

## On Mazurkiewicz Sets from the Measure-Theoretical Point of View

Alexander Kharazishvili\*

*I. Javakishvili Tbilisi State University  
I. Vekua Institute of Applied Mathematics  
2 University St., 0186, Tbilisi, Georgia*

*(Received January 16, 2017; Revised April 19, 2017; Accepted June 1, 2017)*

Mazurkiewicz subsets of the Euclidean plane  $\mathbf{R}^2$  are considered from the view-point of their potential measurability with respect to the class of all nonzero  $\sigma$ -finite translation invariant measures on  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .

**Keywords:** Mazurkiewicz set, Negligible set, Absolutely negligible set, Extension of an invariant measure.

**AMS Subject Classification:** 28A05, 28D05.

This paper may be treated as a continuation of [4], where some measurability properties of well-known Mazurkiewicz type subsets of the Euclidean plane  $\mathbf{R}^2$  are considered. So, we follow the notation and terminology adopted in [4].

The symbol  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^2)$  stands for the family of all those nonzero  $\sigma$ -finite measures on  $\mathbf{R}^2$  which are translation invariant (i.e.,  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -invariant).

A set  $X \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  is called negligible with respect to  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^2)$  (briefly,  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -negligible) if these two conditions are satisfied for  $X$ :

(\*) there exists a measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^2)$  such that  $X \in \text{dom}(\nu)$ ;

(\*\*) for any measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^2)$ , the relation  $X \in \text{dom}(\mu)$  implies the equality  $\mu(X) = 0$ .

A set  $Y \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  is called absolutely negligible with respect to  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^2)$  (briefly,  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -absolutely negligible) if, for every measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^2)$ , there exists a measure  $\mu' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^2)$  such that the relations

$$\mu' \text{ extends } \mu, \quad Y \in \text{dom}(\mu'), \quad \mu'(Y) = 0$$

hold true.

Let us remark that any  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -absolutely negligible set is also  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -negligible, but the converse assertion fails to be valid.

In what follows, the symbol  $\omega$  stands for the least infinite ordinal (cardinal) number and the symbol  $\mathfrak{c}$  stands for the cardinality continuum.

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: kharaz2@yahoo.com

A set  $T \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  is called almost  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -invariant if  $\text{card}(T) = \mathbf{c}$  and

$$\text{card}((h + T) \Delta T) < \mathbf{c}$$

for each vector  $h \in \mathbf{R}^2$  (here  $\Delta$  denotes, as usual, the operation of symmetric difference of two sets).

The symbol  $\lambda_2$  will be used below for denoting the classical two-dimensional Lebesgue measure on the plane  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .

A set  $W \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  is called  $\lambda_2$ -thick (or  $\lambda_2$ -massive) in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  if  $B \cap W \neq \emptyset$  for every Borel set  $B \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  with  $\lambda_2(B) > 0$ .

Let  $e$  be an arbitrary nonzero vector in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .

According to the standard terminology (see, e.g., [5]), a set  $A \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  is uniform in direction  $e$  if  $\text{card}(l \cap A) \leq 1$  for any straight line  $l \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  parallel to  $e$ .

A set  $A \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  is called finite in direction  $e$  (cf. [7]) if  $\text{card}(l \cap A) < \omega$  for every straight line  $l \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  parallel to  $e$ .

A set  $A \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  is called countable in direction  $e$  if  $\text{card}(l \cap A) \leq \omega$  for every straight line  $l \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  parallel to  $e$ .

Obviously,  $A$  is uniform (finite, countable) in direction  $e$  if and only if  $A$  is uniform (finite, countable) in direction  $-e$ .

Recall also that  $S \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  is a Mazurkiewicz set if  $\text{card}(l \cap S) = 2$  for each straight line  $l$  lying in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .

Such a set  $S$  was first constructed by Mazurkiewicz in his remarkable paper [6]. The above definition immediately implies that, for any nonzero vector  $e \in \mathbf{R}^2$ , the set  $S$  is finite in direction  $e$ .

