	statement	reformulation
		not intersecting the other closed subset	

Notice that there is a whole zoo of further variants of [separation axioms](#) that are considered in the literature. But the above are maybe the main ones. Specifically  $T_2 = \text{Hausdorff}$  is the most popular one, often considered by default in the literature, when topological spaces are considered.

## $T_n$ reflection

Not every [universal construction](#) of [topological spaces](#) applied to  $T_n$ -spaces results again in a  $T_n$  topological space, notably [quotient space](#) constructions need not (example [4.10](#) below).

But at least for  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  there is a universal way, called [reflection](#) (prop. [4.12](#) below), to approximate any topological space “from the left” by a  $T_n$  topological spaces.

Hence if one wishes to work withing the [full subcategory](#) of the  $T_n$  among all [topological space](#), then the correct way to construct quotients and other [colimits](#) (see [below](#)) is to first construct them as usual for topological spaces, and then apply the  $T_n$ -reflection to the result.

### Example 4.10. ([line with two origins](#))

Consider the [disjoint union](#)  $\mathbb{R} \sqcup \mathbb{R}$  of two copies of the [real line](#)  $\mathbb{R}$  regarded as the 1-dimensional [Euclidean space](#) (def. [1.6](#)) with its [metric topology](#) (def. [2.9](#)). Moreover, consider the [equivalence relation](#) on the underlying set which identifies every point  $x_i$  in the  $i$ th copy of  $\mathbb{R}$  ( $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ) with the corresponding point in the other, the  $(1 - i)$ th copy, except when  $x = 0$ :

$$(x_i \sim y_j) \Leftrightarrow ((x = y) \text{ and } ((x \neq 0) \text{ or } (i = j))) .$$

The [quotient topological space](#) by this equivalence relation (def. [2.18](#))

$$(\mathbb{R} \sqcup \mathbb{R}) / \sim$$

is called the **line with two origins**.

This is a basic example of a topological space which is a [non-Hausdorff topological space](#):

Because by definition of the [quotient space topology](#), the [open neighbourhoods](#) of  $0_i \in (\mathbb{R} \sqcup \mathbb{R}) / \sim$  are precisely those that contain subsets of the form

$$(-\epsilon, \epsilon)_i := (-\epsilon, 0) \cup \{0_i\} \cup (0, \epsilon) .$$

But this means that the “two origins”  $0_0$  and  $0_1$  may not be separated by neighbourhoods, since the intersection of  $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)_0$  with  $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)_i$  is always non-empty:

$$(-\epsilon, \epsilon)_0 \cap (-\epsilon, \epsilon)_1 = (-\epsilon, 0) \cup (0, \epsilon) .$$

**Example 4.11.** Consider the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  regarded as the 1-dimensional Euclidean space (def. 1.6) with its metric topology (def. 2.9) and consider the equivalence relation  $\sim$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  which identifies two real numbers if they differ by a rational number:

$$(x \sim y) \Leftrightarrow \left( \exists_{p/q \in \mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}} x = y + p/q \right) .$$

Then the quotient topological space (def. 2.18)

$$\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Q} := \mathbb{R} / \sim$$

is a codiscrete topological space (def. 2.13), hence in particular a non-Hausdorff topological space (def. 4.1).

**Proposition 4.12. ( $T_n$ -reflection)**

Let  $n \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ . Then for every topological space  $X$  there exists a  $T_n$ -topological space  $T_n X$  for and a continuous function

$$t_n(X) : X \rightarrow T_n X$$

which is the “closest approximation from the left” to  $X$  by a  $T_n$ -topological space, in that for  $Y$  any  $T_n$ -space, then continuous functions of the form

$$f : X \rightarrow Y$$

are in bijection with continuous function of the form

$$\tilde{f} : T_n X \rightarrow Y$$

and such that the bijection is constituted by

$$f = \tilde{f} \circ t_n(X) : X \xrightarrow{h_X} T_n X \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} Y .$$

Here  $X \xrightarrow{t_n(X)} T_n(X)$  may be called the  $T_n$ -reflection of  $X$ . For  $n = 0$  this is known as the Kolmogorov quotient construction (see prop. 4.15 below). For  $n = 2$  it is known as Hausdorff reflection or Hausdorffication or similar.

Moreover, the operation  $T_n(-)$  extends to continuous functions  $f : X \rightarrow Y$

$$(X \xrightarrow{f} Y) \mapsto (T_n X \xrightarrow{T_n f} T_n Y)$$

such as to preserve [composition](#) of functions as well as [identity functions](#):

$$T_n g \circ T_n f = T_n (g \circ f) \quad , \quad T_n \text{id}_X = \text{id}_{T_n X}$$

Finally, the comparison map is compatible with this in that the follows [squares commute](#):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ h_X \downarrow & & \downarrow h_Y \\ T_n X & \xrightarrow{T_n f} & T_n Y \end{array}$$

#### Remark 4.13. ([reflective subcategories](#))

In the language of [category theory](#) (remark 3.3) the  $T_n$ -reflection of prop. 4.12 says that

1.  $T_n(-)$  is a [functor](#)  $T_n : \text{Top} \rightarrow \text{Top}_{T_n}$  from the [category Top](#) of [topological spaces](#) to the [full subcategory](#)  $\text{Top}_{T_n} \xhookrightarrow{\iota} \text{Top}$  of Hausdorff topological spaces;
2.  $t_n(X) : X \rightarrow T_n X$  is a [natural transformation](#) from the [identity functor](#) on [Top](#) to the functor  $\iota \circ T_n$
3.  $T_n$ -topological spaces form a [reflective subcategory](#) of all [topological spaces](#) in that  $T_n$  is [left adjoint](#) to the inclusion functor  $\iota$ ; this situation is denoted as follows:

$$\text{Top}_{T_n} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{H} \\ \perp \\ \xrightarrow{\iota} \end{array} \text{Top} .$$

There are various ways to see the existence and to construct the  $T_n$ -reflections. The following is the quickest way to see the existence, even though it leaves the actual construction rather implicit.

**Proposition 4.14.** *Let  $n \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ . Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#) and consider the [equivalence relation](#)  $\sim$  on the underlying set  $X$  for which  $x \sim y$  precisely if for every [surjective continuous function](#)  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  into any  $T_n$ -topological space  $Y$  we have  $f(x) = f(y)$ .*

*Then the set of [equivalence classes](#)*

$$T_n X := X / \sim$$

*equipped with the [quotient topology](#) is a  $T_n$ -topological space, and the quotient map  $t_n(X) : X \rightarrow X / \sim$  exhibits the  $T_n$ -reflection of  $X$ , according to prop. 4.12.*

**Proof.** First we observe that every continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  into a  $T_n$ -topological space  $Y$  factors uniquely via  $t_n(X)$  through a continuous function  $\tilde{f}$

$$f = \tilde{f} \circ h_X$$

where

$$\tilde{f}: [x] \mapsto f(x) .$$

To see this, first factor  $f$  through its [image](#)  $f(X)$

$$f : X \rightarrow f(X) \hookrightarrow Y$$

equipped with its [subspace topology](#) as a subspace of  $Y$  (example [2.23](#)). By prop. [4.4](#) also  $f(X)$  is a  $T_n$ -topological space if  $Y$  is.

