

**Point Set Topology**  
**Prof. Ronnie Sebastian**  
**Department of Mathematics**  
**Indian Institute of Technology Bombay**  
**Week 06**  
**Lecture 29**

In the previous lecture, we gave a criterion for metric space, of when a metric space is compact. So this lecture, we will begin with a lemma which is very useful, and it is called the Lebesgue number lemma, but before that we need some preliminaries. So, given the subset  $Z$ , we can define, so we define the function  $d_Z$  from  $X$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  by  $d_Z(x)$  is defined to be infimum (all  $z$  in  $Z$ ) of  $d(x,z)$ . So, what is this mean? This is our  $x$  and this is my  $Z$ , let us say, so this is  $x$ . So, we take the distance of  $x$  from all points in  $Z$  and take the infimum. The infimum may or may not be attained at a point.

For instance, if we take the real line and we take the open interval  $(0,1)$ , we take this to be  $Z$  and we take  $x$  to be  $-1$ . Then the infimum, so the distance between  $d(x,a)=a+1$ , if  $a$  is a point here, then this distance is  $a+1$ . The infimum is never attained because, I am sorry, so I should write it down. So, the infimum is 1, but it is not attained for any  $a$  in the subset  $Z$ .

The infimum may or may not be attained. So, this is a function which we define on  $X$ . Let us check that this is continuous. We claim that  $d_Z$  is a continuous function. For this note that if distance between  $x$  and  $y$  is strictly less than  $\delta$ , then for any  $z$  in  $Z$ , we have the distance of  $x$  from  $Z$  is less than equal to  $X$  and  $Y$ , then  $Y$  and  $Z$ , which is strictly less than  $\delta+d(y,z)$ .

So, when we take infimum, we get  $d_Z(x) \leq \delta + d_Z(y)$ , which implies  $d_Z(x) - d_Z(y) \leq \delta$ . Similarly, switching the roles of  $x$  and  $y$ , we get  $d_Z(y) - d_Z(x)$  is less than equal to  $\delta$ , which implies the absolute value of  $d_Z(y) - d_Z(x)$  is less than equal to  $\delta$ . So thus, for any  $\epsilon$  positive, we let  $\delta$  to be equal to  $\epsilon/2$ . Then  $d(x,y)$  is less than equal to  $\delta$  will imply that  $d_Z$ , let us say strictly less than  $\epsilon$ ,  $d_Z(y) - d_Z(x)$  is strictly less than  $\epsilon$ . So, this shows that  $d_Z$  is continuous.

Using this distance function, let us prove the Lebesgue number lemma. Let  $X$  be a compact metric space, and let  $\mathcal{U}$ , suppose we have given an open cover  $U_i$ 's. So, then there exists  $\delta$  positive, such that for every  $x$ ,  $B(\delta, x)$  is contained in  $U_i$  for some  $i$ . So now, this is something which we have already proved while we were proving our previous theorem because since  $X$  is compact, every sequence has a convergent subsequence and this is precisely the claim (1) which we proved while we were proving the previous theorem. However, using this distance function, let us see a clean/nice proof of this.

So, as  $X$  is compact, there is a finite subcover and we may assume  $X$  is equal to union  $i=1$  to  $n$  of  $U_i$ 's. Let  $C_i$  be  $X \setminus U_i$ . These are closed subspaces of  $X$ . So, define a function  $f$  from  $X$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  ( $x \geq 0$ ) by  $f(x)$  is defined to be summation of  $i=1$  to  $n$  of  $d_{C_i}(x)$ . So, given any point  $x$ , we take the distance of  $x$  from each  $C_i$  and we just add all these.

So, then  $f$  is continuous as all the  $d_{C_i}$  are continuous. We are simply taking a finite sum of continuous functions and that is going to be continuous. If this function takes the value 0, then we have  $\sum d_{C_i}(x) = 0$ . But each of these  $d_{C_i}$ 's is greater than equal to 0. This implies  $d_{C_i}(x)$  is equal to 0 for all  $i$ . But what does that mean? So, note that recall that  $d_{C_i}(x)$  is equal to infimum of  $z$  in  $C_i$  distance of  $x$  from  $z$ , and this is equal to 0.

So, this implies that there is a sequence  $z_n$  in  $C_i$  such that the distance of  $x$  from  $z_n$  is tending to 0, but this implies that  $z_n$  is converging to  $x$ . However, we also know that  $C_i$ 's are closed, as  $C_i$  is closed in  $X$ . This implies that  $x$  belongs to  $C_i$ , which implies that the distance This implies that  $x$  belongs to  $C_i$ , that is all that we need, for all  $i$ . This implies that  $x$  belongs to intersection of  $C_i$ 's. However, intersection of  $C_i$ 's is equal to intersection of  $X \setminus U_i$ 's, which is equal to  $X \setminus (\text{union of } U_i\text{'s})$ , but this is the empty set as the union is equal to  $X$ .

Thus we get a contradiction. Thus  $f(x)$  is always positive. So as  $X$  is compact, this implies  $f(X)$  is compact. This implies  $f(X)$  is closed in  $\mathbb{R}$  and as 0 does not belong to  $f(X)$ . As  $f(X)$  is closed and 0 is in the complement of  $f(X)$ , which is open, this means there is a  $\delta$  neighborhood of 0, which does not meet  $f(X)$ .

This implies that  $f(x)$  is greater than or equal to  $\delta$  for all  $x$  in  $X$ . So, this implies that the summation  $i=1$  to  $n$  of  $d_{C_i}(x)$  is greater than or equal to  $\delta$  for all  $x$ . So, this implies that  $d_{C_i}(x)$  is greater than or equal to  $\delta/n$  for atleast one  $i$ . Because if it was strictly less than  $\delta/n$  for all  $i$ , that would mean that the sum would be strictly less than  $\delta$ . But what does this mean? So, we have our  $C_i$ , and our  $x$  is this.

So, distance of  $x$  from  $C_i$  is greater than or equal to  $\delta/n$ , so this distance is greater than or equal to  $\delta/n$ . But then the complement of  $C_i$  is  $U_i$ , so this implies that  $B(\delta/n, x)$  is contained in  $U_i$ . So, this proves the lemma. So, we will end this lecture here.