

Jaroslav Lukeš

On the topological extensions

*Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, Vol. 10 (1969), No. 3, 407--420

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/105242>

## Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1969

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

ON THE TOPOLOGICAL EXTENSIONS

Jaroslav LUKÉŠ, Praha

0. Introduction. In this note some topological extensions are studied. The notion of the  $\mu$ -topological extension is introduced and it is shown that every topological extension fulfilling the Myškis condition  $(\Gamma)$  is in fact a  $\mu$ -topological extension  $((T, \mathcal{O}_T)$  is a topological extension of the space  $(G, \mathcal{O}_G)$  if  $G$  is a dense subset of the space  $T$  and if  $\mathcal{O}_T/G = \mathcal{O}_G$ ). In part 2, the notion of the  $S^p$ -topological extension is introduced which is a special case of the  $\mu$ -topological extension. Part 3 deals with the notion of the  $C$ -topological extension, which is a generalization of the Caratheodory method for compactification of a simply connected bounded plane domains and which applies also to general Moore spaces. Finally, in part 4, the equivalence of the  $C$ -topological extension with the  $S^p$ -topological extension for plane domains is demonstrated.

1.  $\mu$ -topological extension. Let  $(G, \mathcal{O})$  be a topological space with the system  $\mathcal{O}$  of open sets; let  $Z$  be a set and  $\mu : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \exp(G \cup Z)$  a mapping such that the following axioms are fulfilled:

$$(O_\mu) : \mu(G) = G \cup Z ,$$

$$(1_n): \mu(A \cap B) = \mu(A) \cap \mu(B) \text{ for } A, B \in \mathcal{O}.$$

Then the system  $\{\mu(H) ; H \in \mathcal{O}\}$  forms the base of a certain topology on  $G \cup Z$ ; this topology will be denoted by the symbol  $\mathcal{O}_\mu$ . The original topology of the space  $(G, \mathcal{O})$  will agree with the topology induced on  $G$  if  $\mu(H) \cap G \in \mathcal{O}$  for every  $H \in \mathcal{O}$ . This is certainly the case if

$$(2_n): H \in \mathcal{O} \implies \mu(H) \cap G = H.$$

Lemma 1. Let the mapping  $\mu$  fulfil the axioms  $(0_n)$ ,  $(1_n)$ ,  $(2_n)$ . Then the set  $G$  is dense in the space  $(G \cup Z, \mathcal{O}_\mu)$  iff the following axiom  $(3_n)$  is fulfilled:

$$(3_n): \mu(A) = \emptyset \iff A = \emptyset.$$

Let  $(G, \mathcal{O})$ ,  $Z$  and  $\mu: \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \text{exp}(G \cup Z)$  have the meaning described above and suppose that the axioms  $(0_n)$  -  $(3_n)$  are fulfilled. Then the topological space  $(G \cup Z, \mathcal{O}_\mu)$  is a topological extension of the space  $(G, \mathcal{O})$ ; we call this extension the  $\mu$ -topological extension (precisely the  $(\mu, Z)$ -topological extension).

Lemma 2. 1)  $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{O}$ ,  $H_1 \subset H_2 \implies \mu(H_1) \subset \mu(H_2)$  provided  $\mu$  fulfils  $(1_n)$ ,  
 2)  $H \in \mathcal{O}_\mu \implies H \subset \mu(H \cap G)$  if  $(2_n)$  is fulfilled.

Definition. Let  $(R, \mathcal{Y})$  be a topological extension of the space  $(G, \mathcal{O})$  (in the sense of the introduction). We say that  $(R, \mathcal{Y})$  and  $(G, \mathcal{O})$  fulfil the condition  $(\Gamma)$  (see Myškis [4]), if

$$x \in R, U \in \mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{Y}}(x) \implies [ \text{there is a}$$

$U_1 \in \mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ ,  $U_1 \subset U$  such that  $y \in R - (G \cup U_1)$ ,  
 $V \in \mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \Rightarrow V \cap (G - G \cap U_1) \neq \emptyset$ .

Lemma 3.  $(G \cup Z, \mathcal{O}_\pi)$  and  $(G, \mathcal{O})$  fulfil the condition  $(\Gamma)$ .

Proof. Let  $x \in G \cup Z$ , let  $U \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  be open in the topology  $\mathcal{O}_\pi$ . There is a  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{O}$  with  $U = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{L}} \pi(A)$ ; let  $x \in \pi(A)$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{L}$ . If we put  $U_1 = \pi(A)$ , then  $(\Gamma)$  is easily verified.