As mentioned in [4], every Mazurkiewicz set turns out to be  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -negligible. Moreover, there exists a measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathbf{R}^2$  which extends the Lebesgue measure  $\lambda_2$ , is invariant under the group of all isometries of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ , and contains in its domain all Mazurkiewicz subsets of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .

Also, there exist Mazurkiewicz sets which are  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -absolutely negligible. The latter fact readily follows from the statement that there is a Mazurkiewicz set  $Z$  in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  which simultaneously is a Hamel basis of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . The transfinite construction of  $Z$  modifies, in certain respects, the usual construction of Mazurkiewicz type sets in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  and is fairly standard. However, we would like to give here a detailed proof of the existence of  $Z$ .

**Lemma 1:** *There exists a Mazurkiewicz set  $Z \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  which is a Hamel basis of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .*

**Proof:** For our further purposes, it is convenient to introduce the following notation:

$\alpha =$  the least ordinal number of cardinality  $\mathbf{c}$ ;

$\{l_\xi : \xi < \alpha\} =$  an  $\alpha$ -sequence consisting of all straight lines in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ ;

$\{z_\xi : \xi < \alpha\} =$  an  $\alpha$ -sequence consisting of all points of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .

We may assume, without loss of generality, that the partial family

$$\{l_\xi : \xi < \alpha \ \& \ \xi \text{ is an odd ordinal}\}$$

contains all straight lines of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ , and that the partial family

$$\{z_\xi : \xi < \alpha \ \& \ \xi \text{ is an even ordinal}\}$$

contains all points of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .

In addition to the said earlier, we will use the symbol  $l(y, z)$  for denoting the straight line in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  which passes through two distinct points  $y \in \mathbf{R}^2$  and  $z \in \mathbf{R}^2$ .

We are going to construct by the method of transfinite recursion an increasing (by inclusion)  $\alpha$ -sequence  $\{Z_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$  of subsets of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ , for which the following conditions would be satisfied:

- (a)  $\text{card}(Z_\xi) \leq \text{card}(\xi) + \omega$  for any ordinal  $\xi < \alpha$ ;
- (b) every set  $Z_\xi$  is linearly independent over the field  $\mathbf{Q}$  of all rational numbers;
- (c) every  $Z_\xi$  is a set of points in general position in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ ;
- (d) if an ordinal  $\xi < \alpha$  is odd, then

$$\text{card}(Z_\xi \cap l_\xi) = 2;$$

(e) if an ordinal  $\xi < \alpha$  is even, then the point  $z_\xi$  belongs to the linear hull (over  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) of the set  $Z_\xi$ .

Suppose that, for an ordinal  $\xi < \alpha$ , the partial family  $\{Z_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\}$  has already been constructed fulfilling the above conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e). Let us put

$$Z(\xi) = \cup\{Z_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\}.$$

Observe that the set  $Z(\xi)$  is linearly independent over  $\mathbf{Q}$  and, at the same time, is a set of points in general position in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . Also, it is clear that

$$\text{card}(Z(\xi)) \leq \text{card}(\xi) + \omega.$$

Now, consider the two possible cases.

1. The ordinal  $\xi$  is odd.

In this case, we take the straight line  $l_\xi$  and claim that there exists a subset  $T$  of  $l_\xi$  such that:

- (i)  $Z(\xi) \cup T$  is linearly independent over  $\mathbf{Q}$  and, simultaneously, is a set of points in general position in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ ;
- (ii)  $\text{card}((Z(\xi) \cup T) \cap l_\xi) = 2$ .

Indeed, the validity of our assertion follows from the relation

$$\text{card}(Z(\xi)) \leq \text{card}(\xi) + \omega < \mathfrak{c}$$

and from the fact that the line  $l_\xi$  contains continuum many linearly independent points over  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

So, we may define

$$Z_\xi = Z(\xi) \cup T.$$

Notice that, by virtue of  $\text{card}(T) \leq 2$ , we also have

$$\text{card}(Z_\xi) \leq \text{card}(\xi) + \omega.$$

2. The ordinal  $\xi$  is even.

In this case, we take the point  $z_\xi$ . If  $z_\xi$  belongs to the linear hull (over  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) of the set

$$Z(\xi) = \cup\{Z_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\},$$

then we define  $Z_\xi = Z(\xi)$ .

