

ON CLOSED DEFINABLE SUBSETS IN HENSEL MINIMAL STRUCTURES

KRZYSZTOF JAN NOWAK

ABSTRACT. This paper deals with Hensel minimal structures on non-trivially valued fields K . The main aim is to establish the following two properties of closed 0-definable subsets A in the affine spaces K^n . Every such subset A is the zero locus of a continuous 0-definable function $f : K^n \rightarrow K$, and there exists a 0-definable retraction $r : K^n \rightarrow A$. While the former property is a non-Archimedean counterpart of the one from o-minimal geometry, the former does not hold in real geometry in general. The proofs make use of a model-theoretic compactness argument and ubiquity of clopen sets in non-Archimedean geometry.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper continues our research on Henselian valued fields from our papers [14, 16, 17, 18], and particularly on Hensel minimal structures from [19, 20]. The axiomatic theory of Hensel minimal structures was introduced by Cluckers–Halupczok–Rideau [4, 5]. Actually, their research followed numerous earlier attempts to find suitable approaches in geometry of Henselian valued fields which, likewise o-minimality in real geometry, would realize the postulates of both tame topology and tame model theory. Those attempts have led to various, axiomatically based concepts such as C-minimality [11, 15], P-minimality [12], V-minimality [13], b-minimality [6], tame structures [2, 3], and eventually Hensel minimality.

So let K be a 1-h-minimal structure, i.e. a model of a 1-h-minimal theory in an expansion \mathcal{L} of the language of valued fields. The main aim is to establish the following two properties of closed 0-definable subsets A in the affine spaces K^n .

Theorem 1.1. *Every closed 0-definable subset A of K^n is the zero locus $\mathcal{Z}(g) := \{x \in K^n : g(x) = 0\}$ of a continuous 0-definable function g on K^n .*

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03C65, 03C98, 12J25.

Key words and phrases. Non-Archimedean geometry, Hensel minimality, closed sets, cell decomposition, definable retractions, definable extension.

Theorem 1.2. *For every non-empty closed 0-definable subset A of an affine space K^n , there exists a 0-definable retraction $r : X \rightarrow A$.*

Remark 1.3. Note that while the former property is a counterpart of the one from o-minimal geometry (see e.g. [1, Proposition 2.7.5] and [8, Property 4.22]), the former does not hold in real geometry in general. The proofs of these theorems make use of a model-theoretic compactness argument and ubiquity of clopen sets in non-Archimedean geometry.

As an immediate corollary from Theorem 1.2, we obtain the following non-Archimedean version of the Tietze–Urysohn extension theorem.

Corollary 1.4. *Let A be a closed 0-definable subset of an affine space K^n . Then every continuous 0-definable function $f : A \rightarrow K$ can be extended to a continuous 0-definable function $F : X \rightarrow K$.*

Proof. Put $F := f \circ r$ where $r : K^n \rightarrow A$ is a 0-definable retraction. \square

We shall adopt the multiplicative convention $|\cdot|$ for the valuation of the ground field K . For $x \in K^n$, put

$$|x| := \max \{|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|\}$$

and

$$B(a, r) := \{x \in K^n : |x - a| < r\}$$

for $a \in K^n$, $r \in |K|$, $r > 0$. Note that every two (open) balls $B(a, \epsilon)$ and $B(x, r)$, $a, x \in K^n$, are either disjoint, or one is contained in the other according as $\epsilon \leq r$ or $r \leq \epsilon$.

2. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

We begin by stating two lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. *If $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^s A_i$ and the conclusions of the main theorems hold for every subset A_i , then they hold for A .*

Proof. The case of Theorem 1.1 is immediate. Indeed, if $A_i = \mathcal{Z}(g_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, s$, then $A = \mathcal{Z}(g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_s)$.

For Theorem 1.2, it is enough (by induction on s) to consider the case $s = 2$. Put

$$U_1 := \bigcup \{B(x, r) : x \in A_1 \setminus A_2, r < R(x)\},$$

where

$$B(x, r) := \{y \in K^n : |y - x| < r\}$$

and

$$R(x) := \{|x - y| : y \in A_2\} \text{ for } x \in A_1 \setminus A_2.$$

Obviously, U_1 is an open 0-definable subset of K^n containing $A_1 \setminus A_2$ and disjoint from A_2 .

