

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

## **GENERAL PEXIDER EQUATIONS. II. AN APPLICATION OF THE THEORY OF WEBS**

M. A. MCKIERNAN

# GENERAL PEXIDER EQUATIONS (PART II): AN APPLICATION OF THE THEORY OF WEBS

M. A. McKIERNAN

Given open connected  $\Omega$ ,  $\tilde{\Omega} \subseteq R^n$  and continuous  $T: \Omega \rightarrow R$ ,  $F: \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow R$  both strictly monotonic in each variable separately. The equation  $h\{T(x_1, \dots, x_n)\} = F\{f_1(x_1), \dots, f_n(x_n)\}$  for the unknowns  $h: T(\Omega) \rightarrow R$  and  $\pi: (f_1, \dots, f_n): \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$  can be interpreted within the theory of webs (the "Gewebe" of Blaschke-Bol). The web structure is then used to prove: any continuous solution  $\pi$  is uniquely determined on  $\Omega$  by its value at two points of  $\Omega$ ; if a solution  $\pi$  is not continuous on  $\Omega$ , then  $\pi(\omega)$  is dense in  $\tilde{\Omega}$  for every open  $\omega$  in  $\Omega$ ; if a solution  $\pi$  is continuous at one point of  $\Omega$ , it is continuous on  $\Omega$ .

1. Formulation of results. We consider the equation

$$h\{T(x_1, \dots, x_n)\} = F\{f_1(x_1), \dots, f_n(x_n)\}$$

for given  $T, F$ , with  $h, f_1, \dots, f_n$  the unknowns. Specifically, we assume given two sets  $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$  in  $R^n$  and two functions  $T: \Omega \rightarrow R$ ,  $F: \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow R$ . Let  $\Omega_i$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}_i$  denote the projections of  $\Omega$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  onto the  $i$ th coordinate axis; by a *product mapping*  $\pi: \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$  is understood the restriction to  $\Omega$  of a mapping  $(f_1, \dots, f_n): X_1^n \Omega_i \rightarrow R^n$  defined by the  $n$  functions  $f_i: \Omega_i \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}_i$ . The above equation becomes  $h \circ T = F \circ \pi$  with  $h: T(\Omega) \rightarrow R$  and  $\pi: \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$  the unknowns.

The present note is self-contained in that Part I [2] served only to indicate that the following hypotheses on  $T$  and  $F$  are not as restrictive as one might at first suppose. For the moment we assume only that:

(A.1)  $T$  is continuous and strictly monotonic in each variable on  $\Omega$ ,

(A.2)  $F$  is strictly monotonic in each variable on  $\tilde{\Omega}$ ,

(A.3)  $\Omega$  is open and connected.

**THEOREM 1.** *With (A.1, 2, 3) assume that  $h \circ T = F \circ \pi$  and  $\bar{h} \circ T = F \circ \bar{\pi}$  hold for two product mappings  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  on  $\Omega$ . If  $\pi$  and  $\bar{\pi}$  are equal at the end points of some line segment  $l \subset \Omega$  parallel to a coordinate axis, then  $\pi$  and  $\bar{\pi}$  coincide on a set dense in  $\Omega$ . Hence two continuous solutions must be identical on  $\Omega$  if they agree at the end points of such a line segment.*

In the event  $\Omega = R^n$  as in the classical case  $T(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_1 +$

$\dots + x_n$  (and in other cases indicated in the proofs), any two points may be chosen.

**COROLLARY 1.** *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1 and the further assumption  $\Omega = R^n$ , any two solutions  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  which coincide at two distinct points of  $R^n$  must coincide on a set dense in  $R^n$ . A continuous solution is uniquely determined by its value at two points in  $R^n$ .*

Throughout this note results are stated only in terms of the mapping  $\pi$  since  $h$  is then uniquely determined by the equation itself. It should be noted that for the above theorem,  $F$  need not be continuous, no assumptions are made on  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , and  $\Omega$  need not be a convex region in  $R^n$ . By strengthening the conditions on  $F$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  it is possible to generalize the following known result (for example [5], p. 21):

if  $f: R \rightarrow R$  satisfies Cauchy's equation  $f(x + y) = f(x) + f(y)$  then either  $f(x) = f(1) \cdot x$  or else  $f(\omega)$  is dense in  $R$  for every open  $\omega$ .

Specifically we assume

(B.1)  $T, F$  continuous, strictly monotonic in each variable on  $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$  respectively,

(B.2)  $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$  open and connected subsets of  $R^n$ .

**THEOREM 2.** *With (B.1, 2) assume  $h \circ T = F \circ \pi$  satisfied on  $\Omega$  by a product mapping  $\pi$ . Then either  $\pi$  is continuous on  $\Omega$  or else  $\pi(\omega)$  is dense in  $\tilde{\Omega}$  for every open subset  $\omega \subset \Omega$ . Hence continuity of  $\pi$  at one point implies the continuity of  $\pi$  at every point of  $\Omega$ .*

In terms of the component functions  $f_i$ , Theorem 2 implies the following result.

**COROLLARY 2.** *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 2, with  $\pi = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ , if some  $f_i$  is continuous at one point then all  $f_i$  are continuous on their respective domains. In the event  $\tilde{\Omega} = R^n$ , it suffices to assume some  $f_i$  bounded in a neighborhood of some point in order to conclude all  $f_i$  continuous.*

Before proceeding to the theory of webs and the proofs of the above assertions, we mention the following additional corollary although its proof depends on a result from Part I; under hypothesis weaker than (B.1) (B.2) it was shown that any continuous solution  $\pi$  must be either constant or injective.

