

# SEMIGROUPS OF CONTINUOUS SELFMAPS FOR WHICH GREEN'S $\mathcal{D}$ AND $\mathcal{J}$ RELATIONS COINCIDE

by K. D. MAGILL, JR.

(Received 29 June, 1977)

For algebraic terms which are not defined, one may consult [2]. The symbol  $S(X)$  denotes the semigroup, under composition, of all continuous selfmaps of the topological space  $X$ . When  $X$  is discrete,  $S(X)$  is simply  $\mathcal{T}_X$  the full transformation semigroup on the set  $X$ . It has long been known that Green's relations  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  coincide for  $\mathcal{T}_X$  [2, p. 52] and F. A. Cezus has shown in his doctoral dissertation [1, p. 34] that  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  also coincide for  $S(X)$  when  $X$  is the one-point compactification of the countably infinite discrete space. Our main purpose here is to point out the fact that among the 0-dimensional metric spaces, Cezus discovered the only nondiscrete space  $X$  with the property that  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  coincide on the semigroup  $S(X)$ . Because of a result in a previous paper [6] by S. Subbiah and the author, this property (for 0-dimensional metric spaces) is in turn equivalent to the semigroup being regular. We gather all this together in the following

**THEOREM.** *Let  $X$  be a 0-dimensional metric space. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $S(X)$  is a regular semigroup;
- (2)  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{J}$  in  $S(X)$ ;
- (3)  $X$  is either discrete or is the one-point compactification of the countably infinite discrete space.

*Proof.* The equivalence of (1) and (3) has been established in [6, Theorem 3.11]. It follows from Theorem 2.9 of [2, p. 52] and Proposition 2.19 of [1, p. 34] that (3) implies (2). Now suppose that (2) holds. We want to show that (3) must then hold. As a preliminary step, we show, by contradiction, that  $X$  has at most one limit point. Suppose to the contrary that  $X$  has more. Choose any two distinct limit points and denote them by  $a$  and  $b$  respectively. Now there exist sequences  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  converging to  $a$  and  $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  converging to  $b$  and we assume without loss of generality that all of the points involved are distinct. Let

$$A = \{a, b\} \cup \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \cup \{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$$

and choose mutually disjoint clopen sets  $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  and  $\{H_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  so that  $G_n \cap A = \{x_n\}$ ,  $H_n \cap A = \{y_n\}$ ,  $\lim \text{diam } G_n = 0$  and  $\lim \text{diam } H_n = 0$  where  $\text{diam}$  means diameter. Finally, let

$$B = X \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty [G_n \cup H_n],$$

*Glasgow Math. J.* **20** (1979) 25–28.

and define four functions  $f, g, v, w$  from  $X$  into  $X$  as follows:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} y_{2n} & \text{for } x \in G_n, \\ y_{2n-1} & \text{for } x \in H_n, \\ b & \text{for } x \in B. \end{cases}$$

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} y_n & \text{for } x \in G_n \cup H_n, \\ b & \text{for } x \in B. \end{cases}$$

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} y_n & \text{for } x \in G_n, \\ y_{n/2} & \text{for } x \in H_n, n \text{ even}, \\ y_{(n+1)/2} & \text{for } x \in H_n, n \text{ odd}, \\ b & \text{for } x \in B. \end{cases}$$

$$w(x) = \begin{cases} y_{2n} & \text{for } x \in G_n, \\ y_{2n-1} & \text{for } x \in H_n, \\ b & \text{for } x \in B. \end{cases}$$

Now  $f, g, v,$  and  $w$  are all continuous and, since the verifications are all somewhat similar, we give the details only in the case of the function  $f$ . Since  $G_n$  and  $H_n$  are clopen, it is immediate that  $f$  is continuous at all points of these sets. Let  $V$  be any open set containing the point  $b$ . Then there is a positive integer  $N$  such that  $y_n \in V$  for  $n \geq N$ . One readily verifies that

$$X \setminus [\cup [G_i \cup H_i]_{i=1}^N]$$

is a neighborhood of both  $a$  and  $b$  which  $f$  maps into  $V$ . This means that  $f$  is continuous at both  $a$  and  $b$ . It remains for us to consider a point  $c$  different from  $a$  and  $b$  and not in any  $G_n$  or  $H_n$ . Choose any clopen set  $W$  which contains  $c$  but does not contain either  $a$  or  $b$ . Since  $\lim x_n = a$ ,  $x_n \in G_n$  and  $\lim \text{diam } G_n = 0$ , it follows that  $W$  intersects only finitely many  $G_n$  and, for similar reasons,  $W$  intersects only finitely many  $H_n$  as well. Thus there is a positive integer  $N$  such that  $W \cap [G_n \cup H_n] = \emptyset$  for  $n > N$  and it follows that  $W \setminus \cup [G_i \cup H_i]_{i=1}^N$  is a clopen subset of  $X$  containing  $c$  which  $f$  maps into the point  $b$ . This establishes continuity at the point  $c$  and we now conclude that  $f$  and also the functions  $g, v$  and  $w$  are continuous. That is, they all belong to  $S(X)$ . Routine calculations will serve to verify that  $f = g \circ w$  and  $g = v \circ f$  and this means that  $f$  and  $g$  are  $\mathcal{F}$ -equivalent.

