

COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

J. VAN MILL

A pseudo-interior of λI

Compositio Mathematica, tome 36, n° 1 (1978), p. 75-82

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1978__36_1_75_0

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1978, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (<http://www.compositio.nl/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

A PSEUDO-INTERIOR OF λI^*

J. van Mill

Abstract

We show that the subspace $\lambda_{\text{comp}}\mathbb{R}$ of $\lambda\mathbb{R}$ is homeomorphic to the pseudo-boundary $B(Q) = \{x \in Q \mid \exists i \in \mathbb{N} : |x_i| = 1\}$ of the Hilbert cube Q . This answers a question of A. Verbeek raised in [9].

1. Introduction

If X is a topological space, then the *superextension* λX of X denotes the space of all maximal linked systems consisting of closed subsets of X (a system is called *linked* if every two of its members meet; a *maximal linked system* or *mls* is a linked system not properly contained in another linked system) topologized by taking $\{\mathcal{M} \in \lambda X \mid G \in \mathcal{M} \mid G = G^- \subset X\}$ as a closed subbase (De Groot [4]). In case (X, d) is a compact metric space, then λX also is compact metric (Verbeek [9]) and the topology of λX also can be described by the metric

$$\bar{d}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) = \sup_{S \in \mathcal{M}} \min_{T \in \mathcal{N}} d_H(S, T);$$

here $d_H(S, T)$ denotes the Hausdorff distance of S and T defined by $\inf\{\epsilon > 0 \mid S \subset U_\epsilon(T) \text{ and } T \subset U_\epsilon(S)\}$, where as usual $U_\epsilon(T)$ denotes the ϵ -neighborhood of T (Verbeek [9]). Reflecting on this metric, one sees that there must be a connection between λX and the hyperspace of all nonvoid closed subsets 2^X of X . The hyperspace 2^X is homeomorphic to the Hilbert cube Q if and only if X is a non-degenerate Peano continuum (Curtis & Schori [3]) and it was con-

* KEY WORDS & PHRASES: superextension, linked system, Hilbert cube, capset, pseudo-interior.

jectured by Verbeek [9] that λX is homeomorphic to Q if and only if X is a nondegenerate metrizable continuum. Earlier, De Groot conjectured that λI is homeomorphic to the Hilbert cube, where I denotes the real number interval $[-1, 1]$. This was shown to be true in [7]. If X is a noncompact metrizable space then λX is not metrizable, although it contains some interesting dense metrizable subspaces such as $\lambda_{\text{comp}} X$ (Verbeek [9]). This subspace of λX consists of all maximal linked systems which have a compact defining set, where an *mls* \mathcal{M} is said to be defined on a set M if

for all $S \in \mathcal{M}$ there exists an $S' \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $S' \subset S \cap M$.

It is obvious that $\lambda_{\text{comp}} X$ equals λX in case X is compact, for then X is a compact defining set for all $\mathcal{M} \in \lambda X$. In case X is noncompact there are many maximal linked systems which do not have a compact defining set, for example in case $X = \mathbb{R}$, the real line, $|\lambda_{\text{comp}} \mathbb{R}| = c$ while $|\lambda \mathbb{R}| = 2^c$. Verbeek [9] showed that $\lambda_{\text{comp}} \mathbb{R}$ is a dense, metrizable, contractible, separable, locally connected, strongly infinite dimensional subspace of $\lambda \mathbb{R}$ which is in no point locally compact; he conjectured that $\lambda_{\text{comp}} \mathbb{R}$ is homeomorphic to l_2 , the separable Hilbert space. We will show that this is *not* true. In fact we will show that $\lambda_{\text{comp}} \mathbb{R}$ is homeomorphic to the pseudo-boundary $B(Q) = \{x \in Q \mid \exists i \in \mathbb{N} : |x_i| = 1\}$ of the Hilbert cube Q . As $\lambda_{\text{comp}} \mathbb{R}$ is homeomorphic to $\lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$, which can be identified with the subspace of λI consisting of all maximal linked systems with a compact defining set in $(-1, 1)$ (Verbeek [9]), we can work in $\lambda I \simeq Q$. We will show that $\lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ is a capset of λI (for definitions see section 3) so that $\lambda I \setminus \lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ is a pseudo-interior for λI and hence is homeomorphic to l_2 (Anderson [2]).