**COROLLARY 3.** *As in Corollary 2, if some  $f_i$  is continuous at*

one point, or in the event  $\tilde{\Omega} = R^n$  if some  $f_i$  is bounded in some neighborhood of a point, then either all  $f_i$  are constant or all  $f_i$  are continuous and strictly monotonic.

In the event  $F(u_1, \dots, u_n) = u_1 + \dots + u_n$  with  $\tilde{\Omega} = R^n$ , some of the above results are related to those of C. T. Ng [3], [4] since now, if  $h, \pi$  and  $\bar{h}, \bar{\pi}$  are two solutions so also will  $h + \bar{h}, \pi + \bar{\pi}$  be a solution.

For the most part it will suffice to prove these results in the two dimensional case

$$h\{T(x, y)\} = F\{f(x), g(y)\}$$

with  $T$  defined on  $\Omega \subseteq R^2$ ,  $F$  on  $\tilde{\Omega} \subseteq R^2$  and  $\pi = (f, g): \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$ . The hypothesis (A.1), common to both theorems, allows us to interpret  $\Omega$  as a region covered by a 3-web (also called a 3-net by some authors) in the sense of Blaschke-Bol [1]. Specifically, through each point  $(x_0, y_0)$  of  $\Omega$  there passes three curves: the coordinate curves  $x = x_0, y = y_0$  and the contour curve  $T(x, y) = T(x_0, y_0)$ . Hence  $\Omega$  is covered by three families of curves and any two curves from distinct families determine at most one curve from the third family since  $T$  is strictly monotonic — “at most” since two such curves need not intersect within  $\Omega$ .

But  $x = x_0, y = y_0$ , and  $T(x, y) = T(x_0, y_0)$  are then mapped into the curves  $u = f(x_0), v = g(y_0)$  and the set of points satisfying  $F(u, v) = h\{T(x_0, y_0)\}$  respectively under the mapping  $\pi = (f, g)$ . Once hypothesis (B.2) is introduced these latter curves define a 3-web on  $\tilde{\Omega}$  and  $\pi$  becomes a web preserving mapping.

We now sketch the derivation of some elementary properties of 3-webs in a form needed in the proofs of our theorems; a more complete discussion appears in [1], pp. 1-15.

**2. Elementary 3-web properties.** We consider the two dimensional case and in accordance with hypotheses (A.1) and (A.3) we may assume without loss of generality

*$\Omega$  an open connected subset of the plan  $R^2$ ,  $T: \Omega \rightarrow R$  continuous, strictly monotonic increasing in each variable.*

The sketching of a few figures will help clarify the following constructions and propositions.

By a square  $S$  in  $\Omega$  is understood four points  $(x_i, y_j) \in \Omega$  for  $i, j = 1, 2$  where  $T(x_1, y_2) = T(x_2, y_1)$ ; a path is a sequence  $S_1, \dots, S_n$  of squares such that each  $S_i \wedge S_{i+1}$  has exactly two points; if all the points lie on two horizontal lines, say  $S_i = \{(x_{i-1}, y_0), (x_{i-1}, y_1), (x_i, y_0), (x_i, y_1)\}$ , the path is denoted by

$$(2.1) \quad (y_0 < y_1; x_0 < \cdots < x_n) \text{ where } T(x_{i+1}, y_0) = T(x_i, y_1)$$

or

$$(2.2) \quad (y_0 < y_1; x_0 > \cdots > x_n) \text{ where } T(x_{i+1}, y_1) = T(x_i, y_0)$$

(and analogously if  $y_0 > y_1$ ) and similarly if the points all lie on two vertical lines. The path (2.1) is *increasing horizontal*, (2.2) is *decreasing horizontal*; both *initiate* at  $x_0$  (more precisely  $(x_0, y_0)$  and  $(x_0, y_1)$  are the *initial points*), *terminate* at  $x_n$  (with  $(x_n, y_0)$ ,  $(x_n, y_1)$  as *terminal points*), while  $x_0, \dots, x_n$  are *partition points* of the line segment  $[x_0, x_n] \times \{y_0\}$  (or of  $[x_n, x_0] \times \{y_0\}$ ). Similarly, *increasing* or *decreasing vertical paths* can be defined. All horizontal or vertical paths are called *rectilinear*.

PROPERTY 1. *If  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$  then there exists an integer  $N$  such that every  $n \geq N$  determines a unique  $y_1 > y_0$  and unique partition points  $x_0, \dots, x_n$  such that  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = a < \cdots < x_n = b)$  is an increasing horizontal path, equivalently  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = b > \cdots > x_n = a)$  is a decreasing horizontal path. For fixed  $y_1 > y_0$ , the partition points  $x_i$  are continuous, strictly increasing functions of the end points  $a, b$ . Similarly for  $\{x_0\} \times [c, d] \subset \Omega$  and vertical paths.*

In the language of webs both  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = a < \cdots < x_n = b)$  and  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = b > \cdots > x_n = a)$  define (in general equivalent)  $n$ -partitionings of  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\}$ ; the corresponding  $(x_i, y_0)$ 's are rational points of  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\}$ . For given  $n \geq N$  the corresponding  $y_1 > y_0$  is unique but a path also exists for  $y_1 < y_0$  and these paths may be distinct (unless closure conditions are assumed). Intuitively, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  so also the corresponding  $y_1 \rightarrow y_0$  and  $|x_{i+1} - x_i| \rightarrow 0$ ; hence the rational points on  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\}$  are dense. For sufficiently large  $n$  such rectilinear paths can be extended at both ends since  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$  open. More specifically.