Now, according to theorem (3.1) of [5, p. 1490] a function in  $S(X)$  is regular if and only if its range is a retract of  $X$  and it maps some subspace homeomorphically onto its range. The function  $g$  is not only regular but, in fact, is idempotent. We show that  $f$  is not regular by showing that it doesn't map any subspace homeomorphically onto its range. Let

$E$  be any subspace which  $f$  maps bijectively onto its range. Then  $E \cap G_n$  consists of one point which we denote by  $a_n$  and similarly  $E \cap H_n$  consists of exactly one point which we denote by  $b_n$ . Finally  $E \cap f^{-1}(b)$  consists of one point and we denote it by  $t$ . Then

$$E = \{t\} \cup \{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \cup \{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}.$$

Since  $\lim \text{diam } G_n = 0$ ,  $\lim a_n = a$  and, for analogous reasons,  $\lim b_n = b$ . Since the only point of  $E$  which could possibly be a limit of  $E$  is the point  $t$ , it readily follows that  $E$  is not compact. Thus  $f$  does not map any subspace of  $X$  homeomorphically onto its range and we conclude that  $f$  is not a regular element of  $S(X)$ . Since  $g$  is regular, this means that  $f$  and  $g$  are not  $\mathcal{D}$ -equivalent even though they are  $\mathcal{F}$ -equivalent. We have been able to derive this contradiction because we assumed that  $X$  has more than one limit point. Thus  $X$  has at most one limit point.

We show next that  $X$  is either discrete or compact. Suppose it is neither. Then  $X$  has exactly one limit  $b$  with a sequence  $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  converging to it and another sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  with no limit points at all. We may assume that all of these points are distinct and, as we did previously, we will construct functions which are  $\mathcal{F}$ -equivalent but not  $\mathcal{D}$ -equivalent. In fact, the only difference in what we do now from what we did previously lies in the way we define the set  $A$ . This time, let

$$A = \{b\} \cup \{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \cup \{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}.$$

Then define the sets  $G_n$ ,  $H_n$  and  $B$  and the functions  $f$ ,  $g$ ,  $v$  and  $w$  just as before. They are all continuous and  $f$  and  $g$  are  $\mathcal{F}$ -equivalent since  $f = g \circ w$  and  $g = v \circ f$ . However, they are not  $\mathcal{D}$ -equivalent since  $g$  is idempotent while  $f$  is not even regular since, as before,  $f$  maps no subspace homeomorphically onto its range. This contradiction was reached because we assumed that  $X$  is neither discrete nor compact so it must be one of the two. It remains for us to show that if it is not discrete, then it is the one-point compactification of the countably infinite discrete space. This is easily done, for if  $X$  is not discrete then it is a compact space with exactly one limit point. That is, it is the one-point compactification of a discrete space. But that space must be countably infinite for  $X$  is metrizable and it is well-known that the one-point compactification of an uncountable discrete space is not metrizable [3, p. 247]. This concludes the verification that (2) implies (3), and thus the theorem is proved.

A few closing remarks are in order. In view of the theorem, there are very few 0-dimensional metric spaces  $X$  such that  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{F}$  on  $S(X)$  or, equivalently, such that  $S(X)$  is a regular semigroup. Instances outside the class of 0-dimensional metric spaces are also rare. To be sure, we have deGroot's spaces [4, p. 87] whose semigroups are all left zero semigroups with identities and, of course, such a semigroup is regular and  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  will coincide on it. However, if  $X$  is completely regular and Hausdorff and contains an arc, then  $S(X)$  will not be regular [5, p. 1490] and  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  will be distinct on  $S(X)$  [5, p. 1491].

In conclusion, we express our appreciation to the referee whose suggestions have resulted in a more economical presentation.

## REFERENCES

1. F. A. Cezus, *Green's relations in semigroups of functions*, Ph.D. thesis at Australian National University, Canberra, Australia (1972).
2. A. H. Clifford and G. B. Preston, *The algebraic theory of semigroups*, Vol. 1, Math Surveys of the Amer. Math. Soc. 7 (Providence, R. I., 1961).
3. J. Dugundji, *Topology* (Allyn and Bacon, 1966).
4. J. de Groot, Groups represented by homeomorphism groups I, *Math. Ann.* **138** (1959), 80–102.
5. K. D. Magill, Jr. and S. Subbiah, Green's relations for regular elements of semigroups of endomorphisms, *Canad. J. Math.* **26** (1974), 1484–1497.
6. K. D. Magill, Jr. and S. Subbiah, Green's relations for regular elements of sandwich semigroups II; semigroups of continuous functions, *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **25** (1978), 45–65.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO