



---

Soviet-era science, translated into English

# A. D. TAIMANOV

1960

SovietRxiv

---

View the original and related papers at <https://sovietrxiv.org/items/ru-196001.20835>

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.

**Abstract**

**Full Text**

**A. D. TAIMANOV**

**EXTENSION OF MONOTONE MAPPINGS TO MONOTONE MAPPINGS OF BICOMPACTA**

*(Presented by Academician P. S. Aleksandrov on 11 VI 1960)*

At the Second All-Union Topological Conference V. Ponomarev posed the following question: is it always possible to extend a monotone mapping  $f$  of a space  $X$  onto a space  $Y$  to a monotone mapping of some extension\*  $bX$  onto some extension  $bY$ ? Here a positive solution of V. Ponomarev's problem is given for all closed and all open mappings in the case where the extension of the space  $Y$  is the Čech (maximal) extension  $\beta Y$ . At the end two examples proposed by Yu. M. Smirnov are given. The first shows that even for identity mappings the condition of maximality of the extension  $bY$  (i.e. that  $bY = \beta Y$ ) is essential, and the second—that for arbitrary mappings the theorem is false.

**Theorem.** Let  $bX$  be an arbitrary extension of a completely regular space  $X$ , let  $\beta Y$  be the Čech extension of a normal space  $Y$ , and let  $f_b$  be a mapping of the bicom pactum  $bX$  onto  $\beta Y$  which is the (unique) extension of a monotone mapping  $f$  of the space  $X$  onto the space  $Y$ ; if  $f$  is open or closed, then the extension  $f_b$  is also monotone.

**Proof\*\*.** We make the following simple observation.

**Remark.** Suppose a mapping  $f$  of a space  $X$  into a space  $Y$  is given; if its extension  $f_\beta$ , carrying  $\beta X$  into  $\beta Y$ , is monotone, then for every such extension  $bX$  of the space  $X$  for which the mapping  $f$  can be extended to a mapping  $f_b$  of the extension  $bX$  into  $\beta Y$ , this extension  $f_b$  is also monotone.

Indeed, under the conditions of the remark, for any such extension  $bX$  we have

$$f_\beta = f_b \vartheta,$$

where  $\vartheta$  is the mapping of the bicom pactum  $\beta X$  onto  $bX$  that is identical on  $X$ . Therefore, if for some point  $y$  of  $\beta Y$  the preimage\*\*\*  $f_b^{-1}y$  were disconnected, then the preimage

$$f_\beta^{-1}y = \vartheta^{-1}f_b^{-1}y$$

would also be disconnected.

In view of this remark it is enough to carry out the

**Proof of the theorem for the extension  $f_\beta$ .** Suppose the hypotheses of the theorem are satisfied and at the same time the preimage  $f_\beta^{-1}y$  of some point

$y \in \beta Y$  is disconnected, i.e.

$$f_{\beta}^{-1}y = A \cup B,$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  are nonempty, closed, and disjoint. By the normality of the bicomcompact  $\beta X$  there exist

---

\* By an extension we shall everywhere mean only **bicomcompact** extensions, and by mappings—**continuous** mappings.

\*\* My original proof was somewhat simplified by V. T. Levshenko and Yu. M. Smirnov. I sincerely thank them.

\*\*\* Everywhere only **complete** preimages are considered.

there exist neighborhoods  $U$  and  $V$  of the set  $A$ , respectively of the set  $B$ , such that  $\overline{U}^{\beta} \cap \overline{V}^{\beta} = \emptyset^*$ . Since  $A \subseteq \overline{U}^{\beta} = \overline{U \cap X}^{\beta}$ , it follows that  $y \in \overline{f(U \cap X)}^{\beta}$ . Similarly,  $y \in \overline{f(V \cap X)}^{\beta}$ . Therefore

$$y \in \overline{f(U \cap X)}^{\beta} \cap \overline{f(V \cap X)}^{\beta}. \quad (1)$$

By the normality of the space  $Y$ , the closure operator in  $\beta Y$ , applied to closed subsets of  $Y$ , commutes with the operation of intersection <sup>(1)</sup>. Therefore

$$y \in \overline{f(U \cap X) \cap \overline{f(V \cap X)}^{\beta}}^{\beta}. \quad (2)$$