Furthermore, we assert that the set $U_1 \cup (A_1 \cap A_2)$ is a closed subset of K^n . It suffices to show that if a lies in the closure $\overline{U_1}$ of the set U_1 , then $a \in U_1$ or $a \in A_1 \cap A_2$. So supposing $a \notin A_1 \cap A_2$, we must get $a \in U_1$.

Were $a \in A_2$, we would get $a \notin A_1$. Then

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists x \in A_1 \setminus A_2 \exists r < R(x) \ B(a, \epsilon) \cap B(x, r) \neq \emptyset.$$

If $\epsilon \leq r$, then $B(a, \epsilon) \subset B(x, r)$, and thus $B(x, r) \cap A_2 \neq \emptyset$, which is impossible. Therefore $\epsilon \geq r$, and then $\overline{B(x, r)} \subset B(a, \epsilon)$. Hence $B(a, \epsilon) \cap A_1 \neq \emptyset$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, and thus $a \in \overline{A_1} = A_1$, which again is a contradiction.

Therefore $a \notin A_2$ and then $B(a, \epsilon_0) = \emptyset$ for an $\epsilon_0 > 0$. When $a \in A_1$, then $a \in U_1$, as desired. So suppose $a \notin A_1$. Then

$$\forall \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0) \exists x \in A_1 \setminus A_2 \exists r < R(x) \ B(a, \epsilon) \cap B(x, r) \neq \emptyset.$$

If $\epsilon \leq r$ for some $r < R(x)$, then $B(a, \epsilon) \subset B(x, r)$, $a \in B(x, r)$ and thus $a \in U_1$, as desired. The other case where $\epsilon \geq r$ for all $r < R(x)$ is impossible, because then we would get $\overline{B(x, r)} \subset B(a, \epsilon)$. Hence $B(a, \epsilon) \cap A_1 \neq \emptyset$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, and thus $a \in \overline{A_1} = A_1$, which again is a contradiction. This proves the assertion.

Consequently, U_1 is disjoint from A_2 and is a clopen 0-definable neighbourhood of $A_1 \setminus A_2$ in $K^n \setminus (A_1 \cap A_2)$.

The situation is symmetric. It is easy to check that the set

$$U_2 := K^n \setminus (U_1 \cup (A_1 \cap A_2))$$

is disjoint from A_1 , is a clopen 0-definable neighbourhood of $A_2 \setminus A_1$ in $K^n \setminus (A_1 \cap A_2)$, and the set $U_2 \cup (A_1 \cap A_2)$ is a closed subset of K^n .

Therefore, if $r_1 : X \rightarrow A_1$ and $r_2 : X \rightarrow A_2$ are two 0-definable retractions, so is the map

$$r : K^n \rightarrow (A_1 \cup A_2)$$

given by the formula

$$r(x) = \begin{cases} r_1(x) & \text{if } x \in U_1 \cup (A_1 \cap A_2), \\ r_2(x) & \text{if } x \in U_2 \cup (A_1 \cap A_2), \end{cases}$$

which is the desired result. \square

Lemma 2.2. *There exists a continuous definable function $g_t : K_w^t \rightarrow K$ such that*

$$g_t(w) = 0 \iff w = 0.$$

Proof. We define the functions g_t inductively. Put

$$g_2(w_1, w_2) := \begin{cases} w_1 & \text{if } |w_2| \leq |w_1|, \\ w_2 & \text{if } |w_1| < |w_2|, \end{cases}$$

and

$$g_{t+1}(w_1, \dots, w_{t+1}) := g_2(g_t(w, \dots, t_t), w_{t+1}).$$

□

For the proofs of both theorems under study, we shall proceed by induction with respect to the dimension $k = \dim A$. The case $k = 0$ is straightforward by the above lemmas.

