

# Arcs in the Plane\*

Joan E. Hart<sup>†</sup> and Kenneth Kunen<sup>‡§</sup>

April 19, 2022

## Abstract

Assuming PFA, every uncountable subset  $E$  of the plane meets some  $C^1$  arc in an uncountable set. This is not provable from  $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$ , although in the case that  $E$  is analytic, this is a ZFC result. The result is false in ZFC for  $C^2$  arcs, and the counter-example is a perfect set.

## 1 Introduction

As usual, an *arc* in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is a set homeomorphic to a closed bounded subinterval of  $\mathbb{R}$ . A (simple) *path* is a homeomorphism  $g$  mapping a compact interval onto  $A$ . For  $k \geq 1$ , a path is  $C^k$  iff it is a  $C^k$  function, and an arc  $A$  is  $C^k$  iff  $A$  is the image of some  $C^k$  path  $g$ , with  $g'(t) \neq 0$  for all  $t$ ; equivalently,  $A$  has a  $C^k$  arc length parameterization. Also,  $A$  is  $C^\infty$  iff it is  $C^k$  for all  $k$ . We consider the following:

**Question.** For  $n \geq 2$ , if  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is uncountable, must there be a “nice” arc  $A$  such that  $E \cap A$  is uncountable?

Obviously, the answer will depend on the definition of “nice”. We should expect ZFC results for closed  $E$  (equivalently, for analytic  $E$ ), and independence results for arbitrary  $E$ . In general, under CH things are as bad as possible, and under PFA, things are as good as possible. In most cases, the results are the same for all  $n \geq 2$ , and trivial for  $n = 1$ .

For arbitrary arcs, the results are quite old. In ZFC, every closed uncountable set meets some arc in an uncountable set. For  $n \geq 2$ , arcs are nowhere dense in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ; so under CH there is a Luzin set that meets every arc in a countable set. At

---

\*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 03E50, 03E65, 53A04. Key Words and Phrases: arc, smooth, PFA, MA.

<sup>†</sup>University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, WI 54901, U.S.A., hartj@uwosh.edu

<sup>‡</sup>University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, U.S.A., kunen@math.wisc.edu

<sup>§</sup>Both authors partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-0456653.

the other extreme, under  $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$ , every uncountable  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  meets some arc in an uncountable set.

If “nice” means “straight line”, then there is a trivial counter-example: a perfect set  $E$  which meets every line in at most two points.

Paper [3] introduces results where “nice” means “almost straight”:

**Definition 1.1** *Let  $\rho : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow S^{n-1}$  be the perpendicular retraction given by  $\rho(x) = x/\|x\|$ . Then  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $\varepsilon$ -directed iff for some  $v \in S^{n-1}$ ,  $\|\rho(x-y) - v\| \leq \varepsilon$  or  $\|\rho(x-y) + v\| \leq \varepsilon$  whenever  $x, y$  are distinct points of  $A$ .*

The retraction  $\rho(x-y)$  may be viewed as the *direction* from  $y$  to  $x$ . Every  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is trivially  $\sqrt{2}$ -directed, and  $A$  is 0-directed iff  $A$  is contained in a straight line. If “nice” means “ $\varepsilon$ -directed”, a counter-example to the Question is consistent with  $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$ . By [3], the existence of a *weakly* Luzin set is consistent with  $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$ , and whenever  $\varepsilon < \sqrt{2}$ , a weakly Luzin set (see [3] Definition 2.4) meets every  $\varepsilon$ -directed set in a countable set. However, under SOCA, which follows from PFA, whenever  $\varepsilon > 0$ , every uncountable set meets some  $\varepsilon$ -directed arc in an uncountable set (see Lemma 4.1). Every  $C^1$  arc is a finite union of  $\varepsilon$ -directed arcs, and hence we get the stronger:

**Theorem 1.2** *PFA implies that every uncountable subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  meets some  $C^1$  arc in an uncountable set.*

$\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$  is not sufficient for this theorem, because, as in the  $\varepsilon$ -directed case ( $\varepsilon < \sqrt{2}$ ), a weakly Luzin set provides a counter-example. Theorem 1.2 and the following ZFC theorem for closed sets are proved in Section 4.

**Theorem 1.3** *If  $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is closed and uncountable, then there is a  $C^1$  arc  $A$  with a Cantor set  $Q \subseteq P \cap A$ . Hence, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $P$  meets some  $\varepsilon$ -directed arc in an uncountable set.*

If the Question asks for a  $C^2$  arc, then a ZFC counter-example exists in the plane, and hence in any  $\mathbb{R}^n$  ( $n \geq 2$ ). The counter-example, given in Theorem 1.5, is a *non-squiggly* subset of the plane. A simple example of a non-squiggly set is a  $C^1$  arc whose tangent vector either always rotates clockwise or always rotates counter-clockwise. In particular, such an arc may be the graph of a convex function  $f \in C^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ ; a real differentiable function is *convex* iff its derivative is a monotonically increasing function. But non-squiggly makes sense for non-smooth arcs, and in fact for arbitrary subsets of the plane:

**Definition 1.4**  *$A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  is non-squiggly iff there is a  $\delta$ , with  $0 < \delta \leq \infty$ , such that whenever  $\{x, y, z, t\} \in [A]^4$  and  $\text{diam}(\{x, y, z, t\}) \leq \delta$ , point  $t$  is not interior to triangle  $xyz$ .*

**Theorem 1.5** *There is a perfect non-squiggly set  $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  which lies in a  $C^1$  arc  $A$  and which meets each  $C^2$  arc in a finite set. Moreover, the  $C^1$  arc  $A$  may be taken to be the graph of a convex function.*

As “nice” notions, non-squiggly is orthogonal to smooth:

**Theorem 1.6** *There is a perfect set  $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  which lies in a  $C^\infty$  arc and which meets every non-squiggly set in a countable set.*

Note that by Ramsey’s Theorem, every infinite set in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  has an infinite non-squiggly subset.

In Definition 1.4, allowing  $\delta < \infty$  makes non-squiggly a local notion; so, piecewise linear arcs and some spirals (such as  $r = \theta$ ;  $0 \leq \theta < \infty$ ) are non-squiggly. However, the results of this paper would be unchanged if we simply required  $\delta = \infty$ . For  $0 < \delta \leq \infty$ , if  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  meets a non-squiggly set  $A$  in an uncountable set, then  $E$  has uncountable intersection with a subset of  $A$  whose diameter is at most  $\delta$ .

