

Mathematical Journal of Okayama University

Volume 14, Issue 2

1969

Article 2

DECEMBER 1970

On Pervin's quasi uniformity

Norman Levine*

*The Ohio State University

Copyright ©1969 by the authors. *Mathematical Journal of Okayama University* is produced by
The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress). <http://escholarship.lib.okayama-u.ac.jp/mjou>

ON PERVIN'S QUASI UNIFORMITY

NORMAN LEVINE

1. Introduction

In [1], Pervin introduced a quasi uniformity $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ determined by a topology \mathfrak{X} on the set X by taking sets of the form $O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$, $O \in \mathfrak{X}$ as subbase. He proved that the topology induced by $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ is in fact the original topology \mathfrak{X} . Thus every topological space is quasi-uniformizable.

It is the purpose of this paper to explore more fully the relationships that exist between \mathfrak{X} and $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. In §2, the following topological properties are characterized in terms of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$: T_0 , T_1 , T_2 , $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{C}$ (\mathfrak{C} denoting the class of all closed sets), \mathfrak{X} is discrete, \mathfrak{X} is indiscrete, \mathfrak{X} has three or less elements, (X, \mathfrak{X}) is disconnected, X is finite and \mathfrak{X} is discrete. In §4, relationships between continuity and uniform continuity are determined and compactness is characterized in terms of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. In §5, we give an example to show that $\mathcal{U}(\times \mathfrak{X}_i) \neq \times \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X}_i)$.

2. Topological properties

Theorem 2.1. (X, \mathfrak{X}) is a (i) T_0 -space iff $\Delta = \bigcap \{U \cap U^{-1} : U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})\}$ (ii) T_1 -space iff $\Delta = \bigcap \{U : U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})\}$ and (iii) T_2 -space iff $\Delta = \bigcap \{cU : U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})\}$.

Proof of (i). Suppose that (X, \mathfrak{X}) is a T_0 -space and that $(x, y) \in U \cap U^{-1}$ for each $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. We must show that $x = y$. Suppose on the contrary that $x \neq y$. Case 1. There exists an $O^* \in \mathfrak{X}$ such that $x \in O^*$ and $y \notin O^*$. Then $(x, y) \notin O^* \times O^* \cup \mathcal{C}O^* \times X = U^*$. Thus $(x, y) \notin U^* \cap U^{*-1}$. Case 2. There exists an $O^\# \in \mathfrak{X}$ such that $x \notin O^\#$ and $y \in O^\#$. Then $(y, x) \notin O^\# \times O^\# \cup \mathcal{C}O^\# \times X = U^\#$. Hence $(x, y) \notin U^\# \cap U^{\#-1}$.

Conversely, suppose that $\Delta = \bigcap \{U \cap U^{-1} : U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})\}$ and suppose that $x \neq y$. Then $(x, y) \notin U \cap U^{-1}$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. Case 1. $(x, y) \notin U$. Then $(x, y) \notin O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$ for some $O \in \mathfrak{X}$ and it follows that $x \in O$ and $y \notin O$. Case 2. $(x, y) \notin U^{-1}$. Then $(y, x) \notin U$ and case 1 may be applied.

Proof of (ii). Let (X, \mathfrak{X}) be a T_1 -space and suppose that $x \neq y$. We will show that $(x, y) \notin U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. In fact, we may take $U = \mathcal{C}\{y\} \times \mathcal{C}\{y\} \cup \mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}\{y\} \times X$.

Conversely, let $x \neq y$ in X . Then $(x, y) \notin U^*$ for some $U^* \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A})$ and hence $(x, y) \notin O^* \times O^* \cup \mathcal{C}O^* \times X$ for some $O^* \in \mathfrak{X}$. Hence $x \in O^*$ and $y \notin O^*$.

Proof of (iii). If $\Delta = \bigcap \{cU : U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})\}$, then Δ is closed in $X \times X$ and (X, \mathfrak{X}) is T_2 .