This paper is organised as follows: in the second section we give a retraction property of superextensions, which is needed to prove that $\lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ is a capset of λI . The third section shows that $\lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ is a capset of λI using a lemma of Kroonenberg [6].

2. A retraction property of superextensions

All topological spaces under discussion are assumed to be normal T_1 ; linked system will always mean linked system consisting of closed subsets of the topological space under consideration. If G is a closed subset of the topological space X , then we define G^+ as $G^+ = \{\mathcal{M} \in \lambda X \mid G \in \mathcal{M}\}$; λX is topologized by taking $\{G^+ \mid G \text{ is closed in } X\}$ as a closed subbase. This subbase has the property that each

linked subsystem of it has a nonvoid intersection so that by Alexander's subbase lemma, λX always is compact. Moreover X can be embedded in it by means of the natural embedding $\underline{i}(x) = \{G \subset X \mid G \text{ is closed and } x \in G\}$. We will always identify X and $\underline{i}[X]$. Every linked system is contained in at least one maximal linked system by Zorn's lemma. A linked system \mathcal{M} is called a *pre-mls* if it is contained in precisely one mls; this mls is then denoted by $\underline{\mathcal{M}}$ and we say that \mathcal{M} is a pre-mls for $\underline{\mathcal{M}}$. Obviously \mathcal{M} is a pre-mls iff for all closed sets S_0 and S_1 such that $\mathcal{M} \cup \{S_i\}$ is linked ($i = 0, 1$) we have $S_0 \cap S_1 \neq \emptyset$. If S is a closed subset of the compact metric space (X, d) then for each $\epsilon > 0$ we define

$$B_\epsilon(S) = \{x \in X \mid d(x, S) \leq \epsilon\}.$$

LEMMA 2.1: *Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and let \mathcal{M} be a pre-mls for $\underline{\mathcal{M}} \in \lambda X$. Then for each $\mathcal{N} \in \lambda X$ we have that $\bar{d}(\underline{\mathcal{M}}, \mathcal{N}) = \inf\{a \geq 0 \mid \forall S \in \mathcal{M} : B_a(S) \in \mathcal{N}\}$.*

PROOF: Verbeek [9] proved the following

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{d}(\underline{\mathcal{M}}, \mathcal{N}) &= \min\{a \geq 0 \mid \forall S \in \underline{\mathcal{M}} : B_a(S) \in \mathcal{N} \text{ and } \forall T \in \mathcal{N} : B_a(T) \in \underline{\mathcal{M}}\} \\ &= \min\{a \geq 0 \mid \forall S \in \underline{\mathcal{M}} : B_a(S) \in \mathcal{N}\} \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $\inf\{a \geq 0 \mid \forall S \in \underline{\mathcal{M}} : B_a(S) \in \mathcal{N}\} \leq \bar{d}(\underline{\mathcal{M}}, \mathcal{N})$. Let us assume that $\inf\{a \geq 0 \mid \forall S \in \underline{\mathcal{M}} : B_a(S) \in \mathcal{N}\} < \bar{d}(\underline{\mathcal{M}}, \mathcal{N})$. Then there exists an a_0 such that $0 \leq a_0 < \bar{d}(\underline{\mathcal{M}}, \mathcal{N})$ with the property that for all $S \in \underline{\mathcal{M}}$ we have that $B_{a_0}(S) \in \mathcal{N}$ while there exists a $T \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $B_{a_0}(T) \notin \underline{\mathcal{M}}$. As \mathcal{M} is a pre-mls for $\underline{\mathcal{M}}$ there is an $M \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $B_{a_0}(T) \cap M = \emptyset$. However $B_{a_0}(M) \in \mathcal{N}$, so that $B_{a_0}(M) \cap T \neq \emptyset$. Now, as X is compact, this is a contradiction. \square

The distance between two maps f and $g : X \rightarrow Y$, where (Y, d) is compact metric, is defined by $d(f, g) = \sup_{x \in X} d(f(x), g(x))$. The identity mapping on X is denoted by id_X .