It follows by definition of  $t_n(X)$  that the factorization exists at the level of sets as stated, since if  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  have the same [equivalence class](#)  $[x_1] = [x_2]$  in  $T_n X$ , then by definition they have the same image under all continuous surjective functions to a  $T_n$ -space, hence in particular under  $X \rightarrow f(X)$ . This means that  $\tilde{f}$  as above is well defined.

What remains to be seen is that  $T_n X$  as constructed is indeed a  $T_n$ -topological space. Hence assume that  $[x] \neq [y] \in T_n X$  are two distinct points. We need to open neighbourhoods around one or both of these point not containing the other point and possibly disjoint to each other.

Now by definition of  $T_n X$  this means that there exists a  $T_n$ -topological space  $Y$  and a surjective continuous function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $f(x) \neq f(y) \in Y$ . Accordingly, since  $Y$  is  $T_n$ , there exist the respective kinds of neighbourhoods around these image points in  $Y$ . Moreover, by the previous statement there exists a continuous function  $\tilde{f}: T_n X \rightarrow Y$  with  $\tilde{f}([x]) = f(x)$  and  $\tilde{f}([y]) = f(y)$ . By the nature of continuous functions, the pre-images of these open neighbourhoods in  $Y$  are still open in  $X$  and still satisfy the required disjunction properties. Therefore  $T_n X$  is a  $T_n$ -space. ■

Here are alternative constructions of the reflections:

#### **Proposition 4.15. ([Kolmogorov quotient](#))**

*Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#). Consider the [relation](#) on the underlying set by which  $x_1 \sim x_2$  precisely if neither  $x_i$  has an [open neighbourhood](#) not containing the other. This is an [equivalence relation](#). The [quotient topological space](#)  $X \rightarrow X / \sim$  by this equivalence relation (def. [2.18](#)) exhibits the  $T_0$ -reflection of  $X$  according to prop. [4.12](#).*

**Example 4.16.** The [Hausdorff reflection](#) ( $T_2$ -reflection, prop. [4.12](#))

$$T_2 : \mathbf{Top} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}_{\text{Haus}}$$

of the [line with two origins](#) from example [4.10](#) is the [real line](#) itself:

$$T_2((\mathbb{R} \sqcup \mathbb{R}) / \sim) \simeq \mathbb{R} .$$

## 5. Sober spaces

The alternative characterization of the  $T_0$ -condition in prop. 4.5 immediately suggests the following strengthening, different from the  $T_1$ -condition:

### Definition 5.1. (sober topological space)

A topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is called a sober topological space precisely if every irreducible closed subspace (def. 2.29) is the topological closure (def. 2.24) of a unique point, hence precisely if the function

$$\text{Cl}(\{-\}) : X \rightarrow \text{IrrClSub}(X)$$

from the underlying set of  $X$  to the set of irreducible closed subsets of  $X$  (def. 2.28, well defined according to example 2.29) is bijective.

### Proposition 5.2. (sober implies $T_0$ )

Every sober topological space (def. 5.1) is  $T_0$  (def. 4.1).

**Proof.** By prop. 4.5. ■

### Proposition 5.3. (Hausdorff implies sober)

Every Hausdorff topological space (def. 4.1) is a sober topological space (def. 5.1).

More specifically, in a Hausdorff topological space the irreducible closed subspaces (def. 2.28) are precisely the singleton subspaces (def. 7.2).

**Proof.** The second statement clearly implies the first. To see the second statement, suppose that  $F$  is an irreducible closed subspace which contained two distinct points  $x \neq y$ . Then by the Hausdorff property there are disjoint neighbourhoods  $U_x, U_y$ , and hence it would follow that the relative complements  $F \setminus U_x$  and  $F \setminus U_y$  were distinct proper closed subsets of  $F$  with

$$F = (F \setminus U_x) \cup (F \setminus U_y)$$


in contradiction to the assumption that  $F$  is irreducible.

This proves by contradiction that every irreducible closed subset is a singleton. Conversely, generally the topological closure of every singleton is irreducible closed, by example 2.29. ■

By prop. 5.2 and prop. 5.3 we have the implications on the right of the following diagram:

<u>separation axioms</u>
--------------------------





But there there is no implication between  $T_1$  and sobriety:

**Proposition 5.4.** The [intersection](#) of the [classes](#) of [sober topological spaces](#) (def. [5.1](#)) and  $T_1$ -topological spaces (def. [4.1](#)) is not [empty](#), but neither class is contained within the other.

That the intersection is not empty follows from prop. [5.3](#). That neither class is contained in the other is shown by the following counter-examples:

### Example.

- The [Sierpinski space](#) (def. [2.11](#)) is sober, but not  $T_1$ .
- The [cofinite topology](#) (example [2.14](#)) on a non-[finite set](#) is  $T_1$  but not sober.

## Frames of opens

What makes the concept of [sober topological spaces](#) special is that for them the concept of [continuous functions](#) may be expressed entirely in terms of the relations between their [open subsets](#), disregarding the underlying set of points of which these open are in fact subsets.

Recall from example [2.33](#) that for very [continuous function](#)  $f:(X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$  the [pre-image](#) function  $f^{-1}:\tau_Y \rightarrow \tau_X$  is a [frame homomorphism](#) (def. [2.31](#)).

For sober topological spaces the converse holds:

**Proposition 5.5.** *If  $(X, \tau_X)$  and  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  are [sober topological spaces](#) (def. [5.1](#)), then for every [frame homomorphism](#) (def. [2.31](#))*

$$\tau_X \leftarrow \tau_Y : \phi$$

*there is a unique [continuous function](#)  $f:X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $\phi$  is the function of forming [pre-images](#) under  $f$ :*

$$\phi = f^{-1}.$$

**Proof.** We first consider the special case of frame homomorphisms of the form

$$\tau_* \leftarrow \tau_X : \phi$$

and show that these are in bijection to the underlying set  $X$ , identified with the

continuous functions  $* \rightarrow (X, \tau)$  via example 3.12.

By prop. 2.34, the frame homomorphisms  $\phi: \tau_X \rightarrow \tau_*$  are identified with the irreducible closed subspaces  $X \setminus U_\emptyset(\phi)$  of  $(X, \tau_X)$ . Therefore by assumption of [sobriety](#) of  $(X, \tau)$  there is a unique point  $x \in X$  with  $X \setminus U_\emptyset = \text{Cl}(\{x\})$ . In particular this means that for  $U_x$  an open neighbourhood of  $x$ , then  $U_x$  is not a subset of  $U_\emptyset(\phi)$ , and so it follows that  $\phi(U_x) = \{1\}$ . In conclusion we have found a unique  $x \in X$  such that

$$\phi : U \mapsto \begin{cases} \{1\} & | \text{ if } x \in U \\ \emptyset & | \text{ otherwise } \end{cases}.$$

This is precisely the [inverse image](#) function of the continuous function  $* \rightarrow X$  which sends  $1 \mapsto x$ .

Hence this establishes the bijection between frame homomorphisms of the form  $\tau_* \leftarrow \tau_X$  and continuous functions of the form  $* \rightarrow (X, \tau)$ .

