

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

**CONTINUOUS MEASURE-PRESERVING MAPS ONTO PEANO
SPACES**

ALAN HENRY SCHOENFELD

CONTINUOUS MEASURE-PRESERVING MAPS ONTO PEANO SPACES

ALAN H. SCHOENFELD

In this paper we obtain measure-theoretic versions of some topological existence theorems relating to continuous maps, in particular the Hahn-Mazurkiewitz Theorem. Let X be a Peano Space and λ a Borel measure on X with $\lambda(X) = 1$. There is a continuous measure-preserving surjection from the unit interval (with Lebesgue measure) to X if and only if the support of λ is X .

1. Introduction. Peano's construction in 1890 of a continuous surjection from $I = [0, 1]$ to $S = I \times I$ led twenty-five years later to the Hahn-Mazurkiewitz theorem, which characterizes those topological spaces which are the continuous image of the unit interval.¹ Since the original paper, there have been many elegant constructions of space-filling curves, including one by Hilbert.² Perhaps most striking about Hilbert's construction is its remarkable symmetry: one sees easily that for each of the intervals $A_{i,j} = [i/4^j, (i+1)/4^j]$, the image of $A_{i,j}$ is a square of area 4^{-j} ; and the images of distinct intervals $A_{i,j}$ and $A_{k,j}$ intersect in a set of (planar Lebesgue) measure zero. It is easy, in fact, to verify that Hilbert's space-filling curve is measure-preserving. This suggests the possibility that, under suitable restrictions, a Peano space X which is also a measure space might be the image of a continuous measure-preserving map from the unit interval. Clearly a necessary condition for the existence of such a map is that open subsets of X have positive measure. The aim of this paper is to show that this condition is sufficient as well. We will prove

THEOREM 1. *Let $I = [0, 1]$ and μ be Lebesgue measure on I . Let X be a Peano space and λ a Borel measure on X with $\lambda(X) = 1$. Then a (necessary and) sufficient condition that there be a continuous measure-preserving surjection $f: \langle I, \mu \rangle \rightarrow \langle X, \lambda \rangle$ is that X be the support of λ .³*

1. The Hahn-Mazurkiewitz theorem states:

A topological space X is the continuous image of $I = [0, 1]$ if and only if X is compact, connected, locally connected, and metrizable. Such spaces are called Peano spaces.

2. Pictures of the first three stages of Hilbert's construction may be found in [4], p. 341.

3. After an abstract of this result appeared in the January, 1973 Notices of the American Mathematical Society, R. M. Blumenthal informed me that he had obtained similar results. His proof, entirely different from this, is in [1].

The argument we employ follows essentially the same lines as that given on pp. 129–30 of [2] to prove the Hahn-Mazurkiewicz theorem. One obtains a continuous surjection from a Cantor subset of I to X , and extends that map to one defined on I .

DEFINITION 1.1. Let ν be a Borel measure on a compact metric space Y , λ a Borel measure on a compact measure space X , and $F: Y \rightarrow X$ a surjection. We say F is *measure-positive* if:

- (a) For each Borel set $A \subset X$ with $\lambda(A) > 0$, $\nu(F^{-1}(A)) > 0$.
- (b) For each $B \subset Y$ containing a set of positive ν -measure, $F(B)$ contains a set of positive λ -measure.

DEFINITION 1.2. Let $\langle Y, \nu \rangle$ and $\langle X, \lambda \rangle$ be as above. A surjection $F: Y \rightarrow X$ is *measure-preserving* if for each measurable $A \subset X$, $F^{-1}(A)$ is measurable and $\nu(F^{-1}(A)) = \lambda(A)$.

In §2, we demonstrate the existence of continuous measure-positive surjections from Cantor sets (with nontrivial Borel measures) to compact metric measure spaces. We apply these results to obtain continuous measure-positive surjection from a “fat” Cantor subset of I to the Peano space X , and in §3, extend it to a continuous measure-positive surjection $F: I \rightarrow X$. A simple application of the Radon-Nikodym theorem then guarantees the existence of the desired continuous measure-preserving map.

2. Almost measure-preserving surjections.

DEFINITION 2.1. A *Cantor set* is a compact, perfect, totally disconnected metrizable space.

It is well known⁴ that if K is a Cantor set and X is a compact metric space, there is a continuous surjection from K to X . If μ and λ are Borel measures on a Cantor set K and a compact metric space X respectively, there may not exist a continuous measure-preserving surjection $f: K \rightarrow X$. If, for example, μ is Haar measure on the topological group $K = 2^\omega = \prod_{n=1}^\infty \{0, 1\}$, each open-closed subset of K has measure of the form $a/2^b$ (a, b positive integers). Thus if there is an open-closed subset of X of λ -measure $1/3$, f cannot be both continuous and measure-preserving. The most we can expect in general is that the measure of each $A \subset X$ and its inverse in Y be “close”.

4. See [2], pp. 127–128, [3], p. 166 or [4].

DEFINITION 2.2. Let S be a sigma-algebra of subsets of a space Y , and μ and ν measures defined on S . We say μ and ν are ϵ -close on S if for each $A \in S$ we have

$$(1 + \epsilon)^{-1}\mu(A) \leq \nu(A) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\mu(A).$$

DEFINITION 2.3. Let $\langle X, B, \lambda \rangle$ be a measure triple, with λ a measure defined on the Borel sets B of X . Let μ be a measure on the topological space Y , $f: Y \rightarrow X$ a continuous surjection, and $\epsilon > 0$. We say f is ϵ -almost measure preserving, (AMP(ϵ)), if the measures μ and $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ are ϵ -close. Where there is no risk of confusion, we will suppress the ϵ .

