

Gabriel I. Istrate, Institute of Mathematics, str. Academiei 14, R-70 109, Bucharest, Romania.

## ON TWO GENERALIZATIONS OF THE DARBOUX PROPERTY

The study of those real functions which are the sum of a continuous function and a Darboux function has inspired two natural extensions of the Darboux property which have already been investigated in some aspects by Ellis [EL], Massera [MA], Radaković [RD], Bruckner, Ceder and Weiss [BCW], etc. From the characterizations given in [BCW] the two classes of real functions seem to be related. We shall discuss some topics concerning this relationship, as well as others.

### 0. Preliminaries.

**Definition 0.** Let  $I \subset \mathbf{R}$  be an interval (or  $\mathbf{R}$  itself) and let  $f : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ . For  $x \in I$  let:

$$C_0(f, x) = \{y \in \overline{\mathbf{R}} : \forall N \in V(y), \forall M \in V(x) \ f^{-1}(N) \cap M \neq \emptyset\}$$

$$C(f, x) = \{y \in \overline{\mathbf{R}} : \forall N \in V(y), \forall M \in V(x) \ \text{card} (f^{-1}(N) \cap M) = c\}$$

where  $V(y)$  is the set of the neighborhoods of  $y$ .

The one sided cluster sets  $C_0^-(f, x)$ ,  $C_0^+(f, x)$ ,  $C^-(f, x)$ ,  $C^+(f, x)$  are defined similarly, working with one sided neighborhoods  $M$ .

A function  $f : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is called generalized Darboux if for every interval  $J \subset I$  the set  $f(J)$  is dense in the interval  $[\inf\{f(x) : x \in J\}, \sup\{f(x) : x \in J\}]$  and uniformly generalized Darboux if for every interval  $J \subset I$  and every set  $A$  of cardinality less than  $c$  the set  $f(J \setminus A)$  is dense in  $[\inf\{f(x) : x \in J\}; \sup\{f(x) : x \in j\}]$ .

As in [BCW], the classes of generalized (respectively uniformly generalized) Darboux functions will be denoted by  $U_0$  (respectively  $U$ ). In [BCW] it is shown that  $U$  is the closure of  $D$ , the class of Darboux functions, under uniform convergence. Also the following two lemmas are proved which yield complete characterizations for the classes  $U$  and  $U_0$ :

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $f : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $f \in U_0$
- (ii) any one sided cluster set  $C_0^\varepsilon(f, x)$ ,  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm\}$  is a closed interval (in  $\mathbf{R}$ ).
- (iii) for any  $a, b \in I$ ,  $a < b$  we have:

$$\bigcup \{C_0(f^*, x) : x \in [a, b]\} = [\inf\{f(x) : x \in [a, b]\}, \sup\{f(x) : x \in [a, b]\}].$$

where  $f^* = f|_{[a, b]}$

**Lemma 2.** *Under the same assumptions the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $f \in U$
- (ii) for any  $a, b \in I$ ,  $a < b$  we have
 
$$\bigcup \{C(f^*, x) : x \in [a, b]\} = [\inf\{f(x) : x \in [a, b]\}, \sup\{f(x) : x \in [a, b]\}]$$
- (iii)  $f \in U_0$  and  $f$  (i.e., the graph of  $f$ ) is  $c$ -dense in itself
- (iv)  $f \in U_0$  and for any open  $N$ ,  $f^{-1}(N)$  is empty or  $c$ -dense in itself.

## 1. Results.

### A. A multiplicative analogue of a theorem of Sierpinski.

A classical result due to Sierpinski asserts that every real function is the sum of two Darboux functions. However, as Solomon Marcus has pointed out in [MS 1] there exists a real function which is not the product of two Darboux functions. Things are different with respect to the class  $U$  as is seen from the following:

**Theorem 1.** *Any function  $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is the product of two uniform generalized Darboux functions.*

**Proof:** Let us consider the partition induced on  $\mathbf{R}$  by congruence modulo  $Q$  (i.e.  $x \equiv y$  iff  $x - y \in Q$ ). Let  $k = \mathbf{R}/\equiv$ . Since each equivalence class is countable, (assuming the Continuum Hypothesis)  $k$  is of cardinality  $c$ . Hence we may write

