

## FREE PRODUCTS OF TOPOLOGICAL GROUPS WITH A CLOSED SUBGROUP AMALGAMATED

PETER NICKOLAS

(Received 15 April 1984; revised 1 December 1984)

Communicated by J. H. Rubinstein

### Abstract

It is shown that if  $\{G_n: n = 1, 2, \dots\}$  is a countable family of Hausdorff  $k_\omega$ -topological groups with a common closed subgroup  $A$ , then the topological amalgamated free product  $*_A G_n$  exists and is a Hausdorff  $k_\omega$ -topological group with each  $G_n$  as a closed subgroup. A consequence is the theorem of La Martin that epimorphisms in the category of  $k_\omega$ -topological groups have dense image.

1980 *Mathematics subject classification* (*Amer. Math. Soc.*): 22 A 05; secondary 20 E 06, 54 D 30, 18 A 20.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $\{G_n: n = 1, 2, \dots\}$  be a countable family of  $k_\omega$ -topological groups, each having a fixed topological group  $A$  as a closed subgroup. We show that  $*_A G_n$ , the free topological product of  $\{G_n\}$  with  $A$  amalgamated, exists, is a (Hausdorff)  $k_\omega$ -group, and contains  $G_n$  as a closed subgroup for each  $n$ .

Katz and Morris [2, 3, 4] have already shown that an amalgamated product  $G *_A H$  of  $k_\omega$ -groups is  $k_\omega$  whenever  $A$  is in a class of closed subgroups, including those which are normal and those which are the product of a compact subgroup and a central subgroup. Our theorem clearly contains these results, and moreover yields another proof of La Martin's theorem that epimorphisms in the category of  $k_\omega$ -groups have dense range ([6]; see also [9] and [11]).

The proof of our theorem has similarities to Ordman's proof [10] that the free  $k$ -group on a  $t_2$   $k$ -space exists and is a  $t_2$   $k$ -group, and more especially to the proof of Brown and Hardy [1] that the universal topological groupoid on a  $k_\omega$ -groupoid exists and is  $k_\omega$ .

## 2. The theorem

Recall that a Hausdorff space  $X$  is a  $k_\omega$ -space if it has the weak topology with respect to some increasing sequence of compact subsets  $X_1 \subseteq X_2 \subseteq \cdots$  with union  $X$ ; then we say that  $\bigcup X_n$  is a  $k_\omega$ -decomposition of  $X$ . A topological group is a  $k_\omega$ -group if as a topological space it is  $k_\omega$ . The appendix of [1] contains a useful list of the properties of  $k_\omega$ -spaces.

Let  $\{G_\lambda; \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  be a family of topological groups. Then we say that  $(A, \{i_\lambda\})$  is a *common subgroup* of the  $G_\lambda$  if  $A$  is a topological group and, for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $i_\lambda$  is a topological isomorphism of  $A$  onto a subgroup of  $G_\lambda$ . We denote  $i_\lambda(A)$  by  $A_\lambda$ , and the isomorphism  $i_\mu i_\lambda^{-1}: A_\lambda \rightarrow A_\mu$ , where  $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ , is denoted by  $i_{\lambda, \mu}$ . The common subgroup is *closed* if  $A_\lambda$  is closed in  $G_\lambda$  for each  $\lambda$ .

The above isomorphisms, of course, simply serve to identify the various copies of  $A$  in the  $G_\lambda$ . In purely algebraic arguments involving the amalgamated product it is often convenient to suppress these maps, and to regard  $A$  as a subgroup of each  $G_\lambda$  (cf. Chapter III, 12 of [8]); this can be done with advantage in the lemma below. In topological arguments, on the other hand, it is desirable to use the maps explicitly.

**DEFINITION** (cf. [2, 3, 4]). Let  $(A, \{i_\lambda\})$  be a common subgroup of the topological groups  $G_\lambda$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . A topological group  $G = *_A G_\lambda$  is the *free product of  $\{G_\lambda\}$  with  $A$  amalgamated* if

- (i)  $G_\lambda$  is a topological subgroup of  $G$  for each  $\lambda$ ,
- (ii)  $\bigcup_\lambda G_\lambda$  generates  $G$  algebraically, and
- (iii) for any topological group  $H$  and any collection of continuous homomorphisms  $\phi_\lambda: G_\lambda \rightarrow H$  which agree on  $A$  (that is  $\phi_\lambda i_\lambda = \phi_\mu i_\mu$  for all  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ ), there exists a continuous homomorphism  $\Phi: G \rightarrow H$  which extends each  $\phi_\lambda$ .