So assume that the conclusion holds for the subsets of K^n of dimension $< k$ with $1 \leq k \leq n$. We shall first consider the case $k < n$, reducing the problem to the sets A of a special form. To this end, we shall apply parametrized cell decomposition, Lemma 2.1 and a model-theoretic compactness argument.

In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we can and shall additionally assume that the subset A is bounded. Indeed, put

$$A = \bigcup \{A_I : I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}\} \text{ with } A_I := A \cap B_I$$

with

$$B_I := \{x \in K^n : |x_i| \leq 1 \text{ for } i \in I \text{ and } |x_j| > 1 \text{ for } j \notin I\},$$

and

$$\phi_I : B_I \rightarrow K^n, \quad \phi_I(x) = y,$$

where $y_i = x_i$ for $i \in I$ and $y_j = 1/x_j$ for $j \notin I$. Then B_I are clopen subsets of K^n , ϕ_I are homeomorphisms of B_I onto the bounded subsets $D_I := \phi_I(B_I)$, and $E_I := \phi_I(A_I)$ are closed subsets of D_I . Further, the (topological) closures $\overline{E_I}$ of the sets E_I are bounded subsets of K^n . Therefore, if $\overline{E_I}$ is the zero locus of a continuous 0-definable function $g_I : K^n \rightarrow K$, then A_I is the zero locus of the function $f_I := g_I \circ \phi_I$ which is a continuous 0-definable function on the clopen subset B_I . This establishes the reduction.

For coordinates $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in the affine space K^n , write

$$x = (y, z), \quad y = (x_1, \dots, x_k), \quad z = (x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n).$$

Let $\pi : K^n \rightarrow K^k$ be the projection onto the first k coordinates. For $y \in K^k$, denote by $A_y \subset K^{n-k}$ the fiber of the set A over the point y .

Denote by \overline{E} and $\partial E := \overline{E} \setminus E$ the closure and frontier (in the valuation topology) of a set E , respectively. We have the basic dimension inequality (cf. [4, Proposition 5.3.4]):

$$(2.1) \quad \dim \partial E < \dim E.$$

By Lemma 2.1, along with parametrized cell decomposition (*op.cit.* Theorem 5.7.3) and the induction hypothesis, we can assume that A is (perhaps after a permutation of variables) the closure of a parametrized 0-definable cell $C = (C_\xi)_\xi$ of dimension k of cell-type $(1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$, with RV -sort parameters ξ and centers c_ξ . Since definable RV -unions of finite sets stay finite (*op.cit.*, Corollary 2.6.7), the restriction of π to C has finite fibers of bounded cardinality.

Further, by suitable 0-definable partitioning, we can assume that A is the closure \overline{E} of a 0-definable subset E of dimension k such that all the fibers E_y , $y \in \pi(E)$, have the same cardinality, say s , and the sets

$$C_j(y) = \{c_{ji}(y), i = 1, \dots, s_j\}$$

of the j -th coordinates of points from the fibers E_y have the same cardinality, say s_j , for each $j = k+1, \dots, n$. Since the fibers E_y are finite, the projection

$$F := \pi(E) \subset K^k$$

is of dimension k (*op.cit.*, Corollary 5.3.4). Again, this fact, along with cell decomposition, Lemma 2.1 and the induction hypothesis, allow us to come down to the case where F is an open 0-definable subset of K^k .

Now consider the polynomials

$$P_j(y, Z_j) := \prod_{z \in C_j(y)} (Z_j - z) = \prod_{i=1}^{s_j} (Z_j - c_{ji}(y)), \quad y \in F, \quad j = k+1, \dots, n,$$

Then

$$P_j(y, Z_j) = Z_j^{s_j} + b_{j,1}(y)Z_j^{s_j-1} + \dots + b_{j,s_j}(y), \quad j = k+1, \dots, n,$$

where $b_{j,i} : F \rightarrow K$, $i = 1, \dots, s_j$, are 0-definable functions.

We still need the following lemma, which resembles to some extent the primitive element theorem from algebraic geometry.