PROPERTY 2. *Given  $a < c < b$  with  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$ . Then for arbitrary  $\alpha, \beta$  satisfying  $a \leq \alpha < \beta \leq c$  and for sufficiently large  $n$ , an increasing horizontal path exists of the form  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = \alpha < \cdots < x_n = \beta < \cdots < x_m)$  with both  $x_{m-1}$  and  $x_m$  within the open interval  $]c, b[$ . Similarly for decreasing horizontal and for vertical paths.*

Rather than choosing large  $n, y_1$  can be chosen sufficiently close to  $y_0$ , thereby obtaining horizontal paths with  $|x_{i+1} - x_i|$  arbitrarily small. However in this case the path cannot be assumed to parti-

tion a given interval unless  $y_1$  is judiciously chosen. In this case Property 2 can be modified as follows.

**PROPERTY 3.** *Given  $a < c < b$  with  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$ . Then there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that for arbitrary  $y_1 \in ]y_0, y_0 + \delta[$  and for arbitrary  $\alpha \in [a, c]$ , an increasing horizontal path exists of the form  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = \alpha < \dots < x_m)$  with both  $x_{m-1}$  and  $x_m$  within  $]c, b[$ . Similarly for decreasing horizontal and for vertical paths.*

**3. Proof of Theorem 1.** For the moment consider the two dimensional case  $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega} \subset R^2$  with  $T: \Omega \rightarrow R, F: \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow R$ . Let  $h \circ T = F \circ \pi$  and  $\bar{h} \circ T = F \circ \bar{\pi}$ , two solutions with  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  product functions on  $\Omega$ . The hypotheses imply without loss of generality:

(A-1)  $T$  continuous, strictly monotonic increasing in each variable,

(A-2)  $F$  strictly monotonic increasing in each variable,

(A-3)  $\Omega$  open and connected.

**LEMMA 1.** *If  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  coincide at two points of a square  $S$ , then  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  coincide at all points of any path formed with  $S$  as member.*

*Proof.* Since  $S_i \wedge S_{i+1}$  always has two points it will suffice to prove that if  $\pi = (f, g), \bar{\pi} = (\bar{f}, \bar{g})$  are equal at two points of  $S = \{(x_i, y_j) | i, j = 1, 2\}$ , then so also at the other two points. But if  $\pi(x_i, y_j) = \bar{\pi}(x_i, y_j)$  for  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  and  $(2, 1)$ , or for  $(i, j) = (1, 1)$  and  $(2, 2)$ , then trivially  $f(x_i) = \bar{f}(x_i)$  and  $g(y_j) = \bar{g}(y_j)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . If for  $(i, j) = (1, 1)$  and  $(1, 2)$  (the other cases are similar) then  $f(x_1) = \bar{f}(x_1), g(y_1) = \bar{g}(y_1)$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and hence only  $f(x_2) = \bar{f}(x_2)$  remains. But  $T(x_1, y_2) = T(x_2, y_1)$  implies

$$F\{f(x_1), g(y_2)\} = F\{f(x_2), g(y_1)\} \text{ and } F\{\bar{f}(x_1), \bar{g}(y_2)\} = F\{\bar{f}(x_2), \bar{g}(y_1)\}$$

and since the left hand sides are equal,  $g(y_1) = \bar{g}(y_1)$  implies  $f(x_2) = \bar{f}(x_2)$  by (A-2).

In Lemma 1, equality is assumed at two points of one square; for rectilinear paths a stronger result holds.

**LEMMA 2.** *If  $\pi$  and  $\bar{\pi}$  coincide at two points of a rectilinear path, they coincide at all points of this path.*

*Proof.* Given  $S_i = \{(x_i, y_1), (x_i, y_2), (x_{i+1}, y_2), (x_{i+1}, y_1)\}$  with  $T(x_i, y_2) = T(x_{i+1}, y_1)$ , set  $\pi(x_i, y_j) = (u_i, v_j)$  and  $\bar{\pi}(x_i, y_j) = (\bar{u}_i, \bar{v}_j)$ . Then as above,

$$(1_i) \quad F(u_i, v_2) = F(u_{i+1}, v_1) \text{ and } (1_1) \quad F(u_1, v_2) = F(u_2, v_1),$$

$$(2_i) \quad F(\bar{u}_i, \bar{v}_2) = F(\bar{u}_{i+1}, \bar{v}_1) \text{ and } (2_1) \quad F(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_2) = F(\bar{u}_2, \bar{v}_1).$$

Suppose first that  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  coincide at an initial point, say  $u_1 = \bar{u}_1$  and  $v_1 = \bar{v}_1$ . Monotoneity and  $v_2 \leq \bar{v}_2$  implies  $(1_1) \leq (2_1)$  and hence  $u_2 \leq \bar{u}_2$ ; but then  $(1_2) \geq (2_2)$  and hence  $u_3 \leq \bar{u}_3$  and by induction  $u_i \leq \bar{u}_i$ . In this case  $\pi$  and  $\bar{\pi}$  could never coincide again on the path. Similarly,  $u_1 = \bar{u}_1$  with  $v_2 = \bar{v}_2$  implies  $(1_1) = (2_1)$ ; hence  $v_1 \leq \bar{v}_1$ , implies  $u_2 \geq \bar{u}_2$  and in turn  $(1_2) \leq (2_2)$  and inductively  $u_i \geq \bar{u}_i$ . Again  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  cannot be equal at any other point. Hence equality at two points of this path implies equality at two points of one square, and by Lemma 1, at all points of the path. A similar argument applies to vertical paths.