The aim of this section is to prove

THEOREM 2. Let μ be a nonatomic Borel measure on a Cantor set K , with $\text{supp}(\mu) = K$ and $\mu(K) = 1$. Let λ be a Borel measure on a compact metrizable space X , with $\text{supp}(\lambda) = X$ and $\lambda(X) = 1$. For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is an AMP(ϵ) surjection $f_\epsilon: \langle K, \mu \rangle \rightarrow \langle X, \lambda \rangle$.

The proof consists in the construction of sequences of partitions of both K and X , in such a manner that corresponding partition elements of K and X are of "close" measure.

Note. Any AMP surjection is measure-positive.

Partitions of X .

Agreement. Set $I_n = [0, 1]$ with metric $\rho_n(a_n, b_n) = n^{-1}|a_n - b_n|$. $I^\omega = \prod_{n=1}^\infty I_n$, with metric $\rho(\langle a_n \rangle, \langle b_n \rangle) = \sup_n \rho_n(a_n, b_n)$, is the Hilbert cube. If X is the compact metrizable space of Theorem 2, we can embed X in $\prod_{n=1}^\infty (0, 1)$. All appropriate identifications having been performed, we may think of λ as a Borel measure on I^ω , with $\text{supp} \lambda = X$; and we will use ρ as the metric on X .

DEFINITION 2.4. The finite collection $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n\}$ of subsets of X is called a λ -null partition of X if

- (a) each P_i is closed (relative to X), and $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^n P_i$.
- (b) $\lambda(P_i) > 0$ for each i .
- (c) $i \neq j \Rightarrow \lambda(P_i \cap P_j) = 0$.

Where the context is clear, we will refer to \mathcal{P} simply as a partition.

DEFINITION 2.5. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ and $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_m\}$ be partitions of X . We say \mathcal{Q} is a refinement of \mathcal{P} if, for each P_i , the collection $\{Q_j \in \mathcal{Q} : \lambda(P_i \cap Q_j) > 0\}$ forms a partition of P_i .

DEFINITION 2.6. The *diameter* of any set $A \subset X$ is

$$D(A) = \sup\{\rho(x, y): x, y \in A\}.$$

DEFINITION 2.7. The *mesh* of a partition $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n\}$ is

$$\Delta(\mathcal{P}) = \max\{D(P_i): i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

PROPOSITION 2.1. *There is a sequence $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots$, of λ -null partitions of X , where for each n , \mathcal{P}_{n+1} is a refinement of \mathcal{P}_n and $\Delta(\mathcal{P}_n) < 2^{-n}$.*

Proof. Since $\lambda(X) < \infty$, we have for each i that at most countably many of the 1-co-dimensional hyperplanes of the form $\{x = \langle x_i \rangle \in I^\omega: x_i = c\}$ have positive measure. Consider, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, a collection of points $0 = c_{i,0} < c_{i,1} < \dots < c_{i,f(i)} = 1$ such that for each j ,

- (a) $\rho_i(c_{i,j}, c_{i,j+1}) < 1/N$, and
- (b) $\lambda\{x \in I^\omega: x_i = c_{i,j}\} = 0$.

Each of the sets of the form

$$A = A_{j_1, \dots, j_N} = \{x \in I^\omega: c_{i,j_i} \leq x_i \leq c_{i,j_i+1} \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N, 0 \leq j_i \leq f(i) - 1\}$$

is closed, of diameter less than $1/N$, and intersects any other set $\hat{A} = A_{j_1, \dots, j_N}$ in a set of measure 0. It is straightforward to verify that

$$X = \bigcup \{\overline{X \cap A^0}: A = A_{j_1, \dots, j_N} \text{ and } \lambda(X \cap A^0) > 0\}$$

so that these sets form a λ -null partition of X , of mesh less than $1/N$. A partition such as this clearly admits refinement by any similarly constructed partition, and an inductive argument provides the desired sequence $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots$.

Partitions of K . Any Cantor set is homeomorphic to the Cantor Discontinuum, or “middle thirds set” K ; and any Borel measure on that Cantor set induces on K a Borel measure with respect to which the homeomorphism is measure-preserving. We may therefore assume without loss of generality that the Cantor set K of Theorem 2 is the “middle thirds” set. We note also that the condition $\text{Supp}(\mu) = K$ causes no loss of generality. For μ is nonatomic, so $\text{Supp}(\mu)$ is perfect, and itself a Cantor set; and any closed subset of K is a retract of K ([3], p. 165).

We now develop the apparatus for partitioning K inductively.

Notation. Let K be the “middle thirds” set. We will denote the set

$$\{x \in K: a \leq x \leq b\} \quad \text{by} \quad [a, b]_K.$$

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Let $A = [a, b]_K$ be an open-closed subset of K , $\mu(A) = \alpha > 0$. Suppose that $\beta > 0$ and $\{\beta_i: i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ are positive numbers such that $\beta = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i$, and $\gamma = \max(\alpha/\beta, \beta/\alpha)$. Then for any $\gamma^* > \gamma$, there is a partition of A into m disjoint open-closed sets $A_i = [a_i, b_i]_K$ such that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\alpha_i/\beta_i, \beta_i/\alpha_i) < \gamma^*$, where $\alpha_i = \mu(A_i)$, for each i .*

Proof. Setting

$$\hat{\alpha}_i = \beta_i + \frac{\beta_i}{\beta}(\alpha - \beta) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

we have that $\sum \hat{\alpha}_i = \alpha$ and $\max(\hat{\alpha}_i/\beta_i, \beta_i/\hat{\alpha}_i) = \max(\alpha/\beta, \beta/\alpha) = \gamma$ for each i . Now for each i there is a $\delta_i > 0$ such that

$$(2.8) \quad |x - \hat{\alpha}_i| < \delta_i \Rightarrow \max\left(\frac{x}{\beta_i}, \frac{\beta_i}{x}\right) < \gamma^*.$$