Lemma 2.3. *There exist a finite number of linear functions*

$$\lambda_l : K^{n-k} \rightarrow K, \quad l = 1, \dots, p,$$

with integer coefficients such that, for every $y \in F$, λ_l is injective on the Cartesian product $\prod_{j=k+1}^n C_j(y)$ for some $l = 1, \dots, p$.

Proof. The conclusion follows by a routine model-theoretic compactness argument. \square

By Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.1, we can further assume, after a suitable 0-definable partitioning, that one linear function

$$\lambda : K^{n-k} \rightarrow K$$

with integer coefficients is injective on every product

$$\prod_{j=k+1}^n C_j(y), \quad y \in F.$$

Consider now the polynomial

$$P(y, Z) := \prod_{z \in E_y} (Z - \lambda(z)) = Z^s + b_1(y)Z^{s-1} + \dots + b_s(y),$$

where $b_j : F \rightarrow K$ are 0-definable functions. Then

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \{x = (y, z) \in F \times K^{n-k} : \\ &P_{k+1}(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}) = \dots = P_n(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_n) = \\ &P(x_1, \dots, x_k, \lambda(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The sets of all points at which the functions $b_{ji}(y)$ and $b_i(y)$ are not continuous are 0-definable subsets of F of dimension $< k$ (*op.cit.*, Theorem 5.1.1), and so are the closures of those sets by inequality 2.1. Hence and by Lemma 2.1 along with the induction hypothesis, we can additionally assume that $b_{ji}(y)$ and $b_i(y)$ are continuous functions on the open subset F . Then E is a closed subset of $F \times K^{n-k}$, and thus

$$(2.2) \quad \partial E \subset \partial F \times K^{n-k}.$$

In this manner, we have reduced the proofs of the theorems under study to the case where A is the closure of the set E described above. Moreover, in the proof of the first theorem, we have assumed without loss of generality that the set E is bounded.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Since F is an open subset of K^k , its frontier ∂F is a closed subset of K^k of dimension $< k$ (inequality 2.1). By the induction hypothesis, ∂F is the zero locus of a continuous 0-definable function $f : K^k \rightarrow K$.

Observe now that the functions $b_{ji}(y)$ are bounded because so are the sets A and E under study. Therefore the functions

$$f(y) \cdot b_{ji}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad f(y) \cdot b_i(y)$$

extend by zero through ∂F to continuous functions on \overline{F} . And then they extend by zero off F to continuous 0-definable functions on K^k .

We can thus regard the coefficients of the following polynomials (in the indeterminates Z_{k+1}, \dots, Z_n and Z , respectively):

$$Q_{k+1}(y, Z_j) := f(y) \cdot P_{k+1}(y, Z_{k+1}), \dots, Q_n(y, Z_n) := f(y) \cdot P_n(y, Z_n)$$

and

$$Q(y, Z) := f(y) \cdot P(y, Z),$$

as continuous 0-definable functions on K^k vanishing off the subset F .

Put

$$G := \{x \in K^n : Q_{k+1}(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}) = \dots = Q_n(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_n) = Q(x_1, \dots, x_k, \lambda(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)) = 0\}.$$

Then

$$(2.3) \quad G \cap (F \times K^{n-k}) = E$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad G \cap ((K^k \setminus F) \times K^{n-k}) = (K^k \setminus F) \times K^{n-k}.$$

Put

$$\mathcal{E} := \{(b, c, z) \in E \times K^{n-k} : (b, c) \in E \wedge \forall y \in \partial F |z| < |y - b| \\ \wedge \forall v, w \in K^{n-k} [(b, v), (b, w) \in E, v \neq w] \Rightarrow |z| < |v - w|\}$$

and

$$\tilde{E} := p(\mathcal{E}) \subset K^n = K^k \times K^{n-k},$$

where

$$p : K^k \times K^{n-k} \times K^{n-k} \ni (y, z, w) \mapsto (y, z + w) \in K^k \times K^{n-k}.$$

Let \tilde{A} be the closure of \tilde{E} ; obviously, $E \subset \tilde{E}$ and $A = \overline{E} \subset \tilde{A}$.

