

## Notes on topological bases

The purpose of these notes is to pin down what I said in class today about bases, because it departs from what the book says. The definition of a base for a topology given in the book is not that useful, because it does not work in the most common example, namely the case of open balls in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . The definition I gave, which is the standard definition, is more usable.

Let  $X$  be a set. A *topological basis* for  $X$  is a collection  $\beta$  of subsets of  $X$ , called *basis elements*, satisfying the following axioms.

1.  $X$  is the union of elements of  $\beta$ . In other words, every point of  $X$  is contained in some basis element.
2. If  $U$  and  $V$  are basis elements and  $p \in U \cap V$  then there is some basis element  $W$  such that  $p \in W$  and  $W \subset U \cap V$ .

Given  $\beta$ , a set in  $X$  is declared *open* if  $X$  is a union of basis elements. Equivalently, a subset  $U \subset X$  is declared open if every  $p \in U$  has the property that there is some basis element  $V_p$  with  $p \in V_p$  and  $V_p \subset U$ . These formulations are equivalent because

$$U = \bigcup_{p \in U} V_p.$$

Let's check the axioms for a topology.

- $X$  is open, by Axiom 1.
- $\emptyset$  is open because technically it is the union of basis elements.
- The arbitrary union of open sets is again a union of basis elements. Hence it is open according to the definition.
- For the finite intersection property, it suffices to show that  $U_1 \cap U_2$  is open when  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are open. Choose some  $p \in U_1 \cap U_2$ . By definition, there are basis elements  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  so that  $p \in V_1 \cap V_2$  and  $V_1 \subset U_1$  and  $V_2 \subset U_2$ . By Axiom 2, there is some basis element  $W$  such that  $p \in W \subset V_1 \cap V_2$ . But then  $W \subset U_1 \cap U_2$  as well. Hence  $U_1 \cap U_2$  is open.

It turns out that the same topology can be induced from many different bases. Here are some examples which all give the usual topology on  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .

- The set of open disks in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .
- The set of open squares in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .
- The set of open squares having rational vertices.
- The set of open triangles having irrational vertices.

The way to see that these are all the same is to show that each kind of set is a union of the others. For instance, an open disk is the union of countably many open rational squares. (Hint: use a grid argument, like in class.)

Here is a really wierd example: On  $\mathbf{R}$ , the set of half-open intervals of the form  $[a, b)$  is a basis. The indced topology on  $\mathbf{R}$  is different from the usual one. To see this, I'll prove below that with the standard topology  $\mathbf{R}$  cannot be written as the union of two nonempty disjoint open sets. On the other hand with the half-open topology, both  $(-\infty, 0)$  and  $[0, \infty)$  are open sets. So, in this wierd topology,  $\mathbf{R}$  is the union of two disjoint open sets.

The following result is not really part of what I wanted to say in these notes, but it is pretty neat and I will cover it later in class too. So, just ignore this if you want.

**Lemma 0.1**  *$\mathbf{R}$  cannot be the union of two disjoint nonempty open sets.*

**Proof:** Suppose that  $R = U \cup V$  where  $U$  and  $V$  are both open and nonempty and disjoint from each other. Pick points  $u_0 \in U$  and  $v_0 \in V$ . Given points  $(u_i, v_i)$  consider the point  $w_i$  that is halfway between  $u_i$  and  $v_i$ . If  $w_i \in U$  then set  $u_{i+1} = w_i$  and  $v_{i+1} = v_i$ . If  $w_i \in V$  then set  $u_{i+1} = u_i$  and  $v_{i+1} = w_i$ . This construction produces points  $(u_n, v_n)$  for all  $n$  such that

- $u_n \in U$  and  $v_n \in V$  for all  $n$ .
- Both  $u_n$  and  $v_n$  converge to the same point  $w_\infty$ .

The point  $w_\infty$  lies either in  $U$  or  $V$ . If  $w_\infty \in U$  then  $v_n \in U$  for all  $n$  sufficiently large. This is a contradiction. If  $w_\infty \in V$  then  $u_n \in V$  for all  $n$  sufficiently large. This is also a contradiction. Since all outcomes lead to a contradiction,  $\mathbf{R}$  cannot be written as a nontrivial union of disjoint open sets. ♠