Theorem 4. Let  $(R, \mathcal{Y})$  be a topological extension of  $(G, \mathcal{O})$  and put  $Z = R - G$ . Define the mapping  $\pi$  by

$$\pi(H) = H \cup \{x \in Z; \text{there is a } U \in \mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{Y}}(x) \text{ with } G \cap U \subset H\}, \\ H \in \mathcal{O}.$$

Then  $\pi$  fulfils the axioms  $(\mathcal{O}_\pi) - (\mathcal{Z}_\pi)$  and  $\mathcal{O}_\pi \subset \mathcal{Y}$ ; in addition,

$$\mathcal{O}_\pi = \mathcal{Y} \iff (R, \mathcal{Y}), (G, \mathcal{O}) \text{ fulfil the condition } (\Gamma).$$

Proof. One easily verifies that  $\pi$  fulfils  $(\mathcal{O}_\pi) - (\mathcal{Z}_\pi)$  and  $\mathcal{O}_\pi \subset \mathcal{Y}$ . Let now  $H \in \mathcal{Y}$  and assume  $(\Gamma)$ . Then  $H \cap G \in \mathcal{O}$  and  $H \subset \pi(H \cap G) \in \mathcal{O}_\pi$ . Let us fix  $x \in H$ ; then there is a  $U_1 \in \mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ ,  $U_1 \subset H$  with

$$y \in R - (G \cup U_1), V \in \mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \Rightarrow V \cap (G - G \cap U_1) \neq \emptyset.$$

It is easy to show that  $x \in \pi(U_1 \cap G) \subset H$ , hence  $H \in \mathcal{O}_\pi$ . The rest follows from lemma 3.

2.  $S^{\mathcal{O}}$  -topological extensions. Let again  $(G, \mathcal{O})$  be a topological space, let  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{O}$  be a system of open sets,  $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{L}$ . Suppose that  $\varphi$  is a relation on  $\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{L}$

fulfilling the following axiom

$$(1_{\varphi}): X, Y \in \mathcal{L}, X \varphi Y \implies X \subset Y.$$

An ideal element of  $(G, \mathcal{O})$  is every nonempty system of open sets  $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{L}$  fulfilling the following conditions

$$(1_{\mathcal{S}}): \bigcap_{S \in \mathcal{Y}} S = \emptyset,$$

(2<sub>S</sub>):  $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{Y} \implies$  there exists an  $S \in \mathcal{Y}$  with  $S \subset S_1 \cap S_2$ ,

$$(3_{\mathcal{S}}): S \in \mathcal{Y}, Q \in \mathcal{L}, S \varphi Q \implies Q \in \mathcal{Y},$$

(4<sub>S</sub>):  $S \in \mathcal{Y} \implies$  there exists a  $T \in \mathcal{Y}$  with  $T \varphi S$ ,

(5<sub>S</sub>):  $A, B \in \mathcal{L}, A \varphi B, A \cap S \neq \emptyset$  for every  $S \in \mathcal{Y} \implies B \in \mathcal{Y}$ .

Let  $S^{\varphi}(G)$  denote the set of all ideal elements of  $(G, \mathcal{O})$ .

Lemma 5. 1) If  $\mathcal{Y} \in S^{\varphi}(G)$  then each finite subsystem of  $\mathcal{Y}$  has a non-void intersection.

2) For  $\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2 \in S^{\varphi}(G)$

$$[\mathcal{Y}_1 + \mathcal{Y}_2 \iff \text{there exist } S_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i (i = 1, 2) \text{ with } S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset].$$

3)  $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}' \in S^{\varphi}(G), \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{Y}' \implies \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}'$ .

For every  $H \in \mathcal{O}$  we put

$$\pi(H) = H \cup \{\mathcal{Y} \in S^{\varphi}(G); \text{there is an } S \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ with } S \subset H\}.$$

It is easy to see that the mapping  $\pi: H \rightarrow \pi(H)$  fulfils the axioms  $(0_{\pi}) - (3_{\pi})$ , so that we may form the

$(\pi, S^{\varphi}(G))$ -topological extension of the space  $(G, \mathcal{O})$  according to the preceding paragraph; this extension

will be called the  $S^{\mathcal{P}}$ -topological extension (precisely the  $(S^{\mathcal{P}}(G); \mathcal{L})$ -topological extension) and the topology of this extension will be denoted by  $\mathcal{O}^{\mathcal{P}}$ . For every  $x \in G \cup S^{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ ,  $\mathcal{U}(x) = \{\pi(H); H \in \mathcal{O}, x \in \pi(H)\}$  forms the local open base at  $x$ .