Remark 2.4. Note that the third condition of the conjunction in the definition of the set \mathcal{E} will be used only in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

It is easy to check that $\tilde{E} \supset E$ is a clopen subset of $F \times K^{n-k}$. In view of equality 2.2 and the second condition of the conjunction in the definition of the set \mathcal{E} , we get

$$\partial \tilde{E} = \partial E, \quad \tilde{A} = \tilde{E} \cup \partial E$$

and

$$\tilde{A} \cap ((K^k \setminus F) \times K^{n-k}) = \tilde{A} \cap (\partial F \times K^{n-k}) = \partial E.$$

Hence and by equality 2.4, we get

$$G \cap \tilde{A} \cap ((K^k \setminus F) \times K^{n-k}) = \tilde{A} \cap ((K^k \setminus F) \times K^{n-k}) = \partial E.$$

Further, equality 2.3 yields

$$G \cap \tilde{A} \cap (F \times K^{n-k}) = E \cap \tilde{A} = E.$$

Therefore, combining the above two formulae, we get

$$(2.5) \quad G \cap \tilde{A} = E \cup \partial E = \overline{E} = A.$$

But by the induction hypothesis, $\partial \tilde{E} = \partial E$ is the zero locus of a continuous 0-definable function $e : K^n \rightarrow K$. Then the function

$$\tilde{e}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in \tilde{A}, \\ e(x) & \text{if } x \in K^n \setminus \tilde{A}. \end{cases}$$

is continuous with zero locus \tilde{A} :

$$\tilde{A} = \{x \in K^n : \tilde{e}(x) = 0\}.$$

Hence and by equality 2.5, we obtain

$$(2.6) \quad A = \{Q_{k+1}(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}) = \dots = Q_n(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_n) = Q(x_1, \dots, x_k, \lambda(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)) = \tilde{e}(x) = 0\} \subset K^n.$$

Now it follows immediately from Lemma 2.2 that A is the zero locus of the continuous 0-definable function

$$g_{n-k+2}(Q_{k+1}(x), \dots, Q_n(x), Q(x), \tilde{e}(x)),$$

as desired.

Finally, suppose that A is of dimension $k = n$. Then $A = U \cup E$ for an open 0-definable subset $U \subset K^n$ and a closed 0-definable subset $E \subset K^n$ of dimension $< n$. By the induction hypothesis, E is the zero locus of a continuous 0-definable function $f : K^n \rightarrow K$. Then A is the zero locus of the following continuous definable function

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in A, \\ f(x) & \text{if } x \in K^n \setminus A. \end{cases}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We keep the notation from the foregoing proof and assume that the conclusion holds for the subsets of K^n of dimension $< k$ with $1 \leq k < n$. Again, we are reduced to the case where the set A is the closure \overline{E} of the set E described before. The third condition of the conjunction in the definition of the set \mathcal{E} ensures the following property of the set \tilde{E} :

For each $x = (y, z) \in \tilde{E}$ there is a unique $(y, w) \in E$, denoted by $\rho(x)$, such that

$$v(z - w) = \min \{v(z - u) : (y, u) \in E\}.$$

But, by the induction hypothesis, there exists a 0-definable retraction $p : K^n \rightarrow \partial E$. Then the map $r : K^n \rightarrow A$ given by the formula

$$r(x) := \begin{cases} \rho(x) & \text{if } x \in \tilde{E}, \\ p(x) & \text{if } x \in K^n \setminus \tilde{E} \end{cases}$$

is a 0-definable retraction we are looking for.