Set

$$(2.9) \quad \delta = \frac{1}{m-1} \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\delta_i),$$

and $a_1 = a$. Note that $\{x: [a_1, x]_K \text{ is open-closed}\}$ is dense in A , and recall that μ is nonatomic. Thus there is a point $b_1 \in A$, $b_1 < b$, such that $A_1 = [a_1, b_1]_K$ is open-closed, and $|\mu(A_1) - \hat{\alpha}_1| < \delta$. Now $A \setminus A_1$ is open-closed, and is itself of the form $[a_2, b]_K$ ($a_2 = \inf\{x \in K: x > b_1\}$). We may proceed inductively to define open-closed sets $A_i = [a_i, b_i]_K$ for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ such that

$$i \neq j \Rightarrow A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset,$$

$$[a, b_{m-1}]_K = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} A_i,$$

and

$$(2.10) \quad |\mu(A_i) - \hat{\alpha}_i| < \delta \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m-1.$$

Thus $A_m = A \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} A_i$ is of the form $[a_m, b]_K$ and is open-closed. Set

$\alpha_i = \mu(A_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. By (2.10), $|\alpha_i - \hat{\alpha}_i| < \delta$ for each $i < m$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_m - \hat{\alpha}_m| &= |\mu(A_m) - \hat{\alpha}_m| = \left| \left[\alpha - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \alpha_i \right] - \left[\alpha - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \hat{\alpha}_i \right] \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} |\alpha_i - \hat{\alpha}_i| < (m-1)\delta < \delta_m. \end{aligned}$$

The proposition follows from (2.9) and (2.8).

Proof of Theorem 2.

Step I. Construction of f_ϵ .

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Apply Proposition 2.2 to obtain a sequence $\{\mathcal{P}_n : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ of λ -null partitions of X , where each \mathcal{P}_n refines its predecessor, and $\Delta(\mathcal{P}_n) < 2^{-n}$. Let $1 < \gamma_0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \dots$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $\sup_n \gamma_n < \min(1 + \epsilon, 2)$.

We begin with the inductive construction of a sequence of partitions $\{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n\}$ of K and a correspondence between members of \mathcal{P}_n and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$. For $n = 0$: Let $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0 = \{K\}$. For $n = k$: suppose we have that

$\mathcal{P}_k = \{P_{k,1}, \dots, P_{k,m}\}$, and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_k = \{\hat{P}_{k,1}, \dots, \hat{P}_{k,m}\}$ has been constructed as a partition of K , where

(2.11.a) Each $\hat{P}_{k,j}$ is an open-closed subset of K , of the form $[a, b]_K$.

$$(2.11.b) \quad \max_j \left(\frac{\mu(\hat{P}_{k,j})}{\lambda(P_{k,j})}, \frac{\lambda(P_{k,j})}{\mu(\hat{P}_{k,j})} \right) < \gamma_k.$$

We proceed as follows for $n = k + 1$: Let $P \in \mathcal{P}_k$, and $\lambda(P) = \beta$. We have that \mathcal{P}_{k+1} partitions P into (one or more) closed sets, say P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m , each of positive measure. Say $\lambda(P_i) = \beta_i$; then $\sum \beta_i = \beta$. Corresponding to P we have $\hat{P} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_k$, where \hat{P} is an open-closed subset of K , of the form $[a, b]_K$. If $\mu(\hat{P}) = \alpha$, we have $\max(\alpha/\beta, \beta/\alpha) < \gamma_k$. Thus we may apply Proposition 2.2 and obtain a partition of \hat{P} into m disjoint open-closed sets of the form $\hat{P}_i = [a_i, b_i]_K$ such that if $\alpha_i = \mu(\hat{P}_i)$, $\max_i(\alpha_i/\beta_i, \beta_i/\alpha_i) < \gamma_{k+1}$.

Obtaining in this manner a partitioning of each $\hat{P} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_k$ provides the desired partition of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_k$, and the correspondence from the elements of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{k+1}$ to those of \mathcal{P}_{k+1} . This completes the inductive construction.

Let n be fixed. Each $\hat{P} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ is a Cantor set, and the corresponding $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ a nonempty compact metric space. Where \hat{P} and P correspond, let $f_n|_P : \hat{P} \rightarrow P$ be a continuous surjection. Since distinct

\hat{P} in $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ are disjoint, the map f_n defined piecewise in this fashion is a continuous surjection from K to X .

Now let $x \in K$. Say $x \in \hat{P}_n \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$, and $x \in \hat{P}_{n+1} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n+1}$. The P_{n+1} corresponding to \hat{P}_{n+1} is contained in the P_n corresponding to \hat{P}_n , so that $|f_n(x) - f_{n+1}(x)| \leq D(P_n) \leq \Delta(\mathcal{P}_n) < 2^{-n}$. Thus the sequence f_n converges uniformly to a limit function $f = f_e$, which is easily seen to be a continuous surjection from K to X . We note for future use:

$$(2.12) \quad \text{If } \hat{P} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n \text{ and } f(\hat{P}) = P \in \mathcal{P}_n, \quad \max(\lambda(P)/\mu(\hat{P}), \mu(\hat{P})/\lambda(P)) \leq \gamma_n < \min(1 + \epsilon, 2).$$

Step II. f is ϵ -almost measure-preserving.