Conversely, suppose that (X, \mathfrak{X}) is a T_2 -space and that $x \neq y$. There exist disjoint open sets O_x and O_y such that $x \in O_x$ and $y \in O_y$. Hence $(x, y) \notin cU$ where $U = O_x \times O_x \cup \mathcal{C}O_x \times X$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let \mathfrak{F} denote the family of closed sets in (X, \mathfrak{X}) . Then $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{F}$ iff U is a neighborhood of Δ whenever $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$.*

Proof. If $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{F}$, then $O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$ is an open neighborhood of the diagonal for each $O \in \mathfrak{X}$. Thus U in $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ implies that U is a neighborhood of the diagonal.

Conversely, suppose that U in $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ implies that U is a neighborhood of the diagonal. Let $O \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then $O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ and hence there exists a $G \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{X}$ such that $O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X \supseteq G \supseteq \Delta$. Then $O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times \mathcal{C}O \supseteq G \cap G^{-1} \supseteq \Delta$ and $G \cap G^{-1} \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{X}$. Let $x \in \mathcal{C}O$. Then $x \in G \cap G^{-1}[x] \subseteq (O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times \mathcal{C}O)[x] = \mathcal{C}O$ and $\mathcal{C}O$ is open. It follows then that $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{F}$.

Corollary 2.3. *$\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ is a uniformity iff $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{F}$.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ is a uniformity, then $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ implies that U is a neighborhood of Δ and hence by Theorem 2.2, $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{F}$.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{F}$. It suffices to show that $(O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X)^{-1} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ when $O \in \mathfrak{X}$. But $(O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X)^{-1} \supseteq O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times \mathcal{C}O = (O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X) \cap (\mathcal{C}O \times \mathcal{C}O \cup O \times X) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$.

Corollary 2.4. *The following are equivalent: (i) (X, \mathfrak{X}) is discrete (ii) $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{F}$ and (X, \mathfrak{X}) is a T_0 -space (iii) $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ is a uniformity and $\Delta = \bigcap \{U \cap U^{-1} : U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})\}$.*

Proof. (i) clearly implies (ii) and (ii) is equivalent to (iii) by corollary 2.3 and (i) of theorem 2.1. To show that (ii) implies (i), it suffices to show that $\{x\}$ is closed for each $x \in X$. But $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{F}$ and (X, \mathfrak{X}) a T_0 -space clearly implies that (X, \mathfrak{X}) is a T_2 -space and hence a T_1 -space.

Theorem 2.5. *(X, \mathfrak{X}) is trivial iff $(X, \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X}))$ is trivial.*

Proof. Exercise for the reader.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $B \subseteq X$, $B \neq X$. If $A \times A \cup \mathcal{C}A \times X \subseteq B \times B \cup \mathcal{C}B \times X$, then $A \supseteq B$.*

Proof. Let $b \in B$ and suppose that $b \notin A$. Take $q \notin B$. Then $(b, q) \in A \times A \cup \mathcal{C}A \times X$, but $(b, q) \notin B \times B \cup \mathcal{C}B \times X$, a contradiction.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\emptyset \neq B \subseteq X$ and suppose that $A \times A \cup \mathcal{C}A \times X \subseteq B \times B \cup \mathcal{C}B \times X$. Then $A \subseteq B$.*

Proof. Case 1. $B = X$. Then $A \subseteq B$. Case 2. $B \neq X$. Then by Lemma 2.6, $A \supseteq B$. Now suppose that $A \not\subseteq B$. Take $a \in A$, $a \notin B$ and $b \in B$. Then $(b, a) \in A \times A \subseteq A \times A \cup \mathcal{C}A \times X$, but $(b, a) \notin B \times B \cup \mathcal{C}B \times X$, a contradiction.

Corollary 2.8. *If $\emptyset \neq B \subseteq X$ and $A \times A \cup \mathcal{C}A \times X \subseteq B \times B \cup \mathcal{C}B \times X$, then $A = B$.*

Theorem 2.9. *$\{O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X : O \in \mathfrak{X}\}$ is a base for $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ iff \mathfrak{X} consists of at most three sets.*

Proof. If $\mathfrak{X} = \{\emptyset, X\}$ or if $\mathfrak{X} = \{\emptyset, O, X\}$, then $\{X \times X\}$ or $\{O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X, X \times X\}$ is a base for $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$.