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{R} = \bigcup \{C_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathbf{R}\}$$

where  $a : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow k$  is a bijection and we write  $C_\lambda$  for  $a(\lambda)$ . We consider a partition  $k = L \cup H$ ,  $L \cap H = \phi$  with  $L \sim H \sim (\mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\})$ . Let  $b : \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow a^{-1}(L)$  and

$c : \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow a^{-1}(H)$  be bijections. (Their existence is guaranteed by the fact that  $a$  is bijective.) Set

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} r & \text{if } x \in C_{b(r)} \\ f(x)/s & \text{if } x \in C_{c(s)} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad h(x) = \begin{cases} f(x)/r & \text{if } x \in C_{b(r)} \\ s & \text{if } x \in C_{c(s)} \end{cases}$$

for any  $f, s \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . Clearly  $g$  and  $h$  are well defined and  $g \cdot h = f$ . Since both classes  $C_{b(r)}$  and  $C_{c(s)}$  are dense in  $\mathbf{R}$ ,  $g$  and  $h$  take every nonnull real value in every interval. It follows immediately that  $g, h \in U$ .

### B. Preconnectivities and generalized Darboux functions.

Throughout this paragraph we will identify a function and its graph. We recall the following definitions:  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is said to be connected provided its graph is a connected subset of  $X \times Y$ ;  $f$  is a connectivity function provided that, whenever  $C$  is a connected subset of  $X$ ,  $f|C$  is connected ( $X$  and  $Y$  are two topological spaces). It is well known that a function  $f : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  (where  $I$  is connected) is a connectivity function iff it is connected.

**Definition 1.**  $A \subset X$  is called preconnected iff  $\overline{A}$  is connected.

**Definition 2.** A function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is said to be preconnected if its graph is a preconnected subset of  $X \times Y$ .

**Definition 3.** A function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is called a preconnectivity function provided, whenever  $C$  is a connected subset of  $X$ ,  $f|C$  is preconnected.

There is no analogue to the result quoted before (namely preconnectedness does not imply preconnectivity) as the following example shows. Let

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \sin 1/x & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

The following result offers characterizations of preconnectivity functions:

**Theorem 2.** Let  $A$  be a nontrivial connected subset of  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $f \in U_0$
- (ii)  $f$  is a preconnectivity function.

**Proof:** (i)  $\rightarrow$  (ii) Consider  $[a, b] \subset A$ ,  $a < b$ , and take  $f^* = f|[a, b]$ . It is readily seen that (even for an arbitrary function) we have

$$(2) \quad \bar{\Gamma}_{f^*} = \{(x, y) : x \in \bar{A} \text{ and } y \in C_0(f^*, x)\}.$$

Let us consider the decomposition of  $\bar{\Gamma}_{f^*}$  into connected components.

$$(3) \quad \bar{\Gamma}_{f^*} = \bigcup \{C_i : i \in I\}.$$

Since projection on the  $x$  axis,  $\pi_1$ , is continuous, the sets  $G_i = \pi_1(C_i) \subset \mathbf{R}$ , are connected. Let us show that each  $G_i$  is closed. Let  $x_0 \in \bar{G}_i$ . Suppose, to the contrary that  $x_0 \notin G_i$  and take  $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset G_i$  with  $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ . Without loss of generality we may suppose (since  $x_0 \neq x_n, \forall n \geq 1$ ) that  $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is strictly monotone (for example, strictly increasing). Since  $x_1, x_n \in G_i$  and since  $G_i$  is connected (hence convex),  $[x_1, x_n] \subset G_i \forall n \geq 1$  and hence  $[x_1, x_0) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} [x_1, x_n] \subset G_i$ . It follows that  $\{(x, f(x)) : x \in [x_1, x_0)\} \subset C_i$ . Since  $C_i$  is closed (being a connected component) and since  $f \in U_0$ ,  $(x_0, f(x_0)) \in C_i$ . ( $f$  being in  $U_0$ , we may find a strictly increasing sequence  $(y_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset [x_1, x_0)$ ,  $y_n \rightarrow x_0$  and  $f(y_n) \rightarrow f(x_0)$ .) Consequently  $x_0 \in G_i$ . Thus  $G_i$  is closed.