The proof of Theorem 1.5 uses the assumption that each  $C^2$  arc is parameterized by some  $g$  whose derivative is nowhere 0. Dropping this requirement on  $g'$  yields a weaker notion of  $C^\infty$ , and a different result. Call a  $C^k$  arc *strongly*  $C^k$ , and say that an arc is *weakly*  $C^k$  iff it is the image of a  $C^k$  path. Then, an arc is weakly  $C^\infty$  iff it is weakly  $C^k$  for all  $k$ .

**Theorem 1.7** *If  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is bounded and infinite, then it meets some weakly  $C^\infty$  arc in an infinite set.*

Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 are proved in Section 5; Theorem 1.7 and some related facts are proved in Section 6.

## 2 Remarks on Hermite Splines

We construct the arc of Theorem 1.3 by first producing a “nice” Cantor set  $Q \subseteq P$ . Then we apply results, described in this section, that make it possible to draw a smooth curve through a closed set. These results are a natural extension of results of Hermite for drawing a curve through a finite set. Our proof of Theorem 1.3 reduces the problem to the case where  $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is the graph of a function with domain  $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ ; then we extend this function to all of  $\mathbb{R}$  to produce the desired arc.

First consider the case  $|D| = 2$ , or interpolation on an interval  $[a_1, a_2]$ ; we find  $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$  with predetermined values  $b_1, b_2$  and slopes  $s_1, s_2$  at  $a_1, a_2$ , and we bound  $f, f'$  on  $[a_1, a_2]$  in terms of the *three* slopes:  $s := (b_2 - b_1)/(a_2 - a_1)$ , and  $s_1, s_2$ . Following Hermite,  $f$  will be the natural cubic interpolation function. Our bounds show that if  $s, s_1, s_2$  are all close to each other, then  $f$  is close to the linear interpolation function  $L$ .

**Lemma 2.1** *Given  $s_1, s_2, b_1, b_2$  and  $a_1 < a_2$ , let  $s = (b_2 - b_1)/(a_2 - a_1)$ , and let  $L(x) = b_1 + s(x - a_1)$ . Let  $M = \max(|s_1 - s|, |s_2 - s|)$ . Then there is a cubic  $f$  with each  $f(a_i) = b_i$  and each  $f'(a_i) = s_i$ , such that*

1.  $|(f(x_2) - f(x_1))/(x_2 - x_1) - s| \leq 3M$  whenever  $a_1 \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq a_2$ .

Moreover, for all  $x \in [a_1, a_2]$ :

2.  $|f'(x) - s| \leq 3M$ .
3.  $|f(x) - L(x)| \leq 2M(a_2 - a_1)$ .

**Proof.** (1) follows from (2) and the Mean Value Theorem. Now, let

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= L(x) + \beta_2(x - a_1)^2(x - a_2) + \beta_1(x - a_1)(x - a_2)^2 \\ f'(x) &= s + \beta_2(x - a_1)^2 + \beta_1(x - a_2)^2 + 2(\beta_2 + \beta_1)(x - a_1)(x - a_2) \end{aligned} .$$

Then  $f(a_i) = b_i$  is obvious, and setting  $\beta_i = (s_i - s)/(a_2 - a_1)^2$  we get  $f'(a_i) = s_i$ . To see (2) and (3), note that  $|\beta_i| \leq M/(a_2 - a_1)^2$ , and  $(x - a_1)(a_2 - x) \leq (a_2 - a_1)^2/4$  (the maximum of  $(x - a_1)(a_2 - x)$  occurs at the midpoint  $x = \frac{a_1 + a_2}{2}$ ). ☕

Next, we consider extending, to all of  $\mathbb{R}$ , a  $C^1$  function defined on a closed  $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ . First note that there are two possible meanings for “ $f \in C^1(D)$ ”:

**Definition 2.2** *Assume that  $f, h \in C(D, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $D$  is a closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then  $f' = h$  in the strong sense iff*

$$\forall x \in D \forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0 \forall x_1, x_2 \in D \left[ x_1 \neq x_2 \ \& \ |x_1 - x|, |x_2 - x| < \delta \implies \left| \frac{f(x_2) - f(x_1)}{x_2 - x_1} - h(x) \right| < \varepsilon \right] .$$

The usual or weak sense would only require this with  $x_1$  replaced by the point  $x$ . When  $D$  is an interval, the two senses are equivalent by the continuity of  $h$  and the Mean Value Theorem. Note that  $f' = h$  in the strong sense iff there is a  $g \in C(D \times D, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $g(x, x) = h(x)$  for each  $x$  and  $g(x_1, x_2) = g(x_2, x_1) = (f(x_2) - f(x_1))/(x_2 - x_1)$  whenever  $x_1 \neq x_2$ .

If  $D$  is finite, then  $f' = h$  in the strong sense for *any*  $f, h : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and the cubic Hermite spline is an  $\tilde{f} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  with  $\tilde{f} \upharpoonright D = f$  and  $\tilde{f}' \upharpoonright D = h$ . The following lemma generalizes this to an arbitrary closed  $D$ :

**Lemma 2.3** *Assume that  $f, h \in C(D, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $D$  is a closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $f' = h$  in the strong sense. Then there are  $\tilde{f}, \tilde{h} \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $\tilde{f}' = \tilde{h}$ ,  $\tilde{f} \supseteq f$ , and  $\tilde{h} \supseteq h$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be the collection of pairwise disjoint open intervals covering  $\mathbb{R} \setminus D$ . For each interval  $J \in \mathcal{J}$ , we shall define  $\tilde{f}, \tilde{h}$  on  $J$ .

If  $J$  is the unbounded interval  $(a_1, \infty)$ , with  $a_1 \in D$ , define  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\tilde{h}$  by the linear  $\tilde{f}(x) = f(a_1) + (x - a_1)h(a_1)$  and  $\tilde{h}(x) = h(a_1)$ , for  $x \in J$ . Then  $\tilde{f}, \tilde{h}$  are continuous on  $\bar{J}$  and  $\tilde{f}' = \tilde{h}$  on  $J$ . At  $a_1$ , the derivative of  $\tilde{f}$  from the right is  $h(a_1)$ ; the derivative of  $\tilde{f}$  from the left, as well as the continuity of  $\tilde{f}, \tilde{h}$  from the left, depend on how we extend  $f$  to the bounded intervals.

The unbounded interval  $(-\infty, a_2)$  is handled likewise.

Say  $J = (a_1, a_2)$ , with  $a_1, a_2 \in D$ . On  $J$ , let  $\tilde{f}$  be the cubic obtained from Lemma 2.1, with  $b_i = f(a_i)$  and  $s_i = h(a_i)$ . Then  $\tilde{h}$  is the quadratic  $\tilde{f}'$  on  $J$ .