Finally, suppose that A is of dimension $k = n$ and the conclusion holds for the subsets of K^n of dimension $< n$. As before, $A = U \cup E$ for an open 0-definable subset $U \subset K^n$ and a closed 0-definable subset $E \subset K^n$ of dimension $< n$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a 0-definable retraction $p : K^n \rightarrow E$. Then the map $r : K^n \rightarrow A$ given by the formula

$$r(x) := \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \in U, \\ p(x) & \text{if } x \in K^n \setminus U, \end{cases}$$

is a 0-definable retraction we are looking for. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.2. \square

We conclude with the following comment. In the purely topological setting, the existence of a continuous retraction onto any non-empty closed subset of an ultranormal metrizable space was established by Dancis [7]. Previously, Ellis [9, 10] studied the problem of extension of continuous maps defined on closed subsets of zero-dimensional spaces with values in various types of metric spaces; in particular, of continuous functions from ultranormal and ultraparacompact spaces into a complete field with non-Archimedean absolute value. He obtained, among others, a non-Archimedean analogue of the Tietze–Urysohn theorem on extension of continuous functions from a closed subset of an ultranormal space into a locally compact field with non-Archimedean absolute value.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bochnak, M. Coste, M.-F. Roy, *Real Algebraic Geometry*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Vol. 36, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [2] R. Cluckers, G. Comte, F. Loeser, *Non-Archimedean omdin–Gromov parametrizations and points of bounded height*, Forum Math. Pi **3** (2015), e5.
- [3] R. Cluckers, A. Forey, F. Loeser, *Uniform Yomdin–Gromov parametrizations and points of bounded height in valued fields*, Algebra Number Theory **14** (2020), 1423–1456.
- [4] R. Cluckers, I. Halupczok, S. Rideau, *Hensel minimality I*, Forum Math., Pi, **10** (2022), e11.
- [5] R. Cluckers, I. Halupczok, S. Rideau, *Hensel minimality II: mixed characteristic and a Diophantine application*, arXiv:2104.09475 [math.LO].

- [6] R. Cluckers, F. Loeser, *b-minimality*, J. Math. Logic **7** (2) (2007), 195–227.
- [7] J. Dancis, *Each closed subset of metric space X with $\text{Ind } X = 0$ is a retract*, Houston J. Math. **19** (1993), 541–550.
- [8] L. van den Dries, C. Miller, *Geometric categories and o-minimal structures*, Duke Math. J. **84** (1996), 497–540.
- [9] R.L. Ellis, *A non-Archimedean analogue of the Tietze-Urysohn extension theorem*, Indag. Math. **29** (1967), 332–333.
- [10] R.L. Ellis, *Extending continuous functions on zero-dimensional spaces*, Math. Ann. **186** (1970), 114–122.
- [11] D. Haskell, D. Macpherson, *Cell decomposition of C -minimal structures*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **66** (1994), 113–162.
- [12] D. Haskell, D. Macpherson, *A version of o-minimality for the p -adics*, J. Symbolic Logic **62** (1997), 1075–1092.
- [13] E. Hrushovski, D. Kazhdan, *Integration in valued fields*. In: Algebraic Geometry and Number Theory, Progr. Math. **253**, pp. 261–405. Birkhäuser, Boston, MMA (2006).
- [14] J. Kollár, K. Nowak, *Continuous rational functions on real and p -adic varieties*, Math. Zeitschrift **279** (2015), 85–97.
- [15] D. Macpherson, C. Steinhorn, *On variants of o-minimality*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **79** (1996), 165–209.
- [16] K.J. Nowak, *Some results of algebraic geometry over Henselian rank one valued fields*, Sel. Math. New Ser. **23** (2017), 455–495.
- [17] K.J. Nowak, *A closedness theorem and applications in geometry of rational points over Henselian valued fields*, J. Singul. **21** (2020), 212–233.
- [18] K.J. Nowak, *A closedness theorem over Henselian fields with analytic structure and its applications*. In: Algebra, Logic and Number Theory, Banach Center Publ. **121**, Polish Acad. Sci. (2020), 141–149.
- [19] K.J. Nowak, *Tame topology in Hensel minimal structures*, arXiv:2103.01836 [math.AG].
- [20] K.J. Nowak, *Extension of Lipschitz maps definable in Hensel minimal structures*, arXiv:2204.05900 [math.LO].

Institute of Mathematics
 Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science
 Jagiellonian University
 ul. Profesora S. Łojasiewicza 6
 30-348 Kraków, Poland
E-mail address: nowak@im.uj.edu.pl