Finally, for any  $y_0 \in \bar{A}$ , the points of the set  $\{y_0\} \times C_0(f, y_0)$  lie in a single connected component. Indeed  $C_0(f, y_0)$  is either  $C_0^-(f, y_0)$ ,  $C_0^+(f, y_0)$  or  $C_0^-(f, y_0) \cup C_0^+(f, y_0)$ . Since  $f \in U_0$ ,  $C_0^-(f, y_0)$  and  $C_0^+(f, y_0)$  are closed intervals containing  $f(y_0)$ . So, in any case,  $C_0(f, y_0)$  is connected. It follows that  $\{y_0\} \times C_0(f, y_0)$  is connected. Hence all its points lie in a single connected component. This means that for  $i \neq j$  we have  $G_i \cap G_j = \emptyset$ . Since  $\bar{A}$  is connected, since  $\bar{A} = \bigcup \{G_i : i \in I\}$  and since the sets are closed and mutually disjoint, it follows that  $\text{card}(I) = 1$ ; i.e.,  $\bar{\Gamma}_{f^*}$  connected.

(ii)  $\rightarrow$  (i) We will show that  $f$  satisfies condition (iii) of **Lemma 1**. Take  $a < b \in A$  and set  $f_* = f|[a, b]$ . Then  $\bar{\Gamma}_{f_*} = \{(x, y) : y \in C_0(f_*, x), x \in [a, b]\}$ . Denoting the projection of  $\bar{\Gamma}_{f_*}$  on the  $y$ -axis by  $B$ , we have

$$(4) \quad B = \bigcup C_0(f_*, x) : x \in [a, b].$$

Since  $\bar{\Gamma}_{f_*}$  is connected and since projection on the  $y$ -axis is a continuous function,  $B$  is connected and hence convex. It follows easily that  $\inf f_*(x), \sup f_*(x)$  ( $x$  in  $[a, b]$ ) are in  $B$ . (For example, let us show that  $\inf\{f(x) : x \in [a, b]\} \in \mathbf{R}$ . For any  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  take  $x_n \in [a, b]$  such that  $|f_*(x_n) - \inf\{f(x) : x \in [a, b]\}| \leq 1/n$ . The sequence  $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  has an accumulation point  $x_0 \in [a, b]$ . Hence  $\inf\{f(x) : x \in [a, b] \in C_0(f_*, x_0) \subset B$ .) It follows that  $[\inf f(x), \sup f(x)] : (x \in [a, b]) \subset \bigcup \{C_0(f_*, x) : x \in [a, b]\}$ . The other inclusion is obvious. Hence  $\forall a < b \in A \cup \{C_0(f_*, x) : x \in [a, b]\} = [\inf f_*(x), \sup f_*(x)]$  which means that  $f \in U_0$ .

### C. Quasiuniform Arzelá-Gagaëff-Alexandrov Convergence.

It is known that the classes  $U_0$  and  $U$  are closed under uniform convergence. It is natural to ask if this statement is valid when we replace uniform convergence by a weaker type of convergence. Moreover, since the classes  $U_0$  and  $U$  are “related”, it would be interesting to find a type of convergence so that, under this type of convergence, the closure of  $D$  is exactly  $U_0$ . (We recall that the closure of  $D$  under uniform convergence is  $U$ .) In what follows we offer a first glimpse, by studying the behavior of  $U$  and  $U_0$  under quasiuniform Arzelá-Gagaëff-Alexandrov convergence.

