




Spring 2016

Connecting Connectedness

Nicholas A. Scoville

Ursinus College, nscoville@ursinus.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/triumphs_topology

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), [Geometry and Topology Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Science and Mathematics Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Scoville, Nicholas A., "Connecting Connectedness" (2016). *Topology*. 3.
http://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/triumphs_topology/3

This Course Materials is brought to you for free and open access by the Transforming Instruction in Undergraduate Mathematics via Primary Historical Sources (TRIUMPHS) at Digital Commons @ Ursinus College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Topology by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Ursinus College. For more information, please contact aprock@ursinus.edu.

Connecting Connectedness

Nicholas A Scoville*

Necessary terms and background: open/closed set, neighborhood, limit point, derived set

Connectedness has become a fundamental concept in modern topology. The concept seems clear enough— a space is connected if it is a “single piece.” Yet the definition of connectedness we use today was not what was originally written down. As we will see, today’s version of connectedness is a classic example of a definition that took decades to evolve. The first such definition was given by Georg Cantor. Cantor (1845 - 1918) is best known for his work in set theory. His work in set theory, however, began with questions concerning Fourier series in an 1872 paper [1]. In his study of Fourier series, Cantor was interested in finding conditions for when a Fourier series expansion is unique. This study compelled him to define for the first time some purely topological concepts, including point-set, neighborhood, and derived set. These investigations were the precursors to a series of six papers (*Ueber unendliche, lineare Punktmannichfaltigkeiten* 1879-1884) which were themselves part of his work on set theory. It is his fifth paper in this series from 1883 that we begin with in this project on connectedness. Given this, one could trace not only the origins of modern set theory to Cantor, but also the origins of modern point-set topology.


*Mathematics and Computer Science; 601 E. Main Street; Ursinus College; Collegeville, PA 19426; nscoville@ursinus.edu.

1 Cantor: A continuum

We begin our investigation into connectedness with Cantor's 1883 paper [2]. His reason for writing this paper, however, does not appear to have been a consideration of connectedness. Cantor wrote:




The point of this examination is to establish a precise criterion – but one that is simultaneously as generally applicable as possible – for designating P as a continuum.



Let's put ourselves into Cantor's shoes. What comes to mind when you think of a continuum? A straight line? A closed disk? An open disk? The irrational numbers? Definitions in mathematics tend to be driven by our paradigm examples; that is, what do all the examples of objects that you think of as a continuum have in common? Furthermore, what do all the examples that you think of as violating a continuum have in common? The goal is to abstract away the particulars and find the common properties that a continuum satisfies. As the quote above indicates, this is what Cantor desired to do in this paper.

Exercise 1.1. Consider a straight line, a closed disk, an open disk, and the irrational numbers. Which of these do you consider a continuum? Why?

One concept that Cantor had at his disposal was that of the derived set.



For the sake of brevity I call a given finite or infinite number of . . . points on the line a *point set*. If a point set is given in a finite interval, a second point set is generally given along with it, and with the latter a third, etc., which are essential to understanding the first set. In order to define these point sets, we must begin with the concept of a *limit point of a set*. I define a "limit point of a point set P " to be a point of the line situated in such a way that each neighborhood of it contains *infinitely* many points of P , and it may happen that the point itself belongs to the set. By a "neighborhood of a point" I mean any interval that has the point *in its interior*. . . Every


point of the line is now in a definite relation to a given set P , either being a limit point of P or not, and thereby along with the point set P the set of limit points of P is *conceptually* given, a set which I wish to denote by P' and call the *first derived point set of P* . Unless the point set P' contains only a finite number of points, it also has a derived set P'' , which I call the *second derived point set of P* . By v such transitions one obtains the concept of the v th derived set $P^{(v)}$ of P . . . [If] P is such that the derivation process produces no change:

$$P = P^{(1)}$$

and therefore

$$P = P^{(\gamma)}$$

[then] such sets S I call **perfect** point sets.




Exercise 1.2. Using Cantor's definition of limit point and derived set, determine which of the following sets are perfect in \mathbb{R} .

1. $[0, 1]$
2. (a, b) , $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$
3. $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^2 + y^2 < 1\}$
4. $\{\frac{1}{n} : n = 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$.
5. \mathbb{Q}
6. \mathbb{R}
7. $[\mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)] \cup [-4, 2)$


You have hopefully seen that for the above examples, each set that you would intuitively think of as constituting a continuum is a perfect set, and those which you would not think of as a continuum is not perfect. This raises the question: should a perfect set be defined as a continuum?

Exercise 1.3. Is $[0, 1] \cup [2, 3]$ a perfect set? Should it be a continuum?

As the above example illustrates, being perfect might be necessary, but it is not a sufficient condition for a set to be a continuum. The missing piece that Cantor added to the condition of being perfect in order to complete his definition of a continuum was that the set also be **connected**. Cantor wrote:



A [closed and bounded] point set T is **connected** if for every two of its points t and t' , and arbitrary given positive number ϵ , there always exists a finite number of points t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n of T such that the distances $tt_1, t_1t_2, \dots, t_nt'$ are smaller than ϵ .