LEMMA 3. *If  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  coincide at two points of a line segment  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$ , then  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  coincide on a set dense in this line segment. Similarly for  $\{x_0\} \times [c, d] \subset \Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Lemma 2 implies that if  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  coincide at two points of an  $n$ -partition so also at all points of this partition; if  $(x_i, y_0)$  and  $(x_{i+1}, y_0)$  are two points of this partition, then  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  will coincide at all rational points of  $[x_i, x_{i+1}] \times \{y_0\}$ . Hence if  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  coincide at two partition points of a line segment, they coincide on a set dense on this line segment. Suppose now that  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  are equal at  $(a', y_0), (b', y_0)$  for  $a \leq a' < b' \leq b$ , and consider  $[a', B] \times \{y_0\}$  for  $b - \delta < B \leq b$ . For sufficiently large  $n$  the  $n$ -partitioning of  $[a', B] \times \{y_0\}$  will satisfy  $|x_{i+1} - x_i| < \delta/2$  and by the continuity in Property 1 some  $B$  exists in  $[b - \delta, b]$  such that  $(b', y_0)$  is a partition point of  $[a', B] \times \{y_0\}$ , implying that  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  coincide on a set dense in  $[a', B] \times \{y_0\}$ . Since  $\delta > 0$  is arbitrary, equality holds on a set dense in  $[a', b] \times \{y_0\}$ . Similarly for  $[a, b'] \times \{y_0\}$ .

To prove the Theorem 1, note that  $\Omega$  open and connected implies that any two points of  $\Omega$  can be joined by a polygon with sides parallel to the axes. If  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  coincide at two points of some side, then so also on a set dense on this side; however the adjacent sides may not intersect at one of these points of equality, and hence a "neighboring" polygon is required, as constructed below.

LEMMA 4. *Given two perpendicular line segments  $l_1, l_2 \subset \Omega$ , parallel to the axes and intersecting at a partition point of  $l_1$ . If  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  are equal at the end points of  $l_1$ , then they are equal on a set dense in  $l_1 \cup l_2$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemmas 2 and 3, the  $\pi$  and  $\bar{\pi}$  are equal on any  $n$ -partitioning of  $l_1$  and since any partition point of  $l_1$  belongs to a square on which  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  are equal, they will be equal at two points of  $l_2$  provided the partition is sufficiently fine; this last restriction can be satisfied by choosing  $l_1 \wedge l_2$  together with any other sufficiently close partition point of  $l_1$ .

In  $R^2$ , the theorem follows by considering polygons formed by line segments  $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n$  parallel to the axes and replacing  $l_2$  by a neighboring  $\tilde{l}_2$  through a rational point of  $l_1, l_3$  by  $\tilde{l}_3$  through a rational point of  $\tilde{l}_2$ , etc. Any two partition points of  $l_1$  can be joined to within  $\varepsilon$  of any point in  $\Omega$  by such a polygon—a path in  $\Omega$ . By considering any two variables in  $R^n$ , the theorem now follows fairly easily by decomposing  $\Omega$  into overlapping convex sets, in particular  $n$ -dimensional rectangles; consider the given line segment as one dimensional edge of an  $n$ -dimensional rectangle within  $\Omega \subset R^n$ , sides parallel to the coordinate hyperplanes. The above argument implies  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  equal on a set dense in each two-dimensional “face” containing this edge. For product mappings, equality follows on a set dense in this  $n$ -dimensional rectangle, etc.

For Corollary 1 note that if  $\pi(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \bar{\pi}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  and  $\pi(b_1, \dots, b_n) = \bar{\pi}(b_1, \dots, b_n)$  for product mappings  $\pi = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  and  $\bar{\pi} = (\bar{f}_1, \dots, \bar{f}_n)$  then  $f_i(a_i) = \bar{f}_i(a_i)$  and  $f_i(b_i) = \bar{f}_i(b_i)$ ; hence one need only change one  $a_i$  to a  $b_i$  in  $\pi(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \bar{\pi}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  to obtain equality at the end points of a line segment parallel to a coordinate axis.

4. Preliminary lemmas for Theorem 2. We again consider first the two dimensional case

$$(4.1) \quad h\{T(x, y)\} = F\{f(x), g(y)\}$$

with  $T: \Omega \rightarrow R, F: \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow R$  and  $\pi = (f, g): \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$ . The hypotheses now imply without loss of generality

(B.1)  $T, F$  continuous and strictly monotonic increasing in each variable,

(B.2)  $\Omega$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  open connected subsets of the plane  $R^2$ .