**Definition 4.** Let  $(X, \rho)$  and  $(Y, \sigma)$  be two metric spaces. The sequence  $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty, f_n : X \rightarrow Y$  converges quasiuniformly to  $f$  in the sense of Arzelá-Gagaëff-Alexandrov provided that  $f_n$  converges pointwise to  $f$  and, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a sequence (not necessarily infinite) of positive integers  $n_1 < n_2 \dots < n_p < n_{p+1} \dots$  and a corresponding sequence of open subsets of  $X$ ,  $G_1, G_2 \dots G_p, G_{p+1} \dots$  such that  $X = \bigcup\{G_i : i \geq 1\}$  and, for every  $i \geq 1$  and  $x \in G_i$ , we have  $\sigma(f(x), f_{n_i}(x)) < \varepsilon$ .

Clearly uniform convergence implies quasiuniform Arzelá-Gagaëff-Alexandrov convergence.

**Theorem 3.** *The class  $U_0$  is closed with respect to quasiuniform Arzelá-Gagaëff-Alexandrov (abbreviated AGA) convergence.*

**Proof:** Let  $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  be a sequence in  $U_0$  with  $f_n \xrightarrow{AGA} f$ . Let  $x_0 \in I$ . We will prove that each cluster set  $C_0^-(f, x_0), C_0^+(f, x_0)$  is connected (and then we will apply Lemma 1). Let us prove  $C_0^-(f, x_0)$  is connected. Let  $\alpha = \inf C_0^-(f, x_0)$  and  $\beta = \sup C_0^-(f, x_0)$ . If  $\alpha = \beta$ , there is nothing to prove. If  $\alpha < \beta$ , let  $z \in (\alpha, \beta)$  and set  $\gamma = \min\{|z - \alpha|, |\beta - z|\}$ . Take  $n \geq 1$ . Since  $f_n \xrightarrow{AGA} f$ , we may find  $G_{i_n}$  an open neighborhood of  $x_0$  such that for any  $x \in G_{i_n}$

$$(*) |f_{i_n}(x) - f(x)| < \frac{1}{3} \min(\gamma, 1/n).$$

For  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  let  $\alpha_n = \inf C_0^-(f_{i_n}, x_0)$  and  $\beta_n = \sup C_0^-(f_{i_n}, x_0)$ . Let us prove that  $z \in (\alpha_n, \beta_n)$ . Since  $\alpha = \inf C_0^-(f, x_0)$ , by the Definition 0, it is easy to see that there exists a sequence  $(x_m^{(n)})_{m=1}^\infty$  such that

- (i)  $x_m^{(n)} \in G_{i_n}, \forall m \geq 1$
- (ii)  $x_m^{(n)} < x_0, \forall m \geq 1$
- (iii)  $x_m^{(n)} \rightarrow x_0 (m \rightarrow \infty)$  and  $f(x_m^{(n)}) \rightarrow \alpha$ .

Since  $|f(x_m^{(n)}) - f_{i_n}(x_m^{(n)})| \leq \frac{1}{3} \min(\gamma, 1/n)$  and  $f(x_m^{(n)}) \rightarrow \alpha$ , it follows easily (provided  $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$ ) that the sequence  $(f_{i_n}(x_m^{(n)}))_{m \geq 1}$  is bounded. Hence we may find a convergent subsequence  $(f_{i_n}(x_{m_k}^{(n)}))_{k=1}^{\infty}$ . Let  $u$  be its limit. It is clear that  $u \geq \alpha_n$ . On the other hand from (\*) it follows that  $u \leq \alpha + \frac{1}{3} \min(\gamma, 1/n)$ . Hence  $\alpha_n \leq \alpha + \frac{1}{3} \min(\gamma, 1/n)$ . By the definition of  $\gamma$ ,  $\alpha_n < z$ . If  $\alpha = -\infty$ , then (as is easily verified)  $\alpha_n = -\infty$ . (The case  $\alpha = +\infty$  is not possible). We assumed that  $-\infty + c = -\infty$ .

