

## A WILD SPHERE WHICH CAN BE PIERCED AT EACH POINT BY A STRAIGHT LINE SEGMENT

M. K. FORT, JR.<sup>1</sup>

In this note we describe a wild 2-sphere  $S$  in  $E^3$  which can be pierced at each point by a straight line segment. The existence of such a wild sphere answers the following question which was raised by R. H. Bing in his address *Embedding surfaces in 3-manifolds* at the 1962 International Congress of Mathematicians in Stockholm:

*Is a 2-sphere in  $E^3$  tame if it can be pierced at each point by a straight line interval?*

In order to make the description of  $S$  as concise as possible, we make use of the terminology and notation of [2], the author's modification of Bing's well-known "Dog Bone Decomposition" (see [1]). We let  $G$  be the decomposition space defined in [2], and let  $A_0$  be the union of the nondegenerate elements of  $G$ . It is possible to carry out the construction of  $A_0$  in such a way that the endpoints of the components of  $A_0$  lie in two parallel planes, and we assume that this is the case. We can represent  $A_0 = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n$ , where each set  $B_n$  is the union of  $2^n$  admissible polyhedra (see [2, p. 502, Figure 1])  $P_1^n, P_2^n, \dots, P_{2^n}^n$ . Now, if (in the notation of [2])  $P_j^n$  is represented as  $L \cup M \cup R$ , we define  $Q_j^n$  to be (basic parallelepiped of  $L$ )  $\cup$   $M$   $\cup$  (basic parallelepiped of  $R$ ). We now define  $S$  to be the boundary of

$$\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j=1}^{2^n} Q_j^n.$$

It is easy to see that  $S$  is a "horned" 2-sphere and hence is wildly imbedded in  $E^3$ .  $A_0$  is contained in the union of  $S$  and the bounded component of  $E^3 - S$ , and for each component  $C$  of  $A_0$  the set  $C \cap S$  consists of the endpoints of  $C$ .

If  $p \in A_0 \cap S$ , then we can pierce  $S$  at  $p$  by extending the component  $C$  of  $A_0$  which contains  $p$ . On the other hand, if  $p \in S - A_0$ , then  $S$  is locally polyhedral at  $p$  and can certainly be pierced by a line segment at  $p$ .

In view of the above example, R. H. Bing has raised the following two questions:

(1) Is a topological 2-sphere  $S$  in  $E^3$  tame if corresponding to each point  $p \in S$  there are Euclidean (round) spheres  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  containing  $p$  such that  $\sigma_1 - p$  and  $\sigma_2 - p$  lie on opposite sides of  $S$ ?

---

Received by the editors September 8, 1962.

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported by NSF Grant G23790.

(2) Is a topological 2-sphere  $S$  in  $E^3$  tame if corresponding to each point  $p \in S$  there are cones  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ , each with vertex at  $p$ , such that  $\gamma_1 - p$  and  $\gamma_2 - p$  lie on opposite sides of  $S$ ?

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. R. H. Bing, *A decomposition of  $E^3$  into points and tame arcs such that the decomposition space is topologically different from  $E^3$* , Ann. of Math. (2) 65 (1957), 484–500.
2. M. K. Fort, Jr., *A note concerning a decomposition space defined by Bing*, Ann. of Math. (2) 65 (1957), 501–504.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

---

**CORRECTION TO "A CHARACTERIZATION OF  
QF-3 ALGEBRAS"**

HIROYUKI TACHIKAWA

J. P. Jans is kind enough to inform me a gap of Necessity proof in my paper appearing in these Proceedings, 13 (1962), 701–703. In this note I shall report Theorem 2 in the paper is however valid by a slight alteration of the proof. In p. 702, the argument between line 9 and line 18 should be replaced by the following: Let  $e_\lambda$  be a primitive idempotent of  $A$  such that  $l(N)e_\lambda \neq 0$ . Then there exists an element  $x \in L$  such that  $l(N)e_\lambda x \neq 0$  for  $L$  is faithful. Denote  $x$  by  $\sum_{\kappa \neq \lambda} a_\kappa e_\kappa + a_\lambda e_\lambda$ ,  $a_\kappa, a_\lambda \in A$ . Since  $e_\lambda(\sum_{\kappa \neq \lambda} a_\kappa e_\kappa) \subseteq N$ ,  $l(N)e_\lambda x = l(N)e_\lambda a_\lambda e_\lambda$  and we have  $l(N)e_\lambda L e_\lambda \neq 0$ . Here, suppose  $L e_\lambda \neq A e_\lambda$ . Then  $L e_\lambda \subseteq N e_\lambda$  for  $N e_\lambda$  is the unique maximal left ideal of  $A e_\lambda$  and it follows  $l(N)e_\lambda L e_\lambda \subseteq l(N)N = 0$ . But this is a contradiction. Thus we obtain  $L e_\lambda = A e_\lambda$ . Now, let  $\theta$  be the epimorphism:  $L \rightarrow L e_\lambda (= A e_\lambda)$ , defined by  $\theta(x) = x e_\lambda$  for all  $x \in L$ . Since  $L e_\lambda$  is projective, we have a direct sum decomposition of  $L: L_\lambda \oplus L'_\lambda$ , where  $L_\lambda \approx A e_\lambda$ . Then as  $\text{Hom}(L, K)$  is monomorphic to  $P$  and  $\text{Hom}(A e_\lambda, K)$  is injective,  $\text{Hom}(A e_\lambda, K)$  is isomorphic to a direct summand of  $P$ . Thus if we denote by  $\Lambda$  the set of all indices  $\lambda$  such that  $l(N)e_\lambda \neq 0$ ,  $\text{Hom}(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A e_\lambda, K)$  is projective.