We first prove:

$$(2.13) \quad \text{Let } n \text{ be fixed. If } P, Q \in \mathcal{P}_n \text{ and } P \neq Q, \mu(f^{-1}(P \cap Q)) = 0. \text{ Let } \eta > 0.$$

We have by the construction that $\lambda(P \cap Q) = 0$. Since λ is a finite measure on the compact measure space X , λ is regular: and there is an open set $V \subset X$ such that $(P \cap Q) \subset V$ and $\lambda(V) < \eta/2$. Since X is compact, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for each $x \in X$, $\rho(x, P \cap Q) < \delta \Rightarrow x \in V$. Choose $N > n$ such that $\Delta(\mathcal{P}_N) < \delta$. Let $\hat{R} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_N$, and $f(\hat{R}) = R \in \mathcal{P}_N$. Suppose $\exists \hat{x} \in \hat{R}$, $f(\hat{x}) \in P \cap Q$. For any $\hat{y} \in \hat{R}$, $\rho(f(\hat{x}), f(\hat{y})) \leq D(R) \leq \Delta(\mathcal{P}_N) < \delta$, so that $R = f(\hat{R}) \subset V$. Thus $f^{-1}(P \cap Q) \subset \bigcup \{R \in \mathcal{P}_N : f(R) \subset V\}$. As a consequence of (2.12) and Proposition 2.4 (c), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(f^{-1}(P \cap Q)) &\leq \Sigma\{\mu(\hat{R}) : \hat{R} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_N \text{ and } f(\hat{R}) \subset V\} \\ &< 2 \Sigma\{\lambda(R) : R \in \mathcal{P}_N \text{ and } R \subset V\} < 2\lambda(V) < \eta. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (2.13).

Now let n be fixed, $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_m \in \mathcal{P}_n$, and, for each i , \hat{R}_i the element of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ such that $f(\hat{R}_i) = R_i$. Note that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^m \hat{R}_i \subset f^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^m R_i\right) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^m \hat{R}_i \cup \left\{ \bigcup \left\{ f^{-1}(P \cap Q) : P, Q \in \mathcal{P}_n \right\} \right\}.$$

Recalling (2.13), (2.12), and the fact that

$$i \neq j \Rightarrow \mu(\hat{R}_i \cap \hat{R}_j) = 0 = \lambda(R_i \cap R_j),$$

we have

$$(2.14) \quad (1 + \epsilon)^{-1} \mu\left(f^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^m R_i\right)\right) < \lambda\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^m R_i\right) < (1 + \epsilon) \mu\left(f^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^m R_i\right)\right).$$

If V is any open subset of X , one sees easily that

$$V = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{P \in \mathcal{P}_k : P \subset V\};$$

and thus

$$\lambda(V) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^n \{P \in \mathcal{P}_k : P \subset V\}\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda\left(\bigcup \{P \in \mathcal{P}_n : P \subset V\}\right).$$

Similarly,

$$\mu(f^{-1}(V)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(f^{-1}(\bigcup \{P \in \mathcal{P}_n : P \subset V\})).$$

A simple limit argument employing the preceding and (2.14) yields

$$(2.15) \quad (1 + \epsilon)^{-1} \mu(f^{-1}(V)) \leq \lambda(V) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \mu(f^{-1}(V)),$$

for each open V in X .

Now let A be any measurable subset of X , and $\eta > 0$. λ is a finite measure on the compact metric space X , and is therefore regular. There are open sets V and \hat{V} in X such that $A \subset V$, $\lambda(V \setminus A) < \eta/(1 + \epsilon)^2$, $(V \setminus A) \subset \hat{V}$, and $\lambda(\hat{V}) < \eta/(1 + \epsilon)^2$. Thus

$$(1 + \epsilon)^{-1} \mu(f^{-1}(A)) \leq (1 + \epsilon)^{-1} \mu(f^{-1}(V)) \leq \lambda(V) = \lambda(A) + \lambda(V \setminus A) < \lambda(A) + \eta;$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(A) &\leq \lambda(V) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \mu(f^{-1}(V)) \leq (1 + \epsilon) [\mu(f^{-1}(A)) + \mu(f^{-1}(\hat{V}))] \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon) \mu(f^{-1}(A)) + (1 + \epsilon)^2 \lambda(\hat{V}) < (1 + \epsilon) \mu(f^{-1}(A)) + \eta. \end{aligned}$$

As η is arbitrary,

$$(1 + \epsilon)^{-1} \mu(f^{-1}(A)) \leq \lambda(A) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \mu(f^{-1}(A)),$$

and our proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

COROLLARY. *Let μ be a nonatomic Borel measure on a Cantor set K with $\text{supp}(\mu) = K$ and $\mu(K) < \infty$; λ a Borel measure on the compact metric space X , with $\text{supp}(\lambda) = X$, and $\lambda(X) < \infty$. There is a continuous measure-positive surjection $f: K \rightarrow X$.*

Proof. Normalize μ and λ to total mass 1, and apply Theorem 2. Any almost measure-preserving map is measure-positive.

3. Continuous measure-preserving maps onto Peano spaces. For the balance of this paper μ will denote Lebesgue measure on $I = [0, 1]$. X will be a Peano space with fixed metric ρ , and λ a Borel measure on X , with $\text{supp}(\lambda) = X$ and $\lambda(X) = 1$. Our main objective is to prove

THEOREM 1. *There is a continuous measure-preserving surjection from $\langle I, \mu \rangle$ to $\langle X, \lambda \rangle$.*

This will follow easily from

THEOREM 1'. *There is a continuous measure-positive surjection from $\langle I, \mu \rangle$ to $\langle X, \lambda \rangle$.*

In order to prove this, we need two rather technical propositions. They will allow us to construct a uniformly convergent sequence of continuous surjections from I to X , each of which is measure-positive on an increasingly large part of I , and whose limit is measure-positive. Note that if $X = \{x\}$, Theorem 1 is trivial; we will assume that X contains more than one point.