Analogously one proves that  $z < \beta_n$ . Hence  $z \in (\alpha_n, \beta_n)$ . Since  $f_{i_n} \in U_0$ , we may select  $y_n \in G_{i_n}$  with  $y_n < x_0$  such that  $|y_n - x_0| < 1/m$  and  $|f_{i_n}(y_n) - z| < 1/n$ . It follows easily that  $y_n \rightarrow x_0$  and that  $f_{i_n}(y_n) \rightarrow z$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ). Since  $|f_{i_n}(y_n) - f(y_n)| < \frac{1}{3n}$ , it follows that  $\lim_n f(y_n) = z$ . Thus  $z \in C_0^-(f, x_0)$ . But  $z \in (\alpha, \beta)$  was arbitrary. Hence  $C_0^-(f, x_0)$  (and analogously  $C_0^+(f, x_0)$ ) is connected. By Lemma 1 it follows that  $f \in U_0$ . q.e.d.

The corresponding result for uniformly generalized Darboux functions is as follows:

**Theorem 4.** *The class  $U$  is closed under quasiuniform Arzelá-Gagaeff-Alexandrov convergence.*

**Proof:** Let  $f_n \in U$  with  $f_n \xrightarrow{AGA} f$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ). Since  $f_n \in U \subset U_0$ , by Theorem 3  $f \in U_0$ . Let  $N$  be an open interval such that  $f^{-1}(N) \neq \emptyset$ , let  $x_0 \in f^{-1}(N)$  and set  $y_0 = f(x_0)$ . Since  $x_0$  was chosen arbitrarily in  $f^{-1}(N)$ , to prove that  $f^{-1}(N)$  is  $c$ -dense in itself, it suffices to show that for any neighborhood  $V$  of  $x_0$   $\text{card}(f^{-1}(N) \cap V) = c$ . Consider such a neighborhood  $V$ . Moreover set  $\alpha = \inf N$  and  $\beta = \sup N$ . Then  $N = (\alpha, \beta)$ . Put  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \min\{|\alpha - y_0|, |\beta - y_0|, 1\}$ , let  $M = (y_0 - \gamma, y_0 + \gamma)$ , and let  $\varepsilon = \gamma/3$ . There is an index  $n_k \in \mathbf{N}$  and an open neighborhood  $V_{n_k} \in V(x_0)$  such that  $\forall x \in V_{n_k}$  we have  $|f(x) - f_{n_k}(x)| < \delta$ . Then  $f_{n_k}(x_0) \in M$ , and hence  $f_{n_k}^{-1}(M)$  is  $c$ -dense in itself. Show that  $V \cap V_{n_k} \cap f_{n_k}^{-1}(M) \subset V \cap f^{-1}(N)$ . Let  $z \in f_{n_k}^{-1}(M) \cap V \cap V_{n_k}$ . Then  $|f_{n_k}(z) - y_0| < \gamma$ . Since  $|f_{n_k}(z) - f(z)| < \gamma/3$ ,  $|f(z) - y_0| < \gamma + \gamma/3 < 2\gamma$ . Thus  $z \in f^{-1}(N)$  and hence  $z \in f^{-1}(N) \cap V$ . Since  $V \cap V_{n_k}$  is an open neighborhood of  $x_0$  and  $x_0 \in f_{n_k}^{-1}(M)$ ,  $\text{card}(V \cap V_{n_k} \cap f_{n_k}^{-1}(M)) = c$ . Hence  $\text{card}(V \cap f^{-1}(N)) = c$ . It follows that  $f^{-1}(N)$  is  $c$ -dense in itself. Since  $f \in U_0$ , by Lemma 2,  $f \in U$ . q.e.d.

**Remark:** Since  $D \subset U$ , (denoting by  $D^{AGA}$  the closure of the class of Darboux function under AGA convergence)  $\overline{D} \subset D^{AGA} \subset U^{AGA}$ . (The first inclusion holds because uniform convergence implies AGA convergence.) Since  $\overline{D} = U^{AGA} = U$ ,  $D^{AGA} = U$ . Hence we fail to "reach"  $U_0$  from  $D$  by AGA convergence. During the revising of this paper we have found a type of convergence such that  $\overline{D} = U_0$ .