With this it follows that a general frame homomorphism of the form  $\tau_X \xleftarrow{\phi} \tau_Y$  defines a function of sets  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$  by [composition](#):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ (\tau_* \leftarrow \tau_X) & \mapsto & (\tau_* \leftarrow \tau_X \xleftarrow{\phi} \tau_Y) \end{array}.$$

By the previous analysis, an element  $U_Y \in \tau_Y$  is sent to  $\{1\}$  under this composite precisely if the corresponding point  $* \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{f} Y$  is in  $U_Y$ , and similarly for an element  $U_X \in \tau_X$ . It follows that  $\phi(U_Y) \in \tau_X$  is precisely that subset of points in  $X$  which are sent by  $f$  to elements of  $U_Y$ , hence that  $\phi = f^{-1}$  is the [pre-image](#) function of  $f$ . Since  $\phi$  by definition sends open subsets of  $Y$  to open subsets of  $X$ , it follows that  $f$  is indeed a continuous function. This proves the claim in generality. ■

### Remark 5.6. ([locales](#))

Proposition 5.5 is often stated as saying that sober topological spaces are [equivalently](#) the “[locales with enough points](#)” (Johnstone 82, II 1.). Here “[locale](#)” refers to a concept akin to topological spaces where one considers *just* a “[frame of open subsets](#)”  $\tau_X$ , without requiring that its elements be actual [subsets](#) of some ambient set. The natural notion of [homomorphism](#) between such generalized topological spaces are clearly the [frame](#) homomorphisms  $\tau_X \leftarrow \tau_Y$  as above. From this perspective, prop. 5.5 says that sober topological spaces  $(X, \tau_X)$  are entirely characterized by their [frames of opens](#)  $\tau_X$  and just so happen to “have enough points” such that these are actual open subsets of some ambient set, namely of  $X$ .

## Sober reflection

We saw above in prop. 4.12 that every topological space has a “best approximation from the left” by a [Hausdorff topological space](#). We now discuss the analogous statement for [sober topological spaces](#).

Recall again the [point](#) topological space  $\ast := (\{1\}, \tau_\ast = \{\emptyset, \{1\}\})$  (example 2.10).

**Definition 5.7.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#).

Define  $SX$  to be the set

$$SX := \text{Hom}_{\text{Frame}}(\tau_X, \tau_\ast)$$

of [frame homomorphisms](#) from the [frame of opens](#) of  $X$  to that of the point.

Define a [topology](#)  $\tau_{SX} \subset P(SX)$  on this set by declaring it to have one element  $\tilde{U}$  for each element  $U \in \tau_X$  and given by

$$\tilde{U} := \{\phi \in SX \mid \phi(U) = \{1\}\}.$$

Consider the function

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{s_X} & SX \\ x & \mapsto & (\text{const}_x)^{-1} \end{array}$$

which sends an element  $x \in X$  to the function which assigns [inverse images](#) of the [constant function](#)  $\text{const}_x : \{1\} \rightarrow X$  on that element.

**Lemma 5.8.** *The construction  $(SX, \tau_{SX})$  in def. 5.7 is a [topological space](#), and the function  $s_X : X \rightarrow SX$  is a [continuous function](#)*

$$s_X : (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (SX, \tau_{SX})$$

**Proof.** To see that  $\tau_{SX} \subset P(SX)$  is closed under arbitrary unions and finite intersections, observe that the function

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau_X & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{(-)}} & \tau_{SX} \\ U & \mapsto & \tilde{U} \end{array}$$

in fact preserves arbitrary unions and finite intersections. Whith this the statement follows by the fact that  $\tau_X$  is closed under these operations.

To see that  $\widetilde{(-)}$  indeed preserves unions, observe that (e.g. [Johnstone 82, II 1.3 Lemma](#))

$$\begin{aligned} p \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \tilde{U}_i &\Leftrightarrow \exists_{i \in I} p(U_i) = \{1\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \bigcup_{i \in I} p(U_i) = \{1\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i\right) = \{1\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \in \widetilde{\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i} \end{aligned}$$

where we used that the frame homomorphism  $p: \tau_X \rightarrow \tau_*$  preserves unions. Similarly for intersections, now with  $I$  a [finite set](#):

$$\begin{aligned} p \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \widetilde{U}_i &\Leftrightarrow \forall_{i \in I} p(U_i) = \{1\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \bigcap_{i \in I} p(U_i) = \{1\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p\left(\bigcap_{i \in I} U_i\right) = \{1\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \in \widetilde{\bigcap_{i \in I} U_i} \end{aligned}$$

where now we used that the frame homomorphism  $p$  preserves finite intersections.

To see that  $s_X$  is continuous, observe that  $s_X^{-1}(\tilde{U}) = U$ , by construction. ■

**Lemma 5.9.** For  $(X, \tau_X)$  a [topological space](#), the function  $s_X: X \rightarrow SX$  from def. 5.7 is

1. an [injection](#) precisely if  $X$  is [T0](#);
2. a [bijection](#) precisely if  $X$  is sober.

In this case  $s_X$  is in fact a [homeomorphism](#).

**Proof.** By lemma 2.34 there is an identification  $SX \simeq \text{IrrClSub}(X)$  and via this  $s_X$  is identified with the map  $x \mapsto \text{Cl}(\{x\})$ .

Hence the second statement follows by definition, and the first statement by [this prop.](#)

That in the second case  $s_X$  is in fact a homeomorphism follows from the definition of the opens  $\tilde{U}$ : they are identified with the opens  $U$  in this case (...expand...). ■

**Lemma 5.10.** For  $(X, \tau)$  a [topological space](#), then the topological space  $(SX, \tau_{SX})$  from def. 5.7, lemma 5.8 is sober.

(e.g. Johnstone 82, lemma II 1.7)

**Proof.** Let  $SX \setminus \tilde{U}$  be an [irreducible closed subspace](#) of  $(SX, \tau_{SX})$ . We need to show that it is the [topological closure](#) of a unique element  $\phi \in SX$ .

Observe first that also  $X \setminus U$  is irreducible.

To see this use [this prop.](#), saying that irreducibility of  $X \setminus U$  is equivalent to  $U_1 \cap U_2 \subset U \Rightarrow (U_1 \subset U) \text{ or } (U_2 \subset U)$ . But if  $U_1 \cap U_2 \subset U$  then also  $\tilde{U}_1 \cap \tilde{U}_2 \subset \tilde{U}$  (as in the [proof](#) of lemma 5.8) and hence by assumption on  $\tilde{U}$  it follows that  $\tilde{U}_1 \subset \tilde{U}$  or  $\tilde{U}_2 \subset \tilde{U}$ . By lemma 2.34 this in turn implies  $U_1 \subset U$  or  $U_2 \subset U$ . In conclusion, this shows that also  $X \setminus U$  is irreducible .

By lemma 2.34 this irreducible closed subspace corresponds to a point  $p \in SX$ . By that same lemma, this frame homomorphism  $p: \tau_X \rightarrow \tau_*$  takes the value  $\emptyset$  on all

those opens which are inside  $U$ . This means that the [topological closure](#) of this point is just  $SX \setminus \tilde{U}$ .