To finish, we verify that  $\tilde{f}, \tilde{h}$  are continuous and  $\tilde{f}' = \tilde{h}$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Fix  $z \in D$ . Since differentiability implies continuity, it suffices to show that  $\tilde{h}$  is continuous at  $z$ , and that  $h(z) = \tilde{f}'(z) = \lim_{x \rightarrow z} (\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(z))/(x - z)$ . We verify the continuity of  $\tilde{h}$  from the left at  $z$ , and the difference quotient's limit for  $x$  approaching  $z$  from the left; a similar argument handles these from the right. Let  $\sigma = h(z) = \tilde{h}(z)$ . Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Apply continuity of  $f, h$  on  $D$ , and the fact that  $f' = h$  in the strong sense, to fix  $\delta > 0$  such that whenever  $z - \delta < a_1 < a_2 < z$  with  $a_1, a_2 \in D$ , the quantities  $|s - \sigma|, |s_i - \sigma|, |b_i - f(z)|, |(f(a_2) - f(z))/(a_2 - z) - \sigma|$  are all less than  $\varepsilon$ , where  $s_i = h(a_i)$  and  $b_i = f(a_i)$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $s = (b_2 - b_1)/(a_2 - a_1)$ . Let  $M = \max(|s_1 - s|, |s_2 - s|)$ , as in Lemma 2.1; so  $M \leq 2\varepsilon$ .

Assume that  $z$  is a limit from the left of points of  $D$  and of points of  $\mathbb{R} \setminus D$ ; otherwise checking continuity and the derivative from the left is trivial. Thus,  $\delta$  may be taken small enough so that  $(z - \delta, z)$  misses any unbounded interval in  $\mathcal{J}$ . For  $a_1, a_2 \in D$  with  $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{J}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $z - \delta < a_1 \leq x < a_2 < z$ , the bounds from Lemma 2.1 imply that  $|\tilde{h}(x) - \sigma| \leq |\tilde{h}(x) - s| + |s - \sigma| \leq 3M + \varepsilon \leq 7\varepsilon$ . So  $\tilde{h}$  is continuous. To see that  $h(z) = \tilde{f}'(z)$ , observe that by elementary geometry, the slope  $(\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(z))/(x - z)$  is between the slopes  $(\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(a_2))/(x - a_2)$  and  $(\tilde{f}(a_2) - \tilde{f}(z))/(a_2 - z)$ . Applying Lemma 2.1 again,  $|(\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(a_2))/(x - a_2) - \sigma| \leq 3M + \varepsilon \leq 7\varepsilon$ , so we are done. ☕

### 3 Some Flavors of OCA

The proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 will require the results of this section.

**Definition 3.1** For any set  $E$ , let  $E^\dagger = (E \times E) \setminus \{(x, x) : x \in E\}$ . If  $W \subseteq E^\dagger$  with  $W = W^{-1}$ , then  $T \subseteq E$  is  $W$ -free iff  $T^\dagger \cap W = \emptyset$ , and  $T$  is  $W$ -connected iff  $T^\dagger \subseteq W$ .

Then SOCA is the assertion that whenever  $E$  is an uncountable separable metric space and  $W = W^{-1} \subseteq E^\dagger$  is open, there is either an uncountable  $W$ -free set or an uncountable  $W$ -connected set.

SOCA follows from PFA, but not from  $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$ . It clearly contradicts CH. However, it is well-known [2] that SOCA is a ZFC theorem when  $E$  is Polish:

**Lemma 3.2** *Assume that  $E$  is an uncountable Polish space,  $W \subseteq E^\dagger$  is open, and  $W = W^{-1}$ . Then there is a Cantor set  $Q \subseteq E$  which is either  $W$ -free or  $W$ -connected.*

**Proof.** Shrinking  $E$ , we may assume that  $E$  is a Cantor set; in particular, non-empty open sets are uncountable. Assume that no Cantor subset is  $W$ -free. Since  $W$  is open, the closure of a  $W$ -free set is  $W$ -free; thus every  $W$ -free set has countable closure, and is hence nowhere dense.

Now, inductively construct a tree,  $\{P_s : s \in 2^{<\omega}\}$ . Each  $P_s$  is a non-empty clopen subset of  $E$ , with  $\text{diam}(P_s) \leq 2^{-\text{lh}(s)}$ .  $P_{s \smallfrown 0}$  and  $P_{s \smallfrown 1}$  are disjoint subsets of  $P_s$  such that  $(P_{s \smallfrown 0} \times P_{s \smallfrown 1}) \subseteq W$ . Let  $Q = \bigcup \{\bigcap_n P_{f \upharpoonright n} : f \in 2^\omega\}$ ; then  $Q$  is  $W$ -connected.



An “open covering” version of SOCA follows by induction on  $\ell$ :

**Lemma 3.3** *Let  $E$  be an uncountable separable metric space, with  $E^\dagger = \bigcup_{i < \ell} W_i$ , where  $\ell \in \omega$  and each  $W_i = W_i^{-1}$  is open in  $E^\dagger$ . Assuming SOCA, there is an uncountable  $T \subseteq E$  such that  $T$  is  $W_i$ -connected for some  $i$ . In the case that  $E$  is Polish, this is a ZFC result and  $T$  can be made perfect.*

There is also a version of this lemma obtained by replacing the covering by a continuous function:

**Lemma 3.4** *Assume that  $E$  is an uncountable Polish space,  $F$  is a compact metric space,  $g \in C(E^\dagger, F)$ , and  $g(x, y) = g(y, x)$  whenever  $x \neq y$ . Then there is a Cantor set  $Q \subseteq E$  such that  $g \upharpoonright Q^\dagger$  extends continuously to some  $\hat{g} \in C(Q \times Q, F)$ .*

**Proof.** Construct a tree,  $\{P_s : s \in 2^{<\omega}\}$ . Each  $P_s$  is a Cantor subset of  $E$ , with  $\text{diam}(P_s) \leq 2^{-\text{lh}(s)}$ .  $P_{s \smallfrown 0}$  and  $P_{s \smallfrown 1}$  are disjoint subsets of  $P_s$ . Also, apply Lemma 3.3 to get  $\text{diam}(g(P_s^\dagger)) \leq 2^{-\text{lh}(s)}$ . Let  $Q = \bigcup \{\bigcap_n P_{f \upharpoonright n} : f \in 2^\omega\}$ . ☕