Conversely, suppose that $\emptyset \neq O_i \neq X$ for $i = 1, 2$ and that $\{O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X : O \in \mathfrak{X}\}$ is a base for $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. Then $(O_1 \times O_1 \cup \mathcal{C}O_1 \times X) \cap (O_2 \times O_2 \cup \mathcal{C}O_2 \times X) \supseteq O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$ for some $O \in \mathfrak{X}$. By Corollary 2.8, $O_1 = O = O_2$, and hence \mathfrak{X} consists of at most three sets.

Theorem 2.10. *(X, \mathfrak{X}) is disconnected iff there exists an A such that $\emptyset \neq A \neq X$ and $A \times A \cup \mathcal{C}A \times \mathcal{C}A \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$.*

Proof. If (X, \mathfrak{X}) is disconnected, let A be both open and closed and $\emptyset \neq A \neq X$. Then $A \times A \cup \mathcal{C}A \times \mathcal{C}A = (A \times A \cup \mathcal{C}A \times X) \cap (\mathcal{C}A \times \mathcal{C}A \cup A \times X) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$.

Conversely, suppose that $\emptyset \neq A \neq X$ and that $A \times A \cup \mathcal{C}A \times \mathcal{C}A \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. We will show that A is open (and by symmetry, $\mathcal{C}A$ is open). Let $a \in A$. Then $(A \times A \cup \mathcal{C}A \times \mathcal{C}A)[a] = A$.

Theorem 2.11. *$(X, \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X}))$ is totally bounded ($U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ implies that $U[A] = X$ for some finite set A).*

Proof. Let $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. Then $U \supseteq \bigcap \{O_i \times O_i \cup \mathcal{C}O_i \times X : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Consider the 2^n sets of the form $A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n$ where $A_i = O_i$ or $A_i = \mathcal{C}O_i$. Pick $q \in A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n$ whenever $A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n \neq \emptyset$ and let A be the set of q -points thus picked. Clearly, A is finite and we show now that $U[A]$

$=X$. Let $x \in X$. Let $A_i = O_i$ if $x \in O_i$ and let $A_i = \mathcal{C}O_i$ if $x \in \mathcal{C}O_i$. Then $\bigcap A_i \neq \emptyset$. There exists a q in A such that $q \in \bigcap A_i$. Then $(q, x) \in U$ or $x \in U[A]$. If $(q, x) \notin U$, then $(q, x) \notin O_j \times O_j \cup \mathcal{C}O_j \times X$ for some j and hence $q \in O_j$ and $x \in \mathcal{C}O_j$. Then $A_i = \mathcal{C}O_j$ and $q \in A_j = \mathcal{C}O_j$, a contradiction.

Corollary 2.12. $\Delta \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ iff (i) X is finite and (ii) \mathfrak{X} is discrete.

Proof. Let $\Delta \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. By Theorem 2.11, there exists a finite set A such that $X = \Delta[A] = A$. Thus, X is finite and (i) holds. (ii) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ is a discrete uniform space when $\Delta \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$.

Conversely, suppose that (i) and (ii) hold. Then $\Delta = \bigcap \{ \{x\} \times \{x\} \cup \mathcal{C}\{x\} \times X : x \in X \} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$.

Theorem 2.13. If \mathfrak{X} is countable, then $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ has a countable base. If $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ has a countable base, then (X, \mathfrak{X}) is a second axiom space.

Proof. If $\mathfrak{X} = \{O_i : i \in P\}$, then $\{O_i \times O_i \cup \mathcal{C}O_i \times X : i \in P\}$ is a countable subbase for $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ and hence $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ has a countable base.