This shows that there exists at least one point of which  $X \setminus \tilde{U}$  is the topological closure. It remains to see that there is no other such point.

So let  $p_1 \neq p_2 \in SX$  be two distinct points. This means that there exists  $U \in \tau_X$  with  $p_1(U) \neq p_2(U)$ . Equivalently this says that  $\tilde{U}$  contains one of the two points, but not the other. This means that  $(SX, \tau_{SX})$  is [T0](#). By [this prop.](#) this is equivalent to there being no two points with the same topological closure. ■

**Proposition 5.11.** *For  $(X, \tau_X)$  any [topological space](#), for  $(Y, \tau_Y^{\text{sob}})$  a sober topological space, and for  $f: (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$  a [continuous function](#), then it factors uniquely through the soberification  $s_X: (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (SX, \tau_{SX})$  from [def. 5.7](#), lemma [5.8](#)*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X, \tau_X) & \xrightarrow{f} & (Y, \tau_Y^{\text{sob}}) \\ s_X \downarrow & \nearrow_{\exists!} & \\ (SX, \tau_{SX}) & & \end{array} .$$

**Proof.** By the construction in [def. 5.7](#), we the outer part of the following square [commutes](#):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X, \tau_X) & \xrightarrow{f} & (Y, \tau_Y^{\text{sob}}) \\ s_X \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow s_{SX} \\ (SX, \tau_{SX}) & \xrightarrow{s_f} & (SSX, \tau_{SSX}) \end{array} .$$

By [lemma 5.10](#) and [lemma 5.9](#), the right vertical morphism  $s_{SX}$  is an isomorphism (a [homeomorphism](#)), hence has an [inverse morphism](#). This defines the diagonal morphism, which is the desired factorization.

To see that this factorization is unique, consider two factorizations  $\tilde{f}, \bar{f}: (SX, \tau_{SX}) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y^{\text{sob}})$  and apply the soberification construction once more to the triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X, \tau_X) & \xrightarrow{f} & (Y, \tau_Y^{\text{sob}}) \\ s_X \downarrow & \nearrow_{\tilde{f}, \bar{f}} & \\ (SX, \tau_{SX}) & & \end{array} \quad \mapsto \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (SX, \tau_{SX}) & \xrightarrow{s_f} & (Y, \tau_Y^{\text{sob}}) \\ \simeq \downarrow & \nearrow_{\tilde{f}, \bar{f}} & \\ (SX, \tau_{SX}) & & \end{array} .$$

Here on the right we used again [lemma 5.9](#) to find that the vertical morphism is an isomorphism, and that  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\bar{f}$  do not change under soberification, as they already map between sober spaces. But now that the left vertical morphism is an isomorphism, the commutativity of this triangle for both  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\bar{f}$  implies that  $\tilde{f} = \bar{f}$ . ■

## 6. Compact spaces

From the discussion of [compact metric spaces](#) in def. 1.19 and prop. 1.20 it is now immediate how to generalize these concepts to [topological spaces](#).

The most naive version of the definition directly generalizes the concept via converging sequences from def. 1.19:

**Definition 6.1. (converging sequence in a topological space)**

Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#) (def. 2.3) and let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a [sequence](#) of points  $(x_n)$  in  $X$  (def. 1.15). We say that this sequence [converges](#) in  $(X, \tau)$  to a point  $x_\infty \in X$ , denoted

$$x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} x_\infty$$

if for each open [neighbourhood](#)  $U_{x_\infty}$  of  $x_\infty$  there exists a  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \geq k$  then  $x_n \in U_{x_\infty}$ :

$$\left( x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} x_\infty \right) \Leftrightarrow \bigvee_{\substack{U_{x_\infty} \in \tau_X \\ x_\infty \in U_{x_\infty}}} \left( \exists_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \forall_{n \geq k} x_n \in U_{x_\infty} \right) \right).$$

**Definition 6.2. ([sequentially compact topological space](#))**

Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [topological space](#) (def. 2.3). It is called [sequentially compact](#) if for every [sequence](#) of points  $(x_n)$  in  $X$  (def. 1.15) there exists a sub-sequence  $(x_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  which [converges](#) according to def. 6.1.

But prop. 1.20 suggests to consider also another definition of compactness for topological spaces:

**Definition 6.3. ([open cover](#))**

An [open cover](#) of a [topological space](#)  $X$  (def. 2.3) is a [set](#)  $\{U_i \subset X\}_{i \in I}$  of [open subsets](#)  $U_i$  of  $X$ , indexed by some [set](#)  $I$ , such that their [union](#) is all of  $X$ :

$$\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i = X.$$

**Definition 6.4. ([compact topological space](#))**

A [topological space](#)  $X$  (def. 2.3) is called a [compact topological space](#) if every [open cover](#)  $\{U_i \rightarrow X\}_{i \in I}$  (def. 6.3) has a *finite subcover* in that there is a [finite subset](#)  $J \subset I$  such that  $\{U_i \rightarrow X\}_{i \in J}$  is still a cover of  $X$  in that  $\bigcup_{i \in J} U_i = X$ .

**Remark 6.5. (terminology issue regarding “compact”)**

Beware that the following terminology issue persists in the literature:

Some authors use “compact” to mean “[Hausdorff and compact](#)”. To disambiguate this, some authors (mostly in [algebraic geometry](#)) say “quasi-compact” for what we call “compact” in prop. 6.4.

**Example 6.6.** A [discrete topological space](#) (def. 2.13) is [compact](#) (def. 6.4) precisely if its underlying set is [finite](#).

In terms of these definitions, the familiar statement about metric spaces from prop. 1.20 now equivalently says the following

**Proposition 6.7. ([sequentially compact metric spaces are equivalently compact metric spaces](#))**

*If  $(X, d)$  is a [metric space](#), regarded as a [topological space](#) via its [metric topology](#) (def. 2.9), then the following are equivalent:*

1.  $(X, d)$  is a [compact topological space](#) (def. 6.4).
2.  $(X, d)$  is a [sequentially compact topological space](#) (def. 6.2).

**Proof.** of prop. 1.20 and prop. 6.7

Assume first that  $(X, d)$  is a [compact topological space](#). Let  $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a [sequence](#) in  $X$ . We need to show that it has a sub-sequence which [converges](#).

Consider the [topological closures](#) of the sub-sequences that omit the first  $n$  elements of the sequence

$$F_n := \text{Cl}(\{x_k \mid k \geq n\})$$

and write

$$U_n := X \setminus F_n$$

for their [open complements](#).

