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Abstract

Suppose $Y$ is a continuum, $x \in Y$, and $X$ is the union of all nowhere dense subcontinua of $Y$ containing $x$. Suppose further that there exists $y \in Y$ such that every connected subset of $X$ limiting to $y$ is dense in $X$. And, suppose $X$ is dense in $Y$. We prove $X$ is homeomorphic to a composant of an indecomposable continuum, even though $Y$ may be decomposable. An example establishing the latter was given by Christopher Mouron and Norberto Ordoñez in 2016.

Under similar assumptions, we explore whether a homogeneous continuum $Y$ must be indecomposable, with composant equal to $X$. This problem is closely related to a 2007 question of Janusz Prajs and Keith Whittington.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Terminology

By a continuum (plural form continua) we shall mean a connected compact metrizable space with more than one point. A continuum $Y$ is decomposable if there are two proper subcontinua $H, K \subseteq Y$ such that $Y = H \cup K$. If $Y$ is not decomposable, then $Y$ is indecomposable. We will say, more generally, that a connected space $X$ is indecomposable if $X$ cannot be written as the union of two proper closed connected subsets. Equivalently, $X$ is indecomposable if $X$ is the only closed connected subset of $X$ with non-void interior [7, §48 V Theorem 2].

A connected space $X$ is strongly indecomposable if for every two non-empty disjoint open sets $U$ and $V$ there are two disjoint closed sets $A$ and $B$ such that $X \setminus U = A \cup B$, $A \cap V \neq \emptyset$, and $B \cap V \neq \emptyset$. This term was introduced by the author in [8]. Strong indecomposability requires that the quasi-components of proper closed subsets of $X$ are nowhere dense in $X$, whereas indecomposability only requires that the connected components of proper closed subsets of $X$ are nowhere dense in $X$.

If $Y$ is a continuum and $x \in Y$, then $X$ is the composant of $x$ in $Y$ means that

\[ X = \bigcup \{K \subseteq Y : K \text{ is a proper subcontinuum of } Y \text{ and } x \in K\}. \]

Following [9], $X$ is the meager composant of $x$ in $Y$ if

\[ X = \bigcup \{K \subseteq Y : K \text{ is a nowhere dense subcontinuum of } Y \text{ and } x \in K\}. \]

(1.1)
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Given a connected set $X$, a continuum $Y \supseteq X$, and a point $y \in Y$, then $X$ is said to be singular dense with respect to $y$ if

$$\bar{C} = X \text{ for every connected } C \subseteq X \text{ with } y \in \overline{C}; \text{ and}$$

$$\overline{X} = Y.$$  \hfill (1.2)

This formulation is easily seen to be equivalent to the one in [9].

Say $X$ is a (meager) composant of $Y$ if there exists $x \in Y$ such that $X$ is the (meager) composant of $x$ in $Y$. Likewise, $X$ is a singular dense meager composant of $Y$ if there exists $y \in Y$ such that $X$ is singular with respect to $y$ (1.2), $X$ is dense in $Y$ (1.3), and $X$ is a meager composant of $Y$.

1.2. Motivation

There is no difference between composants and meager composants in an indecomposable continuum [10, Exercise 6.19]. Further, if $Y$ is an indecomposable continuum, and $X$ is any composant of $Y$, then $X$ is singular with respect to each point of the non-empty set $Y \setminus X$ [10, Theorems 11.15 & 11.17]. The composant $X$ is also necessarily dense in $Y$ [10, Theorem 5.4].

By contrast, an example in [9, Section 5] shows the two types of composants can differ quite dramatically inside of a decomposable continuum. There was constructed a plane continuum $\mathcal{Y}$ with only one traditional composant versus uncountably many meager composants, each singular dense.

![Figure 1: The “bucket-handle” $\mathcal{Z}$ and the Mouron-Ordoñez continuum $\mathcal{Y}$](graphics extracted from [9, Figure 3]). Every meager composant of $\mathcal{Y}$ is singular dense, but $\mathcal{Y}$ is decomposable.

That $\mathcal{Y}$ has only one composant follows easily from the fact that $\mathcal{Y} \cap ([0, 3] \times [-1, 1])$ is connected.\(^2\) The (singular dense) meager composants of $\mathcal{Y}$, on the other hand, are in one-to-one correspondence with the composants of the indecomposable “bucket-handle” continuum $\mathcal{Z}$. There is a continuous surjection $f : \mathcal{Z} \to \mathcal{Y}$ witnessing this fact. Letting $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ be the image of the accessible endpoint composant of $\mathcal{Z}$, we can see that $f \upharpoonright (\mathcal{Z} \setminus f^{-1}[\mathcal{X}])$ is a homeomorphism (the sets $f^{-1}[\mathcal{X}] \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ are indicated by the solid lines in Figure 1). In particular, every meager composant of $\mathcal{Y}$ other than $\mathcal{X}$ is homeomorphic to a composant of $\mathcal{Z}$.\(^3\) By the results of this paper, $\mathcal{X}$ is also homeomorphic to a composant of an indecomposable continuum.