It remains to consider the situation when  $z_\xi$  is linearly independent (again, over  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) of the set  $Z(\xi)$ .

In such a situation, we introduce the following notation:

$$U_\xi = \text{the vector space over } \mathbf{Q} \text{ generated by } Z(\xi).$$

Evidently, we may write

$$\text{card}(U_\xi) \leq \text{card}(\xi) + \omega < \mathbf{c}.$$

Further, we define the three sets:

$$K_1 = \cup\{l(z, z') : z \in Z(\xi), z' \in Z(\xi), z \neq z'\},$$

$$K_2 = z_\xi + K_1,$$

$$K_3 = \cup\{l_\xi(z) : z \in Z(\xi)\},$$

where, for each point  $z \in Z(\xi)$ , the symbol  $l_\xi(z)$  denotes the straight line in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  passing through  $z$  and parallel to the nonzero vector  $z_\xi$ .

According to the above definitions, the set

$$K = K_1 \cup K_2 \cup K_3$$

is a union of straight lines in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ , the total number of which is strictly less than  $\mathbf{c}$ . This circumstance implies at once that

$$\text{card}(\mathbf{R}^2 \setminus K) = \mathbf{c}$$

and, consequently,

$$\text{card}(\mathbf{R}^2 \setminus (K \cup U_\xi \cup (U_\xi + z_\xi))) = \mathbf{c}.$$

Also, it can readily be seen that if  $z$  is an arbitrary point from  $\mathbf{R}^2 \setminus K$ , then

$$\{z\} \cup \{z - z_\xi\} \cup Z(\xi)$$

turns out to be a set of points in general position in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .

Our goal now is to choose a point  $z' \in \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus K$  so that the set

$$\{z'\} \cup \{z' - z_\xi\} \cup Z(\xi)$$

would be linearly independent over  $\mathbf{Q}$ . For this purpose, it suffices to find a point  $z' \in \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus K$  having the property that, for any two rational numbers  $p$  and  $r$ , the

relation

$$pz' + r(z' - z_\xi) \in U_\xi$$

necessarily implies the equalities  $p = r = 0$ . To see the existence of such a  $z'$ , let us take an injective family of points

$$\{z_i : i \in I\} \subset \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus (K \cup U_\xi \cup (U_\xi + z_\xi)),$$

where  $\text{card}(I) = \mathbf{c}$  and  $z_i - z_j \notin U_\xi$  for any two distinct indices  $i$  and  $j$  from the set  $I$ .

Supposing, contrary to our assertion, the non-existence of a desired  $z'$ , we get

$$p_i z_i + r_i(z_i - z_\xi) \in U_\xi \quad (i \in I),$$

where rational numbers  $p_i$  and  $r_i$  are such that  $|p_i| + |r_i| > 0$  for each index  $i \in I$ . Since the set  $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$  is countable and the set  $I$  is uncountable, there are two distinct indices  $i \in I$  and  $j \in I$  and two rational numbers  $p$  and  $r$  satisfying the relations

$$|p| + |r| > 0,$$

$$p z_i + r(z_i - z_\xi) \in U_\xi, \quad p z_j + r(z_j - z_\xi) \in U_\xi.$$

The last two relations lead us to

$$(p + r)(z_i - z_j) \in U_\xi,$$

and we obtain a contradiction, because  $p + r \neq 0$  and  $U_\xi$  is a vector space over  $\mathbf{Q}$ . The obtained contradiction shows that we may put

$$Z_\xi = \{z', z' - z_\xi\} \cup Z(\xi)$$

for an appropriate point  $z'$  from the family  $\{z_i : i \in I\}$ . Since we trivially have

$$z_\xi = z' - (z' - z_\xi),$$

the point  $z_\xi$  belongs to the linear hull (over  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) of the set  $Z_\xi$ .