PROPOSITION 3.1. (a) *Let $\epsilon > 0$. There is a $\gamma = \gamma(\epsilon) > 0$ such that if $x, y \in X$ and $\rho(x, y) < \gamma$, there is a Peano subspace $S = S(x, y) \subset X$ such that $x, y \in S$, $\lambda(S) > 0$, and $D(S) < \epsilon$.*

(b) *If $[r, s] \subset I$, there is a continuous surjection $f: [r, s] \rightarrow S(x, y)$ with $f(r) = x$ and $f(s) = y$.*

Proof. X is uniformly locally arcwise connected ([2], p. 130), so

(3.1) *There is a $\delta = \delta(\epsilon/3)$ such that for each pair $a, b \in X$ with $\rho(a, b) < \delta$, there is an arc $A = A(a, b)$ from a to b with $D(A(a, b)) < \epsilon/3$.*

Let $0 < \gamma < \delta$ and suppose we have $x, y \in X$ with $\rho(x, y) < \gamma$. Let $f: I \rightarrow X$ be any continuous surjection such that $f(0) \neq y \neq f(1)$. Set

$$U = \{z \in X: \rho(z, y) < \min(\gamma, \epsilon/3, \rho(f(0), y), \rho(f(1), y))\}.$$

U is open in X , so $\lambda(U) > 0$; $f^{-1}(U) \subset (0, 1)$ is a disjoint union of open intervals, at least one of which, say (p, q) , must have $\lambda(f(p, q)) > 0$. Note $D(f([p, q])) \leq \epsilon/3$ and $\rho(y, f(p)) \leq \gamma < \delta$. By (3.1), there are

arcs $A(x, y)$ and $A(y, f(p))$ from x to y to $f(p)$ respectively, each of diameter less than $\epsilon/3$. The subspace

$$S = S(x, y) = A(x, y) \cup A(y, f(p)) \cup f([p, q])$$

clearly exhibits the desired properties.

Note that Proposition 3.1 provides us with a measure-theoretic replacement for uniform local arcwise connectedness: if any two points of X are "close", we can connect them with a Peano subspace of X , of small diameter and positive measure (instead of an arc of small diameter).

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let S be a Peano subspace of X with $\lambda(S) > 0$, and $x, y \in X$. Let $[r, s] \subset I$ and $\gamma > 0$. There is a Cantor set $K \subset [r, s]$ and a continuous function $f: K \rightarrow S$ which satisfy the following properties:*

$$(3.2) \quad r, s \in K; f(r) = x \quad \text{and} \quad f(s) = y.$$

$$(3.3) \quad \mu(K) > 2/3(r - s) = 2/3(\mu([r, s])).$$

$$(3.4) \quad f: K \rightarrow S \text{ is a measure-positive surjection.}$$

$$(3.5) \quad \text{If } (r', s') \text{ is a component of } [r, s] \setminus K, \rho(f(r), f(s)) < \gamma.$$

Proof. A familiar construction provides a "fat Cantor set" $\hat{K} \subset (r, s)$ such that $\mu(\hat{K}) > 2/3(r - s)$ and $\text{supp}(\mu|_{\hat{K}}) = \hat{K}$. Let $\hat{S} = \text{supp}(\lambda|_S)$. The pairs $\langle \hat{K}, \mu|_{\hat{K}} \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{S}, \lambda|_{\hat{S}} \rangle$ satisfy the conditions of the corollary to Theorem 2, so there is a continuous measure-positive surjection $\hat{f}: \hat{K} \rightarrow \hat{S}$. Note that $\lambda(S \setminus \hat{S}) = 0$. If we have a Cantor set K and function f such that $K \supset \hat{K}$, $\mu(K \setminus \hat{K}) = 0$, and $f: K \rightarrow S$ is an extension of $\hat{f}: \hat{K} \rightarrow \hat{S}$, then f is measure-positive (proof trivial). Since $\hat{K} \subset (r, s)$, we may choose disjoint Cantor sets $\hat{K}_1, \hat{K}_2, \hat{K}_3$ such that $r \in \hat{K}_1$, $s \in \hat{K}_2$, $\hat{K}_i \cap \hat{K} = \emptyset$ and $\mu(\hat{K}_i) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Let $f: \hat{K}_3 \rightarrow S$ be any continuous surjection. Set

$$K^* = \hat{K} \cup \hat{K}_1 \cup \hat{K}_2 \cup \hat{K}_3,$$

and define $f^*: K^* \rightarrow S$ by

$$f^*(k) = \begin{cases} \hat{f}(k), & k \in \hat{K} \\ x, & k \in \hat{K}_1 \\ y, & k \in \hat{K}_2 \\ f(k), & k \in \hat{K}_3. \end{cases}$$

The pair K^*, f^* now satisfies (3.2) through (3.4). Since K^* is compact, f^* is uniformly continuous. There is a $\delta > 0$ such that $|k_1 - k_2| < \delta$ implies $\rho(f^*(k_1), f^*(k_2)) < \gamma$; and thus there are at most finitely many components of $[r, s] \setminus K^*$, say $\{(r_i, s_i): i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$, such that $\rho(f^*(r_i), f^*(s_i)) > \gamma$.

Now S is a compact connected metric space, so for each i we can find a chain of points $x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \dots, x_{i,m(i)}$ from $x_{i,0} = f^*(r_i)$ to $x_{i,m(i)+1} = f^*(s_i)$ such that

$$(3.6) \quad \max \{\rho(x_{i,j}, x_{i,j+1}): j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m(i)\} < \gamma.$$

For each i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $K_{i,1}, K_{i,2}, \dots, K_{i,m(i)}$ be a collection of Cantor subsets of (r_i, s_i) , each of μ -measure zero, such that $\sup(k \in K_{i,j}) < \inf(k \in K_{i,j+1})$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m(i) - 1$. (That is, each $K_{i,j}$ "sits to the left" of $K_{i,j+1}$.) Now set

$$K = \cup \{K_{i,j}: i = 1, 2, \dots, n; j(i) = 1, 2, \dots, m(i)\}$$

and define $f: K \rightarrow S$ by

$$f(k) = \begin{cases} f^*(k), & k \in K^* \\ x_{i,j}, & k \in K_{i,j}. \end{cases}$$

We note that f and K inherit (2.2) and (2.3) from f^* and K^* , and (3.4) as well, since $\mu(K \setminus K^*) = 0$. To examine (3.5), suppose that (r', s') is a component of $[r, s] \setminus K$. If (r', s') is also a component of $[r, s] \setminus K^*$, we have that $\rho(f(r'), f(s')) = \rho(f^*(r'), f^*(s')) < \gamma$. If (r', s') is not a component of $[r, s] \setminus K^*$, there are an i and j such that $f(r') = x_{i,j}$ and $f(s')$ is either $x_{i,j}$ or $x_{i,j+1}$. By (3.6), $\rho(f(r'), f(s')) < \gamma$, and (3.5) holds. This proves Proposition 3.2, and provides us with the inductive mechanism for proving Theorem 1'.