Let  $\Omega_x, \tilde{\Omega}_x$  and  $\Omega_y, \tilde{\Omega}_y$  denote the projections of  $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$  onto the  $x$  and  $y$  axes respectively. We again consider rectilinear paths

$$(4.2) \quad (y_0 < y_1; x_0 < \dots < x_n) \text{ where } T(x_{i+1}, y_0) = T(x_i, y_1)$$

or

$$(4.3) \quad (y_0 < y_1; x_0 > \dots > x_n) \text{ where } T(x_{i+1}, y_1) = T(x_i, y_0).$$

Since now a 3-web is also defined on  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , using the contour curves of  $F$ , the concepts presented in §2 also apply to paths in  $\tilde{\Omega}$ . The significance of such paths lies in the following observation. For the path (4.2), the equation  $h \circ T = F \circ \pi$  implies  $F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_0)\} = F\{f(x_i), g(y_1)\}$  and hence by (B.1),  $g(y_0) \geq g(y_1)$  implies  $f(x_{i+1}) \leq f(x_i)$  for all  $i$  while  $g(y_0) = g(y_1)$  implies  $f(x_{i+1}) = f(x_i)$  for all  $i$ . Similarly for the path (4.3). In effect each path  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 < \dots < x_n)$  in  $\Omega$  defines a path in  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , with  $T$  replaced by  $F$ , of the form  $(g(y_0) \leq g(y_1); f(x_0) \geq \dots \geq f(x_n))$ , assuming  $f$  not constant on  $x_0, \dots, x_n$ . The following lemmas are then clear.

**LEMMA 1.** *Given  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$  with  $f(a) < f(b)$ . Then  $\pi$  maps  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\}$  onto a set dense in  $[f(a), f(b)] \times \{g(y_0)\}$ . Similarly if  $f(b) < f(a)$  and for vertical paths  $\{x_0\} \times [c, d] \subset \Omega$ .*

This lemma states that every  $n$ -partition of  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\}$  has as image an  $n$ -partition of  $[f(a), f(b)] \times \{g(y_0)\}$ , or in the language of webs, rational points on  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\}$  must map to rational points of  $[f(a), f(b)] \times \{g(y_0)\}$ , and the set of rational points on a line segment is dense in that line segment.

**LEMMA 2.** *For any solution  $\pi = (f, g)$ ,  $f$  is either constant or strictly monotone on the partition points of any horizontal path. Similarly for  $g$  on vertical paths.*

The following lemmas are less trivial.

**LEMMA 3.** *If either  $f$  or  $g$  is not monotone on  $\Omega_x, \Omega_y$  respectively then both  $f$  and  $g$  are not monotone on any open interval in their respective domains.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $f$  monotone on some interval  $I$  and let  $]a_0, c[$  be the union of all open intervals, containing  $I$ , on which  $f$  is monotone. We prove  $]a_0, c[ = \Omega_x$ . If  $c \in \Omega_x$  then  $(c, y_0) \in \Omega$  for some  $y_0$  and so also  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$  for some  $a < c < b$ . Choose  $\gamma, \beta$  with  $c \leq \gamma < \beta \leq b$ ; then by Lemma 2,  $f$  will be monotone on any path  $(y_0 < y_1; \beta > \dots > \gamma = x_n > \dots > x_m)$  where, by Property 2, the  $x_{m-1}$  and  $x_m$  can be made to lie within  $]a, c[$ . Monotonicity is thus extended to  $[c, b]$  contradicting the fact that  $]a_0, c[$  was maximal. Hence  $c \notin \Omega_x$  and similarly for  $a_0$ . With  $f$  not monotone it remains to prove  $g$  not monotone on  $\Omega_y$ . Choose  $a < b$  with  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$  for some  $y_0$ . Since  $f$  is not monotone on any interval, choose this  $a, b$  such that for some  $c$  with  $a < c < b$  we have say  $f(a) < f(b) < f(c)$  (the other cases are similar). By partitioning  $[a, c] \times \{y_0\}$  and  $[c, b] \times \{y_0\}$ , Property 1 guarantees the existence of  $y_1, y_2$  for the

paths  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = a < \cdots < x_n = c)$  and  $(y_0 < y_2; \bar{x}_0 = c < \cdots < \bar{x}_n = b)$  where  $T(x_i, y_1) = T(x_{i+1}, y_0)$  and  $T(\bar{x}_i, y_2) = T(\bar{x}_{i+1}, y_0)$  respectively. But then  $h \circ T = F \circ \pi$  implies  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_1)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_0)\}$  and  $F\{f(\bar{x}_i), g(y_2)\} = F\{f(\bar{x}_{i+1}), g(y_0)\}$  respectively. But since  $f(a) < f(c)$ , Lemma 2 implies  $f(x_i) < f(x_{i+1})$  and by (B.1),  $g(y_1) > g(y_0)$ . Similarly  $f(b) < f(c)$  implies  $f(\bar{x}_i) > f(\bar{x}_{i+1})$  and hence  $g(y_2) < g(y_0)$ , that is,  $g(y_2) < g(y_0) < g(y_1)$ . But since  $x_i < x_{i+1}$  so  $y_1 > y_0$  and since  $\bar{x}_i < \bar{x}_{i+1}$  so also  $y_2 > y_0$  implying  $g$  not monotone.

LEMMA 4. *Given any compact subset  $K \subset \tilde{\Omega}$  and any  $v_1 \neq v_0$ . Then there exists an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that*

$$F(u_1, v_0) = F(u_0, v_1) \text{ implies } |u_1 - u_0| > \varepsilon$$

*whenever  $(u_1, v_0)$  and  $(u_0, v_1)$  are in  $K$ .*

*Proof.* If not, then convergent sequences  $\{(u_{1n}, v_0)\}, \{(u_{0n}, v_1)\}$  exist in  $K$  with  $|u_{1n} - u_{0n}| < 1/n$ , and with  $F\{u_{1n}, v_0\} = F\{u_{0n}, v_1\}$ . The limit points  $(u, v_0)$  and  $(u, v_1)$  then satisfy  $F\{u, v_0\} = F\{u, v_1\}$ , a contradiction.

