Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae

Taras O. Banakh; Dušan Repovš

Universal meager F_σ-sets in locally compact manifolds

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 54 (2013), No. 2, 179--188

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/143267

Comment.Math.Univ.Carolin. 54,2 (2013) 179–188

Universal meager F_σ-sets in locally compact manifolds

Taras Banakh, Dušan Repovš

Dedicated to the 120th birthday anniversary of Eduard Čech.

Abstract. In each manifold M modeled on a finite or infinite dimensional cube $[0,1]^n$, $n \le \omega$, we construct a meager F_σ-subset $X \subset M$ which is universal meager in the sense that for each meager subset $A \subset M$ there is a homeomorphism $h : M \to M$ such that $h(A) \subset X$. We also prove that any two universal meager F_σ-sets in M are ambiently homeomorphic.

Keywords: universal nowhere dense subset, Sierpiński carpet, Menger cube, Hilbert cube manifold, n-manifold, tame ball, tame decomposition

Classification: 57N20, 57N45, 54F65

In this paper we shall construct and characterize universal meager F_σ-sets in $\mathbb{I}^n$-manifolds.

A meager subset A of a topological space X is called *universal meager* if for each meager subset $B \subset X$ there is a homeomorphism $h : X \to X$ such that $h(B) \subset A$. So, each universal meager subset of X contains homeomorphic copies of all other meager subsets of X.

In fact, the notion of a universal meager set is a special case of a more general notion of a $\mathcal{K}$-universal set for some family $\mathcal{K}$ of subsets of a topological space X. Namely, we define a set $U \in \mathcal{K}$ to be $\mathcal{K}$-*universal* if for each set $K \in \mathcal{K}$ there is a homeomorphism $h : X \to X$ such that $h(K) \subset U$.

$\mathcal{K}$-Universal sets for various classes $\mathcal{K}$ often appear in topology. A classical example of such set is the Sierpiński Carpet M^2_1, known to be a $\mathcal{K}$-universal set for the family $\mathcal{K}$ of all (closed) nowhere dense subsets of the square $\mathbb{I}^2 = [0,1]^2$ (see [14]). The Sierpiński Carpet M^2_1 is one of the Menger cubes M^n_k, which are $\mathcal{K}$-universal for the family $\mathcal{K}$ of all k-dimensional compact subsets of the n-dimensional cube $\mathbb{I}^n$ (see [15], [8, §4.1]). An analogue of the Sierpiński Carpet exists also in the Hilbert cube $\mathbb{I}^\omega$, which contains a $\mathcal{Z}_0$-universal set for the family $\mathcal{Z}_0$ of closed nowhere dense subsets of $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ (see [3]).

Many $\mathcal{K}$-universal spaces arise in infinite-dimensional topology. For example, the pseudo-boundary $B(\mathbb{I}^\omega) = [0,1]^\omega \setminus (0,1)^\omega$ of the Hilbert cube $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ is known to be $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_\omega$-universal for the family $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_\omega$ of σZ_ω-subsets of $\mathbb{I}^\omega$. What is surprising, up

This research was supported by the Slovenian Research Agency grants P1-0292-0101 and J1-4144-0101. The first author has been partially financed by NCN means granted by decision DEC-2011/01/B/ST1/01439.

to an ambient homeomorphism, $B(\mathbb{I}^\omega)$ is a unique $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_\omega$-universal set in $\mathbb{I}^\omega$. In this paper we shall show that such a uniqueness theorem also holds for $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_0$-universal subsets in the Hilbert cube $\mathbb{I}^\omega$.

Let us recall the definition of the families $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_\omega$ and $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_0$. They consist of σZ_ω-sets and σZ_0-sets, respectively.

A closed subset A of a topological space X is called a *Z_n-set* in X for a (finite or infinite) number $n \le \omega$ if the set $\{f \in C(\mathbb{I}^n, X) : f(\mathbb{I}^n) \cap A = \emptyset\}$ is dense in the space $C(\mathbb{I}^n, X)$ of all continuous functions $f : \mathbb{I}^n \to X$, endowed with the compact-open topology. Here by $\mathbb{I} = [0,1]$ we denote the unit interval and by $\mathbb{I}^n$ the n-dimensional cube. For $n = \omega$ the space $\mathbb{I}^n = \mathbb{I}^\omega$ is the Hilbert cube.

A subset $A \subset X$ is called a *σZ_n-set* in X if A can be written as the union $A = \bigcup_{k\in\omega} A_k$ of countably many Z_n-sets $A_k \subset X$. Let us observe that a subset $A \subset X$ is a Z_0-set in X if and only if it is closed and nowhere dense in X, and A is a σZ_0-set if and only if A is a meager F_σ-set in X.

For a topological space X by $\mathcal{Z}_n$ and $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_n$ we denote the families of Z_n-sets and σZ_n-sets in X, respectively.