THEOREM 1'. *There is a continuous measure-positive surjection $F: \langle I, \mu \rangle \rightarrow \langle X, \lambda \rangle$.*

Proof. We wish to construct a uniformly convergent sequence of continuous surjections $F_n: I \rightarrow X$ such that $F = \lim F_n$ is measure-positive. Begin by applying Proposition 3.1 to obtain $\gamma_n = \gamma(1/2^n)$ for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$. For two points $x, y \in X$ with $\rho(x, y) < \gamma_n$, we can "connect" x to y with a Peano subspace of X , of positive measure and diameter less than 2^{-n} .

Step 1. Construction of F_1 : Apply Proposition 3.2 to obtain a Cantor set $K_1 \subset I$ and a continuous surjection $f_1: K_1 \rightarrow X$ such that

$$(3.7.a) \quad \mu(K_1) > 1/2; \{0, 1\} \subset K_1.$$

$$(3.7.b) \quad f_1: K_1 \rightarrow X \text{ is measure-positive.}$$

$$(3.7.c) \quad \text{If } (r, s) \text{ is a component of } I \setminus K_1, \rho(f_1(r), f_1(s)) < \gamma_1.$$

Recall the note following Proposition 3.2. In view of (3.7.c), we may mimic the proof of the Hahn-Maxurkiewitz theorem and extend $f_1: K_1 \rightarrow X$ to a continuous surjection $F_1: I \rightarrow X$ such that

$$(3.7.d) \quad \text{If } (r, s) \text{ is a component of } I \setminus K_1, F_1([r, s]) \text{ is a Peano subspace of positive measure and diameter less than } 1/2.$$

Step 2. Inductive Construction. Suppose we have Cantor sets $K_1 \subset K_2 \subset \cdots \subset K_m$ and continuous surjections $F_n: I \rightarrow X$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m$) such that

$$(3.8.a) \quad \text{For each } n, \mu(K_n) > 1 - 2^{-n}.$$

$$(3.8.b) \quad \text{If } n_1 > n_2, F_{n_1}|_{K_{n_2}} = F_{n_2}|_{K_{n_2}}.$$

$$(3.8.c) \quad F_n|_{K_n} = f_n: K_n \rightarrow X \text{ is measure-positive.}$$

$$(3.8.d) \quad \text{If } (r, s) \text{ is a component of } I \setminus K_n, F_n([r, s]) \text{ is a Peano subspace of } X, \text{ of positive measure and diameter less than } \gamma_n = \gamma(2^{-n}) \leq 2^{-n}.$$

$$(3.8.e) \quad \sup_{k \in I} |F_n(k) - F_{n-1}(k)| \leq 2^{-n+2}.$$

We now construct K_{m+1} and $F_{m+1}: I \rightarrow X$. First note that F_m is uniformly continuous, so that there is an $\eta > 0$ such that

$$|r - s| < \eta \Rightarrow \rho(F_m(r), F_m(s)) < \gamma_{m+1},$$

and there are at most finitely many (if indeed any) components of $I \setminus K_m$, say $\{(r_i, s_i): i = 1, 2, \dots, t\}$ such that $\rho(F_m(r_i), F_m(s_i)) \geq \gamma_{m+1}$. Add to this collection if need be finitely many other components of $I \setminus K_m$, say $\{(r_i, s_i): i = t + 1, t + 2, \dots, T\}$ so that

$$(3.9) \quad \mu\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^T (r_i, s_i)\right) > \frac{3}{4} \mu(I \setminus K_m).$$

For each $i = 1, 2, \dots, T$, consider the Peano subspace $F_m([r_i, s_i])$. From (3.8.d) we have that $\lambda(F_m([r_i, s_i])) > 0$, and we may thus apply Proposition 3.2 to obtain a Cantor subset $K_{m+1,i} \subset [r_i, s_i]$ and a continuous map $f_{m+1,i}: K_{m+1,i} \rightarrow F_m([r_i, s_i])$ such that

$$(3.10) \quad r_i, s_i \in K_{m+1,i}; f_{m+1,i}(r_i) = F_m(r_i) \quad \text{and} \quad f_{m+1,i}(s_i) = F_m(s_i).$$

$$(3.11) \quad \mu(K_{m+1,i}) > \frac{2}{3}(r_i - s_i).$$

$$(3.12) \quad f_{m+1,i}: K_{m+1,i} \rightarrow F_m([r_i, s_i]) \text{ is a measure-positive surjection.}$$

$$(3.13) \quad \text{If } (r, s) \text{ is a component of } [r_i, s_i] \setminus K_{m+1,i} \text{ then}$$

$$\rho(f_{m+1,i}(r), f_{m+1,i}(s)) < \gamma_{m+1} \leq 2^{-(m+1)}.$$

In view of these, we may extend $f_{m+1,i}: K_{m+1,i} \rightarrow F_m([r_i, s_i])$ to a continuous map $F_{m+1,i}: [r_i, s_i] \rightarrow X$ such that

$$(3.14) \quad \text{For each component } (r, s) \text{ of } [r_i, s_i] \setminus K_{m+1,i}, F_{m+1,i}([r, s]) \text{ is of diameter less than } 2^{-(m+1)} \text{ and is of positive measure. Now set}$$

$$(3.15) \quad K_{m+1} = K_1 \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^T K_{m+1,i} \right), \text{ and define } F_{m+1}: I \rightarrow X \text{ by}$$

$$(3.16) \quad F_{m+1}(k) = \begin{cases} F_m(k), & k \in I \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^T [r_i, s_i] \\ F_{m+1,i}(k), & k \in [r_i, s_i]. \end{cases}$$