Now, to prove Theorem 1.2, we need, under PFA, a version of Lemma 3.4 where  $E$  is just an uncountable subset of a Polish space. We begin with the following, from Abraham, Rubin, and Shelah [1]:

**Theorem 3.5** *Assume PFA. Then  $\text{OCA}_{[\text{ARS}]}$  holds. That is, let  $E$  be a separable metric space of size  $\aleph_1$ . Assume that  $E^\dagger = \bigcup_{i < \ell} W_i$ , where  $\ell \in \omega$  and each  $W_i = W_i^{-1}$  is open in  $E^\dagger$ . Then  $E$  can be partitioned into sets  $\{A_j : j \in \omega\}$  such that for each  $j$ ,  $A_j$  is  $W_i$ -connected for some  $i$ .*

The terminology  $OCA_{[ARS]}$  was used by Moore [4] to distinguish it from other flavors of the Open Coloring Axiom in the literature. Actually, [1] does not mention PFA, but rather its Theorem 3.1 shows, by iterated ccc forcing, that  $OCA_{[ARS]}$  is consistent with  $MA(\aleph_1)$ ; but the same proof shows that it is true under PFA. In our proof of Theorem 1.2, we only need  $MA(\aleph_1)$  plus  $OCA_{[ARS]}$ , so in fact every model of  $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1 \wedge 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_2$  has a ccc extension satisfying the result of Theorem 1.2.

To use  $OCA_{[ARS]}$  for our version of Lemma 3.4, we need the  $A_j$  of Theorem 3.5 to be clopen. This is not always possible, but can be achieved if we shrink  $E$ :

**Lemma 3.6** *Assume  $MA(\aleph_1)$ . Assume that  $X$  is a Polish space and  $E \in [X]^{\aleph_1}$ . For each  $n \in \omega$ , let  $\{A_j^n : j \in \omega\}$  partition  $E$  into  $\aleph_0$  sets. Then there is a Cantor set  $Q \subseteq X$  and, for each  $n$ , a partition of  $Q$  into disjoint relatively clopen sets  $\{K_j^n : j \in \omega\}$  such that  $|Q \cap E| = \aleph_1$  and each  $K_j^n \cap E = A_j^n \cap Q$ .*

**Proof.** Note that for each  $n$ , compactness of  $Q$  implies that all but finitely many of the  $K_j^n$  will be empty.

For  $s \in \omega^{<\omega}$ , let  $A_s = \bigcap \{A_{s(n)}^n : n < \text{lh}(s)\}$ , with  $A_\emptyset = E$ . Shrinking  $E, X$ , we may assume that whenever  $U \subseteq X$  is open and non-empty,  $|E \cap U| = \aleph_1$  and each  $|A_s \cap U|$  is either 0 or  $\aleph_1$ .

Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a countable open base for  $X$ , with  $X \in \mathcal{B}$ . Call  $\mathcal{T}$  a *nice tree* iff:

1.  $\mathcal{T}$  is a non-empty subset of  $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$  which is a tree under the order  $\subset$ , with root node  $X$ .
2.  $\mathcal{T}$  has height  $\text{ht}(\mathcal{T})$ , where  $1 \leq \text{ht}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \omega$ .
3. If  $U \in \mathcal{T}$  is at level  $\ell$  with  $\ell + 1 < \text{ht}(\mathcal{T})$ , then  $U$  has finitely many but at least two children in  $\mathcal{T}$ , and the closures of the children are pairwise disjoint and contained in  $U$ .
4. If  $U \in \mathcal{T}$  is at level  $\ell > 0$ , then  $\text{diam}(U) \leq 1/\ell$ .

This labels the levels  $0, 1, 2, \dots$ , with  $\text{ht}(\mathcal{T})$  the first empty level. Let  $L_\ell(\mathcal{T})$  be the set of nodes at level  $\ell$ . By (1)–(3), each  $L_\ell(\mathcal{T})$  is a finite pairwise disjoint collection.

When  $\text{ht}(\mathcal{T}) = \omega$ , let  $Q_{\mathcal{T}} = \bigcap_{\ell \in \omega} \bigcup L_\ell(\mathcal{T}) = \bigcap_{\ell \in \omega} \text{cl}(\bigcup L_\ell(\mathcal{T}))$ . Then  $Q_{\mathcal{T}}$  is a Cantor set, so it is natural to force with finite trees approximating  $\mathcal{T}$ . Since many Cantor sets are disjoint from  $E$ , each forcing condition  $p$  will have, as a side condition, a finite  $I_p \subseteq E$  which is forced to be a subset of  $Q$ .

Define  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  iff  $p$  is a triple  $(\mathcal{T}, I, \varphi) = (\mathcal{T}_p, I_p, \varphi_p)$ , such that:

- a.  $\mathcal{T}$  is a nice tree of some finite height  $h = h_p \geq 1$ .
- b.  $I$  is finite and  $I \subseteq E \cap \bigcup L_{h-1}(\mathcal{T})$ .
- c.  $\varphi : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \omega^{<\omega}$  with  $\varphi(U) \in \omega^\ell$  for  $U \in L_\ell(\mathcal{T})$ .
- d.  $\varphi(V) \supseteq \varphi(U)$  whenever  $V \subseteq U$ .

e. If  $s = \varphi(U)$  then  $A_s \cap U \neq \emptyset$  and  $I_p \subseteq A_s$ .

Define  $q \leq p$  iff  $\mathcal{T}_q$  is an end extension of  $\mathcal{T}_p$  and  $I_q \supseteq I_p$  and  $\varphi_q \supseteq \varphi_p$ . Then  $\mathbb{1} = (\{X\}, \emptyset, \{(X, \emptyset)\})$ .  $\mathbb{P}$  is ccc (and  $\sigma$ -centered) because  $p, q$  are compatible whenever  $\mathcal{T}_p = \mathcal{T}_q$  and  $\varphi_p = \varphi_q$ . If  $G$  is a filter meeting the dense sets  $\{p : h_p > n\}$  for each  $n$ , then  $G$  defines a tree  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_G = \bigcup \{\mathcal{T}_p : p \in G\}$  of height  $\omega$ , and  $Q = Q_{\mathcal{T}}$  is a Cantor set. We also have  $\varphi_G = \bigcup \{\varphi_p : p \in G\}$ , so  $\varphi_G : \mathcal{T}_G \rightarrow \omega^{<\omega}$ ; also, let  $I_G = \bigcup \{I_p : p \in G\}$ .