A characterization of $\mathcal{Z}_\omega$-universal sets in the Hilbert cube is quite simple and can be easily derived from the Z-Set Unknotting Theorem 11.1 from [7]:

Proposition 1. *A subset $A \subset \mathbb{I}^\omega$ is $\mathcal{Z}_\omega$-universal in $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ if and only if A is a Z_ω-set in $\mathbb{I}^\omega$, containing a topological copy of the Hilbert cube $\mathbb{I}^\omega$.*

A characterization of $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_\omega$-universal sets in the Hilbert cube is also well-known and can be given in many different terms (skeletoid of Bessaga-Pelczynski [4], capsets of Anderson [1], [6], absorptive sets of West [16], pseudoboundaries of Geoghegan and Summerhill [11], [12]). For our purposes the most appropriate approach is that of West [16] and Geoghegan and Summerhill [12]. To formulate this approach, we need to recall some notation.

Let $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{V}$ be two families of sets of a topological space X. Put

$$\mathcal{U} \wedge \mathcal{V} = \{U \cap V : U \in \mathcal{U},\ V \in \mathcal{V},\ U \cap V \neq \emptyset\} \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{U} \vee \mathcal{V} = \{U \cup V : U \in \mathcal{U},\ V \in \mathcal{V},\ U \cap V \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We shall write $\mathcal{U} \prec \mathcal{V}$ and say that $\mathcal{U}$ *refines* $\mathcal{V}$ if each set $U \in \mathcal{U}$ is contained in some set $V \in \mathcal{V}$. Let $\mathcal{S}t(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{V}) = \{\mathcal{S}t(U,\mathcal{V}) : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$ where $\mathcal{S}t(U,\mathcal{V}) = \bigcup\{V \in \mathcal{V} : U \cap V \neq \emptyset\}$. Put $\mathcal{S}t(\mathcal{U}) = \mathcal{S}t(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{S}t^{n+1}(\mathcal{U}) = \mathcal{S}t(\mathcal{S}t^n(\mathcal{U}))$ for each $n > 0$. We shall say that two maps $f, g : Z \to X$ are *$\mathcal{U}$-near* and denote it by $(f,g) \prec \mathcal{U}$ if the family $(f,g) = \{\{f(z), g(z)\} : z \in Z\}$ refines the family $\mathcal{U} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in X\}$. For a family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of a metric space (X,d) we put $\mathrm{mesh}(\mathcal{F}) = \sup_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \mathrm{diam}(F)$.

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a family of closed subsets of a Polish space X and $\sigma\mathcal{K} = \{\bigcup_{n\in\omega} A_n : A_n \in \mathcal{K},\ \ n \in \omega\}$. We shall say that $\mathcal{K}$ is *topologically invariant* if $\mathcal{K} = \{h(K) : K \in \mathcal{K}\}$ for each homeomorphism $h : X \to X$.

A subset $B \subset X$ is called *$\mathcal{K}$-absorptive* in X if $B \in \sigma\mathcal{K}$ and for each set $K \in \mathcal{K}$, open set $V \subset X$, and open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of V there is a homeomorphism $h : V \to V$

such that $h(K \cap V) \subset B \cap V$ and $(h, \mathrm{id}) \prec \mathcal{U}$. An important observation is that each set $A \in \sigma\mathcal{K}$ containing a $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive subset of X is also $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive.

The following powerful uniqueness theorem was proved by West [16] and Geoghegan and Summerhill [12, 2.5].

Theorem 1 (Uniqueness Theorem for $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive sets)**.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a topologically invariant family of closed subsets of a Polish space X. Then any two $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive sets $B, B' \subset X$ are ambiently homeomorphic. More precisely, for any open set $V \subset X$ and any open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of V there is a homeomorphism $h : V \to V$ such that $h(V \cap B) = V \cap B'$ and h is $\mathcal{U}$-near to the identity map of V.*

Two subsets A, B of a topological space X are called *ambiently homeomorphic* if there is a homeomorphism $h : X \to X$ such that $h(A) = B$. This happens if and only if the pairs (X, A) and (X, B) are homeomorphic. We shall say that two pairs (X, A) and (Y, B) of topological spaces $A \subset X$ and $B \subset Y$ are *homeomorphic* if there is a homeomorphism $h : X \to Y$ such that $h(A) = B$. In this case we say that $h : (X, A) \to (Y, B)$ is a homeomorphism of pairs.

According to the following corollary of Theorem 1, each $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive set is $\sigma\mathcal{K}$-universal.

Corollary 1. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a topologically invariant family of closed subsets of a Polish space. If a $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive set B in X exists, then a subset $A \subset X$ is $\sigma\mathcal{K}$-universal in X if and only if A is $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive.*

Proof: Assume that a subset A of X is $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive. The definition implies that $A \in \sigma\mathcal{K}$. To show that A is $\sigma\mathcal{K}$-universal, fix any subset $K \in \sigma\mathcal{K}$. The definition of a $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive set implies that the union $A \cup K$ is $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive. By the Uniqueness Theorem 1, there is a homeomorphism of pairs $h : (X, A \cup K) \to (X, A)$. This homeomorphism embeds the set K into A, witnessing that the $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive set A is $\sigma\mathcal{K}$-universal.