THEOREM 2.2: *Let X be a topological space and let \mathcal{M} be a linked system in X . Then $\cap\{M^+ \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ is a retract of λX . Moreover, if (X, d) is compact metric then the retraction map r can be chosen in such a way that $\bar{d}(r, id_{\lambda X}) \leq \sup_{M \in \mathcal{M}} d_H(X, M)$.*

PROOF: Let \mathcal{M} be a linked system in X . Notice that $\cap\{M^+ \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\} \neq \emptyset$. Choose $\mathcal{N} \in \lambda X$ and define $P\mathcal{N} = \{N \in \mathcal{N} \mid \{N\} \cup \mathcal{M} \text{ is linked}\} \cup \mathcal{M}$.

(a) $P\mathcal{N}$ is a pre-mls.

It is obvious that $P\mathcal{N}$ is linked; so assume to the contrary that it were not a pre-mls. Then there exist closed sets S_i such that $P\mathcal{N} \cup \{S_i\}$ is linked ($i = 0, 1$) but $S_0 \cap S_1 = \emptyset$. The normality of X implies that there exist closed sets G_i ($i = 0, 1$) such that $S_0 \cap G_1 = \emptyset = G_0 \cap S_1$ and $G_0 \cup G_1 = X$. Now, as \mathcal{N} is a maximal linked system one of the sets G_i must belong to \mathcal{N} (if $G_i \notin \mathcal{N}$ ($i = 0, 1$) then there exist $M_i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $M_i \cap G_i = \emptyset$ ($i = 0, 1$) so that $M_0 \cap M_1 = \emptyset$ contradicting the linkedness of \mathcal{N}) so that we may assume that $G_0 \in \mathcal{N}$. Now, $S_0 \subset G_0$ implies that $\mathcal{M} \cup \{G_0\}$ is linked and consequently $G_0 \in P\mathcal{N}$. This is a contradiction since $G_0 \cap S_1 = \emptyset$.

(b) Define $r: \lambda X \rightarrow \lambda X$ by $r(\mathcal{N}) = \underline{P\mathcal{N}}$. Then r is continuous.

Let G be a closed set of X and assume that $r^{-1}(G^+) \neq \emptyset$. We will show that $r^{-1}(G^+)$ is closed in λX . Choose $\mathcal{N} \notin r^{-1}(G^+)$. Then $r(\mathcal{N}) \notin G^+$ and consequently $r(\mathcal{N}) \cup \{G\}$ is not linked; therefore $P\mathcal{N} \cup \{G\}$ is not linked. Choose $N \in P\mathcal{N}$ so that $N \cap G = \emptyset$. Now, if $N \in \mathcal{M}$, then $r^{-1}(G^+)$ is void, which is a contradiction. Therefore $N \in \mathcal{N}$. Choose closed sets S_i ($i = 0, 1$) such that $S_0 \cap N = \emptyset = G \cap S_1$ and $S_0 \cup S_1 = X$. Then $\mathcal{N} \in \lambda X \setminus S_0^+ \subset S_1^+$, while moreover $(\lambda X \setminus S_0^+) \cap r^{-1}(G^+) = \emptyset$. For assume to the contrary that there exists a $\xi \in (\lambda X \setminus S_0^+) \cap r^{-1}(G^+)$. Then $S_1 \in \xi$ and $\mathcal{M} \cup \{N\}$ is linked implies that $\mathcal{M} \cup \{S_1\}$ is linked and consequently $S_1 \in P\xi \subset r(\xi)$. This is a contradiction, since $G \in r(\xi)$ and $S_1 \cap G = \emptyset$.

(c) $r(\lambda X) = \cap \{M^+ \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ and r is a retraction.

Choose $\mathcal{N} \in \lambda X$. Then $\mathcal{M} \subset P\mathcal{N} \subset r(\mathcal{N})$ so that $r(\mathcal{N}) \in \cap \{M^+ \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\}$. Moreover if $\mathcal{N} \in \cap \{M^+ \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ then $P\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}$ and therefore $r(\mathcal{N}) = \mathcal{N}$.

(d) If (X, d) is compact metric, then $\bar{d}(r, id_{\lambda X}) \leq \sup_{M \in \mathcal{M}} d_H(X, M)$.

