

COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

GEORGE CHOGOSHVILI

On a theorem in the theory of dimensionality

Compositio Mathematica, tome 5 (1938), p. 292-298

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1938__5__292_0

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1938, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (<http://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/>

On a theorem in the theory of dimensionality

by

George Chogoshvili

Moscow

1. In his note „Zum allgemeinen Dimensionsproblem”¹⁾ Professor Alexandroff proved the following theorem:

A compact set A of the n -dimensional space R^n has a dimensionality $\leq r$ if and only if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it is ε -removable from an arbitrary $(n-r-1)$ -dimensional polyhedron.

In this theorem a set A is called ε -removable from a set B (where A and B are subsets of the same metric space R) when there exists an ε -transformation f of A with the property:

$$f(A) \cdot B = 0.$$

The main purpose of this note is to generalize and to make more precise the above result established by Prof. Alexandroff:

THEOREM: *Any subset A of the n -dimensional euclidean space R^n has a dimension $\leq r$ then and only then, when for any $\varepsilon > 0$ it is ε -removable from every $(n-r-1)$ -dimensional plane.²⁾*

Remark I. The theorem holds if the word „plane” is replaced by the word „simplex”.

Remark II. An r -dimensional set A is ε -removable even from every countable complex of the dimension $\leq n - r - 1$.

*Remark III.*³⁾ If a set A is r -dimensional there is an $(n-r)$ -dimensional plane (or simplex), parallel to a certain $(n-r)$ -dimensional coordinate plane of R^n , from which A is not ε -removable.

Consequently, any space R is r -dimensional then and only then, when its topological image in euclidian space of a sufficiently large dimension answers the conditions described. The

¹⁾ Gött. Nachrichten 1928, 37.

²⁾ r -dimensional plane of R^n is an r -dimensional euclidian subspace of R^n .

³⁾ This remark is due to Prof. Pontrjagin.

problem of such a generalization of his theorem was proposed to me by Prof. Alexandroff to whom I wish to express here my best thanks for the kind attention he has shown me.

Here we shall dwell for a while on some theorems concerning the ε -transformations which have been proved only as to compact or, in the best cases, as to totally bounded spaces. This will enable us to give a more direct proof of our theorem.

2. The theorem we start from is the following:

Any r -dimensional subset A of a metric separable space R may be covered by arbitrarily small open sets, each $r + 2$ of which has a vacuous intersection; their number being finite in the case of the subset being totally bounded and countable ⁴⁾ in the opposite case.

The proof of the theorem in the case when the set is not necessarily totally bounded is the same as when it is totally bounded ⁵⁾ except for the number (finite or infinite) of the covering sets involved.

With every countable system of sets $\mathfrak{S} = \{U_1, U_2, \dots, U_i, \dots\}$ we associate, as in the case of the finite system, a certain countable complex N , which is said to be the nerve of this system. Vertices of N are in (1-1)-correspondence with the sets of the system \mathfrak{S} , and some subset of them form the vertices of a simplex then and only then when the corresponding sets do not have a null intersection. The nerve N is *realized in the field of vertices E* , if all the vertices belong to this field. N is *realized in \mathfrak{S} or near \mathfrak{S}* , if all the elements of \mathfrak{S} belong to the same space R , and each vertex of N is a point of its corresponding element or of a definite neighborhood of that element. ⁶⁾

If $R = R^n$, then N may be considered as a geometrical complex. If n is sufficiently great and the vertices of N are in a general position then the interiors of the simplexes of N do not intersect each other.

Such a realization of a nerve, which is always possible in R^{2r+1} , when \mathfrak{S} has an order equal to r , i.e. if $\dim N = r$, is called an euclidian realization of the nerve N of \mathfrak{S} .

Having an arbitrarily small finite or countable covering of the order r of an r -dimensional space R , and the realization of

⁴⁾ but locally finite, i.e. any element can intersect only a finite number of other elements of the covering.

⁵⁾ See K. MENGER'S *Dimensionstheorie* [1928], 158.

⁶⁾ P. ALEXANDROFF & H. HOPF: *Topologie I* [1935], Neuntes Kapitel, § 3.

the nerve of this covering, we can, as in the finite case, construct a single-valued continuous transformation of the space R in \bar{N} ; especially we can apply the so-called Kuratowski-transformation $X(p)$ which in the euclidian case gives:

$$X^{-1}[b_{i_0} \dots b_{i_n}] = U_{i_0} \dots U_{i_n} - \sum_{i \neq i_j} U_i;$$

here b_{i_j} is the vertex of N corresponding to the element U_{i_j} of \mathfrak{S} , and $[b_{i_0} \dots b_{i_n}]$ is the interior of the simplex $b_{i_0} \dots b_{i_n} \subset N$. It follows that if a system \mathfrak{S} is an ε -covering of a space R , then $X(p)$ is an ε -mapping of R on \bar{N} , i.e. on an r -dimensional complex.