Assume now that the [intersection](#) of all the  $F_n$  were [empty](#)

$$(\star) \quad \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} F_n = \emptyset$$

or equivalently that the [union](#) of all the  $U_n$  were all of  $X$

$$\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n = X,$$

hence that  $\{U_n \rightarrow X\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  were an [open cover](#). By the assumption that  $X$  is compact, this would imply that there is a [finite subset](#)  $\{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k\} \subset \mathbb{N}$  with

$$\begin{aligned} X &= U_{i_1} \cup U_{i_2} \cup \dots \cup U_{i_k} \\ &= U_{i_k} \end{aligned}$$

This in turn would mean that  $F_{i_k} = \emptyset$ , which contradicts the construction of  $F_{i_k}$ . Hence we have a [proof by contradiction](#) that assumption  $(\star)$  is wrong, and hence that there must exist an element

$$x \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} F_n.$$



By definition of [topological closure](#) this means that for all  $n$  the [open ball](#)  $B_x^\circ(1/(n+1))$  around  $x$  of [radius](#)  $1/(n+1)$  must intersect the  $n$ th of the above subsequence:

$$B_x^\circ(1/(n+1)) \cap \{x_k \mid k \geq n\} \neq \emptyset .$$

Picking one point  $(x'_n)$  in the  $n$ th such intersection for all  $n$  hence defines a sub-sequence, which converges to  $x$ .

This proves that compact implies sequentially compact for metric spaces.

For the converse, assume now that  $(X, d)$  is sequentially compact. Let  $\{U_i \rightarrow X\}_{i \in I}$  be an [open cover](#) of  $X$ . We need to show that there exists a finite sub-cover.

Now by the [Lebesgue number lemma](#), there exists a positive real number  $\delta > 0$  such that for each  $x \in X$  there is  $i_x \in I$  such that  $B_x^\circ(\delta) \subset U_{i_x}$ . Moreover, since [sequentially compact metric spaces are totally bounded](#), there exists then a [finite set](#)  $S \subset X$  such that

$$X = \bigcup_{s \in S} B_s^\circ(\delta) .$$

Therefore  $\{U_{i_s} \rightarrow X\}_{s \in S}$  is a finite sub-cover as required. ■

In contrast to prop. [6.7](#), for general topological spaces being sequentially compact neither implies nor is implied by being compact (...examples...).

In [analysis](#), the [extreme value theorem](#) asserts that a [real](#)-valued [continuous function](#) on the [bounded closed interval](#) (def. [1.12](#)) attains its [maximum](#) and [minimum](#). The following is the generalization of this statement to general topological spaces:

**Lemma 6.8. ([continuous surjections out of compact spaces have compact codomain](#))**

Let  $f:(X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$  be a [continuous function](#) between [topological spaces](#) such that

1.  $(X, \tau_X)$  is a [compact topological space](#);
2.  $f:X \rightarrow Y$  is a [surjective function](#).

Then also  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  is [compact](#).

**Proof.** Let  $\{U_i \subset Y\}_{i \in I}$  be an [open cover](#) of  $Y$ . We need show that this has a finite sub-cover.

By the continuity of  $f$  the [pre-images](#)  $f^{-1}(U_i)$  are [open subsets](#) of  $X$ , and by the surjectivity of  $f$  they form an [open cover](#)  $\{f^{-1}(U_i) \subset X\}_{i \in I}$  of  $X$ . Hence by

compactness of  $X$ , there exists a [finite subset](#)  $J \subset I$  such that  $\{f^{-1}(U_i) \subset X\}_{i \in J \subset I}$  is still an open cover of  $X$ . Finally, using again that  $f$  is assumed to be surjective, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= f(X) \\ &= f\left(\bigcup_{i \in J} f^{-1}(U_i)\right) \\ &= \bigcup_{i \in J} U_i \end{aligned}$$

which means that also  $\{U_i \subset Y\}_{i \in J \subset I}$  is still an open cover of  $Y$ , and in particular a finite subcover of the original cover. ■

### Corollary 6.9. ([continuous images of compact spaces are compact](#))

If  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is a [continuous function](#) out of a [compact topological space](#)  $X$  which is not necessarily [surjective](#), then we may consider its [image factorization](#)

$$f : X \rightarrow \text{im}(f) \hookrightarrow Y$$

as in [example 2.23](#). Now by construction  $X \rightarrow \text{im}(f)$  is surjective, and so [lemma 6.8](#) implies that  $\text{im}(f)$  is compact.

The converse to [cor. 6.9](#) does not hold in general: the pre-image of a compact subset under a continuous function need not be compact again. If this is the case, then we speak of [proper maps](#):

### Definition 6.10. ([proper maps](#))

A [continuous function](#)  $f: (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$  is called [proper](#) if for  $C \in Y$  a [compact topological subspace](#) of  $Y$ , then also its [pre-image](#)  $f^{-1}(C)$  is [compact](#) in  $X$ .

### Definition 6.11. ([mapping space](#))

For  $X$  a [topological space](#) and  $Y$  a [locally compact topological space](#) (in that for every point, every [neighbourhood](#) contains a [compact](#) neighbourhood), the [mapping space](#)

$$X^Y \in \text{Top}$$

is the [topological space](#)

- whose underlying set is the set  $\text{Hom}_{\text{Top}}(Y, X)$  of [continuous functions](#)  $Y \rightarrow X$ ,
- whose [open subsets](#) are [unions](#) of [finitary intersections](#) of the following [subbase](#) elements of standard open subsets:

the standard open subset  $U^K \subset \text{Hom}_{\text{Top}}(Y, X)$  for

- $K \hookrightarrow Y$  a [compact topological space](#) subset
- $U \hookrightarrow X$  an [open subset](#)

is the subset of all those [continuous functions](#)  $f$  that fit into a [commuting diagram](#) of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \hookrightarrow & Y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ U & \hookrightarrow & X \end{array}$$

Accordingly this is called the [compact-open topology](#) on the set of functions.

The construction extends to a [functor](#)

$$(-)^{(-)} : \mathbf{Top}_{\mathrm{lc}}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{Top} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top} .$$

## Relation to Hausdorff spaces

We discuss some important relations between the concepts of compact spaces and of [Hausdorff topological spaces](#).

In [analysis](#) the key recognition principle for compact spaces is the following:

### Proposition 6.12. ([Heine-Borel theorem](#))

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , regard  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as the  $n$ -dimensional [Euclidean space](#) via example 1.6, regarded as a [topological space](#) via its [metric topology](#) (def. 2.9).

Then for a [topological subspace](#)  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  the following are equivalent:

1.  $S$  is [compact](#) according to def. 6.4,
2.  $S$  is [closed](#) (def. 2.24) and [bounded](#) (def. 1.3).

In general [topological spaces](#), the generalized analogue of the [Heine-Borel theorem](#) is the following:

### Proposition 6.13. ([closed subspaces of compact Hausdorff spaces are equivalently compact subspaces](#))

Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [compact Hausdorff topological space](#) (def. 4.1, def. 6.4) and let  $Y \subset X$  be a [topological subspace](#). Then the following are equivalent:

1.  $Y \subset X$  is a [closed subspace](#) (def. 2.24);
2.  $Y$  is a [compact topological space](#).

**Proof.** By lemma 6.14 and prop 6.16. ■

### Lemma 6.14. ([closed subsets of compact spaces are compact](#))

Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a [compact topological space](#) (def. 6.4), and let  $Y \subset X$  be a [closed topological subspace](#). Then also  $Y$  is [compact](#).

**Proof.** Let  $\{V_i \subset Y\}_{i \in I}$  be an [open cover](#) of  $Y$ . We need to show that this has a finite sub-cover.