Let $a = \sup_{M \in \mathcal{M}} d_H(X, M)$ and choose $\mathcal{N} \in \lambda X$. Take $N \in P\mathcal{N}$ and consider $B_a(N)$. If $N \in \mathcal{N}$ then also $B_a(N) \in \mathcal{N}$; if $N \notin \mathcal{N}$ then $N \in \mathcal{M}$ and therefore $B_a(N) = X$ which also is an element of \mathcal{N} . It now follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{d}(\mathcal{N}, r(\mathcal{N})) &= \inf \{a \geq 0 \mid \forall S \in P\mathcal{N} : B_a(S) \in \mathcal{N}\} \\ &\leq \sup_{M \in \mathcal{M}} d_H(X, M). \square \end{aligned} \tag{lemma 2.2}$$

If Y is a closed subset of X , then λY can be embedded in λX by the natural embedding j_{YX} defined by

$$j_{YX}(\mathcal{M}) := \{G \subset X \mid G \text{ is closed and } G \cap Y \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

(Verbeek [9]). It should be noticed that $j_{YX}(\mathcal{M})$ is indeed a *maximal* linked system. We will always identify λY and $j_{YX}(\lambda Y)$.

LEMMA 2.3: Let Y be a closed subset of X . Then $\mathcal{M} \in \lambda X$ is an element of λY if and only if $\{M \cap Y \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ is linked.

PROOF: If $\mathcal{M} \in \lambda Y$, then $\{M \cap Y \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ is a maximal linked system in Y and if $\{M \cap Y \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ is linked, then it is easy to see that it is also maximal linked (in Y) and that $j_{YX}(\{M \cap Y \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\}) = \mathcal{M}$. \square

The importance of Theorem 2.2 now is demonstrated in the proof of the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.4: Let (X, d) be a compact connected metric space and let Y be a nonempty closed proper subset of X . Then for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a continuous map $f_\epsilon : \lambda X \rightarrow \lambda X \setminus \lambda Y$ such that $\bar{d}(f_\epsilon, id_{\lambda X}) < \epsilon$.

PROOF: Choose $\epsilon > 0$ and choose two disjoint finite sets G_0 and G_1 such that $d_H(G_i, X) < \epsilon$ ($i = 0, 1$). Let $p \in X \setminus Y$ and define $F_i = G_i \cup \{p\}$. Let f_ϵ be the retraction of λX onto $F_0^+ \cap F_1^+$ as defined in Theorem 2.2. Then $\bar{d}(f_\epsilon, id_{\lambda X}) \leq \max\{d_H(F_0, X), d_H(F_1, X)\} < \epsilon$ and moreover $f_\epsilon(\lambda X) \cap \lambda Y = \emptyset$. For take $\mathcal{N} \in f_\epsilon(\lambda X)$; then $F_i \in \mathcal{N}$ ($i = 0, 1$) and $(F_0 \cap Y) \cap (F_1 \cap Y) = \emptyset$ and consequently, by Lemma 2.3, $\mathcal{N} \notin \lambda Y$. \blacksquare

3. A Pseudo-interior of λI

By the *Hilbert cube* Q we mean the countable infinite product of intervals $[-1, 1]^\infty$ with the product topology. The topology is generated by the metric

$$d(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} |x_i - y_i|.$$

A closed subset A of Q is called a *Z-set* (Anderson [1]) if for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a continuous map $f : Q \rightarrow Q \setminus A$ such that $d(f, id_Q) < \epsilon$. In addition, a subset M of Q is called a *capset* for Q (Anderson [2]) if M can be written as $M = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} M_i$, where each M_i is a *Z-set* in Q , $M_i \subset M_{i+1}$ ($i \in \mathbb{N}$) and such that the following absorption property holds: for each $\epsilon > 0$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and every *Z-set* $K \subset Q$ there exists a $j > i$ and an embedding $h : K \rightarrow M_j$ such that $h \mid K \cap M_i = id_{K \cap M_i}$ and $d(h, id_K) < \epsilon$. It is known that every capset of Q is equivalent to $B(Q) = \{x \in Q \mid \exists i \in \mathbb{N} : |x_i| = 1\}$, the *pseudo-boundary* of Q , under an *autohomeomorphism* of Q [2]). The complement of a capset is called a *pseudo-interior* of Q and is homeomorphic to l_2 , the separable Hilbert space ([2]). We will show that $\lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ is a capset of λI ,

using the fact that $\lambda I \approx Q$ ([7]). It then follows that $\lambda I \setminus \lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ is a pseudo-interior for λI . In [6] an alternative characterization of capsets is given and we will make use of that characterization.