Given any  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$ , if  $f$  is not monotone on its domain  $\Omega_x$  then by Lemma 3 it is not monotone on any sub-interval of  $[a, b]$ . Hence it may be assumed that  $a$  and  $b$  were chosen such that for some  $c$

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{cases} a < c < b \text{ and either (i) } f(a) < f(b) < f(c) \text{ or} \\ \text{(ii) } f(c) < f(a) < f(b) \text{ or (iii) } f(c) < f(b) < f(a) \\ \text{or finally (iv) } f(b) < f(a) < f(c). \end{cases}$$

LEMMA 5. *Assume (4.4) valid for some  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$  and let  $v_0 = g(y_0)$ . Let  $A$  denote the greatest lower bound (including  $-\infty$ ) and  $B$  the least upper bound (including  $+\infty$ ) of  $f$  on  $[a, b]$ . Then the following assertions hold:*

(4.5) *the image of  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\}$  is dense in  $[A, B] \times \{v_0\}$ , and*

(4.6) *neither  $(A, v_0)$  nor  $(B, v_0)$  can belong to  $\tilde{\Omega}$ .*

*Proof.* The case (4.4i) is proved in detail, (4.4iii) is outlined and the other cases are similar. Recall that for any increasing path  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 < \cdots < x_n)$ , the relation  $T(x_i, y_1) = T(x_{i+1}, y_0)$  and hence  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_1)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_0)\}$  holds; however for decreasing paths  $(y_0 < y_2; x_0 > \cdots > x_n)$  these relations become  $T(x_i, y_0) = T(x_{i+1}, y_2)$  and hence  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_0)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_2)\}$ .

Case (4.4i)  $f(a) < f(b) < f(c)$ .

By Property 1 the paths  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = a < \dots < x_n = c)$  and  $(y_0 < y_2; x_0 = b > \dots > x_n = c)$ , for all  $n \geq N$ , uniquely determine  $y_1$  and  $y_2$ . For  $n$  sufficiently large the corresponding  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  will satisfy  $|y_i - y_0| < \delta$  where  $\delta > 0$  is as in Property 3. Repeated applications of Property 3 permit the construction of sequences  $a_1, a_2, \dots$  and  $b_1, b_2, \dots$  as follows (where  $m$  may denote different integers each time it appears):

- (1<sub>1</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = a < \dots < x_m = b_1)$  for some  $b_1 \in ]c, b[$ ,
- (2<sub>1</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_2; x_0 = b_1 > \dots > x_m = a_1)$  for some  $a_1 \in ]a, c[$ ,
- (1<sub>k</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_1; a_{k-1} < \dots < x_m = b_k)$  for some  $b_k \in ]c, b[$ ,
- (2<sub>k</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_2; b_k > \dots > x_m = a_k)$  for some  $a_k \in ]a, c[$ .

By (1<sub>1</sub>),  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_1)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_0)\}$  and since  $f(a) < f(c)$  by hypothesis, Lemma 2 implies all  $f(x_i) < f(x_{i+1})$ , and in turn  $g(y_1) > g(y_0)$ . But then the same argument applied to (1<sub>k</sub>) yields  $f(x_i) < f(x_{i+1})$  and in turn  $f(a_{k-1}) < f(b_k)$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ . Since  $y_2$  is defined by  $(y_0 < y_2; x_0 = b > \dots > x_n = c)$ , implying  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_0)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_2)\}$ , the hypothesis  $f(b) < f(c)$  together with Lemma 2 yields  $f(x_i) < f(x_{i+1})$ , that is  $g(y_0) > g(y_2)$ . But then a similar argument applied to (2<sub>k</sub>) also yields  $f(x_i) < f(x_{i+1})$ , that is,  $f(b_k) < f(a_k)$ . Hence  $f(a_{k-1}) < f(b_k) < f(a_k)$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ; in particular  $f(a_k)$  is strictly monotone increasing with  $k$ , and in fact  $f(a_k) > f(a)$  in view of (1<sub>1</sub>). By Lemma 1 the image of  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\}$  must be dense in  $[f(a), B[\times \{v\}]$  where  $B = l.u.b. f(a_k)$ . If now  $(B, v_0) \in \tilde{\Omega}$  set  $K = [\alpha, \beta] \times [v_{-1}, v_1]$  for some  $\alpha < B < \beta$  and  $v_{-1} < v_0 < v_1$  such that  $K \subset \tilde{\Omega}$ . Consider (1<sub>k</sub>) with  $u_1 = f(x_{i+1})$  and choose  $v_1 < g(y_1)$ . By Lemma 4 there exists an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that within  $K$ ,  $F\{u_0, v_1\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), v_0\}$  implies  $f(x_{i+1}) > u_0 + \varepsilon$ . If  $v_1$  is increased,  $u_0$  must decrease and hence  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_1)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), v_0\}$  implies  $f(x_{i+1}) > f(x_i) + \varepsilon$ . With  $f(a_{k-1}) \in [\alpha, B]$ , by (1<sub>k</sub>) follows  $f(b_k) > f(a_{k-1}) + m\varepsilon$  and analogously (choose  $v_{-1} > g(y_2)$ ),  $f(a_k) < f(b_k) + m\varepsilon'$  for some  $\varepsilon' > 0$ ; clearly  $(b, v_0) \notin \tilde{\Omega}$ . To prove the corresponding result for the *g.l.b.*  $A$ , use the same  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  as above (with  $g(y_1) > g(y_0)$  and  $g(y_0) > g(y_2)$ ) but replace the previous paths with the following:

- (1<sub>1</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = c > \dots > x_m = a_1)$  for some  $a_1 \in ]a, c[$ ,
- (2<sub>1</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_2; x_0 = a_1 < \dots < x_m = b_1)$  for some  $b_1 \in ]c, b[$ ,
- (1<sub>k</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = b_{k-1} > \dots > x_m = a_k)$  for some  $a_k \in ]a, c[$ ,
- (2<sub>k</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_2; x_0 = a_k < \dots < x_m = b_k)$  for some  $b_k \in ]c, b[$ .