---

\(^1\)Whenever $Y$ is a space of which $X$ is a subspace, and $A \subseteq X$, then we write $\overline{A}$ for the closure of $A$ in $X$, and $\overline{X}$ for the closure of $A$ in $Y$.

\(^2\)Rogers [13] called $\mathcal{Y} \cap ([0, 3] \times [-1, 1])$ the “Cajun accordion”.

\(^3\)Here it is worth noting that all non-endpoint composants of $\mathcal{Z}$ are mutually homeomorphic [1].
1.3. Results

**Theorem 1.** Every singular dense meager composant is strongly indecomposable.

**Corollary 1.** If $Y$ is a continuum and $X$ is a dense meager composant of $Y$, then the following are equivalent:

(i) $X$ is singular in $Y$;

(ii) $X$ is indecomposable;

(iii) $X$ is strongly indecomposable;

(iv) $Y \setminus X \neq \emptyset$ and $X$ is singular with respect to each point of $Y \setminus X$.

**Corollary 2.** If $X$ is indecomposable, and there is a continuum of which $X$ is a meager composant, then $X$ is strongly indecomposable.

It remains an open problem to determine whether there is an indecomposable connected set which is not strongly indecomposable, but we suspect there is such an example. Some variations of this problem appear in [8, Section 5].

**Theorem 2.** Every strongly indecomposable meager composant is homeomorphic to a composant of an indecomposable continuum.

Proving Theorem 2 will demonstrate: If $X$ is strongly indecomposable, and $Y \supseteq X$ is a continuum of which $X$ is a meager composant, then there is an indecomposable continuum $Z$ and homeomorphic embedding $\xi : X \rightarrow Z$ such that $\xi[X]$ is a composant of $Z$, and there is a mapping $f : Z \rightarrow Y$ such that $f[\xi[X]] = X$. We also obtain $\dim(Z) = \dim(X)$, so that $Z$ embeds into $[0,1]^{\dim(X)+2}$.

Theorem 1 plus Theorem 2 equals:

**Corollary 3.** Every singular dense meager composant is homeomorphic to a composant of an indecomposable continuum.

Corollary 2 plus Theorem 2 equals:

**Corollary 4.** If $X$ is indecomposable, and there is a continuum of which $X$ is a meager composant, then $X$ is homeomorphic to a composant of an indecomposable continuum.

The particular construction of $Z$ in Theorem 2 yields:

**Corollary 5.** If the continuum $Y$ has a singular dense meager composant, then each meager composant of $Y$ is dense.

Singularity is critical to Corollary 5. The union of two indecomposable continua with exactly one point in common has both dense and non-dense meager composants.

The following variation of Corollary 5 is false: If the continuum $Y$ has a singular dense meager composant, then each meager composant of $Y$ is singular dense. We have a counterexample which is based on the Mouron-Ordoñez construction, but will not present it here.

Additional results for homogeneous continua are given in an addendum at the end of this paper.
1.4. Organization of paper

Some straightforward but useful propositions are proved in Section 2. Then we will prove:

- Theorem 1 in Section 3;
- Theorem 2 in Section 4; and
- Corollaries 1 though 5 in Section 5.

We will conclude in Sections 6 and 7 with some questions and a brief study of singularities in filament additive homogeneous continua. These final sections are mostly self-contained and independent of Sections 1 though 5.

2. Preliminaries

If $X$ is a topological space, then for each $A \subseteq X$ and $x \in A$ we let $\text{cnt}(x, A)$ denote the connected component of $x$ in $A$. That is,

$$\text{cnt}(x, A) = \bigcup \{C \subseteq A : C \text{ is connected and } x \in C\}.$$

By the component decomposition of $X$ we shall mean the set $\{\text{cnt}(x, X) : x \in X\}$ equipped with the quotient topology; $U$ is open in $\{\text{cnt}(x, X) : x \in X\}$ if and only if $\bigcup U$ is open in $X$.

For any space $Y$, let $K(Y) := \{K \subseteq Y : K \text{ is compact and } K \neq \emptyset\}$ be equipped with the Vietoris topology [4, 2.7.20]. For metrizable $Y$, the Vietoris topology on $K(Y)$ coincides with the topology generated by a Hausdorff metric [4, 4.5.23].