If f is a single-valued continuous transformation of a space R in R^n , then, as in the case when R is compact we get that for a sufficiently small covering of R and for a suitable realization of the nerve of this covering in R^n , $X(p)$ represents an ε -approximation of the given transformation f :

$$\varrho(f(p), X(p)) < \varepsilon.$$

Supposing that $A \subset R^n$ and f is an identical transformation, we get an $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ -deformation of the set A into the polyhedron \bar{N} , i.e. into an r -dimensional complex. On the other hand it may be shown, using our chief theorem⁷⁾ (from which the above is independent), that by an arbitrarily small deformation of an r -dimensional set A it is impossible to transform A into a set of a dimension less than r . In fact it would be possible otherwise to remove A by an arbitrarily small deformation of it from every $(n-r)$ -dimensional plane, but that contradicts the assumption that A is of the dimension r .

Thus we get the following theorem, the first part of which will be wanted later:

An r -dimensional set A of the space R^n is ε -deformable into an r -dimensional polyhedron (finite or countable according as the set A is bounded or not), but not into a polyhedron (not into any set) of a lower dimension.

3. We shall require further the following

LEMMA: *If a set A does not intersect the simplex S ($A, S \subset R^n$) it is possible to get a positive distance between the set A and the simplex S by an arbitrarily small deformation of the set A .*

⁷⁾ Prof. Ephrämowitsch has been so kind as to indicate to me this consequence of our theorem.

Furthermore, at the end of § 4 it will be shown that, if a set A is removable by an arbitrarily small deformation from each simplex of a given finite complex K , then a positive distance between the polyhedron \bar{K} and the set A may be established by an arbitrarily small deformation of the latter.

Proof of the lemma: given $\varepsilon > 0$ let us choose such a number d , that: $0 < d < \varepsilon$ and consider the set F consisting of all points whose distance from S is less than or equal to d . Especially, let $T \subset F$ be the set of those points whose distance from S is equal to d . Let us connect by segments each point of S with all the points of the set T which are at the distance d from this point. We shall call the points of these segments which belong to the simplex S , s -points and those which belong to T , t -points. It is not difficult to show that the set of all these segments fills the whole set $F - S$. No one of these segments intersects any other at a point which does not belong to S . Suppose the contrary: let the segments P and Q intersect in the point o , $o \notin S$. Denoting the s -points of the segments P and Q by s_P and s_Q and the t -points by t_P and t_Q respectively, we have: $s_P \neq s_Q$ (for, otherwise, P and Q would coincide with each other) and $t_P \neq t_Q$ (as, otherwise, the point $t_P = t_Q$ being equally distant from the two points s_P, s_Q of S would be less distant from S than from these points, which is impossible). Suppose that

$$\varrho(t_P, o) \leq \varrho(t_Q, o)^8;$$

then

$$\varrho(o, s_P) \geq \varrho(o, s_Q);$$

for, otherwise, the length of P would be less than that of Q . Therefore we have:

$$\varrho(t_P, o) + \varrho(o, s_Q) \leq d.$$

But that is impossible. The impossibility of the inequality is evident; but no equality can exist either, since, as already mentioned above, a point which is at distance d from a simplex cannot be at this distance from two different points of the simplex. Thus, the segments do not intersect one another. Let us shift each point of the set $A(F - S)$ with uniform velocity in unit time along the segment on which it lies to the t -point of this segment. We obtain in this way a single-valued continuous

⁸⁾ If $\varrho(t_Q, o) < \varrho(t_P, o)$, then, in the following argument P and Q must replace each other.

transformation f of $A(F-S)$ into $R^n - U(S, d)$; we define moreover f as the identical transformation in all points of $A[R^n - U(S, d)]$. Then f is a continuous ε -transformation of A all over and $f(A)$ has a positive distance from S , q.e.d.

4. We get now the first part of our theorem direct from what has been said in § 2: by an arbitrarily small deformation of the set A , we transform it into an r -dimensional complex and, by arbitrarily small shifts of the vertices of the latter remove it from any $(n-r-1)$ -dimensional finite or even countable polyhedron, in particular from any $R^{n-r-1} \subset R^n$, and, moreover from any $(n-r-1)$ -dimensional element.