Now assume that a set $A \subset X$ is $\sigma\mathcal{K}$-universal. Since the $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive set B belongs to the family $\sigma\mathcal{K}$, there is a homeomorphism h of X such that $h(B) \subset A$. The topological invariance of the class $\mathcal{K}$ implies that the set $h(B)$ is $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive, and so is the set $A \supset h(B)$. □

Corollary 1 reduces the problem of studying $\sigma\mathcal{K}$-universal sets in a Polish space X to studying $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive sets in X (under the assumption that a $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive set in X exists). The problem of the existence of $\mathcal{K}$-absorptive sets was considered in several papers. In particular, Geoghegan and Summerhill [12] proved that each Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ contains a $\mathcal{Z}_0$-absorptive set and such a set is unique up to ambient homeomorphism.

Unfortunately, the methods of constructing $\mathcal{Z}_0$-absorptive sets in Euclidean spaces used in [12] do not work in case of the Hilbert cube or Hilbert cube manifolds (in spite of the fact that the paper [12] was written to demonstrate applications of methods of infinite-dimensional topology in the theory of finite-dimensional manifolds). Known results on $\mathcal{Z}_\omega$-absorptive sets in the Hilbert cube $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ and $\mathcal{Z}_0$-absorptive sets in Euclidean spaces allow us to make the following:

Conjecture 1. *The Hilbert cube contains a $\mathcal{Z}_n$-absorptive set for every $n \le \omega$.*

This conjecture is true for $n = \omega$ as witnessed by the pseudoboundary $B(\mathbb{I}^\omega) = \mathbb{I}^\omega \setminus (0,1)^\omega$ of $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ which is a $\mathcal{Z}_\omega$-absorptive set in $\mathbb{I}^\omega$. In this paper we shall confirm Conjecture 1 for $n = 0$. In fact, our proof works not only for the Hilbert cube but also for any $\mathbb{I}^k$-manifold of finite or infinite dimension. By a *manifold modeled on a space E* (briefly, an *E-manifold*) we understand any paracompact space M admitting a cover by open subsets homeomorphic to open subspaces of the model space E. In this paper we consider only manifolds modeled on (finite or infinite dimensional) cubes $\mathbb{I}^n$, $n \le \omega$. So, from now on, by a *manifold* we shall understand an $\mathbb{I}^n$-manifold for some $0 < n \le \omega$. If a manifold X is finite-dimensional, then its *boundary* ∂X consists of all points $x \in X$ which do not have neighborhoods homeomorphic to Euclidean spaces. If X is a Hilbert cube manifold, then we put $\partial X = \emptyset$.

Our approach to constructing $\mathcal{Z}_0$-absorptive sets in manifolds is based on the notion of a tame G_δ-set, which is interesting by itself, see [2]. First we recall some definitions.

A family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of a topological space X is called *vanishing* if for each open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of X the family $\mathcal{F}' = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : \forall U \in \mathcal{U},\ \ F \not\subset U\}$ is locally finite in X. It is easy to see that a countable family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_n\}_{n\in\omega}$ of subsets of a compact metric space (X, d) is vanishing if and only if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{diam}(F_n) = 0$.

An open subset B of an $\mathbb{I}^n$-manifold X is called a *tame open ball* in X if its closure $\bar{B}$ has an open neighborhood $O(\bar{B})$ in X such that the pair $(O(\bar{B}), \bar{B})$ is homeomorphic to the pair $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{I}^n)$ if $n < \omega$ and to the pair $(\mathbb{I}^\omega \times [0,\infty), \mathbb{I}^\omega \times [0,1])$ if $n = \omega$. Tame balls form a neighborhood base at each point $x \in X$, which does not belong to the boundary ∂X of X (this is trivial for $n < \omega$ and follows from Theorem 12.2 of [7] for $n = \omega$).

A subset U of a manifold X is called a *tame open set in X* if $U = \bigcup \mathcal{U}$ for some vanishing family $\mathcal{U}$ of tame open balls having pairwise disjoint closures in X. Observe that the family $\mathcal{U}$ is unique and coincides with the family $\mathcal{C}(U)$ of connected components of the set U. By $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(U) = \{\bar{C} : C \in \mathcal{C}(U)\}$ we shall denote the family of the closures of the connected components of U in X.

A subset $G \subset X$ is called a *tame G_δ-set in X* if $G = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} U_n$ for some decreasing sequence $(U_n)_{n\in\omega}$ of tame open sets such that the family $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} \mathcal{C}(U_n)$ is vanishing and for every $n \in \omega$ the family $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(U_{n+1})$ refines the family $\mathcal{C}(U_n)$ of connected components of U_n.