Note that for each  $x \in E$ ,  $\{p : x \in I_p \vee x \notin \bigcup L_{h_p-1}(\mathcal{T}_p)\}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{P}$ . If  $G$  meets all these dense sets, then  $Q \cap E = I_G$ . We may then let  $K_j^n = Q \cap \bigcup \{U \in L_{n+1}(\mathcal{T}_G) : \varphi(U)(n) = j\}$ .

Finally, if we list  $E$  as  $\{e_\beta : \beta < \omega_1\}$ , note that each set  $\{p : \exists \beta > \alpha [e_\beta \in I_p]\}$  is dense, so that we may force  $Q \cap E$  to be uncountable. ☕

**Lemma 3.7** *Assume PFA. Assume that  $X$  is a Polish space,  $F$  is a compact metric space,  $E \in [X]^{\aleph_1}$ ,  $g \in C(X^\dagger, F)$ , and  $g(x, y) = g(y, x)$  whenever  $x \neq y$ . Then there is a Cantor set  $Q \subseteq X$  such that  $|Q \cap E| = \aleph_1$  and  $g \upharpoonright Q^\dagger$  extends continuously to some  $\hat{g} \in C(Q \times Q, F)$ .*

**Proof.** For each  $n$ , we may use compactness of  $F$  to cover  $X^\dagger$  by finitely many open sets,  $W_i^n = (W_i^n)^{-1}$  for  $i < \ell_n$ , such that each  $\text{diam}(g(W_i^n)) \leq 2^{-n}$ . It follows by Theorem 3.5 that for each  $n$ , we may partition  $E$  into sets  $\{A_j^n : j \in \omega\}$  such that each  $A_j^n$  is  $W_i^n$ -connected for some  $i$ , so that  $\text{diam}(g((A_j^n)^\dagger)) \leq 2^{-n}$ .

By Lemma 3.6, we have a Cantor set  $Q \subseteq X$  and, for each  $n$ , a partition of  $Q$  into disjoint relatively clopen sets  $\{K_j^n : j \in \omega\}$  such that  $|Q \cap E| = \aleph_1$  and each  $K_j^n \cap E = A_j^n \cap Q$ . Shrinking  $Q$ , we may assume  $Q \cap E$  is dense in  $Q$ , so that each  $A_j^n \cap Q$  is dense in  $K_j^n$  and  $\text{diam}(g((K_j^n)^\dagger)) \leq 2^{-n}$ .

Now, fix  $x \in Q$ . For each  $n$ ,  $x$  lies in exactly one of the  $K_j^n$ , and we may let  $H^n = \text{cl}(g((K_j^n)^\dagger))$  for that  $j$ . Then  $\bigcap_n H^n$  is a singleton, and we may define  $\hat{g}$  on the diagonal by  $\{\hat{g}(x, x)\} = \bigcap_n H^n$ . It is easily seen that this  $\hat{g}$  is continuous on  $Q \times Q$ . ☕

## 4 Proofs of Positive Results

**Lemma 4.1** *Fix an uncountable  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  and an  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Assuming SOCA, there is an uncountable  $T \subseteq E$  such that  $T$  is  $\varepsilon$ -directed. In the case that  $E$  is Polish, this is a ZFC result and  $T$  can be made perfect.*



**Proof.** Let  $\{V_i : i < \ell\}$  be an open cover of  $S^{n-1}$  by sets of diameter less than  $\varepsilon$ , and apply Lemma 3.3 with  $W_i = \{(x, y) \in E^\dagger : \rho(x - y) \in V_i\}$ . ☕

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** Applying Lemma 4.1 and shrinking  $P$ , we may assume that  $P$  is a Cantor set and that  $P$  is  $2 \sin(22.5^\circ)$ -directed; so, the direction between any two points of  $P$  is within  $45^\circ$  of some fixed direction. Rotating coordinates, we may assume that this fixed direction is along the  $x$ -axis, where we label our  $n$  axes as  $x, y^1, \dots, y^{n-1}$ . Now,  $P$  is (the graph of) a function which expresses  $(y^1, \dots, y^{n-1})$  as a function of  $x$ , and  $D := \text{dom}(P)$  is a Cantor set. Write  $P(x)$  as  $(P^1(x), \dots, P^{n-1}(x))$ .

The  $xy^i$ -planar slopes of  $P$  are all in  $[-1, 1]$ . That is, for  $x_1, x_2 \in D$  with  $x_1 \neq x_2$ , let  $g^i(x_1, x_2) = (P^i(x_2) - P^i(x_1))/(x_2 - x_1)$ ; then  $|g^i(x_1, x_2)| \leq 1$  for all  $x_1, x_2$ . Each  $g^i \in C(D^\dagger, [0, 1])$  and  $g^i(x_1, x_2) = g^i(x_2, x_1)$  whenever  $x_1 \neq x_2$ . Applying Lemma 3.4 with  $F = [0, 1]^{n-1}$  and shrinking  $D$  if necessary, we may assume that each  $g^i$  extends continuously to some  $\hat{g}^i \in C(D \times D, [0, 1])$ . Let  $h^i(x) = \hat{g}^i(x, x)$ . Then  $h^i$  is the derivative of  $P^i$  in the strong sense. Now, we may apply Lemma 2.3 on each coordinate separately to obtain a  $C^1$  arc  $A \supseteq P$ ;  $A$  is the graph of a  $C^1$  function  $x \mapsto (A^1(x), \dots, A^{n-1}(x))$  defined on an interval containing  $D$ . ☕

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Given Lemma 3.7, the proof is almost identical to the proof of Theorem 1.3. ☕

When  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  has size exactly  $\aleph_1$ , and the Question of Section 1 has a positive answer, it is natural to ask whether  $E$  can be covered by  $\aleph_0$  “nice” arcs. For example, under  $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$ ,  $E$  is covered by  $\aleph_0$  Cantor sets, and hence by  $\aleph_0$  arcs. One can also improve Theorem 1.2:

**Theorem 4.2** *PFA implies every  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  of size  $\aleph_1$  can be covered by  $\aleph_0$   $C^1$  arcs.*

The proof mimics the proof of Theorem 1.2, but uses improved versions of Lemmas 4.1, 3.6 and 3.7. The new and improved Lemma 4.1 gets  $E$  covered by  $\aleph_0$   $\varepsilon$ -directed sets, using Theorem 3.5 rather than SOCA.