For (1<sub>k</sub>) as before,  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_0)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_1)\}$  and hence  $f(x_i) > f(x_{i+1})$ . Hence  $f(c) > f(a_1)$  and  $f(b_{k-1}) > f(a_k)$ . For (2<sub>k</sub>) follows  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_2)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_0)\}$  implying  $f(x_i) > f(x_{i+1})$  and hence

$f(a_k) > f(b_k)$ . Consequently  $f(c) > f(a_1) > \dots > f(b_{k-1}) > f(a_k) > f(b_k)$  implying that now  $f(a_k)$  is a monotone decreasing sequence. As before the image of  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\}$  will be dense in  $]A, f(c)[ \times \{v_0\}$  where  $A = g.l.b. f(a_k)$ . Again  $(A, y_0) \notin \tilde{\Omega}$ .

Case (4.4iii)  $f(c) < f(b) < f(a)$ .

Now define  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  by  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = c < \dots < x_n = b)$  and  $(y_0 < y_2; x_0 = c > \dots > x_n = a)$ . For  $y_1$  follows  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_1)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_0)\}$  and since  $f(c) < f(a)$  so  $f(x_i) < f(x_{i+1})$  and  $g(y_1) > g(y_0)$ . For  $y_2$  follows  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_0)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_2)\}$  and since  $f(c) < f(a)$ , so now  $g(y_0) > g(y_2)$ . Consider

- (1<sub>1</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = c > \dots > x_m = a_1)$  for some  $a_1 \in ]a, c[$ ,
- (2<sub>1</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_2; x_0 = a_1 < \dots < x_m = b_1)$  for some  $b_1 \in ]c, b[$ ,
- (1<sub>k</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_1; x_0 = b_{k-1} > \dots > x_m = a_k)$  for some  $a_k \in ]a, c[$ ,
- (2<sub>k</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_2; x_0 = a_k < \dots < x_m = b_k)$  for some  $b_k \in ]c, b[$ .

For (1<sub>k</sub>) follows  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_0)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_1)\}$  and hence  $f(x_i) > f(x_{i+1})$  and  $f(b_{k-1}) > f(a_k)$ . For (2<sub>k</sub>) follows  $F\{f(x_i), g(y_2)\} = F\{f(x_{i+1}), g(y_0)\}$ , hence  $f(x_i) > f(x_{i+1})$  and  $f(a_k) > f(b_k)$ . Hence  $f(c) > f(a_1) > \dots > f(b_{k-1}) > f(a_k) > f(b_k)$ . In particular the sequence  $f(a_k)$  is monotone decreasing. To obtain a monotone increasing sequence use

- (1<sub>k</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_1; a_{k-1} < \dots < b_k)$

and

- (2<sub>k</sub>)  $(y_0 < y_2; b_k > \dots > a_k)$

with  $a_0 = c$ .

**5. Proof of Theorem 2.** For the moment continue with the two dimensional case. With  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\} \subset \Omega$  let  $v_0 = g(y_0)$ ; in  $\tilde{\Omega}$  the image  $(f(a), v_0)$  of  $(a; y_0)$  lies on some maximal open horizontal line segment  $]A, B[ \times \{v_0\} \subset \tilde{\Omega}$ . The image  $(f(b), v_0)$  of  $(b, v_0)$  may or may not lie within this line segment; conceivably  $\tilde{\Omega}$  could contain  $]A, B[ \times \{v_0\}$  and  $]B, C[ \times \{v_0\}$  with  $(B, v_0) \notin \tilde{\Omega}$  while  $f(a) \in ]A, B[$  and  $f(b) \in ]B, C[$ . Nevertheless if  $f$  is not continuous then by Lemmas 3 and 5, the image of  $[a, b] \times \{y_0\}$  must be dense in  $]A, C[ \times \{v_0\}$ , and in particular dense in  $]A, B[ \times \{v_0\}$ . Similarly for  $g$ . Hence for any point  $(x_0, y_0) \in \omega \subset \Omega$  with  $\omega$  open, the image  $\pi(\omega)$  must be dense in any horizontal or vertical line segment contained in  $\tilde{\Omega}$  and containing  $(f(x_0), g(y_0))$ .