**THEOREM.** *If  $(A, \{i_n\})$  is a common closed subgroup of the  $k_\omega$ -groups  $G_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $*_A G_n$  exists and is a (Hausdorff)  $k_\omega$ -group, with each  $G_n$  as a closed subgroup.*

Note that  $A$  is also necessarily a  $k_\omega$ -group.

The proof of the theorem occupies almost the remainder of the paper.

Let  $U = \sqcup_n G_n$  and  $W = \sqcup_n U^n = \bigcup_n W_n$ , where  $W_n = \sqcup_{i=1}^n U^i$  (here  $\sqcup$  denotes disjoint union (or the coproduct in the category of topological spaces), and  $U^n$  denotes the Cartesian product  $U \times \cdots \times U$  of  $n$  copies of  $U$ ). Clearly  $U$  and  $W$  are  $k_\omega$ -spaces. Let  $G$  be the abstract amalgamated free product  $*_A G_n$  of the  $G_n$  with the  $A_n$  amalgamated, and give  $G$  the quotient topology under the map  $p: W \rightarrow G$  which sends  $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  to the product of  $g_1, \dots, g_n$  in  $G$ . We shall show that  $G$  has all the properties required by the definition. The key to doing this is to show first that  $G$  has a (Hausdorff)  $k_\omega$ -topology, and for this we need the definition and lemma below.

For convenience, first define  $\Omega: U \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  by setting  $\Omega(g)$ , for  $g \in U$ , equal to the (unique)  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  for which  $g \in G_n$ .

**DEFINITION.** An  $n$ -tuple  $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in W$  is *reduced* if  $g_j \in G_{\Omega(g_j)} \setminus A_{\Omega(g_j)}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , and if  $\Omega(g_j) \neq \Omega(g_{j+1})$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ .

**LEMMA.** Let  $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  and  $(h_1, \dots, h_m)$  be reduced elements of  $W$ . Then, writing  $\omega(j) = \omega(g_j)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , we have  $p(g_1, \dots, g_n) = p(h_1, \dots, h_m)$  if and only if

- (i)  $n = m$ ,
- (ii)  $\Omega(h_j) = \omega(j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , and
- (iii)  $h_1^{-1}g_1 \in A_{\omega(1)}$ ,  
 $h_2^{-1}i_{\omega(1), \omega(2)}(h_1^{-1}g_1)g_2 \in A_{\omega(2)}$ ,  
 $\dots$   
 $h_{n-1}^{-1}i_{\omega(n-2), \omega(n-1)}(h_{n-2}^{-1} \cdots g_{n-2})g_{n-1} \in A_{\omega(n-1)}$ , and  
 $h_n^{-1}i_{\omega(n-1), \omega(n)}(h_{n-1}^{-1} \cdots g_{n-1})g_n = 1$ .

Moreover, (i), (ii) and (iii) together imply that  $p(g_1, \dots, g_n) = p(h_1, \dots, h_m)$ , whether or not  $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  and  $(h_1, \dots, h_m)$  are reduced.

**PROOF.** Suppose  $p(g_1, \dots, g_n) = p(h_1, \dots, h_m)$ . By Chapter I of [8], we see that  $p(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  and  $p(h_1, \dots, h_m)$  have lengths  $n$  and  $m$ , respectively, in  $G$ , so that  $n = m$ , proving (i).

Let  $S_k$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ) be a complete set of left coset representatives for  $A_k$  in  $G_k$ , with the representative of  $A_k$  always taken to be 1. Recall that for all  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $i_k(a)$  and  $i_l(a)$  are identified as elements of  $G$ , for each  $a \in A$ . In the group  $G_{\omega(1)}$ , set

$$(1) \quad g_1 = s_1 a_1 \quad (s_1 \in S_{\omega(1)} \setminus \{1\}, a_1 \in A_{\omega(1)}),$$

and in the group  $G_{\omega(j)}$ ,  $j = 2, \dots, n$ , set

$$(2) \quad i_{\omega(j-1), \omega(j)}(a_{j-1})g_j = s_j a_j \quad (s_j \in S_{\omega(j)} \setminus \{1\}, a_j \in A_{\omega(j)}).$$

Then from the well-known algebraic structure of  $G$  [8], we see that, in the group  $G$ ,  $g_1 g_2 \cdots g_n = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n a_n$ , and that the latter is the (uniquely-defined) normal form of  $g_1 g_2 \cdots g_n$ . Computing the normal form of  $h_1 h_2 \cdots h_n$  similarly, we see that (writing  $\Omega'(j) = \Omega(h_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) we have

$$(3) \quad h_1 = s'_1 a'_1 \quad (s'_1 \in S_{\omega'(1)} \setminus \{1\}, a'_1 \in A_{\omega'(1)})$$

and, for  $j = 2, \dots, n$ ,

$$(4) \quad i_{\omega'(j-1), \omega'(j)}(a'_{j-1}) h_j = s'_j a'_j \quad (s'_j \in S_{\omega'(j)} \setminus \{1\}, a'_j \in A_{\omega'(j)}),$$

so that  $h_1 h_2 \cdots h_n$  has normal form  $s'_1 s'_2 \cdots s'_n a'_n$ . Since each element of  $G$  has a unique normal form, we must have  $s_j = s'_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , and  $a_n = a'_n$ , and so  $\omega(j) = \omega'(j)$  for each  $j$ , proving (ii).