LEMMA 3.1 ([6]): *Suppose M is a σ -compact subset of Q such that*

(i) *For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a map $h: Q \rightarrow Q \setminus M$ such that $d(h, id_Q) < \epsilon$.*

(ii) *M contains a family of compact subsets $M_1 \subset M_2 \subset \dots$ such that each M_i is a copy of Q and M_i is a Z -set in M_{i+1} ($i \in \mathbb{N}$), and such that for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an integer $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and a map $h: Q \rightarrow M_i$ with $d(h, id_Q) < \epsilon$.*

Then M is a capset for Q .

First we will show that $\lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ is σ -compact.

LEMMA 3.2: $\lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1) = \bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} \lambda[-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n]$.

PROOF: Choose $\mathcal{M} \in \lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ and let $M \subset (-1, 1)$ be a compact defining set for \mathcal{M} . Then choose $n_0 \geq 2$ such that $M \subset [-1 + 1/n_0, 1 - 1/n_0]$; from Lemma 2.3 it now follows that $\mathcal{M} \in \lambda[-1 + 1/n_0, 1 - 1/n_0]$.

Moreover, if $\mathcal{M} \in \lambda[-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n]$ then for all $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we have that also $M \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n]$ belongs to \mathcal{M} , showing that $[-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n]$ is a defining set for \mathcal{M} . For assume to the contrary that for some $M \in \mathcal{M}$ it were true that $M \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] \notin \mathcal{M}$; then there would exist an $M_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $M_0 \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] \cap M = \emptyset$, contradicting the linkedness of $\{M \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] \mid M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ (Lemma 2.3). ■

LEMMA 3.3: *For each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a map $f_\epsilon: \lambda I \rightarrow \lambda I \setminus \lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ such that $\bar{d}(f_\epsilon, id_{\lambda I}) < \epsilon$.*

PROOF: Choose $\epsilon > 0$. For each $n \geq 2$, let $F_{n,0}$ and $F_{n,1}$ be finite subsets of I such that

- (i) $d_H(I, F_{n,i}) < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$ ($i = 0, 1$)
- (ii) $F_{n,0} \cap F_{n,1} \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] = \emptyset$
- (iii) $\{-1, 1\} \subset F_{n,0} \cap F_{n,1}$,

and let f_ϵ be the retraction map, given by Theorem 2.2, of λI onto $\bigcap_{n=2}^{\infty} (F_{n,0}^+ \cap F_{n,1}^+)$. Then $\bar{d}(f_\epsilon, id_{\lambda I}) \leq \sup\{d_H(I, F_{n,i}) \mid n \geq 2, i = 0, 1\} \leq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon < \epsilon$, while moreover the image of λI is disjoint from $\lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$.

For choose $\mathcal{N} \in f_\epsilon(\lambda I)$ and $n \geq 2$; then $F_{n,i} \in \mathcal{N}$ ($i = 0, 1$) and $F_{n,0} \cap F_{n,1} \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] = \emptyset$. Therefore \mathcal{N} is not an element of $\lambda[-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n]$ by Lemma 2.3. Consequently $\mathcal{N} \notin \lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ (Lemma 3.2). \square

THEOREM 3.4: $\lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ is a capset for λI .

PROOF: Choose $\epsilon > 0$ and let $n \geq 2$ such that $1/n < \epsilon$. Define a retraction $r: [-1, 1] \rightarrow [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n]$ by

$$r(x) = \begin{cases} -1 + 1/n & \text{if } -1 \leq x \leq -1 + 1/n \\ x & \text{if } -1 + 1/n \leq x \leq 1 - 1/n \\ 1 - 1/n & \text{if } 1 - 1/n \leq x \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

This map can be extended to a map $\bar{r}: \lambda I \rightarrow \lambda[-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n]$ in the following manner

$$\bar{r}(\mathcal{M}) = \{G \subset [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] \mid G \text{ is closed and } r^{-1}(G) \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