Tame open and tame G_δ-sets can be equivalently defined via tame families of tame open balls. A family $\mathcal{U}$ of non-empty open subsets of a topological space X is called *tame* if $\mathcal{U}$ is vanishing and for any distinct sets $U, V \in \mathcal{U}$ one of three possibilities hold: either $\bar{U} \cap \bar{V} = \emptyset$ or $\bar{U} \subset V$ or $\bar{V} \subset U$. For a family $\mathcal{U}$ of subsets of a set X by

$$\bigcup^\infty \mathcal{U} = \bigcap \left\{ \bigcup(\mathcal{U} \setminus \mathcal{F}) : \mathcal{F} \text{ is a finite subfamily of } \mathcal{U} \right\}$$

we denote the set of all points $x \in X$ which belong to infinite number of sets $U \in \mathcal{U}$.

Proposition 2. *A subset T of a manifold X is tame open (resp. tame G_δ) if and only if $T = \bigcup \mathcal{T}$ (resp. $T = \bigcup^\infty \mathcal{T}$) for a suitable tame family $\mathcal{T}$ of tame open balls in X.*

Proof: The "only if" part follows directly from the definition of a tame open (resp. tame G_δ) set. To prove the "if" part, assume that $\mathcal{T}$ is a tame family of tame open balls in X. Endow the family $\mathcal{T}$ with a partial order $\le$ defined by the reverse inclusion relation, that is $U \le V$ if and only if $U \supset V$. The vanishing property of $\mathcal{T}$ guarantees that for each set $U \in \mathcal{T}$ the set $\downarrow U = \{V \in \mathcal{T} : V \le U\}$ is finite. This allows us to define the ordinal rank(U) letting rank$(U) = |\downarrow U|$. For each number $n \in \omega$ let $\mathcal{T}_n = \{U \in \mathcal{T} : \text{rank}(U) = n+1\}$. It follows from the definition of a tame family that the union $U_n = \bigcup \mathcal{T}_n$ is a tame open set and $U_n \subset U_{n-1}$, where $U_{-1} = X$. In particular, the union $\bigcup \mathcal{T} = U_0$ is tame open set in X and the set $T = \bigcup^\infty \mathcal{T} = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} U_n$ is a tame G_δ-set in X. □

The classes of dense tame open sets and dense tame G_δ-sets have the following cofinality property.

Proposition 3. (1) *Each open subset of a manifold X contains a dense tame open set.*
(2) *Each G_δ-subset of a manifold contains a dense tame G_δ-set.*

Proof: Let X be a manifold and d be a metric generating the topology of X.

1. Given an open set $V \subset X$ and an open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of V we shall construct a tame open set $W \subset X$ such that W is dense in V and the family $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(W)$ refines the cover $\mathcal{U}$. Replacing V by $V \setminus \partial X$, we can assume that the set V does not intersect the boundary ∂X of X. Replacing the set V by $V \setminus \{v\}$ for some point $v \in V$, we can additionally assume that the set V is not compact. We can also assume that $V = \bigcup \mathcal{U}$. Without loss of generality, the manifold X is connected and hence separable. So, we can fix a countable dense subset $\{x_n\}_{n\in\omega}$ in V. By induction we can construct an increasing number sequence $(n_k)_{k\in\omega}$ and a sequence B_k of tame open balls in X such that for each $k \in \omega$ the following conditions hold:

(1) n_k is the smallest number n such that $x_n \notin \bigcup_{i<k} \bar{B}_k$;
(2) B_k is a tame open ball such that $x_{n_k} \in B_k$, the closure $\bar{B}_k$ of B_k in X has diameter $< 2^{-k}$ and is contained in $U \setminus \bigcup_{i<k} \bar{B}_k$ for some set $U \in \mathcal{U}$.

It is easy to check that $W = \bigcup_{k\in\omega} B_k$ is a required dense tame open set in V with $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(W) = \{\bar{B}_k\}_{k\in\omega} \prec \mathcal{U}$.

2. Fix an arbitrary G_δ-set G in X and write it as the intersection $G = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} U_n$ of a decreasing sequence $(U_n)_{n\in\omega}$ of open sets in X. By the (proof of the) preceding item, we can construct inductively a decreasing sequence $(V_n)_{n\in\omega}$ of tame open sets in X such that for every $n \in \omega$ we get

- $\operatorname{mesh}\bar{\mathcal{C}}(V_n) < 2^{-n}$,
- $\bigcup\bar{\mathcal{C}}(V_n) \subset V_{n-1} \cap U_n$, and
- V_n is dense in $V_{n-1} \cap U_n$.

Here we assume that $V_{-1} = X$. It follows that $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} \mathcal{C}(V_n)$ is a tame family of tame open balls whose limit set $\bigcup^\infty \mathcal{V} = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} V_n$ is a required dense tame G_δ-set in G. □

It is easy to see that any two tame open balls in a connected $\mathbb{I}^n$-manifold are ambiently homeomorphic. A similar fact holds also for dense tame open sets. Generalizing earlier results of Whyburn [17] and Cannon [5], Banakh and Repovš in [3, Corollary 2.8] proved the following Uniqueness Theorem for dense tame open sets.