**Proposition 1.** Let $(A_n) \in [K(Y)]^\omega$ be a sequence of continua in a non-empty space $Y$. If no subsequence of $(A_n)$ has connected union, then each $K(Y)$-accumulation point of $(A_n)$ is nowhere dense in $Y$.

**Proof.** Suppose $M \in K(Y)$ is an accumulation point of $(A_n)$.

For a contradiction, suppose $M^o \neq \emptyset$. Then $\Omega := \{n < \omega : A_n \cap M^o \neq \emptyset\}$ is infinite. By hypothesis, $S := \bigcup \{A_n : n \in \Omega\}$ is not connected. So there are $Y$-open sets $U$ and $V$ such that $U \cap S \neq \emptyset$, $V \cap S \neq \emptyset$, $U \cap V \cap S = \emptyset$, and $S \subseteq U \cup V$. The Vietoris open set $\{K \in K(Y) : K \cap U \cap M^o \neq \emptyset \text{ and } K \cap V \cap M^o \neq \emptyset\}$ contains $M$ as an element, but has empty intersection with $\{A_n : n < \omega\}$. This is a contradiction. Therefore $M^o = \emptyset$, i.e. $M$ is nowhere dense in $Y$. \qed

Let us now establish some direct consequences of (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3).

**Proposition 2.** Let $X$ be a meager composant of a continuum $Y$. If $K$ is a nowhere dense subcontinuum of $Y$, and $K \cap X \neq \emptyset$, then $K \subseteq X$.

**Proof.** Let $x$ be such that $X$ is the meager composant of $x$ in $Y$. Let $K$ be a nowhere dense subcontinuum of $Y$ such that $K \cap X \neq \emptyset$. Let $x' \in K \cap X$. By (1.1) there is a nowhere dense continuum $L \supseteq \{x, x'\}$. Then $K \cup L$ is a nowhere dense continuum containing $x$, whence $K \subseteq X$ by (1.1). \qed

**Remark 1.** Proposition 2 shows that meager composants partition a continuum.

**Proposition 3.** Every singular dense set is indecomposable.
Proof. Let \( X \) be singular dense with respect to \( y \) in a continuum \( Y \). Suppose \( X \) is the union of two proper closed connected subsets \( H \) and \( K \). Since \( y \in \overline{X} \) by (1.3), we have \( y \in \overline{H} \) or \( y \in \overline{K} \). Neither \( \overline{H} \) nor \( \overline{K} \) is equal to \( X \), so this violates (1.2).

Remark 2. [9, Theorem 7.6] says that every irreducible continuum with a singular dense meager composant is indecomposable. The proof uses the idea of minimal decompositions. For an alternate proof, combine Proposition 3 with [8, Theorem 6(iii)]. These results show that if \( Y \) is an irreducible continuum in which any connected set is singular dense, then \( Y \) is indecomposable.

Proposition 4. Every proper closed connected subset of an indecomposable meager composant is compact.

Proof. Let \( X \) be an indecomposable meager composant of a continuum \( Y \). Let \( C \) be a proper closed connected subset of \( X \). Then \( C \) is nowhere dense in \( X \), so \( \overline{C} \) is a nowhere dense subcontinuum of \( Y \).

By Proposition 2, \( \overline{C} \subseteq X \). Thus, \( \overline{C} = \overline{\overline{C}} = C \) is compact. \( \square \)

Proposition 5. Every indecomposable meager composant is of the first category of Baire.

Proof. Let \( X \) be a meager composant of a point \( x \) in a continuum \( Y \), and suppose \( X \) is indecomposable. Let \( \{U_n : n < \omega\} \) be a basis for \( X \setminus \{x\} \) consisting of non-empty open sets. Clearly \( X \supseteq \bigcup \{\text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U_n) : n < \omega\} \). Conversely, by (1.1) every point of \( X \) is in some \( \text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U_n) \). Thus \( X = \bigcup \{\text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U_n) : n < \omega\} \). Each \( \text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U_n) \) is nowhere dense by indecomposability of \( X \).

3. Proof of Theorem 1

Let \( X \) be a singular dense meager composant of continuum \( Y \). Let \( U \) and \( V \) be non-empty disjoint open subsets of \( X \). To show \( X \) is strongly indecomposable, we need to exhibit a relatively clopen (closed and open) subset of \( X \setminus U \) which intersects \( V \), but does not contain \( V \).

Let \( \mathcal{A} := \{\text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U) : x \in X \setminus U\} \) be the component decomposition of \( X \setminus U \). By indecomposability of \( X \) there are two components \( A_0, A_1 \in \mathcal{A} \) such that \( A_0 \neq A_1 \), \( A_0 \cap V \neq \emptyset \), and \( A_1 \cap V \neq \emptyset \).