Proceeding in this manner, we will come to the family  $\{Z_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$  of subsets of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ , for which all conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) hold true. Now, we define

$$Z = \cup\{Z_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}.$$

Conditions (b) and (c) give us that the set  $Z$  is linearly independent over  $\mathbf{Q}$  and, simultaneously, is a set of points in general position in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . By virtue of condition (d), the same  $Z$  is a Mazurkiewicz subset of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . Finally, in view of condition (e), the set  $Z$  is a Hamel basis of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . Lemma 1 has thus been proved.  $\square$

Further, we need the following auxiliary proposition.

**Lemma 2:** *Let  $E$  be an uncountable vector space over the field  $\mathbf{Q}$  of all rational numbers and let  $H$  be a Hamel basis of  $E$ . Then  $H$  is an  $E$ -absolutely negligible subset of  $E$ .*

Actually, the argument presented in [3] yields also a proof of Lemma 2. Notice that a more general result can be stated. For any natural number  $n$ , denote by  $H_n$  the set of all those vectors in  $E$  whose representation via the Hamel basis  $H$  contains at most  $n$  nonzero rational coefficients. Then each set  $H_n$  ( $n < \omega$ ) turns out to be  $E$ -absolutely negligible in  $E$ .

Lemmas 1 and 2 imply the following statement.

**Theorem 3:** *There exists a Mazurkiewicz subset  $X$  of  $\mathbf{R}^2$  which is absolutely negligible with respect to the class  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^2)$ . Therefore, for an arbitrary measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^2)$ , there exists a measure  $\mu' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^2)$  extending  $\mu$  and such that  $X \in \text{dom}(\mu')$  and  $\mu'(X) = 0$ .*

It was proved in [4] that, under the Continuum Hypothesis (**CH**), there are Mazurkiewicz sets which are not  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -absolutely negligible. Here we wish to establish the same result without using any additional set-theoretical assumptions. The method applied below is primarily taken from the paper [2]. As demonstrated in [2], there exists a set of points in general position in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  which is not  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -absolutely negligible. However, it should be emphasized that not every set of points in general position in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  is contained in an appropriate Mazurkiewicz set. There are known rather simple examples of plane sets of points in general position, which do not admit an expansion to a Mazurkiewicz set (see, for instance, [1]). For this reason, the method of [2] needs certain modifications.

We begin with the following easy auxiliary proposition.

**Lemma 4:** *Let  $e$  be a nonzero vector in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  and let  $Z$  be a subset of  $\mathbf{R}^2$  countable in direction  $e$ . Then there exist a set  $Z_0 \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  and a countable family  $\{h_n : n < \omega\} \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  such that:*

- (1)  $Z_0$  is uniform in direction  $e$ ;
- (2)  $Z \subset \cup\{h_n + Z_0 : n < \omega\}$ .

**Proof:** We may assume, without loss of generality, that the vector  $e$  is parallel to the axis  $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}$ . Since  $Z$  is countable in direction  $e$ , it suffices to show that, for any function

$$\phi : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$$

and for any disjoint countable family  $\{[a_n, b_n[ : n < \omega\}$  of half-open subintervals of  $\mathbf{R}$  such that

$$\sum\{b_n - a_n : n < \omega\} = +\infty,$$

there exist a family  $\{h_n : n < \omega\} \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  and a partial function

$$\psi : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$$

having the property that:

- (a)  $\text{dom}(\psi) = \cup\{[a_n, b_n[ : n < \omega\}$ ;
- (b)  $\text{Gr}(\phi) \subset \cup\{\text{Gr}(\psi) + h_n : n < \omega\}$ , where  $\text{Gr}(\phi)$  and  $\text{Gr}(\psi)$  denote, respectively, the graph of  $\phi$  and the graph of  $\psi$ .

Now, it is not difficult to see that the existence of the required  $\{h_n : n < \omega\}$  and  $\psi$  is guaranteed by the assumption  $\sum\{b_n - a_n : n < \omega\} = +\infty$ .  $\square$

**Remark 1:** Another proof of Lemma 4 is presented in [2]. Notice, by the way, that all vectors  $h_n$  ( $n < \omega$ ) can be taken to be parallel to the axis  $\mathbf{R} \times \{0\}$ .