Theorem 2 (Uniqueness Theorem for Dense Tame Open Sets in Manifolds)**.** *Any two dense tame open sets $U, U' \subset X$ of a manifold X are ambiently homeomorphic. Moreover, for each open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of X there is a homeomorphism $h : (X,U) \to (X,U')$ such that $(h, \mathrm{id}) \prec \mathcal{S}t(\bar{\mathcal{C}}(U), \mathcal{U}) \vee \mathcal{S}t(\bar{\mathcal{C}}(U'), \mathcal{U})$.*

This theorem will be our main tool in the proof of the following Uniqueness Theorem for dense tame G_δ-sets.

Theorem 3 (Uniqueness Theorem for Dense Tame G_δ-Sets in Manifolds)**.** *Any two dense tame G_δ-sets G, G' in a manifold X are ambiently homeomorphic. Moreover, for each open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of X there is a homeomorphism $h : (X,G) \to (X,G')$ such that $(h, \mathrm{id}) \prec \mathcal{U}$.*

Proof: Fix a bounded complete metric d generating the topology of the manifold X. By [9, 8.1.10], the metric d can be chosen so that the cover $\{\bar{B}(x,1) : x \in X\}$ by closed balls of radius 1 refines the cover $\mathcal{U}$. In this case any two functions $f, g : X \to X$ with $d(f,g) = \sup_{x\in X} d(f(x), g(x)) \le 1$ are $\mathcal{U}$-near.

Represent the tame G_δ-sets G and G' as the limit sets $G = \bigcup^\infty \mathcal{G}$ and $G' = \bigcup^\infty \mathcal{G}'$ of suitable tame families $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$ of tame open balls in X. For every $n \in \omega$ let $\mathcal{G}_n = \{U \in \mathcal{G} : |\{V \in \mathcal{G} : V \supset \bar{U}\}| \ge n\}$ and $\mathcal{G}'_n = \{U \in \mathcal{G}' : |\{V \in \mathcal{G}' : V \supset \bar{U}\}| \ge n\}$. It follows that $G = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} \bigcup \mathcal{G}_n$ and $G' = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} \bigcup \mathcal{G}'_n$.

Let $U_{-1} = U'_{-1} = X$ and $h_{-1} : X \to X$ be the identity homeomorphism of X. Let also $\mathcal{U}_{-1} = \mathcal{U}'_{-1}$ be a cover of X by open subsets of diameter $\le \frac{1}{8}$.

For every $n \in \omega$ we shall construct a homeomorphism $h_n : X \to X$, two tame open sets $U_n, U'_n \subset X$, and open covers $\mathcal{U}_n$, $\mathcal{U}'_n$ of the sets U_n, U'_n, respectively, such that

(1) $G \subset U_n \subset U_{n-1} \cap \bigcup \mathcal{G}_n$ and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(U_n) \prec \mathcal{U}_{n-1}$;
(2) $G' \subset U'_n \subset U'_{n-1} \cap \bigcup \mathcal{G}'_n$ and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(U'_n) \prec \mathcal{U}'_{n-1} \wedge h_{n-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n-1})$;
(3) $h_n(U_n) = U'_n$;

(4) $h_n|X \setminus U_{n-1} = h_{n-1}|X \setminus U_{n-1}$;
(5) $d(h_n, h_{n-1}) \le 2^{-n-1}$ and $d(h_n^{-1}, h_{n-1}^{-1}) \le 2^{-n-1}$;
(6) $\mathrm{mesh}(\mathcal{U}'_n) < 2^{-n-3}$, $\mathrm{mesh}(\mathcal{U}_n) < 2^{-n-3}$, and $\mathcal{S}t^2(\mathcal{U}_n) \prec \{B(x, d(x, X \setminus U_n)/2) : x \in U_n\}$.

Assume that for some $n \in \omega$ the open sets U_{n-1}, U'_{n-1}, open covers $\mathcal{U}_{n-1}, \mathcal{U}'_{n-1}$ and a homeomorphism $h_{n-1} : (X, U_{n-1}) \to (X, U'_{n-1})$ satisfying the conditions (1)–(6) have been constructed. Consider the subfamilies $\mathcal{F}_n = \{U \in \mathcal{G}_n : \{\bar{U}\} \prec \mathcal{U}_{n-1}\}$ and $\mathcal{F}'_n = \{U \in \mathcal{G}'_n : \{\bar{U}\} \prec \mathcal{U}'_{n-1} \wedge h_{n-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n-1})\}$. The vanishing property of the tame families $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$ implies that the sets $U_n = \bigcup \mathcal{F}_n$ and $U'_n = \bigcup \mathcal{F}'_n$ satisfy the conditions (1), (2) of the inductive construction. The sets U_n and U'_n are tame open, being unions of the tame families $\mathcal{F}_n$ and $\mathcal{F}'_n$, respectively. Moreover, $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(U_n) \prec \mathcal{U}_{n-1}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(U'_n) \prec \mathcal{U}'_{n-1} \wedge h_{n-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n-1})$.