If \( \mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \) is clopen, \( A_0 \in \mathcal{O} \), and \( A_1 \notin \mathcal{O} \), then \( \bigcup \mathcal{O} \) is a relatively clopen subset of \( X \setminus U \) which intersects \( V \), but does not contain \( V \). To prove the existence of \( \mathcal{O} \), we will show \( \mathcal{A} \) is zero-dimensional (that is, \( \mathcal{A} \) has a basis of clopen sets).

Claim 3.1. \( \mathcal{A} \subseteq K(X) \).

Proof. Propositions 3 & 4. \( \square \)

Claim 3.2. For every closed \( C \subseteq X \setminus U \), the set \( C' := \bigcup \{A \in \mathcal{A} : A \cap C \neq \emptyset\} \) is closed.

Proof. Let \( C \subseteq X \setminus U \) be closed. Suppose \( x \in \overline{C'} \). There exists \( (x_n) \in [C']^\omega \) such that \( x_n \to x \) as \( n \to \infty \). For each \( n < \omega \), let \( A_n = \text{cnt}(x_n, X \setminus U) \).

Case 1: A subsequence of \( (A_n) \) has connected union. Let \( (A_{n_k}) \) be a subsequence whose union is connected. Then by maximality of the connected component \( A_{n_0} \), we have \( A_{n_k} = A_{n_0} \) for each \( k \in \omega \). Then \( x \in A_{n_0} \) by the fact that \( A_{n_0} \) is closed, therefore \( x \in C' \).

Case 2: No subsequence of \( (A_n) \) has connected union. By Claim 3.1 and compactness of \( K(Y) \) [10, Corollary 4.13], \( (A_n) \in [K(Y)]^\omega \) has an accumulation point \( K \in K(Y \setminus U) \). Necessarily, \( K \) is a continuum [10, Corollary 4.18]. By Proposition 1, \( K \) is nowhere dense in \( Y \). Also, \( x \in K \). By Proposition 2, we have \( K \subseteq X \setminus U \). Further, \( K \cap C \neq \emptyset \). Otherwise, letting \( W \) be a \( Y \)-open set such that \( W \cap X = X \setminus C \), we find that \( K \subseteq W \) yet \( W \) contains no \( A_n \) because \( A_n \cap C \neq \emptyset \). Let \( A = \text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U) \). Then \( x \in K \subseteq A \subseteq C' \).

In each of the two possible cases we found that \( x \in C' \). Therefore \( C' = \overline{C'} \) is closed. \( \square \)
Whenever $E$ is a closed equivalence relation on a separable metrizable space $X$ (meaning the canonical epimorphism $\varphi : X \to X/E$ is closed), and the equivalence classes of $E$ are compact, then the quotient space $X/E$ is metrizable [4, Theorem 4.2.13]. This is a consequence of perfect maps such as $\varphi$ preserving regularity and second countability.

Let $E = \bigcup \{A^2 : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$, so that $\mathcal{A} = (X \setminus U)/E$. Let $\varphi : X \setminus U \to (X \setminus U)/E$ be the epimorphism defined by $\varphi(x) = \text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U)$. Observe that Claim 3.2 says $\varphi$ is closed because $\varphi^{-1}[\varphi[C]] = C'$. Together with Claim 3.1, this implies via [4, Theorem 4.2.13] that $\mathcal{A}$ is (separable and) metrizable.

Now we would like to represent $\mathcal{A}$ as a countable sum of closed zero-dimensional subspaces. To that end, let $U'$ be an open subset of $Y$ such that $U' \cap X = U$. By Propositions 3 & 5, there exists $y \in U' \setminus X$. Let $W_0 \supseteq W_1 \supseteq W_2 \ldots$ be a sequence of open subsets of $U'$ such that

$$\{y\} = \bigcap \{\overline{W_n} : n < \omega\}.$$

Fix $x' \in X \setminus U$.

**Claim 3.3.** $X \setminus U \subseteq \bigcup \{\text{cnt}(x', X \setminus W_n) : n < \omega\}$.

**Proof.** Let $x \in X \setminus U$. There is a nowhere dense continuum $L \subseteq X$ such that $\{x, x'\} \subseteq L$. Since $y \notin L$, there exists $n < \omega$ such that $W_n \cap L = \emptyset$. Then $x \in \text{cnt}(x', X \setminus W_n)$. \(\square\)

**Claim 3.4.** If $x \in K_n := \text{cnt}(x', X \setminus W_n) \setminus U$, then $\text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U) = \text{cnt}(x, K_n)$.