**Lemma 5:** *Let  $G$ ,  $A$ , and  $B$  satisfy the following conditions:*

- (1)  $G$  is a subgroup of the additive group  $(\mathbf{R}^2, +)$  and  $\text{card}(G) < \mathbf{c}$ ;
- (2)  $A$  is a subset of  $\mathbf{R}^2$  and  $\text{card}(A) < \mathbf{c}$ ;
- (3)  $B$  is a  $\lambda_2$ -measurable subset of  $\mathbf{R}^2$  with  $\lambda_2(B) > 0$ .

*Then there exists a point  $z \in B$  such that:*

- (i)  $(G + z) \cap A = \emptyset$ ;
- (ii) for any two distinct points  $a \in A$  and  $a' \in A$ , the line  $l(a, a')$  does not intersect the orbit  $G + z$ ;
- (iii) for any two distinct points  $x \in G + z$  and  $y \in G + z$ , the line  $l(x, y)$  does not intersect the set  $A$ .

**Proof:** Let us denote

$$A_1 = \cup\{l(x, y) : x \in G + A, y \in G + A, x \neq y\},$$

$$A_2 = \cup\{l_x(y) : x \in G, x \neq 0, y \in A\},$$

where the symbol  $l_x(y)$  stands for the straight line passing through a point  $y$  and parallel to a nonzero vector  $x$ . Further, consider the set

$$A_3 = (G + A) \cup (G + A_1) \cup (G + A_2).$$

Obviously, this set is contained in the union of some family of lines in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  whose cardinality is strictly less than  $\mathbf{c}$ . Since  $\lambda_2(B) > 0$ , we must have  $B \setminus A_3 \neq \emptyset$ . Pick a point  $z \in B \setminus A_3$ . It is not hard to check that the relations (i), (ii), and (iii) of Lemma 5 are fulfilled for  $G + z$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6:** *Let  $\Gamma$  be any countably infinite non-collinear subgroup of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . There exists a Mazurkiewicz set  $Z$  such that  $\Gamma + Z$  has the following property: for each countable family  $\{h_m : m < \omega\} \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ , the set*

$$\cap\{h_m + \Gamma + Z : m < \omega\}$$

*is  $\lambda_2$ -thick in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  and the equality*

$$\text{card}(\cap\{h_m + \Gamma + Z : m < \omega\}) = \mathbf{c}$$

*holds true.*

**Proof:** Denote again by  $\alpha$  the least ordinal number of cardinality  $\mathbf{c}$  and let  $\{G_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$  be an  $\alpha$ -sequence of all those countable subgroups of  $\mathbf{R}^2$  which contain  $\Gamma$

and satisfy the relation

$$\text{card}(G_\xi/\Gamma) = \omega.$$

For every group  $G$  from the above  $\alpha$ -sequence, define the set

$$\Xi(G) = \{\xi < \alpha : G_\xi = G\}.$$

We may assume, without loss of generality, that

$$\text{card}(\Xi(G)) = \mathfrak{c}.$$

Further, take a family  $\{B_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$  of Borel subsets of  $\mathbf{R}^2$  such that, for any ordinal  $\xi < \alpha$ , the partial family  $\{B_\zeta : \zeta \in \Xi(G_\xi)\}$  consists of all Borel subsets of  $\mathbf{R}^2$  having strictly positive  $\lambda_2$ -measure. The existence of  $\{B_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$  is evident.

Finally, let  $\{l_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$  be an  $\alpha$ -sequence of all straight lines lying in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .

By using the method of transfinite recursion, let us construct a double family

$$\{z_{k,\xi} : k < \omega, \xi < \alpha\}$$

of points in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  and a family  $\{T_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}$  of subsets of  $\mathbf{R}^2$  satisfying the following conditions:

(1)  $(\{z_{k,\xi} : k < \omega, \xi < \alpha\}) \cup (\cup\{T_\xi : \xi < \alpha\})$  is a set of points in general position in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ ;

(2)  $\text{card}(T_\xi) \leq 2$  for each  $\xi < \alpha$ ;

(3) if  $\xi < \alpha$ , then  $z_{0,\xi} \in B_\xi$ ;

(4) for each  $\xi < \alpha$ , the set  $\Gamma + \{z_{k,\xi} : k < \omega\}$  coincides with  $G_\xi + z_{0,\xi}$ ;

(5)  $\text{card}(l_\xi \cap ((\cup\{T_\zeta : \zeta \leq \xi\}) \cup \{z_{k,\zeta} : k < \omega, \zeta \leq \xi\})) = 2$  for each  $\xi < \alpha$ .