Since  $f_{\beta}^{-1}y \subseteq U \cup V$  and the mapping  $f_{\beta}$  is closed, there exists a neighborhood  $Oy$  such that

$$f_{\beta}^{-1}(Oy) \subseteq U \cup V. \quad (3)$$

**First case:**  $y \in \overline{U}$ . Then, by connectedness of the set  $f^{-1}y$ , either  $f^{-1}y \subseteq U$ , or  $f^{-1}y \subseteq V$ ; suppose, for example, that  $f^{-1}y \subseteq U$ . Hence, on the basis of (1), we have

$$y \in Oy \cap f(U \cap X) \cap \overline{f(V \cap X)}.$$

If the mapping  $f$  is open, then the image  $f(U \cap X)$  is open in  $Y$ , and therefore the set  $H = Oy \cap f(U \cap X) \cap \overline{f(V \cap X)}$  is nonempty. Let  $y' \in H$ . Then  $f^{-1}y' \subseteq f_{\beta}^{-1}(Oy) \subseteq U \cup V$ ,  $f^{-1}(y') \cap U \neq \emptyset$  and  $f^{-1}(y') \cap V \neq \emptyset$ , which is impossible. If, however, the mapping  $f$  is closed, then there is a neighborhood  $Uy$  such that  $f^{-1}(Uy) \subseteq Y \setminus \overline{V}^{\beta}$ , since  $f^{-1}y \subseteq X \setminus \overline{V}^{\beta}$ . By (1), similarly to the preceding, we obtain that  $y \in Uy \cap \overline{f(V \cap X)}$ . Therefore the set  $H' = Uy \cap \overline{f(V \cap X)}$  is nonempty, and for any point  $y'$  of  $H'$  we again obtain a

contradiction:  $f^{-1}y' \subseteq f^{-1}(Uy) \subseteq Y \setminus \overline{V}^\beta$  and  $f^{-1}(y') \cap V \neq \emptyset$ . Thus, if  $y \in Y$ , then the preimage  $f_\beta^{-1}y$  is connected.

**Second case:**  $y \in \beta Y \setminus Y$ . By (2), the set  $H'' = Oy \cap \overline{f(U \cap X) \cap f(V \cap X)}$  is nonempty. Let  $y' \in H''$ . We now show that  $f_\beta^{-1}(y') \cap \overline{U}^\beta \neq \emptyset$ . Assuming the contrary, by closedness of the mapping  $f_\beta$ , we find a neighborhood  $Oy'$  such that  $f_\beta^{-1}(Oy') \cap \overline{U}^\beta = \emptyset$ . Then the set  $H''' = Oy \cap Oy' \cap \overline{f(U \cap X)}$  would be nonempty, and for any point  $y''$  of  $H'''$  we would have  $f_\beta^{-1}y'' \subseteq f_\beta^{-1}(Oy') \subseteq \beta X \setminus \overline{U}^\beta$  and  $f_\beta^{-1}(y'') \cap U \neq \emptyset$ , which is impossible. Thus,  $f_\beta^{-1}(y') \cap \overline{U}^\beta \neq \emptyset$ . Similarly,  $f_\beta^{-1}(y') \cap \overline{V}^\beta \neq \emptyset$ . At the same time, by (3),  $f_\beta^{-1}y' \subseteq f_\beta^{-1}(Oy) \subseteq \overline{U}^\beta \cup \overline{V}^\beta$ . Since  $y' \in H'' \subseteq Y$ , the preimage  $f_\beta^{-1}y'$  is connected, which, in view of the three relations just proved, contradicts the condition  $\overline{U}^\beta \cap \overline{V}^\beta = \emptyset$ , which the sets  $U$  and  $V$  satisfy. Thus, the supposition that the preimage of some point  $y \in \beta Y$  is disconnected leads, in both possible cases, to a contradiction. The theorem is proved.

**Example 1.** Let  $N$  be a countable space consisting of isolated points, let  $bN$  be any countable extension of it (for example, the extension  $N \cup \xi$  of P. S. Aleksandrov), let  $f$  be the identity mapping of the space  $N$  onto itself, and let  $f_\beta$  be its natural extension mapping  $\beta N$  onto  $bN$ . Since the extension  $\beta N$  is uncountable, there exist points  $y \in bN$  with infinite preimages. At all such points the mapping  $f_\beta$  is not monotone, since  $\dim \beta N = 0$ , and hence  $\dim f_\beta^{-1}y = 0$  for all points  $y$ .

---

\*  $\overline{M}^\beta$  denotes closure in the Čech extension,  $\overline{M}$  denotes closure in the space being extended, and  $\emptyset$  denotes the empty set.

**Example 2.** Let  $X = N$ , and let  $Y$  be an arbitrary countable compactum, and let  $f$  be some one-to-one mapping of the space  $X$  onto  $Y$ . It is discontinuous, not open, and not closed. The extended mapping  $f_\beta$  of the extension  $\beta X$  onto  $\beta Y = Y$  is nonmonotone by the same considerations as in Example 1.

Mathematical Institute  
of the Siberian Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR

Received  
11 V 1960

## References

1. P. S. Aleksandrov, UMN, 2, no. 1 (17) (1946).

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.*