**Proof.** Suppose $x \in K_n$.

$$(\supseteq): \text{cnt}(x, K_n) \text{ is a connected subset of } X \setminus U \text{ containing } x, \text{ so } \text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U) \supseteq \text{cnt}(x, K_n).$$

$$(\subseteq): \text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U) \subseteq \text{cnt}(x, X \setminus W_n) = \text{cnt}(x', X \setminus W_n), \text{ thus}$$

$$\text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U) = \text{cnt}(x, \text{cnt}(x, X \setminus U) \setminus U) \subseteq \text{cnt}(x, \text{cnt}(x', X \setminus W_n) \setminus U) = \text{cnt}(x, K_n). \quad \square$$

For each $n < \omega$ let $\mathcal{R}_n = \{\text{cnt}(x, K_n) : x \in K_n\}$ be the component decomposition of $K_n$. By Claims 3.3 and 3.4, $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup \{\mathcal{R}_n : n < \omega\}$ is the component decomposition of $\mathcal{A}$. Endowed with the quotient topology, $\mathcal{A}$ contains each $\mathcal{R}_n$ as a subspace. And by compactness of $K_n$ (Propositions 3 & 4), each $\mathcal{R}_n$ is zero-dimensional [4, Theorem 6.2.24]. Thus, $\mathcal{A}$ being the separable metrizable union of the $\mathcal{R}_n$ implies it is zero-dimensional [6, Theorem 1.3.1].

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

4. **Proof of Theorem 2**

Suppose $X$ is strongly indecomposable and $Y \supseteq X$ is a continuum of which $X$ is a meager component. We will construct an indecomposable continuum $Z$ such that $X$ is homeomorphic to a component of $Z$.

By [8, Theorem 9], there is a homeomorphic embedding $\iota : X \hookrightarrow [0, 1]^{\omega}$ such that $I := \overline{\iota[X]}$ is an indecomposable continuum.

Let $\Gamma : Y \hookrightarrow [0, 1]^{\omega}$ be a homeomorphic embedding of $Y$, and put $\gamma := \Gamma | X$.

Let $\pi_n : [0, 1]^{\omega} \to [0, 1]$ be the $n$-th coordinate projection. According to [5, Exercise 1.7.C], and also [6], there is a continuum

$$Z = \overline{\xi[X]}$$

such that $\dim(Z) = \dim(X)$, and for each $n < \omega$ the maps

$$\varphi_n := \pi_n \circ \iota \circ \xi^{-1} : \xi[X] \to [0, 1]; \text{ and}$$

$$\psi_n := \pi_n \circ \gamma \circ \xi^{-1} : \xi[X] \to [0, 1]$$

(4.1)
continuously extend to $Z$.

For each $n < \omega$, let $\Phi_n : Z \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\Psi_n : Z \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the continuous extensions of $\varphi_n$ and $\psi_n$, respectively. Define $\Phi : Z \rightarrow [0, 1]^\omega$ by $\pi_n \circ \Phi = \Phi_n$, and likewise for $\Psi$. Then $\Phi$ maps onto $I$, and $\Psi$ maps onto $\gamma[X]$. Observe that $\Phi \upharpoonright \xi[X] = \iota \circ \xi^{-1}$ and $\Psi \upharpoonright \xi[X] = \gamma \circ \xi^{-1}$ are homeomorphisms. Together with (4.1), we have

$$\Phi^{-1}[\iota[X]] = \xi[X]; \text{ and}$$

$$\Psi^{-1}[\gamma[X]] = \xi[X].$$

Claim 4.1. $Z$ is indecomposable.

Proof. By (4.1) and (4.2), $\Phi$ maps proper subcontinua of $Z$ onto proper subcontinua of $\iota[X]$. Therefore, indecomposability of $I$ implies $Z$ is indecomposable. For if $Z$ were the union of two proper subcontinua $H$ and $K$, then $I$ would be the union of proper subcontinua $\Phi[H]$ and $\Phi[K]$. \qed

Claim 4.2. $\Psi$ maps nowhere dense subcontinua of $Z$ to nowhere dense subcontinua of $\Gamma[Y]$.

Proof. For any compact $N \subseteq Z$, if $\Psi[N] \subseteq \gamma[X]$ has non-void interior, then $\xi \circ \gamma^{-1}[\Psi[N]] \subseteq N$, true by (4.3), shows that $N$ has non-void interior in $Z$. \qed

By (4.3), Claim 4.2, and the assumption that $X$ is a meager composant of $Y$, $\xi[X]$ contains a meager composant of $Z$. By Claim 4.1, this means $\xi[X]$ contains a composant of $Z$. Conversely, by Proposition 5 we know $\xi[X] \neq Z$. Since $X$ is also continuum-wise connected, $\xi[X]$ is contained in a composant of $Z$. Therefore $\xi[X]$ is equal to a composant of $Z$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

![Figure 2: Commutative diagrams for $\Phi$ and $\Psi$.](image)

Remark 3. Define $f = \Gamma^{-1} \circ \Psi$ for a surjection $f : Z \rightarrow \overline{X}$ such that $f[\xi[X]] = X$.