By definition of the [subspace topology](#), there exist open subsets  $U_i$  of  $X$  with

$$V_i = U_i \cap Y.$$

By the assumption that  $Y$  is closed, the [complement](#)  $X \setminus Y$  is an open subset of  $X$ , and therefore

$$\{X \setminus Y \subset X\} \cup \{U_i \subset X\}_{i \in I}$$

is an [open cover](#) of  $X$ . Now by the assumption that  $X$  is compact, this latter cover has a finite subcover, hence there exists a [finite subset](#)  $J \subset I$  such that

$$\{X \setminus Y \subset X\} \cup \{U_i \subset X\}_{i \in J \subset I}$$

is still an open cover of  $X$ , hence in particular intersects to a finite open cover of  $Y$ . But since  $Y \cap (X \setminus Y) = \emptyset$ , it follows that indeed

$$\{V_i \subset Y\}_{i \in J \subset I}$$

is a cover of  $Y$ , and in indeed a finite subcover of the original one. ■

**Lemma 6.15. (separation by neighbourhoods of points from compact subspaces in Hausdorff spaces)**

Let

1.  $(X, \tau)$  be a [Hausdorff topological space](#);
2.  $Y \subset X$  a [compact subspace](#).

Then for every  $x \in X \setminus Y$  there exists

1. an [open neighbourhood](#)  $U_x \supset \{x\}$ ;
2. an open neighbourhood  $U_Y \supset Y$

such that

- they are still disjoint:  $U_x \cap U_Y = \emptyset$ .

**Proof.** By the assumption that  $(X, \tau)$  is Hausdorff, we find for every point  $y \in Y$  disjoint open neighbourhoods  $U_{x,y} \supset \{x\}$  and  $U_y \supset \{y\}$ . By the nature of the [subspace topology](#) of  $Y$ , the restriction of all the  $U_y$  to  $Y$  is an [open cover](#) of  $Y$ :

$$\{(U_y \cap Y) \subset Y\}_{y \in Y}.$$

Now by the assumption that  $Y$  is compact, there exists a finite subcover, hence a [finite set](#)  $S \subset Y$  such that

$$\{(U_y \cap Y) \subset Y\}_{y \in S \subset Y}$$

is still a cover.

But the finite intersection

$$U_x := \bigcap_{s \in S \subset Y} U_{x,s}$$

of the corresponding open neighbourhoods of  $x$  is still open, and by construction it is disjoint from all the  $U_s$ , hence in particular from their union

$$U_Y := \bigcup_{s \in S \subset Y} U_s.$$

Therefore  $U_x$  and  $U_Y$  are two open subsets as required. ■

This immediately implies the following:

**Proposition 6.16. (compact subspaces of Hausdorff spaces are closed)**

Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a Hausdorff topological space (def. 4.1) and let  $C \subset X$  be a compact (def. 6.4) topological subspace (def. 2.17). Then  $C \subset X$  is also a closed subspace (def. 2.24).

**Proof.** Let  $x \in X \setminus C$  be any point of  $X$  not contained in  $C$ . We need to show that there exists an open neighbourhood of  $x$  in  $X$  which does not intersect  $C$ . This is implied by lemma 6.15. ■

**Proposition 6.17. (maps from compact spaces to Hausdorff spaces are closed and proper)**

Let  $f: (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$  be a continuous function between topological spaces such that

1.  $(X, \tau_X)$  is a compact topological space;
2.  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  is a Hausdorff topological space.

Then  $f$  is

1. a closed map (def. 3.7);
2. a proper map (def. 6.10).

**Proof.** For the first statement, we need to show that if  $C \subset X$  is a closed subset of  $X$ , then also  $f(C) \subset Y$  is a closed subset of  $Y$ .

Now

1. since closed subsets of compact spaces are compact (lemma 6.14) it follows that  $C \subset C$  is also compact;
2. since continuous images of compact spaces are compact (cor. 6.9) it then

follows that  $f(C) \subset Y$  is compact;

3. since compact subspaces of Hausdorff spaces are closed (prop. 6.16) it finally follow that  $f(C)$  is also closed in  $Y$ .

For the second statement we need to show that if  $C \subset Y$  is a compact subset, then also its pre-image  $f^{-1}(C)$  is compact.

Now

1. since compact subspaces of Hausdorff spaces are closed (prop. 6.16) it follows that  $C \subseteq Y$  is closed;
2. since pre-images under continuous of closed subsets are closed (prop. 3.2), also  $f^{-1}(C) \subset X$  is closed;
3. since closed subsets of compact spaces are compact (lemma 6.14), it follows that  $f^{-1}(C)$  is compact.

■

**Proposition 6.18. (continuous bijections from compact spaces to Hausdorff spaces are homeomorphisms)**

Let  $f: (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$  be a continuous function between topological spaces such that

1.  $(X, \tau_X)$  is a compact topological space;
2.  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  is a Hausdorff topological space.
3.  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a bijection of sets.

Then  $f$  is a homeomorphism, i. e. its inverse function  $Y \rightarrow X$  is also a continuous function.

In particular then both  $(X, \tau_X)$  and  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  are compact Hausdorff spaces.

**Proof.** Write  $g: Y \rightarrow X$  for the inverse function of  $f$ .

We need to show that  $g$  is continuous, hence that for  $U \subset X$  an open subset, then also its pre-image  $g^{-1}(U) \subset Y$  is open in  $Y$ . By prop. 3.2 this is equivalent to the statement that for  $C \subset X$  a closed subset then the pre-image  $g^{-1}(C) \subset Y$  is also closed in  $Y$ .

But since  $g$  is the inverse function to  $f$ , its pre-images are the images of  $f$ . Hence the last statement above equivalently says that  $f$  sends closed subsets to closed subsets. This is true by prop. 6.17. ■

**Proposition 6.19. (compact Hausdorff spaces are normal)**

Every compact Hausdorff topological space is a normal topological space (def. 4.8).

**Proof.** First we claim that  $(X, \tau)$  is regular. To show this, we need to find for each point  $x \in X$  and each disjoint closed subset  $Y \in X$  disjoint open neighbourhoods  $U_x \supset \{x\}$  and  $U_Y \supset Y$ . But since closed subspaces of compact spaces are compact, the subset  $Y$  is in fact compact, and hence this is in fact the statement of lemma 6.15.

Next to show that  $(X, \tau)$  is indeed normal, we apply the idea of the proof of lemma 6.15 once more:

Let  $Y_1, Y_2 \subset X$  be two disjoint closed subspaces. By the previous statement then for every point  $y_1 \in Y_1$  we find disjoint open neighbourhoods  $U_{y_1} \subset \{y_1\}$  and  $U_{Y_2, y_1} \supset Y_2$ . The union of the  $U_{y_1}$  is a cover of  $Y_1$ , and by compactness of  $Y_1$  there is a finite subset  $S \subset Y_1$  such that

$$U_{Y_1} := \bigcup_{s \in S \subset Y_1} U_{y_1}$$

is an open neighbourhood of  $Y_1$  and

$$U_{Y_2} := \bigcap_{s \in S \subset Y_1} U_{Y_2, s}$$

is an open neighbourhood of  $Y_2$ , and both are disjoint. ■

## Relation to quotient spaces

**Proposition 6.20. (*continuous surjections from compact spaces to Hausdorff spaces are quotient projections*)**

Let

$$\pi : (X, \tau_X) \longrightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$$

be a continuous function between topological spaces such that

1.  $(X, \tau_X)$  is a compact topological space (def. 6.4);
2.  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  is a Hausdorff topological space (def. 4.1);
3.  $\pi : X \longrightarrow Y$  is a surjective function.