(Verbeek [9]). Let $j: \lambda[-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] \rightarrow \lambda I$ be the natural embedding defined by $j(\mathcal{M}) = \underline{\mathcal{M}} = \{G \subset I \mid G \text{ is closed and } G \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] \in \mathcal{M}\}$. The composition $g = j \circ \bar{r}: \lambda I \rightarrow \lambda I$ can be described by

$$g(\mathcal{M}) = \{G \subset I \mid G \text{ is closed and } r^{-1}(G \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n]) \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

We will show that g moves the points less than ϵ . It is clear that $g(\lambda I) = \lambda[-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n]$. Choose $\mathcal{M} \in \lambda I$ and assume that $\bar{d}(\mathcal{M}, g(\mathcal{M})) > 1/n$. Then there exists an $M \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $B_{1/n}(M) \notin g(\mathcal{M})$ (Lemma 2.1). Consequently there exists a $G \in g(\mathcal{M})$ such that $r^{-1}(G \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n]) \in \mathcal{M}$ and $B_{1/n}(M) \cap G = \emptyset$. Now take a $p \in M \cap r^{-1}(G \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n])$. Then $d(r(p), p) \leq 1/n$ and hence $r(p) \in G \cap [-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] \cap B_{1/n}(M) \subset G \cap B_{1/n}(M)$, which is a contradiction. It now follows that $\bar{d}(g, id_{\lambda I}) \leq 1/n < \epsilon$.

It is obvious that $\lambda[-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] \subset \lambda[-1 + 1/n + 1, 1 - 1/n + 1]$ ($n \geq 2$), so that by Theorem 2.4, Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3 and the fact that $\lambda[-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] \approx \lambda I \approx Q$ the family $\{\lambda[-1 + 1/n, 1 - 1/n] \mid n \geq 2\}$ satisfies all conditions of Lemma 3.1. Therefore $\lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ is a capset for λI . \square

COROLLARY 3.5: $\lambda_{\text{comp}}\mathbb{R}$ is homeomorphic to $B(Q) = \{x \in Q \mid \exists i \in \mathbb{N}: |x_i| = 1\}$. $\lambda I \setminus \lambda_{\text{comp}}(-1, 1)$ is homeomorphic to l_2 .

The space $\lambda\mathbb{R}$ now turns out to be a very strange space. It is a connected, locally connected (super)compact Hausdorff space of cardinality 2^c and weight c , which possesses a dense subset

homeomorphic to $B(Q)$. The closure of \mathbb{R} in $\lambda\mathbb{R}$ is $\beta\mathbb{R}$, its Čech-Stone compactification (Verbeek [9]).

REFERENCES

- [1] R.D. ANDERSON: On topological infinite deficiency. *Mich. Math. J.*, 14 (1967) 365–383.
- [2] R.D. ANDERSON: On sigma-compact subsets of infinite dimensional spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* (to appear).
- [3] D.W. CURTIS and R.M. SCHORI 2^X and $C(X)$ are homeomorphic to the Hilbert cube. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 80 (1974) 927–931.
- [4] J. DE GROOT, *Superextensions and supercompactness*. Proc. I. Intern. Symp. on extension theory of topological structures and its applications (VEB Deutscher Verlag Wiss., Berlin 1967), 89–90.
- [5] J. DE GROOT, G.A. JENSEN and A. VERBEEK, *Superextensions*, Report Mathematical Centre ZW 1968-017, Amsterdam, 1968.
- [6] N. KROONENBERG, Pseudo-interiors of hyperspaces (to appear).
- [7] J. VAN MILL, The superextension of the closed unit interval is homeomorphic to the Hilbert cube, rapport 48, Department of Mathematics, Free University, Amsterdam (1976) (to appear in *Fund. Math.*).
- [8] R. SCHORI and J.E. WEST, 2^I is homeomorphic to the Hilbert cube, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 78 (1972) 402–406.
- [9] A. VERBEEK, Superextensions of topological spaces, *Mathematical Centre tracts*, 41, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam (1972).

(Oblatum 3–VIII–1976)

Department of Mathematics
Free University
De Boelelaan 1081
Amsterdam – The Netherlands