The covering versions of Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 get Cantor sets  $Q_\ell \subseteq X$  for  $\ell \in \omega$  satisfying the conditions of the lemmas and so that  $E \subseteq \bigcup_\ell Q_\ell$ . To get the  $Q_\ell$  for  $\ell \in \omega$ , force with the finite support product of  $\omega$  copies of the poset  $\mathbb{P}$  described in the proof of Lemma 3.6. Then, use the  $Q_\ell$  to prove the covering version of Lemma 3.7. Even though the proof of Lemma 3.7 shrinks  $Q$ , it does so by deleting at most countably many points from  $E$ , so these points may be covered by  $\aleph_0$  straight lines. Thus,  $E$  will be covered by  $\bigcup_\ell Q_\ell$  together with a countable union of lines.

## 5 Proofs of Negative Results

**Lemma 5.1** *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}$  be closed. Then there is an  $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $h(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x$  and  $D = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : h(x) = 0\}$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $U = \mathbb{R} \setminus D$ ; we shall call our function  $h_U$ . If  $U = (a, b)$ , then such  $h_U$  are in standard texts; for example, let  $h_{(a,b)}(x)$  be  $\exp(-1 \div (x-a)(b-x))$  for  $x \in (a, b)$  and 0 otherwise. Now, say  $U = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} J_n$ , where each  $J_n$  is a bounded open interval. Let  $h_U = \sum_{n \in \omega} c_n h_{J_n}$ , where each  $c_n > 0$  and the  $c_n$  are small enough so that for each  $\ell \in \omega$ , the  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  derivative  $h_U^{(\ell)}$  is the uniform limit of the sum  $\sum_{n \in \omega} c_n h_{J_n}^{(\ell)}$ . ☕

**Proof of Theorem 1.6.** Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}$  be a Cantor set. Integrating the function of Lemma 5.1, fix  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $f'(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x$  and  $D = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f'(x) = 0\}$ . Then  $f$  is strictly increasing.

Let  $P$  be the graph of  $f \upharpoonright D$ . Fix an uncountable  $A \subseteq P$ , and assume that  $A$  is non-squiggly; we shall derive a contradiction. Fix  $\delta > 0$  as in Definition 1.4; then, shrinking  $A$ , we may assume that  $\text{diam}(A) \leq \delta$  so that whenever  $\{x, y, z, t\} \in [A]^4$ , point  $t$  is not interior to triangle  $xyz$ .

Let  $S$  be an infinite subset of  $\text{dom}(A)$  such that every point of  $S$  is a limit, from the left and right, of other points of  $S$ .

Now, fix  $a, b, c \in S$  with  $a < b < c$ ; then  $f(a) < f(b) < f(c)$ . Let  $L$  be the straight line passing through  $(a, f(a))$  and  $(c, f(c))$ . Moving  $b$  slightly if necessary, we may assume (since  $f'(b) = 0$ ) that  $L$  does not pass through  $(b, f(b))$ . Then either  $L(b) > f(b)$  or  $L(b) < f(b)$ .

Suppose that  $L(b) > f(b)$ . Consider triangle  $(a, f(a)), (b, f(b)), (c, f(c))$ . One leg of this triangle is the graph of  $L \upharpoonright [a, c]$ , which passes above the point  $(b, f(b))$ . Since all three legs have positive slope and  $f'(b) = 0$ , the points  $(b - \varepsilon, f(b - \varepsilon))$  are interior to the triangle when  $\varepsilon > 0$  is small enough. Choosing such an  $\varepsilon$  with  $b - \varepsilon \in S$  yields a contradiction.

$L(b) < f(b)$  is likewise contradictory, using points  $(b + \varepsilon, f(b + \varepsilon))$ . ☕

Observe that the arc in Theorem 1.6 cannot be real-analytic, since if  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is real-analytic, then  $[0, 1]$  can be decomposed into finitely many intervals on which either  $f'' \geq 0$  or  $f'' \leq 0$ . On each of these intervals, the graph of  $f$  is non-squiggly.

**Proof of Theorem 1.5.** As in the proof of Theorem 1.6, let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}$  be a Cantor set, and fix  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $f$  is strictly increasing,  $f'(y) \geq 0$  for all  $y$ , and  $D = \{y \in \mathbb{R} : f'(y) = 0\}$ . Also, to simplify notation, assume that  $f(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}$ , so that  $\varphi := f^{-1} \in C(\mathbb{R})$  and is also a strictly increasing function. Let  $K = f(D)$ ; so  $K$  is also a Cantor set. Then  $\varphi$  is  $C^\infty$  on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus K$ , and  $\varphi'(x) = +\infty$  for  $x \in K$ . Integrating, fix  $\psi \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $\psi' = \varphi$ ; so  $\psi$  is a convex function.

Note that whenever  $x \in K$  and  $M > 0$ , there is an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\varphi'(u) \geq M$  whenever  $|u - x| < \varepsilon$ . When  $x - \varepsilon < a \leq v \leq b < x + \varepsilon$ , we can integrate this to get  $\varphi(a) + M(v - a) \leq \varphi(v) \leq \varphi(b) - M(b - v)$ . Integrating again yields

$$(b - a)\varphi(a) + (b - a)^2 M/2 \leq \psi(b) - \psi(a) \leq (b - a)\varphi(b) - (b - a)^2 M/2 .$$

This implies that, for  $x \in K$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\psi(x + t) - \psi(x))/t - \varphi(x)}{t} = +\infty ; \quad (*)$$

the argument can be broken into two cases:  $t \searrow 0$  (consider  $a = x < x + t = b$ ) and  $t \nearrow 0$  (consider  $a = x + t < x = b$ ).

Now let  $P = \psi \upharpoonright K$ ; so  $P$  is a Cantor set in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Suppose that  $P$  meets the  $C^2$  arc  $A$  in an infinite set. Since the intersection is compact, it contains a limit point  $(x_0, y_0)$ . At  $(x_0, y_0)$ , the tangent to the arc  $A$  is parallel to the tangent of the  $C^1$  arc  $y = \psi(x)$ ; in particular, this tangent is not vertical. Thus, replacing  $A$  by a segment thereof, we may assume that  $A$  is the arc  $y = \xi(x)$ , where  $\xi$  is a  $C^2$  function defined in some neighborhood of  $x_0$ . Now  $y_0 = \xi(x_0) = \psi(x_0)$  and  $\xi'(x_0) = \psi'(x_0) = \varphi(x_0)$ . Also, since  $(x_0, y_0)$  is a limit point of the intersection, there are non-zero  $t_k$ , for  $k \in \omega$ , converging to 0, such that each  $\psi(x_0 + t_k) = \xi(x_0 + t_k)$ . Applying Taylor's Theorem to  $\xi$ ,

$$\psi(x_0 + t_k) = \psi(x_0) + \varphi(x_0)t_k + \frac{1}{2}\xi''(z_k)t_k^2 \text{ for some } z_k \text{ between } x_0 \text{ and } x_0 + t_k .$$