**D. Stationary sets for generalized Darboux (uniformly generalized Darboux) functions.**

Throughout this paragraph all the functions are defined on  $(0, 1)$ . Following Boboc and Marcus [BM] we say that  $A \subset (0, 1)$  is stationary for a class  $F$  of functions if any  $f \in F$  is constant on  $(0, 1)$  when it is constant on  $A$ . In the same paper it is shown that the set  $A$  is stationary for the class  $D$  iff its complement is at most countable. (To obtain this result the Continuum Hypothesis is assumed.) Here we characterize the stationary sets for the classes  $U$  and  $U_0$ . We shall see assume the Continuum Hypothesis.

To attain this goal we must recall the following:

**Lemma 3 [BM].** *A real set contains a  $c$ -dense in itself subset iff it is of cardinality  $c$ .*

With these preliminaries we can prove the next result.

**Theorem 5.**  *$A \subset (0, 1)$  is stationary for the class  $U$  iff its complement is at most countable.*

**Proof:** (i) The condition is necessary: Suppose that  $A$  is stationary for the class  $U$ . Since  $D \subset U$ ,  $A$  is stationary for the class  $D$ . By the results in [BM] it follows that its complement is at most countable.

**Remark:** Since  $D \subset U \subset U_0$ , the condition is still necessary when replacing  $U$  by  $U_0$ .

(ii) The condition is sufficient: Assume that  $A$  is not stationary for the class  $U$ . We will show that  $C_A$  has the power of continuum. We may assume without loss of generality that  $A$  is dense in  $(0, 1)$  (otherwise  $C_A$  would contain an interval). Since  $A$  is not stationary for  $U$ , there is a constant  $k$  and a nonconstant function  $f \in U$  such that  $f(x) = k \forall x \in A$ . Let

$$B = \{x \in (0, 1) : f(x) \neq k\}.$$

Clearly  $B \subset C_A$ . We will show that  $B$  is  $c$ -dense in itself. Let  $x \in B$ . Assume that  $f(x) < k$  (to make a choice) and let  $I$  be an interval containing  $x$ . Since  $A$  is dense in  $(0, 1)$ , let  $y \in I$  such that  $f(y) = k$ . From the fact that  $f \in U$  it follows that  $C = \{z \in [x, y] : f(z) \in (f(x), f(y))\}$  is uncountable (otherwise it would contradict the definition of  $U$ ). Since  $C \subset B \cap [x, y] \subset B \cap I$ ,  $B \cap I$  is uncountable. Hence  $B$  is  $c$ -dense in itself. By **Lemma 3**  $C_A$  is uncountable.

Let us pass to the study of the stationary sets for the class  $U_0$ .

**Theorem 6.**  $A \subset (0, 1)$  is stationary for the class  $U_0$  iff its complement does not contain a set which is bilaterally dense in itself.

**Proof:** (i) The condition is necessary: Let  $A$  be stationary for  $U_0$ . It follows that its complement is at most countable. Since the case when  $(0, 1) \setminus A$  is finite is trivial, suppose  $(a_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is an enumeration of  $(0, 1) \setminus A$ . Let  $(r_n)_{n=0}^\infty$  be an enumeration of  $\mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$ . Suppose to the contrary that  $(0, 1) \setminus A$  contains a countable subset  $B$  bilaterally dense in itself. We will construct a nonnull function  $f : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f \in U_0$  such that  $f = 0$  on  $A$ . For any  $x \in (0, 1) \setminus B$  (hence also in  $A$ ) put  $f(x) = 0$ . Let  $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$  be an enumeration of  $B$ . We will define  $f$  inductively:

Step  $n = 0$ . Put  $f(b_0) = 1$ . Since  $B$  is bilaterally dense in itself, we may consider two subsequences of  $(b_n)$ ,  $(b_{i_k}^0)_{k=0}^\infty$  and  $(b_{j_k}^0)_{k=0}^\infty$  such that for any  $k \geq 0$ ,  $b_{i_k}^0 < b_0 < b_{j_k}^0$  and  $\lim_k b_{i_k}^0 = \lim_k b_{j_k}^0 = b_0$ . Put

$$f(b_{i_k}^0) = f(b_{j_k}^0) = \begin{cases} r_n & \text{iff } k \text{ is a power of } p_n \text{ the } n\text{-th prime number} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Step  $n + 1$ . Suppose  $f(b_0), \dots, f(b_n)$  have been already defined and for any  $0 \leq \ell \leq n$  we have chosen two sequences  $(b_{i_k}^\ell)_{k=0}^\infty$  and  $(b_{j_k}^\ell)_{k=0}^\infty$  just as in Step  $n = 0$ .