Lemma 6.  $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2 \in S^{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_1 \neq \mathcal{S}_2 \implies$  there exist  $U_i \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{S}_i)$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) with  $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$ .

Proof: According to lemma 5 there are  $S_i \in \mathcal{S}_i$  with  $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$ . We put  $U_i = \pi(S_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

In what follows we suppose that the relation  $\varphi$  fulfils the following strengthening  $(\overline{T}_{\varphi})$  of the axiom  $(1_{\varphi})$ :

$$(\overline{T}_{\varphi}): X, Y \in \mathcal{L}, X \varphi Y \implies \mu X \subset Y$$

(where  $\mu X$  denotes the closure of  $X$  in the space  $(G, \mathcal{O})$ ).

Lemma 7.  $\mathcal{Y} \in S^{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ ,  $x \in G \implies$  there exist  $U_1 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Y})$ ,  $U_2 \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  with  $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$ .

Proof: Suppose that  $A \cap H \neq \emptyset$  for every  $A \in \mathcal{Y}$  and for every  $H \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap \mathcal{O}$ . Then  $x \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{Y}} \mu A$ . According to  $(4_S)$  and  $(\overline{T}_{\varphi})$ , given  $A \in \mathcal{Y}$  there is a  $B_A \in \mathcal{Y}$  with  $\mu B_A \subset A$ . Thus  $x \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{Y}} A$ , in contradiction with  $(1_S)$ .

Theorem 8. 1) The one-point sets in  $S^{\mathcal{P}}(G)$  are closed in the space  $(G \cup S^{\mathcal{P}}(G), \mathcal{O}^{\mathcal{P}})$ .

2) If  $(G, \mathcal{O})$  is a  $T_0$  ( $T_1, T_2$  resp.) space, then  $(G \cup S^{\mathcal{P}}(G), \mathcal{O}^{\mathcal{P}})$  is a  $T_0$  ( $T_1, T_2$  resp.) space.

Further properties of the  $S^{\mathcal{P}}$ -topological exten-

sion are studied in [7]; J.C. Taylor demonstrated, besides other things, that the  $S^{\varphi}$ -topological extension is even a compactification provided the relation  $\varphi$  fulfils the following axioms

- ( $\overline{1}_{\varphi}$ ):)  $A \varphi B \Rightarrow \mu A \subset B$ ,
- ( $4_{\varphi}$ ):)  $A_i \varphi B_i, i = 1, 2 \Rightarrow (A_1 \cap A_2) \varphi (B_1 \cap B_2)$ ,
- ( $5_{\varphi}$ ):)  $A \varphi B \Rightarrow (G - \mu B) \varphi (G - \mu A)$ ,
- ( $\forall_{\varphi}$ ):)  $A \varphi B \Rightarrow$  there is a set  $C, A \varphi C \varphi B$ .

3. C-topological extensions. Let  $(T, \mathcal{O})$  be a topological space, let  $G \subset T$  be a domain (a nonempty connected open set). We say that an arc  $\widehat{AB}$  in  $T$  is a cross-cut of  $G$  if  $\widehat{AB} \subset G \cup \{A, B\}$ ,  $A, B \notin G$ . Let us denote by  $Q(G)$  the set of all cross-cuts of  $G$ . For  $q \in Q(G)$  put further  $\dot{q} = q \cap G$ ; obviously  $\dot{q}$  is a connected set.  $G \subset T$  is called a Q-domain, if for every cross-cut  $q \in Q(G)$  there exist the separate domains  $G_1, G_2 \subset G$  with the property  $G - q = G_1 \cup G_2$ ,  $q \subset H(G_1) \cap H(G_2)$  (the symbol  $H(M)$  denotes the boundary of  $M \subset T$  in the space  $(T, \mathcal{O})$ ). Every bounded simply connected domain in the euclidean plane or, more generally, every nonempty domain bounded by a continuum in the Moore space fulfilling axioms 1 - 5 (see Moore, [6], theorem 34) is an example of a Q-domain.