Suppose that, for an ordinal number  $\xi < \alpha$ , the partial families

$$\{z_{k,\zeta} : k < \omega, \zeta < \xi\}, \quad \{T_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\}$$

have already been constructed with the properties corresponding to (1)-(5), and put

$$G = G_\xi, \quad B = B_\xi,$$

$$A = (\{z_{k,\zeta} : k < \omega, \zeta < \xi\}) \cup (\cup\{T_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\}).$$

Observe that  $A$  is a set of points in general position in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . Also,

$$\text{card}(A) < \mathfrak{c}, \quad \text{card}(G) = \omega < \mathfrak{c}, \quad \lambda_2(B) > 0.$$

So, Lemma 5 is applicable to  $G$ ,  $A$ , and  $B$ . Let  $z \in B$  be a point as in Lemma 5 and let us consider the  $G$ -orbit  $G + z$  of this point. Since we have the relations

$$G = G_\xi, \quad \text{card}(G_\xi/\Gamma) = \omega,$$



the set  $G + z$  is the union of some pairwise disjoint  $\Gamma$ -orbits  $\{Z_k : k < \omega\}$ . Clearly, an enumeration of these  $\Gamma$ -orbits can be chosen so that  $z \in Z_0$ . Now, we put

$$z_{0,\xi} = z$$

and define a sequence of points  $\{z_{k,\xi} : k < \omega\}$  in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  by ordinary induction. Assume that the finite collection of points

$$z_{0,\xi} \in Z_0, \quad z_{1,\xi} \in Z_1, \quad \dots, \quad z_{k,\xi} \in Z_k$$

has already been determined and consider the  $\Gamma$ -orbit  $Z_{k+1}$ . Keeping in mind the fact that  $\Gamma$  is not a collinear subgroup of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ , we deduce that the set  $Z_{k+1}$  cannot be covered by finitely many straight lines in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . Therefore, there exists a point  $t \in Z_{k+1}$  which does not belong to any line passing through two distinct points from the finite set  $\{z_{0,\xi}, z_{1,\xi}, \dots, z_{k,\xi}\}$ . We then put

$$z_{k+1,\xi} = t.$$

Proceeding in this manner, we finally come to the desired sequence of points  $\{z_{k,\xi} : k < \omega\}$ .

According to the above construction, the set

$$A^* = (\{z_{k,\zeta} : k < \omega, \zeta \leq \xi\}) \cup (\cup\{T_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\})$$

is again in general position in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . Consider now the straight line  $l_\xi$  and the set  $A^* \cap l_\xi$ . Obviously, we have the inequalities

$$\text{card}(A^*) < \mathfrak{c}, \quad \text{card}(A^* \cap l_\xi) \leq 2.$$

It is not hard to see that there exists a set  $T \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  which satisfies the following relations:

- (a)  $\text{card}(T) \leq 2$ ;
- (b)  $T \cup A^*$  is a set of points in general position;
- (c)  $\text{card}((T \cup A^*) \cap l_\xi) = 2$ .

So, putting  $T_\xi = T$ , we obtain the family  $\{T_\zeta : \zeta \leq \xi\}$ .

The transfinite process just described and continued up to the ordinal  $\alpha$  yields the two families

$$\{z_{k,\xi} : k < \omega, \xi < \alpha\}, \quad \{T_\xi : \xi < \alpha\}.$$

A straightforward verification then shows that all conditions (1)-(5) are fulfilled for these families. In particular, conditions (1) and (5) imply at once that

$$Z = \{z_{k,\xi} : k < \omega, \xi < \alpha\} \cup (\cup\{T_\xi : \xi < \alpha\})$$

is a Mazurkiewicz subset of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . In addition to this, (3) and (4) imply that, for any countable family  $\{h_m : m < \omega\} \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ , the set

$$\cap\{h_m + \Gamma + Z : m < \omega\}$$

is  $\lambda_2$ -thick in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  and satisfies the equality

$$\text{card}(\cap\{h_m + \Gamma + Z : m < \omega\}) = \mathbf{c}.$$

Lemma 6 has thus been proved.  $\square$

**Theorem 7:** *Let  $Z$  and  $\Gamma$  be as in Lemma 6. There exists a measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathbf{R}^2$  such that:*