5. Proofs of Corollaries 1 through 5

Proof of Corollary 1. (i)$\Rightarrow$(iii): Theorem 1.

(iii)$\Rightarrow$(ii): See the second paragraph in [8, Section 2].

(ii)$\Rightarrow$(iv): Suppose $Y$ is a continuum, $X$ is a dense meager composant of $Y$, and $X$ is indecomposable. By Proposition 5, $Y \setminus X \neq \emptyset$. Let $y$ be any point in $Y \setminus X$. Let $C$ be a connected subset of $X$ such that $y \in \overline{C}$. Since $X$ is a meager composant, $\overline{C}$ has non-empty interior, so $\overline{C}$ has non-empty interior in $X$. By indecomposability of $X$ we have $\overline{C} = X$. This shows $X$ is singular with respect to $y$.

(iv)$\Rightarrow$(i): Trivial. \qed
Proof of Corollary 2. Assuming \( X \) is indecomposable, and \( Y \) is a continuum of which \( X \) is a meager composant, then \( X \) is a singular dense meager composant of \( \overline{Y} \) by Corollary 1. Then by Theorem 1, \( X \) is strongly indecomposable.

Proof of Corollary 3. Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.


Proof of Corollary 5. If continuum \( Y \) has a singular dense meager composant, we have shown that a continuum \( Z \) maps onto \( Y \) so that each meager composant of \( Y \) contains the image of a composant of \( Z \). Each composant of \( Z \) is dense, therefore each meager composant of \( Y \) is dense.

6. Questions

**Question 1.** Let \( Y \) be a continuum with a singular dense meager composant. Must \( Y \) have at least three meager composants?

Compare Question 1 with [9, Problem 8.8], on whether there is a continuum \( Y \) with a point \( x \) such that the meager composants of \( Y \) are \( \{x\} \) and \( Y \setminus \{x\} \). A counterexample to Question 1 would also have exactly two meager composants; a dense first category \( F_\sigma \)-set and its complement, a dense \( G_\delta \)-set. This \( G_\delta \) would not be \( F_\sigma \), contrary to [9, Conjecture 8.4]. Therefore, we conjecture a positive answer to Question 1.

A subcontinuum \( K \) of a continuum \( Y \) is filament if there exists an open set \( U \supseteq K \) such that \( \text{cnt}(K,U) \) is nowhere dense (Prajs & Whittington [11]). \( X \subseteq Y \) is the filament composant of a point \( x \in Y \) means that

\[
X = \bigcup \{ K \subseteq Y : K \text{ is a filament subcontinuum of } Y \text{ and } x \in K \}.
\]

Filament composants are always contained in meager composants, but meager composants may be much larger than filament composants. In \( \mathbb{R} \) (Figure 1), for example, each meager composant is dense, but each filament composant is nowhere dense. The filament composant of \( (0,1) \) is \( \emptyset \times [0,1] \), for instance. The filament composant of \( (0,0) \) is the arc from \( (0,-1) \) to \( (3,1) \), excluding the latter point. Generally, it is known that if \( X \) is a filament composant of continuum \( Y \), then \( X \) is a first category \( F_\sigma \)-subset of \( Y \) [11, Proposition 1.8].

**Question 2.** Is there a decomposable continuum with a singular dense filament composant?

Question 2 is also of interest for homogeneous and/or filament additive continua. A space is homogeneous if for every two points \( x \) and \( y \) in the space, there is a homeomorphism which maps the entire space onto itself, and maps \( x \) to \( y \). A continuum is filament additive if the union of every two intersecting filament subcontinua is filament [12]. This property implies the filament composants partition the continuum into pairwise disjoint sets.\(^4\)

**Question 3.** Let \( Y \) be a filament additive homogeneous continuum with singular dense filament composants. Is \( Y \) necessarily indecomposable?

**Remark 4.** The circle times a (non-circle) solenoid shows the answer to Question 3 is “no” in the absence of the singular hypothesis. The dense hypothesis is equally important (see Remark 5 in the next section).

\(^4\)Observe that \( \mathbb{R} \) is neither filament additive nor homogeneous.
7. Addendum: Filament composants and singularities in homogeneous continua

Here we give some results toward answering Question 3 in the affirmative. Throughout the section, $Y$ is assumed to be a filament additive homogeneous continuum with dense filament composants.