Now we shall construct a homeomorphism $h_n : (X, U_n) \to (X, U'_n)$. Since $h_{n-1}(U_{n-1}) = U'_{n-1}$, each connected component $C \in \mathcal{C}(U_{n-1})$ of the open set U_{n-1} maps onto the connected component $C' = h_{n-1}(C) \in \mathcal{C}(U'_{n-1})$ of the set U'_{n-1}. Taking into account that each set $\bar{B} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}(U_n)$ is a compact connected subset of the open set $\bigcup \mathcal{U}'_{n-1} = U'_{n-1}$, we see that the intersection $U'_n \cap C'$ is a dense tame open set in the open set C'. Consequently, its image $h_{n-1}^{-1}(U'_n \cap C')$ is a dense tame open set in the open set $C = h_{n-1}^{-1}(C')$. By Theorem 2, there is a homeomorphism of pairs $g_C : (C, C \cap U_n) \to (C, h_{n-1}^{-1}(C' \cap U'_n))$ which is $\mathcal{W}_C$-near to the identity map $\mathrm{id}_C : C \to C$ for the cover $\mathcal{W}_C = \mathcal{S}t(\bar{\mathcal{C}}(C \cap U_n), \mathcal{U}_{n-1}) \vee \mathcal{S}t(\bar{\mathcal{C}}(h_{n-1}^{-1}(C' \cap U'_n)), \mathcal{U}_{n-1})$.

Taking into account that

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathcal{C}}(C \cap U_n) \prec \bar{\mathcal{C}}(U_n) \prec \mathcal{U}_{n-1} \text{ and } \bar{\mathcal{C}}(h_{n-1}^{-1}(U'_n \cap C')) &\prec \bar{\mathcal{C}}(h_{n-1}^{-1}(U'_n)) \\ = h_{n-1}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{C}}(U'_n)) &\prec h_{n-1}^{-1}(h_{n-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n-1})) = \mathcal{U}_{n-1},\end{aligned}$$

we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_C &= \mathcal{S}t(\bar{\mathcal{C}}(C \cap U_n), \mathcal{U}_{n-1}) \vee \mathcal{S}t(\bar{\mathcal{C}}(h_{n-1}^{-1}(C' \cap U'_n)), \mathcal{U}_{n-1}) \\ &\quad \prec \mathcal{S}t(\mathcal{U}_{n-1}, \mathcal{U}_{n-1}) \vee \mathcal{S}t(\mathcal{U}_{n-1}, \mathcal{U}_{n-1}) \\ &= \mathcal{S}t(\mathcal{U}_{n-1}) \vee \mathcal{S}t(\mathcal{U}_{n-1}) \prec \mathcal{S}t^2(\mathcal{U}_{n-1}) \prec \{B(x, d(X \setminus U_{n-1})/2) : x \in U_{n-1}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Now the vanishing property of the family $\mathcal{C}(U_{n-1})$ implies that the map $g_n : X \to X$ defined by

$$g_n(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \notin U_{n-1}, \\ g_C & \text{if } x \in C \in \mathcal{C}(U_{n-1}) \end{cases}$$

is a homeomorphism of X such that $(g_n, \mathrm{id}) \prec \mathcal{S}t^2(\mathcal{U}_{n-1})$ and $(g_n, \mathrm{id}) \prec \mathcal{C}(U_{n-1})$. Then $h_n = h_{n-1} \circ g_n$ is a homeomorphism of X satisfying the conditions (3) and (4) of the inductive construction.

To prove the condition (5) we shall consider separately the cases of $n = 0$ and $n > 0$. If $n = 0$, then $h_0 = g_0$ and hence $(h_0, h_{-1}) = (g_0, \mathrm{id}) \prec \mathcal{S}t^2(\mathcal{U}_{-1})$. It follows from $\mathrm{mesh}(\mathcal{U}_{-1}) \le 1/8$ that $d(h_0^{-1}, h_{-1}^{-1}) = d(h_0, h_{-1}) \le \mathrm{mesh}(\mathcal{S}t^2(\mathcal{U}_{-1})) \le \frac{1}{2}$.

If $n > 0$, then $(h_n, h_{n-1}) = (h_{n-1} \circ g_n, h_{n-1} \circ \mathrm{id}) \prec h_{n-1}(\mathcal{C}(U_{n-1})) = \mathcal{C}(U'_{n-1}) \prec \mathcal{U}'_{n-2}$ implies $d(h_n, h_{n-1}) \le \mathrm{mesh}(\mathcal{U}'_{n-2}) \le 2^{-n-1}$. By analogy, $(h_n^{-1}, h_{n-1}^{-1}) = (g_n^{-1} \circ h_{n-1}^{-1}, h_{n-1}^{-1}) = (g_n^{-1}, \mathrm{id}) = (g_n, \mathrm{id}) \prec \mathcal{C}(U_{n-1}) \prec \mathcal{U}_{n-2}$ implies $d(h_n^{-1}, h_{n-1}^{-1}) \le \mathrm{mesh}(\mathcal{U}_{n-2}) \le 2^{-n-1}$. So, the condition (5) holds.