Exercise 1.4. Rewrite this definition using modern notation (and possibly terms), and use that definition to prove that $[0, 1] \cup [2, 3]$ is not connected. Then prove that $[0, 1]$ is connected.


Exercise 1.5. According to Cantor's definition, what can be said about the set $[0, 1] - \{\frac{1}{2}\}$ in terms of connectedness?

2 Jordan: Distance between sets

Cantor's definition appeals to a notion of distance, which is not as general a setting as one encounters in topology today. The definition would next be taken up by French mathematician Camille Jordan (1838–1922) in his *Cours D'Analyse* [3]. Jordan generalized the ideas begun by Cantor by defining a distance between sets.




Let E, E' be two [closed] sets with no point in common. The distance between the various points p in E to the various points p' in E' form a set of nonnegative numbers. It is therefore bounded below, and it admits a minimum Δ , positive or 0, we call the **distance** between the sets E, E' . If the distance is greater than 0, we say that the sets E, E' are **separated**.




Exercise 2.1. Using Jordan's definition, compute the distance between two closed, disjoint disks in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Jordan immediately makes the following statement and provides a proof.




If two bounded and closed sets E, E' which have no points in common have distance Δ , then they will contain at least a couple of points whose mutual distance is precisely Δ . . .




Exercise 2.2. Show that this is not necessarily true if the sets in question are not closed.

We are finally ready for Jordan's definition. Jordan writes as follows:




We say that a closed and bounded set E is a **component** if it cannot decompose into several separated sets.




Exercise 2.3. Using Jordan's definitions of component, prove that a closed and bounded set E in \mathbb{R}^n is connected if and only if E itself is a component.

3 Schoenflies: No distance required

We have noted that both Cantor and Jordan defined connected by appealing to a distance. The German mathematician Schoenflies (1853 - 1928), who is best known for the Jordan-Schoenflies theorem, gave a purely set-theoretic definition of connected [6], which did not appeal to the concept of distance. His definition is simple and elegant.



A perfect set T is called **connected** if it can not be decomposed into subsets, each of which is perfect.



Exercise 3.1. Rewrite Schoenflies's definition of connected with modern terms and notation.


Exercise 3.2. Does the Schoenflies' definition give us any better indication of whether or not $[0, 1] - \{\frac{1}{2}\}$ is connected?

Although there are other things that Schoenflies did with this definition, our main purpose here is to note that he abstracted away any need for distance, yet kept the definition very much in the spirit of Jordan and Cantor, as the following Exercise illustrates.


Exercise 3.3. Prove that if a set satisfies the Jordan definition, then it must satisfy the Schoenflies definition. Why is the converse not necessarily true?

4 Lennes: The modern definition


Finally, we turn to Nels Johann Lennes (1874–1951). Lennes was a Norwegian-born mathematician who earned his PhD at the University of Chicago and lived out most of his mathematics career at Montana State University. Lennes was aware of the mathematical thought on connectedness up to this point. He wrote:




It is apparent that in a geometry possessing linear order and continuity curves and limit curves exist independently of metric properties. . . Schoenflies uses metric hypotheses in the proof of practically every important theorem dealing with curves and the regions defined by them. . . his treatment makes full use of metric properties. . . [5]



Lennes gave his own definition of limit point.



A point ℓ is a **limit-point** of a set of points P if there are points of P other than ℓ within every [neighborhood] of which ℓ is an interior point.




Exercise 4.1. Compare Cantor’s definition of limit point with that of Lennes. Are they equivalent? If so, prove it. If not, give a counterexample.


Lennes was interested in the Jordan curve theorem, one of the most important and difficult theorems of the late 19th and early 20th century mathematics. This Theorem states “Let J be a closed curve in \mathbb{R}^2 which does not self intersect. Then $\mathbb{R}^2 - J$ is disconnected with exactly two open, connected components.” Although easy to state and intuitively obvious, a rigorous and satisfying proof of this fact eluded mathematicians for many years. In order to attempt a rigorous proof then, Lennes needed a careful and precise definition of connectedness.

A set of points is a **connected set** if at least one of any two complementary subsets contains a limit point of points in the other set.

This definition given by Lennes turns out to be equivalent to the modern definition. To substantiate our claim, here is a definition of connected from a modern classic book on point-set topology [4, p. 53].



A topological space is **connected** iff X is not the union of two non-void separated [open] subsets.



Exercise 4.2. Show that this definition and the one given by Lennes are equivalent. Then determine whether or not $[0, 1] - \{\frac{1}{2}\}$ is connected.

5 Conclusion

We have seen how the definition of connectedness, starting with Cantor, has evolved into the modern definition. For Cantor, connectedness was somewhat of a sidenote— it needed to be defined in order to properly understand the definition of a continuum. Jordan thought this definition of connected interesting enough to take it up in his own work, studying in as an interesting concept in-and-of-itself. Schoenflies then realized that there was no need to appeal to a notion of “distance” to give a coherent definition of connected. Finally, Lennes tweaked Schoenflies’ definition sufficiently to one that is accepted by mathematicians today. So remember this the next time you see a definition in a textbook. The crisp, clean, and pithy definition may have taken some of the world’s greatest mathematicians years to arrive at!