By considering any two variables in  $R^n$ , a similar result holds: for any point  $p_0 \in \omega \subset \Omega \subset R^n$  with  $\omega$  open, the image  $\pi(\omega)$  must be dense in any line segment  $\gamma \subset \tilde{\Omega}$  with  $\gamma$  parallel to a coordinate axis and with  $q_0 = \pi(p_0) \in \gamma$ . Since  $\tilde{\Omega}$  is open and connected this  $q_0$  can

be joined to any other point  $q_n \in \tilde{Q}$  by a polygon consisting of line segments  $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_n$  parallel to the axes with  $\gamma_i \subset \tilde{Q}$ ,  $q_0 \in \gamma_0$  and  $q_n \in \gamma_n$ . Since  $\pi(\omega)$  is dense in  $\gamma_0$ ,  $\gamma_1$  can be replaced by  $\gamma_1^*$  arbitrarily close to  $\gamma_1$  and with  $\gamma_0 \wedge \gamma_1^* \in \pi(\omega)$ , and in general, with  $\pi(\omega)$  dense in  $\gamma_i^*$ ,  $\gamma_{i+1}$  can be replaced by  $\gamma_{i+1}^*$  arbitrarily close to  $\gamma_{i+1}$  but with  $\gamma_i^* \wedge \gamma_{i+1}^* \in \pi(\omega)$ . The polygon  $\gamma_0, \gamma_1^*, \dots, \gamma_n^*$  then joins  $q_0$  to  $q_n^*$  with  $q_n^*$  arbitrarily close to  $q_n$  and since  $q_n$  was arbitrary,  $\pi(\omega)$  is dense in  $\tilde{Q}$ .

## REFERENCES

1. W. -Bol, G. Blaschke, *Geometrie der Gewebe*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1938.
2. M. A. McKiernan, *General Peirder equations (Part I): existence of injective solutions*, Pacific J. Math.
3. C. T. Ng, *Local boundedness and continuity for a functional equation on topological spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **39-3** (1973), 525-529.
4. ———, *On the functional equation  $f(x) + \sum g_i(y_i) = h(T(x, y_1, \dots, y_n))$* , Annales Pol. Math., **27** (1973), 329-336.
5. A. Wilansky, *Functional Analysis*, Blaisdell Pub. Co., New York-Toronto-London, (1964) 21.

Received March, 13, 1978 and in revised form October 20, 1978.

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO  
WATERLOO, ONTARIO N2L 3G1  
CANADA

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

## EDITORS

DONALD BABBITT (Managing Editor)

University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

HUGO ROSSI

University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

C. C. MOORE and ANDREW OGG

University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

J. DUGUNDJI

Department of Mathematics  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

R. FINN and J. MILGRAM

Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

## SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO  
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY  
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII  
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO  
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

---

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

---

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of the manuscript. However, you may use them in the displayed equations. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Please propose a heading for the odd numbered pages of less than 35 characters. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. **39**. Supply name and address of author to whom proofs should be sent. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints to each author are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

---

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$84.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$42.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for numbers issued in the last three calendar years, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924, U.S.A. Older back numbers obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.).

8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Copyright © 1979 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics  
Manufactured and first issued in Japan

Krishnaswami Alladi and Paul Erdős, <i>On the asymptotic behavior of large prime factors of integers</i> .....	295
Alfred David Andrew, <i>A remark on generalized Haar systems in <math>L_p</math>, <math>1 &lt; p &lt; \infty</math></i> .....	317
John M. Baker, <i>A note on compact operators which attain their norm</i> .....	319
Jonathan Borwein, <i>Weak local supportability and applications to approximation</i> .....	323
Tae Ho Choe and Young Soo Park, <i>Wallman's type order compactification</i> .....	339
Susanne Dierolf and Ulrich Schwanengel, <i>Examples of locally compact noncompact minimal topological groups</i> .....	349
Michael Freedman, <i>A converse to (Milnor-Kervaire theorem) <math>\times R</math> etc.</i> ..	357
George Golightly, <i>Graph-dense linear transformations</i> .....	371
H. Groemer, <i>Space coverings by translates of convex sets</i> .....	379
Rolf Wim Henrichs, <i>Weak Frobenius reciprocity and compactness conditions in topological groups</i> .....	387
Horst Herrlich and George Edison Strecker, <i>Semi-universal maps and universal initial completions</i> .....	407
Sigmund Nyrop Hudson, <i>On the topology and geometry of arcwise connected, finite-dimensional groups</i> .....	429
K. John and Václav E. Zizler, <i>On extension of rotund norms. II</i> .....	451
Russell Allan Johnson, <i>Existence of a strong lifting commuting with a compact group of transformations. II</i> .....	457
Bjarni Jónsson and Ivan Rival, <i>Lattice varieties covering the smallest nonmodular variety</i> .....	463
Grigori Abramovich Kolesnik, <i>On the order of Dirichlet L-functions</i> .....	479
Robert Allen Liebler and Jay Edward Yellen, <i>In search of nonsolvable groups of central type</i> .....	485
Wilfrido Martínez T. and Adalberto Garcia-Maynez Cervantes, <i>Unicoherent plane Peano sets are <math>\sigma</math>-unicoherent</i> .....	493
M. A. McKiernan, <i>General Pexider equations. I. Existence of injective solutions</i> .....	499
M. A. McKiernan, <i>General Pexider equations. II. An application of the theory of webs</i> .....	503
Jan K. Pachl, <i>Measures as functionals on uniformly continuous functions</i> .....	515
Lee Albert Rubel, <i>Convolution cut-down in some radical convolution algebras</i> ....	523
Peter John Slater and William Yslas Vélez, <i>Permutations of the positive integers with restrictions on the sequence of differences. II</i> .....	527
Raymond Earl Smithson, <i>A common fixed point theorem for nested spaces</i> .....	533
Indulata Sukla, <i>Generalization of a theorem of McFadden</i> .....	539
Jun-ichi Tanaka, <i>A certain class of total variation measures of analytic measures</i> .....	547
Kalathoor Varadarajan, <i>Modules with supplements</i> .....	559
Robert Francis Wheeler, <i>Topological measure theory for completely regular spaces and their projective covers</i> .....	565