In order to prove the second part, let us prove first of all that by sufficiently small deformation of the given bounded set A of dimension r it is impossible to remove it from a certain $(n-r)$ -dimensional finite polyhedron. From here naturally follows an analogous statement as to an unbounded set. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be so small that at a finite ε -covering of the set A by sets closed in it there should be at least one point belonging to $r+1$ elements of the covering. Let us, following Lebesgue⁹⁾, decompose the space R^n in cubes with the side $\eta < \frac{\varepsilon}{3n}$ so that the points belonging to, at least, s , $1 \leq s \leq n+1$, cubes lie on $(n-s+1)$ -dimensional sides of these cubes.

Let Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_t be all the cubes of the polyhedral neighborhood of that polyhedron¹⁰⁾ of this decomposition whose cubes intersect the set A .

Let us denote by K the $(n-r)$ -dimensional polyhedron formed by all $(n-r)$ -dimensional sides of these cubes. It is clear that

$$\varrho\left(A, R^n - \sum_{i=1}^t Q_i\right) \geq \eta.$$

Suppose that by η -deformation of the set A which transforms A into A' , it is possible to remove A from K . Sets $Q_i A'$, $1 \leq i \leq t$, closed in A' , form $\frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ -covering of the set A' of the order r at most. Let the sets A_i be the originals („Urbild“) of the sets $Q_i A'$ of the deformation in question. As originals of sets closed in A' the sets A_i are closed in A ; their aggregate covers A ; their

⁹⁾ Fund. Math. 2 (1921), 256—285.

¹⁰⁾ i.e. the aggregate of all the cubes of the decomposition in question intersecting that polyhedron.

diameters are less than ε , and each $r + 1$ of them has a null set in its intersection; but all this contradicts the choice of the number ε .

It remains to prove the impossibility of removing the given set from a certain $(n-r)$ -dimensional simplex and, therefore from the $(n-r)$ -dimensional plane which is determined by this simplex.

Suppose that it is possible: A may be ε -removed, by arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, from every $(n-r)$ -dimensional simplex. Let us have any $(n-r)$ -dimensional polyhedron

$$K = \sum_{i=1}^k S_i, \dim S_i \leq n - r,$$

and any positive number ε . Let us choose ε_1 , so that $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \frac{\varepsilon}{k}$ and by an ε_1 -deformation f_1 of A establish a positive distance between $f_1(A) = A_1$ and S_1 :

$$\varrho(A_1, S_1) = d_1.$$

This is possible in virtue of the above assumption and the lemma of § 3 from which evidently follows: if by an arbitrarily small deformation of a set A it is possible to remove the latter from a simplex S , then it is possible to establish a positive distance between A and S by an arbitrarily small deformation of A .

Let

$$\varepsilon_i, f_i, A_i, d_i; i = 1, 2, \dots, j - 1,$$

be already constructed.

Let us choose ε_j so that

$$0 < \varepsilon_j < \min\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{k}, \frac{d_i}{k-i}\right), i = 1, 2, \dots, j - 1,$$

and, by an ε_j -deformation f_j of the set A_{j-1} , say $f_j(A_{j-1}) = A_j$, establish a positive distance between A_j and S_j :

$$\varrho(A_j, S_j) = d_j > 0.$$

We shall get

$$\varrho(A_j, S_t) > \frac{k-j}{k-t} d_t \geq 0, t = 1, 2, \dots, j,$$

for when $j = t$ we had

$$\varrho(A_j, S_t) = d_t > 0$$

and with the following $j - t$ deformations all the shifts, in virtue of the properties of ε_τ , $\tau = t + 1, \dots, j$, were less than $\frac{d_t}{k-t}$.

Let us perform the same construction for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and consider the mapping

$$f^*(A) = f_k \dots f_2 f_1(A) = A^*.$$

f^* being the result of k successive $\frac{\varepsilon}{k}$ -deformations of A is an ε -deformation of this set. A^* does not intersect the polyhedron \bar{K} , moreover, they are at a positive distance from each other, since

$$A^* = f_k(A_{k-1}) = A_k$$

and

$$\varrho(A_k, S_t) > 0, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, k. \quad (11)$$

The contradiction of the fact just established with our former statement proves our theorem completely. The above considerations prove also the generalizations of the lemma mentioned in § 3.

Remarks I and II are already proved. It is obvious that remark III holds too. In fact, in Lebesgue's decomposition of R^n every $(n-r)$ -dimensional side is parallel to a certain $(n-r)$ -dimensional coordinate plane; but, on the other hand, it was proved already that the set A cannot be removed by an arbitrarily small deformation from one of these sides.

(Received, February 10th, 1937.)

¹¹⁾ The expression $\varrho(A_k, S_t) > \frac{k-t}{k-t} d_t$, for $t = k$, is not undetermined, as, according to the definition of f_k :

$$\varrho(A_k, S_k) = d_k > 0.$$