Since  $\xi''(z_k) \rightarrow \xi''(x_0)$ , we have

$$[(\psi(x_0 + t_k) - \psi(x_0))/t_k - \varphi(x_0)]/t_k \rightarrow \xi''(x_0)/2 ,$$

contradicting (\*). ☹

If  $\psi$  were  $C^2$ , the limit in (\*) would be  $\psi''(x)/2 \neq \infty$  (by Taylor's Theorem). Moreover, the Cantor set  $P = \psi \upharpoonright K$  meets *any*  $C^2$  arc in a finite set. This illustrates a difference between  $C^1$  and  $C^2$ : rotation can cure an infinite derivative, but not an infinite second derivative. Even though  $\varphi'(x) = \infty$  for  $x \in K$ , rotating the graph of  $\varphi \upharpoonright K$  gives us the graph of  $f \upharpoonright D$ , which lies on a  $C^\infty$  arc.

## 6 Remarks on Arcs

Although the notion of *strongly*  $C^k$  is the one capturing the geometric notion of "smooth", every polygonal path is weakly  $C^\infty$ . Moreover, the standard formulas for

evaluating line integrals (e.g.,  $\int_A \vec{\Phi}(\vec{x}) \cdot d\vec{x} = \int_a^b \vec{\Phi}(\vec{g}(t)) \cdot \vec{g}'(t) dt$ ) only require the path  $\vec{g}(t)$  to be *weakly*  $C^1$ ; the arc  $A$  may have corners, with the velocity vector  $\vec{g}'(t)$  becoming zero at a corner.

Theorems 1.2, 1.3, and 1.6 produce *strongly*  $C^k$  arcs. In contrast, Theorem 1.5 produces a perfect set which *meets* all strongly  $C^2$  arcs in a finite set. Theorem 1.7 shows that the *weakly* version of this theorem is false.

To prove Theorem 1.7, we begin with an interpolation result.

**Definition 6.1** *An interpolation function is a  $\psi \in C([0, 1], [0, 1])$  such that  $\psi(0) = 0$  and  $\psi(1) = 1$ .*

**Definition 6.2** *Assume that  $D$  is a closed subset of  $[0, 1]$  with  $0, 1 \in D$ . Fix  $g \in C(D, \mathbb{R}^n)$ , and let  $\psi$  be an interpolation function. Then the  $\psi$  interpolation for  $g$  is the function  $\tilde{g} \in C([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$  extending  $g$  such that whenever  $(a, b)$  is a maximal interval in  $[0, 1] \setminus D$  and  $u \in (a, b)$ ,*

$$\tilde{g}(u) = g(a) + (g(b) - g(a))\psi((u - a)/(b - a)) .$$

It is easily seen that  $\tilde{g}$  is indeed continuous on  $[0, 1]$ .

**Definition 6.3** *Assume that  $D$  is a closed subset of  $[0, 1]$  with  $0, 1 \in D$ . Then  $g \in C(D, \mathbb{R}^n)$  is flat iff for all  $\alpha \in \omega$ , there is a bound  $M_\alpha$  such that for all  $u, t \in D$   $\|g(u) - g(t)\| \leq M_\alpha |u - t|^\alpha$ .*

That is,  $g$  is flat iff for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N} = \omega \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $g$  is uniformly Lipschitz of order  $\alpha$  on  $D$ . If  $D$  is finite, then every  $g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is flat. If  $D$  contains an interval, then a flat  $g$  is constant on that interval, because it is Lipschitz of order 2 there; for  $t < t + h$  in the interval:  $\|g(t + h) - g(t)\| \leq k \cdot M_2 \cdot h^2/k^2$  for all  $k \geq 1$ .

**Lemma 6.4** *Assume that  $D$  is a closed subset of  $[0, 1]$  with  $0, 1 \in D$ . Assume that  $g \in C(D, \mathbb{R}^n)$  is flat. Let  $\psi$  be an interpolation function such that  $\psi \in C^\infty([0, 1], [0, 1])$  and  $\psi^{(k)}(0) = \psi^{(k)}(1) = 0$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\tilde{g}$  be the  $\psi$  interpolation for  $g$ . Then  $\tilde{g} \in C^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\tilde{g}^{(k)}(t) = 0$  for all  $t \in D$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

**Proof.** It is sufficient to produce bounds  $B_k$  giving the following Lipschitz condition for all  $t \in D$  and  $u \notin D$ :

1.  $\|\tilde{g}(u) - \tilde{g}(t)\| \leq B_0 |u - t|^2 .$
2.  $\|\tilde{g}^{(k)}(u)\| \leq B_k |u - t|^2$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Note that (1)(2) fail for  $u, t \notin D$ , since the derivatives there need not be 0. On the other hand, (1) holds for  $u, t \in D$ , because  $g$  is flat.

Observe that (1) and 2-Lipschitz on  $D$  prove  $\tilde{g}'(t) = 0$  for  $t \in D$ , so that (2) makes  $\tilde{g} \in C^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$ . For  $k \geq 2$ , induct on  $k$  to see that  $\tilde{g} \in C^{(k)}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$ : (2) for  $k - 1$  and the fact that  $\tilde{g}^{(k-1)}$  is 2-Lipschitz on  $D$  prove  $\tilde{g}^{(k)}(t) = 0$  for  $t \in D$ , so (2) for  $k$  makes  $g^{(k)}$  continuous.

To prove (1)(2), assume, without loss of generality,  $t < u$ . To handle (1)(2) together, let  $Q_0(u, t) = \|\tilde{g}(u) - \tilde{g}(t)\|$ , and for  $k > 0$ ,  $Q_k(u, t) = \|\tilde{g}^{(k)}(u)\|$ . Consider the two cases:

Case I.  $(t, u) \cap D = \emptyset$ : Say  $t = a < u < b$ , where  $a, b \in D$  and  $(a, b)$  is a maximal interval in  $[0, 1] \setminus D$ . So

$$Q_k(u, t) = \|g(b) - g(a)\| \cdot \left| \psi^{(k)} \left( \frac{u-a}{b-a} \right) \right| \cdot \frac{1}{(b-a)^k} .$$

Let  $S_k$  be the largest value taken by the function  $|\psi^{(k)}|$ . Consider:

Subcase I.1.  $(b-a)^2 \leq (u-a)$ : Here,

$$Q_k(u, t) \leq \|g(b) - g(a)\| \cdot S_k \cdot \frac{1}{(b-a)^k} \cdot \frac{(u-a)^2}{(u-a)^2} \leq M_{k+4} S_k (u-a)^2 .$$