The terms homogeneous, filament continuum, filament composant, and filament additive were defined in the previous section. For each point $x \in Y$, let $fcs(x)$ denote the filament composant of $x$. Let

$$\text{sng}(x) = \{ y \in Y : (\forall \text{ connected } C \subseteq fcs(x) \text{ with } x \in C)(y \in \overline{C} \Rightarrow \overline{C} = fcs(x)) \}$$

be the set of filament singularities of $x$.

Non-filament subcontinua of $Y$ are called ample.\(^5\) An ample subcontinuum $A \subseteq Y$ is minimal if every proper subcontinuum of $A$ is a filament subcontinuum of $Y$.

### 7.1. Non-singularities in ample subcontinua

**Proposition 6.** Let $A$ be an ample subcontinuum of $Y$, and $x \in A$. If $A \neq Y$, then

$$A \setminus [fcs(x) \cup sng(x)] \neq \emptyset.$$  

**Proof.** Suppose $A \neq Y$.

By [12, Corollary 3.6], there is an open $U \subseteq Y$ such that $fcs(x) \subseteq U$, and every continuum in $U$ is filament. Since $A$ is ample, $A \setminus U \neq \emptyset$. Let $\varepsilon = d_{\inf}(x, A \setminus U) = \inf \{ d(x, y) : y \in A \setminus U \}$. For each $n < \omega$, let $V_n \supseteq A \setminus U$ be the open “ball” of $d_{\inf}$-radius $\varepsilon/2^n$ around $A \setminus U$. Each continuum $A_n := \text{cnt}(x, A \setminus V_n)$ is a subset of $U$, and is therefore filament. Since $x \in A_n$, this means $A_n \subseteq fcs(x)$. Now consider the connected set $C := \bigcup \{ A_n : n < \omega \}$. Apparently $x \in C \subseteq fcs(x)$. Further, density of $fcs(x)$ implies $fcs(x) \setminus A \neq \emptyset$, so $\overline{C} \neq fcs(x)$. Therefore $\overline{C} \setminus sng(x) = \emptyset$.

By [4, Lemma 6.1.25], $A_n \cap \partial V_n \neq \emptyset$ for each $n < \omega$. So by compactness of $A \setminus U$, there exists $z \in \overline{C} \setminus U$. We have $z \in \overline{C} \setminus [U \cup sng(x)] \subseteq A \setminus [fcs(x) \cup sng(x)]$. \(\Box\)

**Theorem 3.** $Y$ is indecomposable if and only if $fcs(x) \cup sng(x) = Y$ for some (every) $x \in Y$.

**Proof.** If $Y$ is indecomposable, then the equation holds for each $x$ because the filament composants and traditional composants of $Y$ coincide and partition $Y$. Conversely, if $Y$ is decomposable then there is a proper ample subcontinuum $A \subseteq Y$. Let $x \in A$. By Proposition 6, $fcs(x) \cup sng(x) \neq Y$. Since $Y$ is homogeneous, we have $fcs(x) \cup sng(x) \neq Y$ for every $x \in Y$. \(\Box\)

**Remark 5.** The circle of pseudoarcs shows the statement of Theorem 3 is false unless filament composants are assumed to be dense. Thanks to Janusz Prajs for suggesting this example.

To answer Question 3 in the affirmative, by Theorem 3 it suffices to show singular dense filament composants are singular with respect to all points in their respective complements. This was true for meager composants (Corollary 1), but remains unknown in the present setting.

### 7.2. The non-singularity relation

Let $\neg \text{sng} = \{ \langle x, y \rangle \in Y^2 : y \notin \text{sng}(x) \}$. Write $\neg \text{sng}(x, y)$ for $\langle x, y \rangle \in \neg \text{sng}$.

**Proposition 7.** $\neg \text{sng}(x, y)$ implies $\neg \text{sng}(x', y)$ when $x$ and $x'$ are in the same filament composant.

---

Proof. Suppose ¬sng(x, y) and x′ ∈ fcs(x). Let C ⊆ fcs(x) be connected such that x ∈ C ⊆ Cl ≠ fcs(x) and y ∈ Cl. Let L ⊇ {x, x′} be a filament subcontinuum of Y. Then C ∪ L is a connected subset of fcs(x) = fcs(x′), x′ ∈ C ∪ L, and y ∈ Cl ∪ L. And since L is nowhere dense we find Cl ∪ L ≠ fcs(x′). Thus C ∪ L witnesses ¬sng(x′, y).

Equivalently, sng(x) = sng(x′) if x and x′ are in the same filament composant. Thus, fcs(x) is singular (as defined in Section 1) if and only if sng(x) ≠ ∅.

Proposition 8. ¬sng is an equivalence relation.

Proof. We need to show ¬sng is reflexive, transitive, and symmetric.