Suppose $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ has a countable base $\{U_i : i \in P\}$. Now $U_i \supseteq \bigcap \{O_{ij} \times O_{ij} \cup \mathcal{C}O_{ij} \times X : 1 \leq j \leq n_i\}$ for each $i \in P$. We will show that the $\{O_{ij}\}$ forms a subbase for \mathfrak{X} . Let $x \in O \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then $U[x] \subseteq O$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. But $U \supseteq U_i \supseteq \bigcap \{O_{ij} \times O_{ij} \cup \mathcal{C}O_{ij} \times X : 1 \leq j \leq n_i\}$ and hence $\bigcap \{O_{ij} \times O_{ij} \cup \mathcal{C}O_{ij} \times X\}[x] \subseteq O$. But $(O_{ij} \times O_{ij} \cup \mathcal{C}O_{ij} \times X)[x] = O_{ij}$ or X . Thus $x \in O^* \subseteq O$ where O^* is an intersection of sets from the collection $\{O_{ij} : 1 \leq j \leq n_i\}$.

Theorem 2.14. (i) If (X, \mathfrak{X}) is regular, then $c(\Delta) \subseteq O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$ for each $O \in \mathfrak{X}$. (ii) If $c(\Delta) \subseteq O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$ for each $O \in \mathfrak{X}$, then (X, \mathfrak{X}) is an R_0 -space ($x \in O \in \mathfrak{X}$ implies that $c(x) \subseteq O$). (iii) If (X, \mathfrak{X}) is T_2 then $c(\Delta) \subseteq O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$ for each $O \in \mathfrak{X}$.

Proof. (i) Suppose $(x, y) \notin O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$ for some $O \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then $x \in O$ and $y \notin O$. But $x \in O^* \subseteq cO^* \subseteq O$ for some $O^* \in \mathfrak{X}$ since (X, \mathfrak{X}) is regular. Hence $(x, y) \in O^* \times \mathcal{C}cO^*$ and $O^* \times \mathcal{C}cO^* \cap \Delta = \emptyset$. Thus $(x, y) \notin c\Delta$.

(ii) Let $x \in O \in \mathfrak{X}$ and suppose that $c(x) \not\subseteq O$. Then take $y \in c(x) \cap \mathcal{C}O$. Thus $(x, y) \in c(x) \times c(y) \subseteq c(x) \times c(x) \subseteq c\Delta \subseteq O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$. Hence $(x, y) \in O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$. But $x \in O$ and $y \in \mathcal{C}O$, a contradiction.

(iii) If (X, \mathfrak{X}) is T_2 , then $c\Delta = \Delta \subseteq O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$ for each $O \in \mathfrak{X}$.

The converse of (i) is false; take (X, \mathfrak{X}) any T_2 -space that is not regular. The converse of (iii) is false; take any regular space that is not

T_2 . The converse of (ii) is false; take (X, \mathfrak{X}) an infinite space with the cofinite topology.

3. Subspaces

Theorem 3.1. *Let (X', \mathfrak{X}') be a subspace of (X, \mathfrak{X}) . Then $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X}') = X' \times X' \cap \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$.*

Proof. If $O' = O \cap X'$ where $O \in \mathfrak{X}$, then $O' \times O' \cup \mathcal{C}O' \times X' = X' \times X' \cap (O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X)$.

4. Transformations

Theorem 4.1. *Let (X, \mathfrak{X}) and (Y, \mathfrak{X}') be topological spaces and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ a transformation. Then f is continuous relative to \mathfrak{X} and \mathfrak{X}' iff f is uniformly continuous relative to $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ and $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X}')$.*

Proof. Only the necessity requires proof. Let $O' \times O' \cup \mathcal{C}O' \times Y$ be subbasic in $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X}')$. Then $(f \times f)^{-1}(O' \times O' \cup \mathcal{C}O' \times Y) \supseteq (f^{-1}O' \times f^{-1}O') \cup \mathcal{C}f^{-1}O' \times X$. Since $f^{-1}O' \in \mathfrak{X}$, it follows that $(f \times f)^{-1}(O' \times O' \cup \mathcal{C}O' \times Y) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$.

