A few comments about "Topology" by Munkres

Pierre-Yves Gaillard[1]

As the title indicates, we make a comments about the book **Topology** by James R. Munkres. This is a work in progress.

• **Definition of $\mathbb{R}$ p. 31.** The object $\mathbb{R}$ is defined by assuming that there exists a set $\mathbb{R}$ having certain properties. We take this assumption for granted. Then it is easy to see that there are several sets having these properties. So, let $\mathbb{R}'$ be a set having the same properties as $\mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathbb{Z}'_+, \mathbb{Z}'$ and $\mathbb{Q}'$ be to $\mathbb{R}'$ what $\mathbb{Z}_+, \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ are to $\mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 1. *There is a unique morphism of fields from $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}'$. This morphism is an isomorphism of ordered fields, and it induces isomorphisms $\mathbb{Z}_+ \to \mathbb{Z}'_+, \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}'$ and $\mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Q}'$.*

Lemma 2. *There is a unique map $g : \mathbb{Z}_+ \to \mathbb{Z}'_+$ such that $g(0) = 0$ and $g(n+1) = g(n)+1$ for all n in $\mathbb{Z}_+$. Similarly, there is a unique map $h : \mathbb{Z}'_+ \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $h(0) = 0$ and $h(n+1) = h(n)+1$ for all n in $\mathbb{Z}'_+$.*

Proof. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\varphi : \{1, \dots, i\} \to \mathbb{Z}'_+$ define $\rho(\varphi) \in \mathbb{Z}'_+$ by $\rho(\varphi) := \varphi(i) + 1$. Then the first statement follows from the Principle of Recursive Definition (Theorem 3 p. 2). The proof of the second statement is similar. □

Proof of Theorem 1. In the notation of Lemma 2, set $u := h \circ g$. Then $u : \mathbb{Z}_+ \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ satisfies $u(0) = 0$ and $u(n + 1) = u(n) + 1$ for all n in $\mathbb{Z}_+$. One can easily prove that $u(n) = n$ by induction. The same argument works for $g \circ h$. This shows that $g : \mathbb{Z}_+ \to \mathbb{Z}'_+$ and $h : \mathbb{Z}'_+ \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ are inverse isomorphisms. Then we extend g to morphisms $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}'$ and $\mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Q}'$, and similarly for h, and, arguing as before, we show that these morphisms are isomorphisms. More precisely, we see that there is a unique morphism $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}'$ extending g, and that this morphism is an isomorphism, and similarly for the morphism $\mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Q}'$. So we can make the identifications $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \mathbb{Z}'_+, \mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}', \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}'$. To show that there is a unique morphism of fields $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}'$, and that this morphism is an isomorphism (inducing the identity of $\mathbb{Q}$), we argue as in Section *Appendix to Chapter 1* in *A few comments about "Principles of Mathematical Analysis" by Rudin*, available at `https://zenodo.org/records/13955297`. □

• **Exercise 7.6. p. 51.** We say that two sets A and B **have the same cardinality** if there is a bijection of A with B.

(a) Show that if $B \subset A$ and if there is an injection

$$f : A \to B,$$

[1]ORCID https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7960-1698

then A and B have the same cardinality. [Hint: Define $A_1 = A, B_1 = B$, and for $n > 1$, $A_n = f(A_{n-1})$ and $B_n = f(B_{n-1})$. (Recursive definition again!) Note that $A_1 \supset B_1 \supset A_2 \supset B_2 \supset A_3 \supset \cdots$ Define a bijection $h : A \to B$ by the rule

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in A_n \setminus B_n \text{ for some } n, \\ x & \text{otherwise.]} \end{cases}$$

(b) *Theorem (Schroeder-Bernstein theorem).* If there are injections $f : A \to C$ and $g : C \to A$, then A and C have the same cardinality.

Solution. (a) We will freely use the following two obvious facts:

(F1) For $x \in A$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we have

$$x \in A_n \iff f(x) \in A_{n+1} \text{ and } x \in B_n \iff f(x) \in B_{n+1}.$$

(F2) We have $\bigcap_{n\geq 1} A_n = \bigcap_{\geq 1} B_n =: I$.

Setting $A'_n := A_n \setminus B_n, B'_n := B_n \setminus A_{n+1}$, we get

$$A = \left(\bigcup_{n\geq 1} A'_n\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{n\geq 1} B'_n\right) \cup I,$$

and this union is disjoint. We also have

$$B = \left(\bigcup_{n\geq 2} A'_n\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{n\geq 1} B'_n\right) \cup I.$$

The injection f induces bijections $f_n : A'_n \to A'_{n+1}$ (here we are using (F1)). To define a bijection $h : A \to B$, it suffices to define three bijections

$$u : \bigcup_{n\geq 1} A'_n \to \bigcup_{n\geq 2} A'_n, \quad v : \bigcup_{n\geq 1} B'_n \to \bigcup_{n\geq 1} B'_n, \quad w : I \to I.$$

We define u by $u(x) = f_n(x)$ if $x \in A'_n$, and take v and w to be the identity maps.