Reflective: The standing assumption fcs(x) = Y implies {x} ⊆ fcs(x). Therefore ¬sng(x, x).

Transitive: Suppose ¬sng(x, y) and ¬sng(y, z). We will show ¬sng(x, z).

If fcs(x) decomposes into two proper relatively closed connected subsets, then z lies in the Y-closure of at least one of the two sets. Thus ¬sng(x′, z) for some x′ ∈ fcs(x). Then ¬sng(x, z) by Proposition 7. Let us now assume fcs(x) is indecomposable.

Let C and D be connected subsets of fcs(x) and fcs(z), respectively, such that x ∈ C, z ∈ D, y ∈ Cl ∩ D, C ≠ fcs(x) and D ≠ fcs(z). Indecomposability of fcs(x) implies Cl is nowhere dense. Thus, there exists x′ ∈ fcs(x) \ (Cl ∪ D) and ε > 0 such that B(x′, 2ε) ∩ (Cl ∪ D) = ∅. For each n < ω, let δn be an Effros number\(^6\) for ε/2\(^n\). Choose (x\(_n\)) ∈ C ≤ \(\bigcap\)\(\{\bigcup\{B(y, \delta_n/2) : n < \omega\}\) and (z\(_n\)) ∈ D ≤ \(\bigcap\)\(\{\bigcup\{B(y, \delta_n/2) : n < \omega\}\), so that d(x\(_n\), z\(_n\)) < \(\delta_n\). Let h\(_n\) : Y → Y be a surjective homeomorphism such that h\(_n\)(z\(_n\)) = x\(_n\) and d(w, h\(_n\)(w)) < ε/2\(^n\) for all w ∈ Y. The connected set

\[ E := C \cup \bigcup\{h_n[D] : n < \omega\} \]

shows ¬sng(x, z). Indeed, x ∈ E, and E ⊆ fcs(x) by filament additivity. Further, x′ ∈ fcs(x) \ E, and h\(_n\)(z) → z as n → ∞. Therefore ¬sng(x, z).

Symmetric: Let x, z ∈ Y, and suppose ¬sng(z, x). One can show ¬sng(x, z) by modifying the two previous paragraphs. Simply replace C with \{x\}, and y with x (illustrated in Figure 3). The set E will again witness ¬sng(x, z).

Figure 3: Transitivity (left) and symmetry (right) of ¬sng; Proposition 8.

Remark 6. By Proposition 8, \(Y / \neg \text{sng} = \{Y \setminus \text{sng}(x) : x ∈ Y\}\) partitions Y. By Proposition 7 and symmetry of ¬sng, this partition is coarser than the partition of Y into filament composants. Likewise, each sng(x) is a union of filament composants.

Remark 7. Theorem 3 says Y is indecomposable if and only if \(Y / \neg \text{sng} = \{\text{fcs}(x) : x ∈ Y\}\).

Remark 8. Question 3 asks whether \(|Y / \neg \text{sng}| > 1\) implies Y is indecomposable.

\(\bigwedge\)If Y is a homogeneous continuum, then for every ε > 0 there is a positive number δ, called an Effros number for ε, such that for each pair of points with d(x, y) < δ there is an onto homeomorphism h : Y → Y such that h(x) = y and d(z, h(z)) < ε for each z ∈ Y. This is called the Effros Theorem. It follows from the more general [3, Theorem 2].
7.3. A question of Prajs & Whittington

[12, Question 7]: Let $Y$ be a homogeneous filament additive continuum with dense filament composants. Does each ample continuum in $Y$ intersect every filament composant of $Y$?

Assuming the answer to this question is “yes”, the answer to Question 3 is also “yes”. For suppose that the dense filament composants of $Y$ are singular. Let $x$ and $y$ be such that $y \in sng(x)$. Let $A$ be a minimal ample subcontinuum of $Y$, provided by [11, Corollary 2.5]. Assuming $A$ intersects every filament composant, there exists $x' \in A \cap fcs(x)$ and $y' \in A \cap fcs(y)$. Since $fcs(y) \subseteq sng(x)$ (Remark 6), we have $y' \in sng(x) = sng(x')$. If $A \neq Y$, then by the proof of Proposition 6 there is a connected $C \subseteq A \cap fcs(x')$ such that $x' \in C \subseteq \overline{C} \neq fcs(x')$ and $\overline{C} \setminus fcs(x') \neq \emptyset$. Then $\overline{C}$ is ample, so $\overline{C} = A$ by minimality of $A$. This contradicts $y' \in sng(x')$. Therefore $A = Y$, i.e. $Y$ is indecomposable.

By these arguments, the existence of one minimal ample subcontinuum which meets two non-singularity classes would imply $Y$ is indecomposable.
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