In the remainder of this paragraph  $G$  denotes a Q-domain in some topological space  $(T, \mathcal{O})$ .

Lemma 9. a) Let  $q \in Q(G)$  and suppose that the domains  $G_1, G_2, G'_1, G'_2$  in  $G$  fulfil the conditions  $G_1 \cap G_2 = \emptyset = G'_1 \cap G'_2$ ,  $q \subset H(G_1) \cap H(G_2) \cap H(G'_1) \cap H(G'_2)$ . Then  $G_1, G_2$  are separated and either  $G_1 = G'_1$  and  $G_2 = G'_2$  or  $G_1 = G'_2$  and  $G_2 = G'_1$ .

b) Let  $q_1, q_2 \in Q(G)$ ,  $\dot{q}_1 \cap \dot{q}_2 = \emptyset$ ,  $G - q_1 = G_1 \cup G_2$ , where  $G_1, G_2$  are separated domains,  $q_1 \subset H(G_1) \cap H(G_2)$ . Then either  $\dot{q}_2 \subset G_1$  or  $\dot{q}_2 \subset G_2$ .

Let  $q_1, q_2 \in Q(G)$ ,  $\dot{q}_1 \cap \dot{q}_2 = \emptyset$ . According to previous lemma the arc  $q_1$  separates  $G$  into two disjoint domains; the domain that has nonempty intersection with the arc  $q_2$  will be denoted by  $G(q_1, q_2)$ . Let now  $q_1, q_2, q_3 \in Q(G)$ ,  $\dot{q}_i \cap \dot{q}_j = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$ . We say that the cross-cut  $q_2$  separates the cross-cuts  $q_1, q_3$ , if  $G(q_2, q_1) \cap G(q_2, q_3) = \emptyset$ .

Lemma 10. a)  $q_1, q_2 \in Q(G)$ ,  $\dot{q}_1 \cap \dot{q}_2 = \emptyset \implies \dot{q}_2 \subset G(q_1, q_2)$ ,

b)  $q_1, q_2 \in Q(G)$ ,  $\dot{q}_1 \cap \dot{q}_2 = \emptyset \implies G - G(q_2, q_1) \subset G(q_1, q_2)$ ,

c)  $q_2$  separates  $q_1, q_3 \iff q_2$  separates  $q_3, q_1 \iff G(q_2, q_3) \subset G(q_1, q_2) \iff G(q_2, q_1) \subset G(q_3, q_2)$ .

Proof: a) This follows immediately from lemma 9.  
 b) We may write  $G - q_2 = G(q_2, q_1) \cup G'$ , where  $G(q_2, q_1), G'$  are separated domains,  $q_2 \subset H(G(q_2, q_1)) \cap H(G')$ . On account of the relation  $G' = G' \cup \dot{q}_2 \subset G' \cup H(G')$  we conclude that the set  $G' \cup \dot{q}_2$  is connected. Write again  $G - q_1 =$



$= G(\varrho_1, \varrho_2) \cup G''$ , where  $G(\varrho_1, \varrho_2)$ ,  $G''$  are separated domains,  $\varrho_1 = H(G(\varrho_1, \varrho_2)) \cap H(G'')$ . We have

$$G' \cup \tilde{\varrho}_2 \subset G(\varrho_1, \varrho_2) \cup G'', (G' \cup \tilde{\varrho}_2) \cap G(\varrho_1, \varrho_2) \supset \tilde{\varrho}_2,$$

whence  $G' \cup \tilde{\varrho}_2 \subset G(\varrho_1, \varrho_2)$ .

c) This assertion follows from the preceding part.

Definition. The sequence  $\{\varrho_n; \varrho_n \in Q(G)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is called a C-chain of the domain  $Q$ , if

$$1) \varrho_n \cap \varrho_{n+1} = \emptyset \quad \text{for every } n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

$$2) \varrho_n \text{ separates } \varrho_{n-1}, \varrho_{n+1} \quad \text{for every } n = 2, 3, \dots,$$

according to lemma 10 we may replace the condition 2) by

$$2^*) G(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}) \subset G(\varrho_{n-1}, \varrho_n) \quad \text{for every } n \geq 2.$$

If  $\{\varrho_n\}$ ,  $\{\varrho'_n\}$  are the C-chains of the domain  $G$ , we define the following relations  $\rightarrow$ ,  $\sim$ :

$$I) \{\varrho_n\} \rightarrow \{\varrho'_n\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \forall n \exists k (G(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}) \subset G(\varrho'_k, \varrho'_{k+1})),$$

$$II) \{\varrho_n\} \sim \{\varrho'_n\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \{\varrho_n\} \rightarrow \{\varrho'_n\} \text{ and } \{\varrho'_n\} \rightarrow \{\varrho_n\}.$$

It is easy to see that the relation  $\sim$  just defined is an equivalence relation.