Finally, using the paracompactness of the metrizable spaces U_n and U'_n choose two open covers $\mathcal{U}_n$ and $\mathcal{U}'_n$ of U_n and U'_n satisfying the condition (6).

After completing the inductive construction, we obtain a sequence of homeomorphisms $h_n : (X, U_n) \to (X, U'_n)$, $n \in \omega$. The condition (5) guarantees that the limit map $h = \lim_{n\to\infty} h_n$ is a well-defined homeomorphism of X such that $d(h, \mathrm{id}) \le 1$. Moreover, the conditions (1) and (3) imply

$$h(G) = h\Big(\bigcap_{n\in\omega} U_n\Big) = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} h(U_n) = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} U'_n = G'.$$

By the choice of the metric d, the inequality $d(h, \mathrm{id}) \le 1$ implies $(h, \mathrm{id}) \prec \mathcal{U}$. So, $h : (X, G) \to (X, G')$ is a required homeomorphism of pairs with $(h, \mathrm{id}) \prec \mathcal{U}$. □

Now we are able to prove a characterization of $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_0$-universal sets in manifolds.

Theorem 4 (Characterization of $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_0$-Universal Sets in Manifolds)**.** *For a subset A of a manifold X the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *A is $\sigma\mathcal{Z}_0$-universal in X;*
2. *A is $\mathcal{Z}_0$-absorptive in X;*
3. *the complement $X \setminus A$ is a dense tame G_δ-set in X.*

Proof: We shall prove the equivalences (3) ⇔ (2) ⇔ (1). Let d be a metric generating the topology of the manifold X.

To prove that (3) ⇒ (2), assume that the complement $X \setminus A$ is a dense tame G_δ-set in X. To prove that A is $\mathcal{Z}_0$-absorptive, fix any open set $V \subset X$, an open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of V and a closed nowhere dense subset $K \subset X$. We lose no generality assuming that $\mathcal{U} \prec \{B(x, d(x, X \setminus V)/2) : x \in V\}$. Since $V \setminus (A \cup K)$ is a dense G_δ-set in V, we can apply Proposition 3 and find a dense tame G_δ-set $G \subset V \setminus (A \cup K)$. The characterization of tame G_δ-sets given in Proposition 2 implies that the intersection $V \cap (X \setminus A) = V \setminus A$ is a dense tame G_δ-set in V. By Theorem 3, there is a homeomorphism of pairs $h : (V, G) \to (V, V \setminus A)$ such that $(h, \mathrm{id}) \prec \mathcal{U}$. Since $\mathcal{U} \prec \{B(x, d(x, X \setminus V)/2) : x \in V\}$, the homeomorphism h of V extends to a homeomorphism $\bar{h} : X \to X$ such that $\bar{h}|X \setminus V = \mathrm{id}$. Observing that $\bar{h}(V \cap K) \subset \bar{h}(V \setminus G) = V \cap A$, we see that the set A is $\mathcal{Z}_0$-absorptive.

To prove that (2) ⇒ (3), assume that the set A is $\mathcal{Z}_0$-absorptive. By Proposition 3, the dense G_δ-set $X \setminus A$ contains a dense tame G_δ-set G in X. Since $A \subset X \setminus G$, the set $X \setminus G \in \sigma\mathcal{Z}_0$ is $\mathcal{Z}_0$-absorptive. By the Uniqueness Theorem 3, there is a homeomorphism of pairs $h : (X, A) \to (X, X \setminus G)$. Then $X \setminus A = h(G)$ is a dense tame G_δ-set in X, which completes the proof of the implication (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3).

By Proposition 3, X contains a dense tame G_δ-set G and by the implication (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) proved above the complement $X \setminus G$ is $\mathcal{Z}_0$-absorptive. Now Corollary 1 yields the equivalence (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (1). □

Theorem 4 implies:

Corollary 2. *Each dense G_δ-subset of a dense tame G_δ-set in a manifold is tame.*

We finish this paper by some open problems. It is clear that each tame G_δ-set in a manifold is zero-dimensional. However, not each zero-dimensional dense G_δ-subset of the Hilbert cube $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ is tame.

Proposition 4. *For any dense G_δ-set $G \subset \mathbb{I}$ the countable product G^ω is not a tame G_δ-set in $\mathbb{I}^\omega$.*

Proof: Assuming that G^ω is tame, we can find a dense tame open set $T \subset \mathbb{I}^\omega$ containing G^ω. By Theorem 1.4 of [3], the complement $S = \mathbb{I}^\omega \setminus T$ is homeomorphic to the Hilbert cube and the boundary $\bar{B} \setminus B$ of each tame open ball $B \in \mathcal{C}(T)$ in $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ is a Z_ω-set in S. Let $\mathrm{pr}_n : \mathbb{I}^\omega \to \mathbb{I}$, $n \in \omega$, denote the projection of the Hilbert cube $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ onto the nth coordinate. Since $\mathbb{I}^\omega \setminus T \subset \bigcup_{n\in\omega} \mathrm{pr}_n^{-1}(\mathbb{I} \setminus G)$, Baire Theorem yields a non-empty open subset $W \subset S$ such that $W \subset \mathrm{pr}_n^{-1}(\mathbb{I} \setminus G)$ for some $n \in \omega$. Since S is homeomorphic to the Hilbert cube, we can assume that the set W is connected and hence is contained in $\mathrm{pr}_n^{-1}(t)$ for some point $t \in \mathbb{I} \setminus G$. Since the union $\Delta = \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{C}(U)} \bar{B} \setminus B$ is a σZ_ω-set in S, we can choose a point $x_0 \in W \setminus \Delta$. Choose an open neighborhood U of x_0 in $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ such that $U \cap S \subset W$ and $U \setminus \mathrm{pr}_n^{-1}(t)$ has at most two connected components.

