

## THE POINT OF POINTLESS TOPOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

BY PETER T. JOHNSTONE

**Introduction.** A celebrated reviewer once described a certain paper (in a phrase which never actually saw publication in *Mathematical Reviews*) as being concerned with the study of “valueless measures on pointless spaces”. This article contains nothing about measures, valueless or otherwise; but I hope that by giving a historical survey of the subject known as “pointless topology” (i.e. the study of topology where open-set lattices are taken as the primitive notion) I shall succeed in convincing the reader that it does after all have some point to it. However, it is curious that the point (as I see it) is one which has emerged only relatively recently, after a substantial period during which the theory of pointless spaces has been developed without any very definite goal in view. I am sure there is a moral here; but I am not sure whether it shows that “pointless” abstraction for its own sake is a good thing (because it might one day turn out to be useful) or a bad thing (because it tends to obscure whatever point there might be in a subject). That much I shall leave for the reader to decide.

This article is in the nature of a trailer for my book *Stone spaces* [35], and detailed proofs of (almost) all the results stated here will be found in the book (together with a much fuller bibliography than can be accommodated in this article). However, I should make it plain that I do not claim personal credit for more than a small proportion of these results, and that my own understanding of the nature of pointless topology has been enriched by my contacts with a number of other mathematicians, amongst whom I should particularly mention Bernhard Banaschewski, Michael Fourman, Martin Hyland, John Isbell, André Joyal and Myles Tierney. I should also mention the work of Bill Lawvere, particularly as reported in [41], on the nature of continuous variation and the conceptual relation between constant and variable quantities, which has had a profound influence on the developments which I wish to describe; but such questions as these will not be explicitly considered in the present article.

**1. Lattices and spaces.** It is well known that Hausdorff [21] was the first mathematician to take the notion of open set (or neighbourhood) as primitive in the study of continuity properties in abstract spaces. (As Fingerman [14] has

---

Received by the editors April 28, 1982.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 06A23, 18B30, 54A05; Secondary 01A60, 06D05, 18B25.

<sup>1</sup> This article is based on a lecture given as part of the University of Chicago’s “Friday Lecture Series” on 29th January 1982. The author is grateful to Saunders Mac Lane and Felix Browder for the suggestion that he write up the lecture in its present form.

©1983 American Mathematical Society  
0273-0979/82/0000-0617/\$03.75