Every equivalent class of the C-chains is called the end of the domain  $G$ . If  $E_1, E_2$  are the ends of  $G$ , we define

$$E_1 \rightarrow E_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \forall \{\varrho'_m\} \in E_1, \forall \{\varrho''_m\} \in E_2 (\{\varrho'_m\} \rightarrow \{\varrho''_m\}).$$

The primend of the  $Q$ -domain  $G$  is the end  $E$  of  $G$  with the property:

$$E' \rightarrow E, \quad E' \text{ is the end} \implies E' = E.$$

Let  $C(G)$  denote the set of all primends of the domain

$G$ . For  $A \subset G$  we put

$$\mu(A) = A \cup \{E \in C(G); \forall \{\varrho_n\} \in E \exists n_0 (G(\varrho_{n_0}, \varrho_{n_0+1}) \subset A)\}.$$

It is easy to see that the mapping  $\mu: H \rightarrow \mu(H)$  fulfils

the axioms  $(0_{\mu}) - (3_{\mu})$  (where  $\mathcal{O}$  is the system of all open subsets of a set  $G$ ,  $Z = \mathcal{C}(G)$ ); we may form again the  $\mu$ -topological extension of the  $\mathcal{Q}$ -domain  $G$  with the topology  $\mathcal{O}$ ; we call this extension the  $\mathcal{C}$ -topological extension (precisely the  $\mathcal{C}(T, G)$ -topological extension).

For every  $\mathcal{Q}$ -domain  $G$  of the topological space  $(T, \mathcal{O})$  we define the system  $\mathcal{L}(G)$  in the following way:

$A \in \mathcal{L}(G) \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} A \subset G$  is a domain and there is a  $q \in \mathcal{Q}(G)$  such that  $G - q = A \cup (G - \{q \cup A\})$ , where the domains  $A, G - (q \cup A)$  are separated,  $q \subset H(A) \cap H(G - (q \cup A))$ .

Lemma 11. a)  $A \in \mathcal{L}(G)$  iff there is precisely one cross-cut  $q \in \mathcal{Q}(G)$  with the property just introduced (we denote this cross-cut by the symbol  $q_A$ ),  
 b)  $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(G), A \cap B \neq \emptyset \neq B - A, q_A \cap q_B = \emptyset \implies q_A \subset B$ .

For  $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(G)$  we define

$$A \wp B \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \mu A \cap G \subset B, q_A \cap q_B = \emptyset.$$

It is easy to see that the relation  $\wp$  on  $\mathcal{L}(G)$  fulfils the axiom  $(\overline{T}_\wp)$  from the part 2, so that we may form the  $S^\wp$ -topological extension of the domain  $G$ , too. The relation between the  $\mathcal{C}$ -topological extension and the  $S^\wp$ -topological extension of a bounded simply connected plane domain will be examined in the next paragraph.

At this moment we remark only that already in the

simplest cases (where  $G$  is not a bounded simply connected plane domain) the  $\mathcal{C}$ -topological extension need not be a compactification, for example if  $T = \{[x, y] \in \mathbb{R}^2; y > 0\} \cup \{[x, y] \in \mathbb{R}^2; y = 0, x = \frac{1}{n}, n = 2, 3, \dots\}$ ,  $\mathcal{O} =$  the euclidean topology,  $G = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ .

4. The equivalence in the euclidean plane. In the following part  $G$  denotes a nonempty bounded simply connected domain in the euclidean plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . According to the previous paragraph we may form the  $\mathcal{C}$ -topological extension of the domain  $G$ , we may define the system  $\mathcal{L}(G)$  and the relation  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{L}(G)$  and hence we may form the  $\mathcal{S}^{\rho}$ -topological extension of the domain  $G$ .