Then  $\tau_Y$  is the quotient topology inherited from  $\tau_X$  via the surjection  $f$  (def. 2.18).

**Proof.** We need to show that an subset  $U \subset Y$  is an open subset  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  precisely if its pre-image  $\pi^{-1}(U) \subset X$  is an open subset in  $(X, \tau_X)$ . Equivalently, as in prop. 3.2, we need to show that  $U$  is a closed subset precisely if  $\pi^{-1}(U)$  is a closed subset. The implication



$$(U \text{ closed}) \Rightarrow (f^{-1}(U) \text{ closed})$$

follows via prop. [3.2](#) from the continuity of  $\pi$ . The implication

$$(f^{-1}(U) \text{ closed}) \Rightarrow (U \text{ closed})$$

follows since  $\pi$  is a [closed map](#) by prop. [6.17](#). ■

**Proposition 6.21. (quotient projections out of compact Hausdorff spaces are closed precisely if the codomain is Hausdorff)**

Let

$$\pi : (X, \tau_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$$

be a [continuous function](#) between [topological spaces](#) such that

1.  $(X, \tau)$  is a [compact Hausdorff topological space](#) (def. [6.4](#), def. [4.1](#));
2.  $\pi$  is a [surjection](#) and  $\tau_Y$  is the corresponding [quotient topology](#) (def. [2.18](#)).

Then the following are equivalent

1.  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  is itself a [Hausdorff topological space](#) (def. [4.1](#));
2.  $\pi$  is a [closed map](#) (def. [3.7](#)).

**Proof.** The implicaton  $((Y, \tau_Y) \text{ Hausdorff}) \Rightarrow (\pi \text{ closed})$  is given by prop. [6.17](#). We need to show the converse.

Hence assume that  $\pi$  is a closed map. We need to show that for every pair of distinct point  $y_1 \neq y_2 \in Y$  there exist [open neighbourhoods](#)  $U_{y_1}, U_{y_2} \in \tau_Y$  which are disjoint,  $U_{y_1} \cap U_{y_2} = \text{emptyst}$ .

Therefore consider the [pre-images](#)

$$C_1 := \pi^{-1}(\{y_1\}) \quad C_2 := \pi^{-1}(\{y_2\}) .$$

Observe that these are [closed subsets](#), because in the Hausdorff space  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  the singleton subsets  $\{y_i\}$  are closed by prop. [4.6](#), and since pre-images under continuous functions preserves closed subsets by prop. [3.2](#).


Now since [compact Hausdorff spaces are normal](#) it follows (by def. [4.8](#)) that we may find disjoint open subset  $U_1, U_2 \in \tau_X$  such that

$$C_1 \subset U_1 \quad C_2 \subset U_2 .$$

Moreover, by lemma [3.9](#) we may find these  $U_i$  such that they are both [saturated subsets](#) (def. [2.19](#)). Therefore finally lemma [3.9](#) say that the images  $\pi(U_i)$  are open in  $(Y, \tau_Y)$ . These are now clearly disjoint open neighbourhoods of  $y_1$  and  $y_2$ . ■

**Example 6.22.** Consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} [0, 2\pi] / \sim &\rightarrow S^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \\ t &\mapsto (\cos(t), \sin(t)) \end{aligned}$$



- from the [quotient topological space](#) (def. 2.18) of the [closed interval](#) (def. 1.12) by the [equivalence relation](#) which identifies the two endpoints

$$(x \sim y) \Leftrightarrow ((x = y) \text{ or } ((x \in \{0, 2\pi\} \text{ and } (y \in \{0, 2\pi\}))))$$

- to the unit [circle](#)  $S^1 = S_0(1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  (def. 1.2) regarded as a [topological subspace](#) of the 2-dimensional [Euclidean space](#) (def. 1.6) equipped with its [metric topology](#) (def. 2.9).

This is clearly a [continuous function](#) and a [bijection](#) on the underlying sets. Moreover, since [continuous images of compact spaces are compact](#) (cor. 6.9)  $[0, 1]$

Hence by prop. 6.18 the above map is in fact a [homeomorphism](#)

$$[0, 2\pi] / \sim \simeq S^1.$$

Compare this to the counter-example 3.18, which observed that the analogous function

$$\begin{aligned} [0, 2\pi) &\rightarrow S^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \\ t &\mapsto (\cos(t), \sin(t)) \end{aligned}$$

is *not* a homeomorphism, even though this, too, is a bijection on the the underlying sets. But the [half-open interval](#)  $[0, 2\pi)$  is not compact, and hence prop. 6.21 does not apply.

## 7. Universal constructions

One point of the general definition of “[topological space](#)” is that it admits constructions which intuitively should exist on “continuous spaces”, but which do not in general exist, for instance, as [metric spaces](#).

We discuss [universal constructions](#) in [Top](#), such as [limits/colimits](#), etc.

**Definition 7.1.** Let  $\{X_i = (S_i, \tau_i) \in \mathbf{Top}\}_{i \in I}$  be a [class](#) of [topological spaces](#), and let  $S \in \mathbf{Set}$  be a bare [set](#). Then

- For  $\{S \xrightarrow{f_i} S_i\}_{i \in I}$  a set of [functions](#) out of  $S$ , the [initial topology](#)  $\tau_{\text{initial}}(\{f_i\}_{i \in I})$  is the topology on  $S$  with the [minimum](#) collection of [open subsets](#) such that all  $f_i : (S, \tau_{\text{initial}}(\{f_i\}_{i \in I})) \rightarrow X_i$  are [continuous](#).

- For  $\{S_i \xrightarrow{f_i} S\}_{i \in I}$  a set of [functions](#) into  $S$ , the [final topology](#)  $\tau_{\text{final}}(\{f_i\}_{i \in I})$  is the topology on  $S$  with the [maximum](#) collection of [open subsets](#) such that all  $f_i: X_i \rightarrow (S, \tau_{\text{final}}(\{f_i\}_{i \in I}))$  are [continuous](#).

**Example 7.2.** For  $X$  a single topological space, and  $\iota_S: S \hookrightarrow U(X)$  a subset of its underlying set, then the initial topology  $\tau_{\text{initial}}(\iota_S)$ , def. 7.1, is the [subspace topology](#), making

$$\iota_S : (S, \tau_{\text{initial}}(\iota_S)) \hookrightarrow X$$

a [topological subspace](#) inclusion.

**Example 7.3.** Conversely, for  $p_S: U(X) \rightarrow S$  an [epimorphism](#), then the final topology  $\tau_{\text{final}}(p_S)$  on  $S$  is the [quotient topology](#).