If  $f(b_{n+1})$  has not yet been defined, put  $f(b_{n+1}) = 1$ . Consider (as in Step  $n = 0$ ) two subsequences:  $(b_{i_k}^{n+1})_{k=0}^\infty$  and  $(b_{j_k}^{n+1})_{k=0}^\infty$  such that for any  $k \geq 0$

$$b_{i_k}^{n+1} < b_{n+1} < b_{j_k}^{n+1}$$

and

$$\lim_k b_{i_k}^{n+1} = \lim_k b_{j_k}^{n+1} = b_{n+1}.$$

Furthermore, just as for any  $0 \leq \ell \leq n$ ,  $\lim_k b_{i_k}^\ell = \lim_k b_{j_k}^\ell = b_\ell \neq b_{n+1}$ , we may suppose that for no  $k \geq 0$  have  $f(b_{i_k}^{n+1})$  and  $f(b_{j_k}^{n+1})$  been defined (by choosing them in an adequate neighborhood of  $b_{n+1}$ ). Put

$$f(b_{i_k}^{n+1}) = f(b_{j_k}^{n+1}) = \begin{cases} r_t & \text{if } k \text{ is a power of } p_t \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We have constructed  $f : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f = 0$  on  $A$ . Moreover, since  $\lim_k b_{i_{p_t^k}}^n = \lim_k b_{j_{p_t^k}}^n = b_n$  and for any  $k$   $f(b_{i_{p_t^k}}^n) = f(b_{j_{p_t^k}}^n) = r_t$  and  $\mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ , it is not hard to show that  $f \in U_0$ .

(ii) The condition is sufficient: Suppose  $A$  is not stationary for  $U_0$ . Then we may find  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $f \in U_0$  such that  $f = k$  on  $A$  but  $f \neq k$ . Let  $B = \{x \in (0, 1) : f(x) \neq k\}$ . Since  $f \in U_0$ ,  $B$  is bilaterally dense in itself. But  $B \subset (0, 1) \setminus A$ . q.e.d.



**E. Another characterization for the class  $U_0$ .**

We have seen that generalized Darboux functions do not preserve connectedness but have some “weaker” remarkable properties. In the sequel we will characterize them as the functions that “almost” preserve connectedness (in a sense it is given below).

For  $A \subset \mathbf{R}$  let

$$\nu(A) = \sup\{\lambda(B) : B = B^0, B \subset co(A) \setminus A\}$$

where  $B^0$  is the interior of  $B$ ,  $\lambda$  is Lebesgue measure, and  $co(A)$  is the convex hull of  $A$ .  $\nu(A)$  is a reasonable “measure” of the “holes” of the set  $A$ . Let  $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  and let  $I_0 \subset \mathbf{R}$  be an interval. Put

$$\omega_f^\nu(I_0) = \sup\{\nu(f(I)) : I \subset I_0, I \text{ interval}\}$$

and

$$\omega_f^\nu(x_0) = \inf\{\omega_f^\nu(I) : I \text{ interval}, x_0 \in I^0\}.$$

$\omega_f^\nu(x_0)$  is called the  $\nu$ -oscillation of  $f$  at  $x_0$ .

Finally, say that  $f$  is  $\nu$ -continuous at  $x_0$  iff  $\omega_f^\nu(x_0) = 0$ . It is easy to see that every generalized Darboux function defined on an interval  $I_0$  is  $\nu$ -continuous. (Indeed, for any interval  $I \subset I_0$ ,  $co f(I) = [\inf\{f(x) : x \in I\}, \sup\{f(x) : x \in I\}]$ . Hence the set  $f(I)$  is dense in  $co(f(I))$ . Thus  $\nu(f(I)) = 0$ .)