The relationship between  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{S}^{\rho}$ -extensions is explained by the following

Theorem 12. The  $\mathcal{S}^{\rho}$ -topological extension of  $G$  and the  $\mathcal{C}$ -topological extension of  $G$  are homeomorphic and the corresponding homeomorphism can be so chosen that it reduces to the identity map on  $G$ .

Proof: First of all we construct a one-to-one mapping  $F$  from  $G \cup \mathcal{C}(G)$  to  $G \cup \mathcal{S}^{\rho}(G)$ . For  $E \in \mathcal{C}(G)$  we define  $F(E)$  as follows:

$A \in F(E) \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff}$  there is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -chain  $\{Q_n\} \in \mathcal{C}(E)$  and a natural number  $k$  such that  $A = G(Q_k, Q_{k+1})$ .

We shall show that  $F(E) \in \mathcal{S}^{\rho}(G)$ . We must verify the axioms  $(1_{\mathcal{S}}) - (5_{\mathcal{S}})$  from the part 2. The axioms  $(1_{\mathcal{S}}) - (4_{\mathcal{S}})$  are obviously fulfilled. We are going to verify the axiom  $(5_{\mathcal{S}})$ ; let  $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(G)$ ,  $A \rho B$ ,  $A \cap X \neq \emptyset$

for every  $X \in F(E)$ . According to [1] there exist concentric circles  $K(s, \kappa_m)$  with the centre  $s$  and the radii  $\kappa_m$  and a  $C$ -chain  $\{k_m\} \in E$  such that

$$k_m \subset K(s, \kappa_m), \lim \kappa_m = 0.$$

We put  $K_m = G(k_m, k_{m+1})$ . Clearly  $A \cap K_m \neq \emptyset$  for every  $m$ . There are three following possibilities:

I)  $A \subset K_m$  for all  $m$ ; consequently,  $A \subset \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} K_m = \emptyset$  - in contradiction with  $A \in \mathcal{L}(G)$ .

II) There exists an  $N$  such that  $K_N \subset A$ ; then there are again two possibilities:

a) There is an  $n \geq N$  such that  $(k_n - \overset{\circ}{k}_n) \cap (q_A - \overset{\circ}{q}_A) = \emptyset$ . This implies  $K_n \not\subset A$ , whence  $A \in F(E)$  and, consequently,  $B \in F(E)$ .

b) For no  $n \geq N$  is  $(k_n - \overset{\circ}{k}_n) \cap (q_A - \overset{\circ}{q}_A) = \emptyset$ . If  $X, Y$  are the end-points of the cross-cut  $q_A$ , it follows in this case that either  $\kappa_n = |s - X|$  or  $\kappa_n = |s - Y|$  for every  $n \geq N$ . But this is impossible on account of  $\lim \kappa_n = 0$ .

III) There is an  $N$  such that  $A - K_n \neq \emptyset \neq K_n - A$  for all  $n \geq N$ ; we distinguish two cases again:

a)  $\overset{\circ}{k}_n \cap \overset{\circ}{q}_A = \emptyset$  for infinitely many  $n \geq N$ ; for those  $n$  we have  $\overset{\circ}{q}_A \subset K_n$  (lemma 11) and  $\overset{\circ}{q}_A \subset \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} K_m = \emptyset$ .

b) There is an  $N_1 \geq N$  such that  $\overset{\circ}{k}_n \cap \overset{\circ}{q}_A \neq \emptyset$  for all  $n \geq N_1$ . We choose an arbitrary  $P_n \in \overset{\circ}{k}_n \cap \overset{\circ}{q}_A$  for every  $n \geq N_1$ . The set  $q_A$  being compact we may choose a subsequence  $\{P_{n_k}\}$  and a point  $P \in q_A$  such

that  $P_{m_n} \rightarrow P$ . Hence  $P = s \in H(G)$  and at least one end point of the arc  $q_A$  coincides with  $s$ . In the case III b) there are three possibilities again:

I\*)  $B \subset K_m$  for all  $m$  is easily seen to be impossible.

II\*) There exists an  $N_2 \geq N_1$  such that  $K_{N_2} \subset B$  and

a\*)  $(k_m - \dot{k}_m) \cap (q_B - \dot{q}_B) = \emptyset$  for some  $m \geq N_2$ ; it is easy to see that in this case  $B \in F(E)$ .

b\*)  $(k_m - \dot{k}_m) \cap (q_B - \dot{q}_B) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $m \geq N_2$ ; an argument similar to that used in II b) shows that this is impossible.