As an easy consequence of (3.10), $F_{m+1}: I \rightarrow X$ is continuous; as an extension of $F_1|_{K_1}$, F_{m+1} is onto. We now consider (3.8.a) through (3.8.e) for $n = m + 1$. We have from (3.15), (3.12), and (3.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(K_{m+1}) &> \mu(K_m) + \frac{2}{3} \left[\left(\frac{3}{4} \right) (1 - \mu(K_m)) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \mu(K_m) > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (1 - 2^{-m}) = 1 - 2^{-(m+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

proving (3.8.a). (3.8.b) holds trivially, for $F_{m+1}|_{K_m} = F_m|_{K_m}$ by definition. Hence $F_{m+1}|_{K_m}$ is measure-positive, and each $F_{m+1}|_{K_{m+1,i}} = f_{m+1,i}$ is measure-positive by construction; (3.8.c) follows.

Now suppose (r, s) is a component of $I \setminus K_{m+1}$. Recall that the collection $\{(r, s_i): i = 1, 2, \dots, T\}$ includes all those components (r, s) of $I \setminus K_m$ such that $D(F_m([r, s])) \geq \gamma_{m+1}$. If $(r, s) \not\subset \bigcup_{i=1}^T (r_i, s_i)$, we have that

$F_{m+1}([r, s]) = F_m([r, s])$ and thus that $D(F_{m+1}([r, s])) < \gamma_{m+1}$. If, on the other hand, $(r, s) \subset (r_i, s_i)$ for some i , we may employ (3.14). This proves (3.8.d).

Prior to verifying (3.8.e) for $n = m + 1$, we show that

$$(3.17) \quad D(f_{m+1}([r_i, s_i])) \leq 2^{-m+1} \quad \text{for each } i = 1, 2, \dots, T.$$

Now if $x \in [r_i, s_i]$, either $x \in K_{m+1,i}$ or $x \in (r, s)$, a component of $[r_i, s_i] \setminus K_{m+1,i}$; as a consequence of (3.13), $\rho(F_{m+1}(x), F_{m+1}(K_{m+1,i})) < 2^{-m-1}$. By (3.12) and (3.8.d),

$$D(F_{m+1}(K_{m+1,i})) = D(f_{m+1,i}(K_{m+1,i})) = D(F_m([r_i, s_i])) \leq 2^{-m}.$$

(3.17) follows from the triangle inequality.

Now let $x \in I$, and examine $\rho(F_{m+1}(x), F_m(x))$. If $x \in I \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^T (r_i, s_i)$, $F_{m+1}(x) = F_m(x)$; if $x \in (r_i, s_i)$ for some i , $F_m(x) \in F_m([r_i, s_i]) \subset F_{m+1}([r_i, s_i])$, and by (3.17), $\rho(F_m(x), F_{m+1}(x)) \leq 2^{-m+1}$. Thus (3.8.e) holds for $n = m + 1$, and our inductive construction is complete.

From (3.8.e) we have that the inductively defined sequence $\{F_n: I \rightarrow X\}$ of continuous surjections converges uniformly to a continuous surjection $F: I \rightarrow X$. F is also measure-positive.

(a) Let $A \subset X$ with $\lambda(A) > 0$. Since $F|_{K_1} = F_1|_{K_1}$ is measure-positive, we have $\mu(F^{-1}(A)) \geq \mu(K_1 \cap F^{-1}(A)) > 0$.

(b) From (3.8.a), $\mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} K_i) = 1$.

If $B \subset I$ and $\mu(B) > 0$, then $\exists K_i$, such that $\mu(B \cap K_i) > 0$. Since $F|_{K_i}$ is measure-positive, $F(B \cap K_i)$ contains a set of positive λ -measure. This completes the proof of Theorem 1'. We now obtain

THEOREM 1. *There is a continuous measure-preserving surjection $F: I \rightarrow X$.*

Proof. Use Theorem 1' to obtain a continuous measure-positive surjection $F: I \rightarrow X$, and consider the measure M induced on X by F :

$$(3.18) \quad M(B) = \mu(F^{-1}(B)) \text{ for each Borel set } B \subseteq X.$$

We note that

$$(3.19) \quad \int_B (g(dM)) = \int_{F^{-1}(B)} ((g \cdot f)d\mu), \text{ for every Borel set } B \text{ in } X$$

and every extended real-valued Borel measurable function g in X (in the sense that if either integral exists, then the other does and the two are equal).

An easy consequence of (3.17) and the fact that F is measure-positive, we have that the measures M and λ are mutually absolutely continuous. As $\lambda \ll M$, we may apply the Radon-Nikodym theorem to obtain a non-negative Borel measurable function $u: X \rightarrow R$ such that

$$(3.20) \quad \lambda(B) = \int_B (u(dM)) \text{ for each Borel set } B \text{ in } X.$$

As $M \ll \lambda$, we have that u is positive everywhere (M), and, since the null sets of λ and M coincide, u is positive a.e. (λ). We may therefore assume

$$(3.21) \quad u(x) > 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

Define the measure L on I by setting

$$(3.22) \quad L(E) = \int_E ((u \cdot F)d\mu), \text{ for each Borel set } E \subset I.$$

As a consequence of (3.19) and (3.20), we have

$$(3.23) \quad L(F^{-1}(B)) = \int_{F^{-1}(B)} (u \cdot F)d\mu = \int_B (u(dM)) = \lambda(B)$$

for each Borel set B in X .