- (1)  $\nu$  is an extension of  $\lambda_2$ ;
- (2)  $\nu$  is translation invariant, i.e.,  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -invariant;
- (3)  $(\Gamma + Z) \in \text{dom}(\nu)$  and  $\nu(\mathbf{R}^2 \setminus (\Gamma + Z)) = 0$ .

*In particular, the Mazurkiewicz set  $Z$  is not  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -absolutely negligible in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ .*

**Proof:** Denote by  $\mathcal{I}$  the  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -invariant  $\sigma$ -ideal of subsets of  $\mathbf{R}^2$  generated by the one-element family  $\{\mathbf{R}^2 \setminus (\Gamma + Z)\}$ . By virtue of Lemma 6, the inner  $\lambda_2$ -measure of every element of  $\mathcal{I}$  is equal to zero. So, we may apply to  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\lambda_2$  Marczewski's classical method of extending invariant measures (see [8] or [9]). This method gives us the measure  $\nu$  satisfying (1), (2), and (3) of the theorem. Relation (3) trivially implies that  $Z$  is not  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -absolutely negligible.  $\square$

**Remark 2:** Let  $e$  be any nonzero vector in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . It is easy to see that the set  $\Gamma + Z$  is countable in direction  $e$ . By Lemma 4, there exist a set  $Z_0 \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  and a countable family  $\{h_n : n < \omega\} \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  such that:

- (a)  $Z_0$  is uniform in direction  $e$ ;
- (b)  $\Gamma + Z \subset \cup\{h_n + Z_0 : n < \omega\}$ .

Consequently,  $Z_0$  is  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -negligible but is not  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -absolutely negligible.

**Remark 3:** Assuming the Continuum Hypothesis, it was proved in [4] that, for any countably infinite non-collinear group  $\Gamma \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ , there exists a Mazurkiewicz set  $Y \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  such that the set  $\Gamma + Y$  contains some  $\lambda_2$ -thick almost  $\mathbf{R}^2$ -invariant subset of cardinality  $\mathbf{c}$ . This result substantially strengthens Lemma 6, but is heavily based on **CH**. It is unknown whether the same result can be established without using additional set-theoretical assumptions.

### Acknowledgements

This work is partially supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation, Grant FR/116/5-100/14.

### References

- [1] J.J. Dijkstra, J. van Mill, *Two point set extensions - a counterexample*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **125**, 8 (1997), 2501-2502.
- [2] A. Kharazishvili, *Some Questions of Set Theory and Measure Theory* (in Russian), Izd. Tbil. Gos. Univ., Tbilisi, 1978.
- [3] A. Kharazishvili, *One property of Hamel bases* (in Russian), Bull. Acad. Sci. GSSR, **95**, 2 (1979), 277-280.
- [4] A. Kharazishvili, *Measurability properties of Mazurkiewicz sets*, Bulletin of TICMI, **20**, 2 (2016), 44-46.
- [5] N. N. Luzin, *Collected Works* (in Russian), Izd. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Moscow, **2** (1958).
- [6] S. Mazurkiewicz, *Sur un ensemble plan qui a avec chaque droite deux et seulement deux points communs*, C.R. Varsovie, **7** (1914), 382-384.
- [7] W. Sierpiński, *Cardinal and Ordinal Numbers*, PWN, Warszawa, 1958.
- [8] E. Szpilrajn (E. Marczewski), *Sur l'extension de la mesure lebesguienne*, Fund. Math., **25** (1935), 551-558.
- [9] E. Szpilrajn (E. Marczewski), *On problems of the theory of measure* (in Russian), Uspekhi Mat. Nauk, **1**, 2 (12), (1946), 179-188.