III\*) There exists an  $N_2 \geq N_1$  such that  $B - K_m \neq \emptyset \neq K_m - B$  for all  $m \geq N_2$  and

a\*)  $\dot{k}_m \cap \dot{q}_B = \emptyset$  for infinitely many  $m \geq N_2$ ; as in III a) one can show that this is impossible.

b) There exists an  $N_3 \geq N_2$  such that  $\dot{k}_m \cap \dot{q}_B \neq \emptyset$  for all  $m \geq N_3$ ; as in III b) we have  $s \in q_B - \dot{q}_B$  and we see that the arcs  $q_A, q_B$  are not disjoint (in contradiction with  $A \cap B$ ).

All possibilities have been exhausted and in every case  $B \in F(E)$ .

It is easy to see that  $F(E_1) \neq F(E_2)$  whenever  $E_1 \neq E_2$ . We want now to show that  $F(C(G)) = S^p(G)$ . Let  $\mathcal{Y} \in S^p(G)$  and suppose that  $F(E) = \mathcal{Y}$  for no  $E \in C(G)$ .

For every  $H \subset G$  we put

$\pi_1(H) = H \cup \{\mathcal{Y} \in S^p(G); \text{ there is an } A \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ with } A \subset H\}$ ,

$\pi_2(H) = H \cup \{E \in C(G); \text{ for every } C\text{-chain } \{q_m\} \in E$

there exists an  $m_0$  such that  $G(q_{m_0}, q_{m_0+1}) \subset H$  .

According to lemma 5, for every  $E \in C(G)$  there are  $A_E \in F(E)$ ,  $S_E \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $A_E \cap S_E = \emptyset$  . Obviously  $E \in \pi_c(A_E)$ , whence  $\bigcup_{E \in C(G)} \pi_c(A_E) \supset C(G)$  .

According to lemma 7, for every  $X \in G$  there are the sets  $U_X \in \mathcal{U}(X)$ ,  $B_X \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $U_X \cap \pi_b(B_X) = \emptyset$  and, consequently,  $(U_X \cap G) \cap B_X = \emptyset$  . Obviously  $\bigcup_{X \in G} (U_X \cap G) = G$  . The sets  $\pi_c(A_E)$ ,  $U_X \cap G$  are open in  $G \cup C(G)$  and

$$\bigcup_{E \in C(G)} \pi_c(A_E) \cup \bigcup_{X \in G} (U_X \cap G) = G \cup C(G) .$$

The  $C$ -topological extension of the plane domain  $G$  is a compactification (see Caratheodory [1]); there are  $E_1, \dots, E_m \in C(G)$ ,  $X_1, \dots, X_k \in G$  such that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^m \pi_c(A_{E_i}) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k (U_{X_i} \cap G) = G \cup C(G) .$$

Hence it follows

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^k B_{X_i} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^m S_{E_i} = \emptyset ,$$

in contradiction with lemma 5. Further we define  $F$  as the identity map on  $G$  . Then  $F$  is a one-to-one correspondence between  $G \cup C(G)$  and  $G \cup S\mathcal{P}(G)$  . It is easy to verify the following implications:

$$H \subset G, X \in \pi_c(H) \implies F(X) \in \pi_b(H) ,$$

$$H \subset G, X \in \pi_b(H) \implies F^{-1}(X) \in \pi_c(H) .$$

We see that  $F$  is a homeomorphism.

R e f e r e n c e s

- [1] C. CARATHEODORY: Ueber die Begrenzung einfach zusammenhängender Gebiete. Math.Ann.73(1913), 323-370.
- [2] E. ČECH: Topological Spaces, Prague,1966.
- [3] H. FREUDENTHAL: Enden und Primenden, Fund.Math.39 (1952),189-210.
- [4] A.D. MYŠKIS: K ponjatiju granicy, Mat.sbornik 25 (1949),387-414.
- [5] S. FOMIN: Extension of topological spaces, Ann.Math. 44(1943),471-481.
- [6] R.L. MOORE: Foundations of point set theory, Amer. Math.Soc.Coll.Publ.XIII(1932).
- [7] J.C. TAYLOR: Filter spaces determined by relations, I,II. Indag.Math.25(1963),7-40.

Matematicko-fyzikální fakulta KU,  
Sokolovská 83,Praha 8,Československo

(Oblatum 28.6.1969)