Thus the map $F: \langle I, L \rangle \rightarrow \langle X, \lambda \rangle$ is a continuous measure-preserving surjection.

It is a simple consequence of (3.21) and (3.22) that the measures L and μ are mutually absolutely continuous. Since $F^{-1}(X) = I$, we have from (3.23) that $L(I) = \lambda(X) = 1$. Thus the distribution function of L ,

$$D(x) = L([0, x]),$$

is a strictly monotonic continuous surjection from I to I . It is straightforward to verify that the homeomorphism $D: \langle I, L \rangle \rightarrow \langle I, \mu \rangle$ is measure-preserving, so that the map $D^{-1}: \langle I, \mu \rangle \rightarrow \langle I, L \rangle$ is a measure-preserving homeomorphism.

Now set

$$f = FD^{-1}: \langle I, \mu \rangle \rightarrow \langle X, \lambda \rangle.$$

Being the composition of two measure-preserving surjections, f is itself measure-preserving and onto. This completes the proof.

REFERENCES

1. R. M. Blumenthal and H. H. Corson, *On Continuous Collections of Measures*, Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Vol. II, pp. 33–40.
2. John G. Hocking and Gail S. Young, *Topology*, (Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass. 1961).
3. John L. Kelley, *General Topology*, (Van Nostrand, Princeton, New Jersey, 1955).
4. Alan H. Schoenfeld, *Continuous surjections from Cantor sets to compact metric spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 46, No. 1, October 1974.
5. George F. Simmons, *Introduction to Topology and Modern Analysis*, (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1963).

Received January 22, 1974.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)

University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

J. DUGUNDJI

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

R. A. BEAUMONT

University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

D. GILBARG AND J. MILGRAM

Stanford University
Stanford, California 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
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
OSAKA UNIVERSITY

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

* * *

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

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 contents 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. 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. Items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in duplicate, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. 39. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

100 reprints 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: \$ 72.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$ 36.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION
Printed at Jerusalem Academic Press, POB 2390, Jerusalem, Israel.

Copyright © 1975 Pacific Journal of Mathematics
All Rights Reserved

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 58, No. 2

April, 1975

Zvi Artstein and John Allen Burns, <i>Integration of compact set-valued functions</i>	297
Mark Benard, <i>Characters and Schur indices of the unitary reflection group [321]³</i>	309
Simeon M. Berman, <i>A new characterization of characteristic functions of absolutely continuous distributions</i>	323
Monte Boisen and Philip B. Sheldon, <i>Pre-Prüfer rings</i>	331
Hans-Heinrich Brungs, <i>Three questions on duo rings</i>	345
Iracema M. Bund, <i>Birnbaum-Orlicz spaces of functions on groups</i>	351
John D. Elwin and Donald R. Short, <i>Branched immersions between 2-manifolds of higher topological type</i>	361
Eric Friedlander, <i>Extension functions for rank 2, torsion free abelian groups</i>	371
Jon Froemke and Robert Willis Quackenbush, <i>The spectrum of an equational class of groupoids</i>	381
Barry J. Gardner, <i>Radicals of supplementary semilattice sums of associative rings</i>	387
Shmuel Glasner, <i>Relatively invariant measures</i>	393
George Rudolph Gordh, Jr. and Sibe Mardesic, <i>Characterizing local connectedness in inverse limits</i>	411
Siegfried Graf, <i>On the existence of strong liftings in second countable topological spaces</i>	419
Stanley P. Gudder and D. Strawther, <i>Orthogonally additive and orthogonally increasing functions on vector spaces</i>	427
Darald Joe Hartfiel and Carlton James Maxson, <i>A characterization of the maximal monoids and maximal groups in β_X</i>	437
Robert E. Hartwig and S. Brent Morris, <i>The universal flip matrix and the generalized faro-shuffle</i>	445
William Emery Haver, <i>Mappings between ANRs that are fine homotopy equivalences</i>	457
J. Bockett Hunter, <i>Moment sequences in l^p</i>	463
Barbara Jeffcott and William Thomas Spears, <i>Semimodularity in the completion of a poset</i>	467
Jerry Alan Johnson, <i>A note on Banach spaces of Lipschitz functions</i>	475
David W. Jonah and Bertram Manuel Schreiber, <i>Transitive affine transformations on groups</i>	483
Karsten Juul, <i>Some three-point subset properties connected with Menger's characterization of boundaries of plane convex sets</i>	511
Ronald Brian Kirk, <i>The Haar integral via non-standard analysis</i>	517
Justin Thomas Lloyd and William Smiley, <i>On the group of permutations with countable support</i>	529
Erwin Lutwak, <i>Dual mixed volumes</i>	531
Mark Mahowald, <i>The index of a tangent 2-field</i>	539
Keith Miller, <i>Logarithmic convexity results for holomorphic semigroups</i>	549
Paul Milnes, <i>Extension of continuous functions on topological semigroups</i>	553
Kenneth Clayton Pietz, <i>Cauchy transforms and characteristic functions</i>	563
James Ted Rogers Jr., <i>Whitney continua in the hyperspace $C(X)$</i>	569
Jean-Marie G. Rolin, <i>The inverse of a continuous additive functional</i>	585
William Henry Ruckle, <i>Absolutely divergent series and isomorphism of subspaces</i>	605
Rolf Schneider, <i>A measure of convexity for compact sets</i>	617
Alan Henry Schoenfeld, <i>Continuous measure-preserving maps onto Peano spaces</i>	627
V. Merriline Smith, <i>Strongly superficial elements</i>	643
Roger P. Ware, <i>A note on quadratic forms over Pythagorean fields</i>	651
Roger Allen Wiegand and Sylvia Wiegand, <i>Finitely generated modules over Bezout rings</i>	655
Martin Ziegler, <i>A counterexample in the theory of definable automorphisms</i>	665