Since the family $\mathcal{C}(T)$ is vanishing and $T = \bigcup \mathcal{C}(T)$ is dense in $\mathbb{I}^\omega$, there are three pairwise distinct tame open balls $B_1, B_2, B_3 \in \mathcal{C}(T)$ such that $\bar{B}_1 \cup \bar{B}_2 \cup \bar{B}_2 \subset U$. Since the set $U \setminus \mathrm{pr}_n^{-1}(t)$ has at most two connected components, there are two distinct indices $1 \le i, j \le 3$ such that the balls B_i and B_j meet the same connected component V of $U \setminus \mathrm{pr}_n^{-1}(t)$. Since $\bar{B}_i \setminus B_i \subset U \cap S \subset \mathrm{pr}_n^{-1}(t)$, the set $V \cap B_i$ is closed-and-open in the connected set V and hence coincides with V. So, $V \subset B_i$. By the same reason, $V \subset B_j$, which is not possible as the balls B_i and B_j are disjoint. □

Problem 1. *Can the countable power G^ω of a dense G_δ-set $G \subset \mathbb{I}$ be covered by countably many dense tame G_δ-sets?*

By Smirnov's result [9, 5.2.B], the Hilbert cube $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ can be covered by $\aleph_1$ zero-dimensional G_δ-sets.

Problem 2. *What is the smallest cardinality of a cover of the Hilbert cube $\mathbb{I}^\omega$ by tame G_δ-sets? Is it equal to $\aleph_1$?* (By Theorem 1.6 of [2] this cardinality does not exceed $\mathrm{add}(\mathcal{M})$, the additivity of the ideal $\mathcal{M}$ of meager subsets on the real line.)

References

[1] Anderson R.D., *On sigma-compact subsets of infinite-dimensional manifolds*, unpublished manuscript.

[2] Banakh T., Morayne M., Rałowski R., Żeberski S., *Topologically invariant σ-ideals on the Hilbert cube*, preprint (http://arxiv.org/abs/1302.5658).

[3] Banakh T., Repovš D., *Universal nowhere dense subsets of locally compact manifolds*, preprint (http://arxiv.org/abs/1302.5651).

[4] Bessaga C., Pelczyński A., *Selected topics in infinite-dimensional topology*, PWN, Warsaw, 1975.

[5] Cannon J.W., *A positional characterization of the $(n-1)$-dimensional Sierpinski curve in S^n $(n \neq 4)$*, Fund. Math. **79** (1973), no. 2, 107–112.

[6] Chapman T.A., *Dense sigma-compact subsets of infinite-dimensional manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **154** (1971), 399–426.

[7] Chapman T.A., *Lectures on Hilbert Cube Manifolds*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1976.

[8] Chigogidze A., *Inverse Spectra*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1996.

[9] Engelking R., *General Topology*, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[10] Engelking R., *Theory of dimensions finite and infinite*, Heldermann Verlag, Lemgo, 1995.

[11] Geoghegan R., Summerhill R., *Infinite-dimensional methods in finite-dimensional geometric topology*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **78** (1972), 1009–1014.

[12] Geoghegan R., Summerhill R., *Pseudo-boundaries and pseudo-interiors in Euclidean spaces and topological manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **194** (1974), 141–165.

[13] Menger K., *Allgemeine Raume und Cartesische Raume Zweite Mitteilung: "Uber umfassendste n-dimensional Mengen"*, Proc. Akad. Amsterdam **29** (1926), 1125–1128.

[14] Sierpiński W., *Sur une courbe cantorienne qui contient une image biunivoque et continue de toute courbe donnée*, C.R. Acad. Sci., Paris, **162** (1916), 629–632.

[15] Štanko M.A., *The embedding of compact into Euclidean space*, Math USSR Sbornik **12** (1970), 234–254.

[16] West J., *The ambient homeomorphy of an incomplete subspace of infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **34** (1970), 257–267.

[17] Whyburn G., *Topological characterization of the Sierpinski curve*, Fund. Math. **45** (1958), 320–324.

Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce (Poland) and Ivan Franko National University of Lviv (Ukraine)

E-mail: t.o.banakh@gmail.com

Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, and Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana (Slovenia)

E-mail: dusan.repovs@guest.arnes.si

(*Received* February 26, 2013)