References

- [1] G. Cantor, *Über die Ausdehnung eines Satzes aus der Theorie der trigonometrischen Reihen*, Math. Ann. **5** (1872), no. 1, 123–132.
- [2] ———, *Über unendliche, lineare Punktmannigfaltigkeiten 5*, Math. Ann. **21** (1883), 545–586.
- [3] C. Jordan, *Cours d’Analyse*, vol. 1, 1893.
- [4] John L. Kelley, *General topology*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975, Reprint of the 1955 edition [Van Nostrand, Toronto, Ont.], Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 27.
- [5] N. J. Lennes, *Curves in Non-Metrical Analysis Situs with an Application in the Calculus of Variations*, Amer. J. Math. **33** (1911), no. 1-4, 287–326.
- [6] A. Schoenflies, *Beiträge zur Theorie der Punktmengen I*, Math. Ann. **58** (1904), 195–238.

Notes to the Instructor

The purpose of this project is two-fold. First, it is meant to show where definitions come from. The second purpose is to show how a definition can evolve and be adjusted over time until it finally blossoms into one which has been tweaked, edited, and refined in order to be as robust yet succinct as possible. The first goal is mostly achieved in this mini-PSP in section 1 on Cantor in two different ways. The first way is to make precise an intuitive idea. The discussion on a continuum is meant to imitate the working out of a definition. We all have in our minds paradigm examples of what we do and don't consider a continuum. Let us take all those examples, abstract away the particulars, and be left with what they all have in common- the essence of what it means to be a continuum. A good way to accomplish this in class is to ask the students to give examples of what they think are and are not continuum, and to write their responses in two columns on the board. This should generate a discussion of some of the properties that students do and don't consider to be essential to a continuum. There may be students for whom nothing comes to mind when they hear continuum." That is okay. But by the end of this exercise, the class as a whole should have a somewhat unified if not vague idea of what continuum means.

The next step is then attempting to precisely form this definition of a continuum. In order to tease this out, students are asked to recall the definition of a perfect point set. After a little reflection, it seems that our intuitive idea of what ought and ought not constitute a continuum coincides perfectly with that of a perfect set (in fact, I have had classes where those sets which the class considered a continuum were precisely the perfect point sets while sets which were not considered a continuum were precisely those which are not perfect). Exercise 3, however, serves as an example to show why equating the two concepts is not appropriate. This leads into the second way to show where definitions come from- what property needs to be added to "perfect" in order to exclude examples like the one in Exercise 3 from being considered a continuum? There is thus a need to define this new concept, and the concept that seems to work well is that of being "connected." Students are then asked to wrestle with Cantor's original formulation of the definition.

The section on Jordan begins the second goal of showing how a definition can evolve,

either in its definition or in its point of view. While Cantor defined what it means for a set to be connected, Jordan adds the viewpoint of “separation” to connectedness. That is, now we have a positive definition of this concept (connected) as well as a negative concept (a separation). The concept of separation can furthermore be quantified in the sense that if a separation exists, we can sometimes assign a number to this (e.g. Exercise 6). The culmination of section 2 is in Exercise 9 where students are asked to show that the two definitions are equivalent.

The Schoenflies section is brief and meant to be a bit ambiguous. What does he mean by “decomposed into”? A partition? Only two sets? A finite number of sets? Students will wrestle with this question and justify an answer that makes the most sense relative to what Schoenflies was trying to do in Exercise 10. However, it should be noted that Schoenflies has now given a definition that is not equivalent to Cantor or Jordan’s since there is no appeal to a metric. The final definition due to Lennes is easily motivated with a word about the Jordan Curve theorem, and it is satisfying for the students to see that this is the first time that we see the current definition being used.

The background for this project assumes some familiarity with point-set topology. In particular, the student should have been exposed to derived sets. Otherwise, the definition of perfect in section 1 comes seemingly out of left field. Furthermore, there is a running example of determining whether or not $[0, 1] - 1/2$ is connected or not. Since for both Cantor and Jordan connectedness only applied to closed and bounded sets, this question doesn’t even make sense, a seemingly major drawback of the definition. Depending on how students interpret Schoenflies, students may or may not find the set connected according to his definition. However, it should once again be satisfying to see this simple example, unclear for many years, now easily shown to be disconnected using the Lennes definition.

Acknowledgement

The development of this student project has been partially supported by the Transforming Instruction in Undergraduate Mathematics via Primary Historical Sources (TRIUMPHS) Program with funding from the National Science Foundations Improving Undergraduate STEM Education (IUSE) Program under grant number 1524065. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this project are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the National Science Foundation. For more information about TRIUMPHS, visit <http://webpages.ursinus.edu/nscoville/TRIUMPHS.html>.

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>). It allows re-distribution and re-use of a licensed work on the conditions that the creator is appropriately credited and that any derivative work is made available under “the same, similar or a compatible license”.