(b) We set $B := g(C) \subset A$ and define $f' : A \to B$ by $f'(a) := g(f(a))$. Then $f' : A \to B$ satisfies the assumptions for $f : A \to B$ in (a).

• **Exercise 8.7. p. 56.** Prove Theorem 8.4 p. 54.

Solution. Recall the statement of Theorem 8.4.

Theorem 3 (Principle of Recursive Definition, Theorem 8.4 of the book)**.** *Let A be a set; let a_0 be an element of A. Suppose ρ is a function that assigns, to each function f mapping a nonempty section of the positive integers into A, an element of A. Then there exists a unique function*

$$h : \mathbb{Z}^+ \to A$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} &h(1) = a_0, \\ &h(i) = \rho(h|\{1, \dots, i-1\}) \text{ for } i > 1. \end{aligned} \tag{$*$}$$

The formula $(*)$ is called a recursion formula for h. It specifies $h(1)$, and it expresses the value of h at $i > 1$ in terms of the values of h for positive integers less than i.

The book gives a detailed proof of the particular case when $\rho(h|\{1,\dots,i-1\})$ is equal to $\min(C \setminus h(\{1,\dots,i-1\}))$, where "min" means "*minimum*", and C is an infinite set. A close inspection of this proof reveals that the sole property of the element c of C defined by the equality $c := \min(C \setminus h(\{1,\dots,i-1\}))$ is that it depends only on the restriction $h|\{1,\dots,i-1\}$. This implies that, if, in the proof given by the book, we replace "$\min(C \setminus h(\{1,\dots,i-1\}))$" with "$\rho(h|\{1,\dots,i-1\})$", then we obtain a proof of Theorem 3.

• **Exercise 10.7 p. 67.** Let J be a well-ordered set. A subset J_0 of J is said to be **inductive** if for every $\alpha \in J$,

$$(S_\alpha \subset J_0) \Rightarrow \alpha \in J_0.$$

Theorem (The principle of transfinite induction). If J is a well-ordered set and J_0 is an inductive subset of J, then $J_0 = J$.

Solution. If $J_0 \neq J$, let α be the least element of $J \setminus J_0$. We get $S_\alpha \subset J_0$, and thus $\alpha \in J_0$, contradiction.

• **Exercise 10.10 p. 67. Theorem.** Let J and C be well-ordered sets; assume that there is no surjective function mapping a section of J onto C. Then there exists a unique function $h : J \to C$ satisfying the equation

$$h(x) = \min(C \setminus h(S_x)) \tag{$*$}$$

for each $x \in J$, where S_x is the section of J by x.

Proof.

(a) If h and k map sections of J, or all of J, into C and satisfy $(*)$ for all x in their respective domains, show that $h(x) = k(x)$ for all x in both domains.

(b) If there exists a function $h : S_\alpha \to C$ satisfying $(*)$, show that there exists a function $k : S_\alpha \cup \{\alpha\} \to C$ satisfying $(*)$.

(c) If $K \subset J$ and for all $\alpha \in K$ there exists a function $h_\alpha : S_\alpha \to C$ satisfying $(*)$, show that there exists a function

$$k : \bigcup_{\alpha \in K} S_\alpha \to C$$

satisfying $(*)$.

(d) Show by transfinite induction that for every $\beta \in J$, there exists a function $h_\beta : S_\beta \to C$ satisfying $(*)$. [Hint: If β has an immediate predecessor α, then $S_\beta = S_\alpha \cup \{\alpha\}$. If not, S_β is the union of all S_α with $\alpha < \beta$.]

(e) Prove the theorem.

Solution.

(a) Otherwise there would be a least x such that $h(x) \neq k(x)$, we would get $h(S_x) = k(S_x)$, and $(*)$ would yield a contradiction.

(b) We define k by $k(x) = h(x)$ if $x < \alpha$ and $k(x) = \min(C \setminus h(S_x))$ if $x = \alpha$, and verify that k satisfies $(*)$.

(c) Set $k(x) = h_\alpha(x)$ if $x \in S_\alpha$. To show that $k(x)$ is well defined, we must check that $\beta > \alpha$ implies $h_\beta(x) = h_\alpha(x)$. But this follows from (a).

(d) Let I be the set of all $\beta \in J$ such that there is a map $h_\beta : S_\beta \to C$ satisfying $(*)$. It suffices to show that I is inductive. So, assume that β is in J and that $S_\beta \subset I$. We must show $\beta \in I$. To do that, we use (b) if β has an immediate predecessor, and we use (c) if not.