**Proposition 7.4.** Let  $I$  be a [small category](#) and let  $X_\bullet: I \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$  be an  $I$ -[diagram](#) in [Top](#) (a [functor](#) from  $I$  to  $\mathbf{Top}$ ), with components denoted  $X_i = (S_i, \tau_i)$ , where  $S_i \in \mathbf{Set}$  and  $\tau_i$  a topology on  $S_i$ . Then:

1. The [limit](#) of  $X_\bullet$  exists and is given by [the](#) topological space whose underlying set is [the](#) limit in [Set](#) of the underlying sets in the diagram, and whose topology is the [initial topology](#), def. 7.1, for the functions  $p_i$  which are the limiting [cone](#) components:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \varprojlim_{i \in I} S_i & \\ p_i \swarrow & & \searrow p_j \\ S_i & \longrightarrow & S_j \end{array}$$

Hence

$$\varprojlim_{i \in I} X_i \simeq \left( \varprojlim_{i \in I} S_i, \tau_{\text{initial}}(\{p_i\}_{i \in I}) \right)$$

2. The [colimit](#) of  $X_\bullet$  exists and is the topological space whose underlying set is the colimit in [Set](#) of the underlying diagram of sets, and whose topology is the [final topology](#), def. 7.1 for the component maps  $\iota_i$  of the colimiting [cocone](#)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_i & \longrightarrow & S_j \\ \iota_i \searrow & & \swarrow \iota_j \\ & \varinjlim_{i \in I} S_i & \end{array}$$

Hence

$$\varinjlim_{i \in I} X_i \simeq \left( \varinjlim_{i \in I} S_i, \tau_{\text{final}}(\{\iota_i\}_{i \in I}) \right)$$

(e.g. [Bourbaki 71](#), section I.4)

**Proof.** The required [universal property](#) of  $\left(\lim_{\longleftarrow i \in I} S_i, \tau_{\text{initial}}(\{p_i\}_{i \in I})\right)$  is immediate: for

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & (S, \tau) & \\ f_i \swarrow & & \searrow f_j \\ X_i & \longrightarrow & X_j \end{array}$$

any [cone](#) over the diagram, then by construction there is a unique function of underlying sets  $S \rightarrow \lim_{\longleftarrow i \in I} S_i$  making the required diagrams commute, and so all that is required is that this unique function is always [continuous](#). But this is precisely what the initial topology ensures.

The case of the colimit is [formally dual](#). ■

## Examples of (co-)limits of topological spaces

**Example 7.5.** The limit over the empty diagram in  $\mathbf{Top}$  is the [point](#)  $*$  with its unique topology.

**Example 7.6.** For  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  a set of topological spaces, their [coproduct](#)  $\bigsqcup_{i \in I} X_i \in \mathbf{Top}$  is their [disjoint union](#) (example 2.15).

**Example 7.7.** For  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  a set of topological spaces, their [product](#)  $\prod_{i \in I} X_i \in \mathbf{Top}$  is the [Cartesian product](#) of the underlying sets equipped with the [product topology](#), also called the [Tychonoff product](#).

In the case that  $S$  is a [finite set](#), such as for binary product spaces  $X \times Y$ , then a [sub-basis](#) for the product topology is given by the [Cartesian products](#) of the open subsets of (a basis for) each factor space.

**Example 7.8.** The [equalizer](#) of two [continuous functions](#)  $f, g: X \rightrightarrows Y$  in  $\mathbf{Top}$  is the equalizer of the underlying functions of sets

$$\text{eq}(f, g) \hookrightarrow S_X \xrightleftharpoons[f]{g} S_Y$$

(hence the targets subset of  $S_X$  on which both functions coincide) and equipped with the [subspace topology](#), example 7.2.

**Example 7.9.** The [coequalizer](#) of two [continuous functions](#)  $f, g: X \rightrightarrows Y$  in  $\mathbf{Top}$  is the coequalizer of the underlying functions of sets

$$S_X \xrightleftharpoons[f]{g} S_Y \twoheadrightarrow \text{coeq}(f, g)$$

(hence the [quotient set](#) by the [equivalence relation](#) generated by  $f(x) \sim g(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ ) and equipped with the [quotient topology](#), example 7.3.


**Example 7.10.** For

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\ f \downarrow & & \\ X & & \end{array}$$

two [continuous functions](#) out of the same [domain](#), then the [colimit](#) under this diagram is also called the [pushout](#), denoted

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow g_* f \\ X & \longrightarrow & X \sqcup_A Y . \end{array}$$

(Here  $g_* f$  is also called the pushout of  $f$ , or the [cobase change](#) of  $f$  along  $g$ .) If  $g$  is an inclusion, one also write  $X \cup_f Y$  and calls this the [attaching space](#).



By example 7.9 the pushout/attaching space is the [quotient topological space](#)

$$X \sqcup_A Y \simeq (X \sqcup Y) / \sim$$


of the [disjoint union](#) of  $X$  and  $Y$  subject to the [equivalence relation](#) which identifies a point in  $X$  with a point in  $Y$  if they have the same pre-image in  $A$ .

(graphics from [Aguilar-Gitler-Prieto 02](#))

**Example 7.11.** As an important special case of example 7.10, let

$$i_n : S^{n-1} \longrightarrow D^n$$

be the canonical inclusion of the standard [\(n-1\)-sphere](#) as the [boundary](#) of the standard [n-disk](#) (both regarded as [topological spaces](#) with their [subspace topology](#) as subspaces of the [Cartesian space](#)  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ).



Then the colimit in [Top](#) under the diagram, i.e. the [pushout](#) of  $i_n$  along itself,

$$\left\{ D^n \xleftarrow{i_n} S^{n-1} \xrightarrow{i_n} D^n \right\},$$

is the [n-sphere](#)  $S^n$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 S^{n-1} & \xrightarrow{i_n} & D^n \\
 i_n \downarrow & (\text{po}) & \downarrow \\
 D^n & \longrightarrow & S^n
 \end{array}$$

(graphics from Ueno-Shiga-Morita 95)

Next section [Introduction to Topology -- 2](#).

## 8. References

Introductory textbooks to topology include

- [James Munkres](#), *Topology*, Prentice Hall 1975 (2000)
- Terry Lawson, *Topology: A Geometric Approach*, Oxford University Press (2003) ([pdf](#))
- [Steven Vickers](#), *Topology via Logic*, Cambridge University Press (1989)

See also

- [Alan Hatcher](#), [Algebraic Topology](#)

and see also the references at [algebraic topology](#).

Lecture notes include

- [Friedhelm Waldhausen](#), *Topologie* ([pdf](#))
- Alex Kuronya, *Introduction to topology*, 2010 ([pdf](#))
- Anatole Katok, Alexey Sossinsky, *Introduction to modern topology and geometry* ([pdf](#))

Disucssion of [sober topological spaces](#) is in

- [Peter Johnstone](#), section II 1. of *Stone Spaces*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **3**, Cambridge University Press 1982. xxi+370 pp. [MR85f:54002](#), reprinted 1986.

See also

- [Topospaces](#), a Wiki with basic material on topology.

Revised on April 18, 2017 04:49:21 by [Urs Schreiber](#) (46.183.103.8)

**Edit** | **Back in time** (14 revisions) | **See changes** | **History** | Views: [Print](#) | [TeX](#) | [Source](#)

*This site is running on [Instiki 0.19.7\(MML+\)](#)  
Powered by [Ruby on Rails 2.3.18](#)*