Theorem 4.2. *A net $S: D \rightarrow X$ is $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ -Cauchy iff $O \in \mathfrak{X}$ implies that S is eventually in O or S is eventually in $\mathcal{C}O$.*

Proof. Let $S: D \rightarrow X$ be a $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ -cauchy net and suppose that $O \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then there exists an N in D such that $m, n \geq N$ implies that $(S(m), S(n)) \in O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$. Suppose S is not eventually in O nor eventually in $\mathcal{C}O$. Take $m^* \geq N$ and $S(m^*) \notin O$. Take $n^* \geq N$ and $S(n^*) \notin \mathcal{C}O$. Then $m^*, n^* \geq N$, but $(S(n^*), S(m^*)) \notin O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$, a contradiction.

Conversely, suppose $S: D \rightarrow X$ is a net with the property that S is eventually in O or eventually in $\mathcal{C}O$ for each $O \in \mathfrak{X}$. We will show that S is then $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ -cauchy. Let $O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$ be subbasic in $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$. If S is eventually in O , then $S \times S$ is eventually in $O \times O \subseteq O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$. If S is eventually in $\mathcal{C}O$, then $S \times S$ is eventually in $\mathcal{C}O \times X \subseteq O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X$.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $S: D \rightarrow X$ be a net. Then S is $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{X})$ -cauchy iff S frequently in $O \in \mathfrak{X}$ implies that S is eventually in O .*

In a space (X, \mathfrak{X}) , a net $S: D \rightarrow X$ is called an O -net iff for $O \in \mathfrak{X}$, S frequently in O implies that S is eventually in O . In [2], the following theorem is proved.

Theorem 4.4. *(X, \mathfrak{X}) is compact iff every O -net in X converges.*

Theorem 4.5. (X, \mathfrak{I}) is compact iff $(X, \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I}))$ is complete.

Proof. $(X, \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I}))$ is complete iff every $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I})$ -cauchy net converges iff every O -net converges (Corollary 4.3) iff (X, \mathfrak{I}) is compact (Theorem 4.4).

Theorem 4.6. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a transformation and \mathfrak{I}' a topology for Y . Let \mathfrak{I} be the weak topology for X determined by f and \mathfrak{I}' . Let \mathcal{U} be the weak quasi uniformity for X induced by f and $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I}')$. Then $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I})$.

Proof. $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is \mathfrak{I} - \mathfrak{I}' continuous and by Theorem 4.1, $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I})$ - $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I}')$ uniformly continuous. Thus $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I})$. We show now that $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I}) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. Let $O' \in \mathfrak{I}'$. Then $f^{-1}O' \times f^{-1}O' \cup \mathcal{C}f^{-1}O' \times X$ is subbasic in $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I})$. But $f^{-1}O' \times f^{-1}O' \cup \mathcal{C}f^{-1}O' \times X \subseteq (f \times f)^{-1}(O' \times O' \cup \mathcal{C}O' \times X) \in \mathcal{U}$.

5. Products

Example 5.1. For each positive integer i , let (X_i, \mathfrak{I}_i) be the two point space $\{0, 1\}$ with the discrete topology and let $(X, \mathfrak{I}) = \times \{(X_i, \mathfrak{I}_i) : i \in P\}$. Then $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I}) \neq \times \{\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I}_i) : i \in P\}$. For, let $O = \cup \{P_i^{-1}[o] : i \in P\}$. Then $O \in \mathfrak{I}$ and $O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I})$. But $O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X \notin (P_1 \times P_1)^{-1}\Delta \cap \dots \cap (P_n \times P_n)^{-1}\Delta$ for every integer n and hence $O \times O \cup \mathcal{C}O \times X \notin \times \{\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{I}_i) : i \in P\}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] W.J. PERVIN: Quasi Uniformization of Topological Spaces, Math. Ann. 147 (1962).
- [2] L.C. ROBERTSON and S.P. FRANKLIN: O-sequences and O-nets, The American Mathematical Monthly, Vol. 72, Number 5, May 1965.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

(Received November 18, 1969)