(e) We define h by

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} \min(C \setminus h_x(S_x)) & \text{if } x = \max(J) \\ h_{x+1}(x) & \text{if } x \neq \max(J), \end{cases}$$

where "$x \neq \max(J)$" means "$x \neq \max(J)$ if J has a maximum", and $x + 1$ is the least element greater than x. Let us show that h satisfies $(*)$, that is, $h(x) = \min(C \setminus h(S_x))$. We can assume $x \neq \max(J)$ (in the above sense). We must show $h_{x+1}(x) = \min(C \setminus h(S_x))$. Since we have $h_{x+1}(x) = \min(C \setminus h_{x+1}(S_x))$ by (d) it suffices to prove $h(S_x) = h_{x+1}(S_x)$. Let y be in S_x, that is, $y \in J$ and $y < x$. It is enough to verify $h(y) = h_{x+1}(y)$, that is, $h_{y+1}(y) = h_{x+1}(y)$. We have $y + 1 < x + 1$, and thus $S_{y+1} \subset S_{x+1}$, and (a) implies $h_{x+1}|S_{y+1} = h_{y+1}$. This proves $h_{y+1}(y) = h_{x+1}(y)$, which is what we wanted.

• **Supplementary Exercise 11.1 p. 72.** *Theorem* (General principle of recursive definition). Let J be a well-ordered set; let C be a set. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the set of all functions mapping sections of J into C. Given a function $\rho : \mathcal{F} \to C$, there exists a unique function $h : J \to C$ such that $h(\alpha) = \rho(h|S_\alpha)$ for each $\alpha \in J$.

[Hint: Follow the pattern outlined in Exercise 10 of §10.]

Solution. In the solution to Exercise 10.10 above, we just replace $\min(C \setminus h(S_x))$ with $\rho(h|S_x)$. (See solution to Exercise 8.7 above.)

• **Solution to Exercise 13.6 p. 83.** We must show that the topologies $\mathcal{T}_\ell$ and $\mathcal{T}_K$ are incomparable.

Claim: $[2, 3) \notin \mathcal{T}_K$. Proof. If not we would have $2 \in (a, b) \setminus K \subset [2, 3)$ for some a and b, hence $a < 2$ and $a \leq 2$, contradiction.

Claim: $(-1, 1) \setminus K \notin \mathcal{T}_\ell$. Proof. If not we would have $0 \in [a, b) \subset (-1, 1) \setminus K \subset [2, 3)$ for some a and b, hence $a \leq 0 < b$, hence $a < \frac{1}{n} < b$ for some n, contradiction.

• **Solution to Exercise 13.7 p. 83.** Let us use the following notation:

$\mathcal{T}_s :=$ standard topology,

$\mathcal{T}_K :=$ topology of $\mathbb{R}_K$,

$\mathcal{T}_{fc} :=$ finite complement topology,

$\mathcal{T}_u :=$ upper limit topology (having the sets $(a,b]$ as basis),

$\mathcal{T}_\infty :=$ topology having the sets $(-\infty,a)$ as basis.

We denote the corresponding topological spaces by $\mathbb{R}_s, \mathbb{R}_K, \mathbb{R}_{fc}, \mathbb{R}_u$ and $\mathbb{R}_\infty$. Finally we write $\mathcal{B}_s, \mathcal{B}_K, \mathcal{B}_u$ and $\mathcal{B}_\infty$ for the obvious bases.

The inclusions between these five topologies on $\mathbb{R}$ can be summarized by the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & u & \\ & K & \\ & s & \\ fc & & \infty, \end{array}$$

where "i below j" means "$\mathcal{T}_i \subsetneq \mathcal{T}_j$"[2], and "$i$ and j on the same level" means "$\mathcal{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_j$ are incomparable".

Preliminary comments: It is easy to see that the elements of $\mathcal{T}_\infty$ are $\varnothing$, the intervals $(-\infty,a)$, and $\mathbb{R}$, and to observe that $\mathcal{T}_\infty \cap \mathcal{T}_{fc} = \{\varnothing, \mathbb{R}\}$. It is also easy to compare the standard topology $\mathcal{T}_s$ to the others: the elements of $\mathcal{T}_{fc}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\infty$ are clearly open in $\mathbb{R}_s$, and it is plain that the intervals (a,b) (which are the elements on $\mathcal{B}_s$) are open in $\mathbb{R}_K$ and in $\mathbb{R}_\infty$ (note that $(a,b) = \bigcup_{d<b}(a,d]$). Clearly, $(-1,1) \setminus K \in \mathcal{T}_K$ and $(a,b] \in \mathcal{T}_u$ are not open in $\mathbb{R}_s$. Moreover $(2,3]$ is in $\mathcal{T}_u$ but not in $\mathcal{T}_K$. So, it only remains to prove $\mathcal{T}_K \subset \mathcal{T}_u$.

Let x be in $(a,b) \setminus K$. It suffices to show that there is a c such that $x \in (c,x] \subset (a,b) \setminus K$. If $x \le 0$ we set $c := a$. If $\frac{1}{n+1} < x < \frac{1}{n}$ we set $c := \frac{1}{n+1}$. If $x > 1$ we set $c := \max(1,a)$.

[2] I denote inclusion by $\subset$ and proper inclusion by $\subsetneq$. I know that, in some sense, it would be more coherent to use $\subseteq$ for inclusion, but I prefer to do it that way, and hope the reader will not be confused.