Subcase I.2.  $(b-a)^2 \geq (u-a)$ : In this case, use Taylor's Theorem and the assumption  $\psi^{(n)}(0) = 0$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , to bound  $|\psi^{(k)}(z)|$  by  $\frac{S_{2k+4}}{(k+4)!} z^4$ . Then,

$$Q_k(u, t) \leq M_0 \cdot \left| \psi^{(k)} \left( \frac{u-a}{b-a} \right) \right| \cdot \frac{(b-a)^{k+4}}{(u-a)^{k+4}} \cdot \frac{(u-a)^{k+4}}{(b-a)^{2k+4}} \leq M_0 \cdot \frac{S_{2k+4}}{(k+4)!} \cdot (u-a)^2 .$$

Case II.  $(t, u) \cap D \neq \emptyset$ : Let  $a = \sup(D \cap [t, u])$ , so  $t < a < u$  and Case I applies to  $a, u$ . For (1), use the fact that  $g$  is flat, together with

$$\|\tilde{g}(u) - \tilde{g}(t)\| \leq \|\tilde{g}(u) - \tilde{g}(a)\| + \|g(a) - g(t)\| .$$

For (2),  $\|\tilde{g}^{(k)}(u)\| \leq B_k |u-a|^2 \leq B_k |u-t|^2$ . ☕

**Proof of Theorem 1.7.** Passing to a subset, and possibly translating it, let  $E = \{\vec{x}_j : j \in \omega\}$ , where the  $\vec{x}_j$  converge to  $\vec{0}$ , and

- a.  $\|\vec{x}_0\| > \|\vec{x}_1\| > \|\vec{x}_2\| > \dots$ .
- b.  $\|\vec{x}_j\| \leq 2^{-j^2}$  for each  $j$ .

Let  $A$  be the set obtained by connecting each  $\vec{x}_j$  to  $\vec{x}_{j+1}$  by a straight line segment; so  $A$  is a "polygonal" arc, with  $\omega$  steps. Moreover, the natural path which traverses it from  $\vec{0}$  to  $\vec{x}_0$  will be 1-1, because (a) guarantees that the line segments forming  $A$  meet only at the  $\vec{x}_j$ . Let  $D = \{0\} \cup \{2^{-j} : j \in \omega\}$ , and define  $g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  by  $g(0) = \vec{0}$  and  $g(2^{-j}) = \vec{x}_j$ . Then  $g$  is flat, by (b) (with  $M_\alpha = 2^{1+\alpha^2}$ ).

Let  $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  be such that

- ☞  $\psi(t) = 0$  when  $t \leq 0$  and  $\psi(t) = 1$  when  $t \geq 1$ .
- ☞  $\psi'(t) > 0$  for  $0 < t < 1$ .
- ☞  $\psi^{(k)}(0) = \psi^{(k)}(1) = 0$  for  $k \geq 1$ .

Such a  $\psi$  may be obtained by integrating a scalar multiple of the function described in Lemma 5.1. Let  $\tilde{g} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be the  $\psi$  interpolation for  $g$ . Then, by Lemma 6.4,  $\tilde{g} \in C^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$ . ☞

For the path  $\tilde{g}$  in the preceding proof, all  $\tilde{g}^{(k)}$  (for  $k \geq 1$ ) will be  $\vec{0}$  when passing through each  $\vec{x}_j$ , so that no acceleration is felt when rounding a corner. Also, each  $\tilde{g}^{(k)}$  will be  $\vec{0}$  at  $t = 0$ .

Now consider the perfect set version.

**Theorem 6.5** *If  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is Borel and uncountable, then  $E$  meets some weakly  $C^\infty$  arc in an uncountable set.*

**Proof.** Write elements of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as  $\vec{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^n)$ . By shrinking and rotating  $E$ , we may assume that  $E$  is a Cantor set and the projection  $\pi^1$  of  $E$  on the  $x^1$  coordinate is 1-1. Shrinking  $E$  further, we may assume that  $E = \bigcap_j (\bigcup \{F_\sigma : \sigma \in \{0, 2\}^j\})$ , where the  $F_\sigma$  are compact and form a tree and each  $\text{diam}(F_\sigma) \leq 3^{-(\text{lh}(\sigma))^2}$ .

In  $\mathbb{R}$ , the “ $t$ -axis”, let  $D$  be the usual middle-third Cantor set. Then  $D = \bigcap_j (\bigcup \{I_\sigma : \sigma \in \{0, 2\}^j\})$ , where  $I_\sigma$  is an interval of length  $3^{-\text{lh}(\sigma)}$ . Let  $g : D \rightarrow E$  be the natural homeomorphism. So, if  $\alpha \in \{0, 2\}^\omega$ , it determines the point  $t_\alpha = \sum_{i \in \omega} (\alpha_i 3^{-i}) \in D$ . Then  $\bigcap_{i \in \omega} I_{\alpha \upharpoonright i} = \{t_\alpha\}$  and  $\bigcap_{i \in \omega} F_{\alpha \upharpoonright i} = \{g(t_\alpha)\}$ .

Note that  $g$  is flat. Let  $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  be as in the proof of Theorem 1.7, and let  $\tilde{g}$  be the  $\psi$  interpolation for  $g$ . Then  $\tilde{g} \in C^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$ .

Finally, in choosing  $E$  and the  $F_\sigma$ , make sure that if  $\sigma < \tau$  lexicographically, then all elements of  $\pi^1(F_\sigma)$  are less than all elements of  $\pi^1(F_\tau)$ . This will guarantee that  $\pi^1 \circ g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is order-preserving, so that  $\tilde{g}$  is a 1-1 function. ☞

Under  $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$ , if  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  has size  $\aleph_1$ , then  $E$  can be covered by  $\aleph_0$  weakly  $C^\infty$  arcs. In particular,  $E$  can be covered by  $\aleph_0$  copies, or rotated copies, of the perfect set  $g(D)$  constructed in the preceding proof.

## References

- [1] U. Abraham, M. Rubin, and S. Shelah, On the consistency of some partition theorems for continuous colorings, and the structure of  $\aleph_1$ -dense real order types, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 29 (1985) 123-206.
- [2] F. Galvin, Partition theorems for the real line, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* 15 (1968) 660.
- [3] K. Kunen, Locally connected HL compacta, to appear.
- [4] J. T. Moore, Open colorings, the continuum and the second uncountable cardinal, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 130 (2002) 2753-2759.