**Lemma 4.** *If  $\omega_f^\nu(x_0) = 0$ , then the cluster sets  $C_0^-(f, x_0)$  and  $C_0^+(f, x_0)$  are connected.*

**Proof:** We shall prove the assertion only for  $C_0^-(f, x_0)$ . Suppose that  $C_0^-(f, x_0)$  is not connected. Since  $C_0^-(f, x_0)$  is closed, there are  $y_0 \in co(C_0^-(f, x_0))$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $(y_0 - \varepsilon, y_0 + \varepsilon) \subset co(C_0^-(f, x_0))$  and  $(y_0 - \varepsilon, y_0 + \varepsilon) \cap C_0^-(f, x_0) = \phi$ . Then we find  $b < x_0$  such that  $\forall t \in (b, x_0)$ ,  $f(t) \notin [y_0 - \varepsilon/2, y_0 + \varepsilon/2]$ . Since  $y_0 + \varepsilon \in co(C_0^-(f, x_0)) = [\inf C_0^-(f, x_0), \sup C_0^-(f, x_0)]$ , there are  $x', y' \in C_0^-(f, x_0)$  with  $x' > y_0 + \varepsilon/2$  and  $y' < y_0 - \varepsilon/2$ . Set  $\alpha = \min\{|x' - y_0 - \varepsilon/2|, |y' - y_0 + \varepsilon/2|\}$ . Let  $p \leq b$  and  $V = [p, x_0]$ . Since  $x', y' \in C_0^-(f, x_0)$ , there are  $x_1, y_1 \in V$  with  $|f(x_1) - x'| < \alpha/2$  and  $|f(y_1) - y'| < \alpha/2$ . It follows easily that  $f(y_1) < y_0 - \varepsilon/2 < y_0 + \varepsilon/2 < f(x_1)$ . Consequently  $f(V)$  contains the “hole”  $[y_0 - \varepsilon/2, y_0 + \varepsilon/2]$ . Hence  $\nu(f(V)) \geq \varepsilon$ .

Let  $I$  be an interval containing  $x_0$  as an interior point.  $\nu(f(I \cap V)) \geq \varepsilon$  implies  $\omega_f^\nu(x_0) \geq \varepsilon$ . But this is a contradiction since  $\omega_f^\nu(x_0) = 0$ . Hence  $C_0^-(f, x_0)$  is connected.

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be a real function. Then  $f$  is  $\nu$ -continuous iff  $f$  is generalized Darboux.*

**Proof:** The assertion follows directly from **Lemma 4** and **Lemma 1**.

**Note:** The kind help of many anonymous referees in rewriting this paper is gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks to Professor Solomon Marcus for his constant help and valuable advice.

## References

- [BM] N. Boboc, S. Marcus, *Sur la détermination d'une fonction par les valeurs prises sur un certain ensemble*, Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Sup. (3) 76, (1959), 151-159.
- [BCW] A. M. Bruckner, J. Ceder, *Uniform limits of Darboux functions*, Colloq. Math. 15 (1966), 65-77.
- [EL] H. W. Ellis, *Darboux properties and applications to non-absolutely convergent integrals*, Canad. J. Math. 3 (1951), 471-485.
- [GT] B. D. Garrett, *Connected and connectivity functions on dendrites*, Real Anal. Exch. vol. 14, no. 2 (1988-1989), 440-447.
- [MS1] S. Marcus, *Sur la représentation d'une fonction arbitraire par des fonctions jouissant de la propriété de Darboux*, Trans. A.M.S., June 1960, vol. 95, no. 3, 489-494.
- [MS2] S. Marcus, *Private letter*, November, 1988.
- [MS3] S. Marcus, *Sur une classe de fonctions définies par des inégalités, introduite par M.A. Czaszar*, Ann. Sci. Math. 19 (3-4), 1958, 192-218.
- [MS4] S. Marcus, *Sur une propriété appartenant à toutes les fonctions réelles d'une variable réelle*, Boletín de la Facultad de Ingeniería 2 (Año 9) (1944), 647-668.
- [RD] T. Radakovič, *Über Darbouxche und Stetige funktionen*, Monatshefte für Math. und Physik 38 (1931), 117-122.

*Received January 28, 1991*