Combining (1) and (3) then shows that  $h_1^{-1} g_1 = (a'_1)^{-1} a_1 \in A_{\omega(1)}$ , and from repeated combination of (2) and (4) it follows that  $h_j^{-1} i_{\omega(j-1), \omega(j)}(h_{j-1}^{-1} \cdots g_{j-1}) g_j = (a'_j)^{-1} a_j \in A_{\omega(j)}$ ,  $j = 2, \dots, n$ . Thus (noting that  $(a'_n)^{-1} a_n = 1$ ) we see that (iii) is true.

The remainder of the proof of the lemma follows along similar lines, again using the normal form, and the details are left to the reader.

**PROPOSITION.** *The graph  $\Gamma$  of the equivalence relation defined by  $p$  (that is, the set  $\{(w, w') \in W \times W: p(w) = p(w')\}$ ) is closed in  $W \times W$ .*

**PROOF.** Clearly  $W \times W$  has the weak topology with respect to the sets  $W_n \times W_n$ , and it suffices to show that  $\Gamma_n = \Gamma \cap (W_n \times W_n)$  is closed in  $W_n \times W_n$  for each  $n$ . The proof is by induction on  $n$ . We point out that the proof will not make use of the fact that the  $G_n$  are  $k_\omega$ ; Hausdorffness is the only topological condition required.

Now  $W_1 \times W_1 = U \times U = \sqcup_{j,k} G_j \times G_k$ , and it is clear that

$$\Gamma \cap (G_j \times G_k) = \begin{cases} \{(g, g): g \in G_j\}, & j = k, \\ \{(i_j(a), i_k(a)): a \in A\}, & j \neq k, \end{cases}$$

which is closed for all  $j$  and  $k$ , as each  $G_i$  is Hausdorff and  $A_i$  is closed in each  $G_i$ . Hence  $\Gamma_1$  is closed in  $W_1 \times W_1$ .

Suppose that  $\Gamma_{n-1}$  is closed in  $W_{n-1} \times W_{n-1}$  for some  $n \geq 2$ . We proceed to show that  $\Gamma_n$  is closed in  $W_n \times W_n$ . This will be done by decomposing  $W_n \times W_n$  into a disjoint union of smaller subspaces, and by showing that the intersection of  $\Gamma_n$  with each of these is closed. To this end, we introduce some definitions.

For  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$  define  $K(k_1, \dots, k_n)$  to be the set of  $(g_1, \dots, g_n, h_1, \dots, h_n) \in G_{k_1} \times \cdots \times G_{k_n} \times G_{k_1} \times \cdots \times G_{k_n}$  such that  $g_1, \dots, g_n, h_1, \dots, h_n$  satisfy all the conditions listed in (iii) of the lemma. It is straightforward to check that  $K(k_1, \dots, k_n)$  is a closed subset of the above product.

Also for  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define certain classes of functions from subsets of  $G_{k_1} \times \dots \times G_{k_n}$  into  $W_{n-1}$  as follows. First, if for any  $p$  ( $1 \leq p \leq n-1$ ),  $k_p$  and  $k_{p+1}$  are equal, we define  $\lambda_p^{(k_1, \dots, k_n)} \equiv \lambda_p$  by  $\lambda_p(g_1, \dots, g_n) = (g_1, \dots, (g_p g_{p+1}), \dots, g_n) \in W_{n-1}$  for each  $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G_{k_1} \times \dots \times G_{k_n}$ , the multiplication taking place in  $G_{k_p}$ . And second, if  $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  is such that  $g_p$  lies in  $A_{k_p}$ , we define  $\mu_p^{(k_1, \dots, k_n)} \equiv \mu_p$  by

$$\mu_p(g_1, \dots, g_n) = (g_1, \dots, (i_{k_p, k_{p+1}}(g_p)g_{p+1}), \dots, g_n)$$

for  $p = 1, \dots, n-1$ , and  $\nu_p^{(k_1, \dots, k_n)} \equiv \nu_p$  by

$$\nu_p(g_1, \dots, g_n) = (g_1, \dots, (g_{p-1} i_{k_p, k_{p-1}}(g_p)), \dots, g_n) \quad \text{for } p = 2, \dots, n.$$

By means of these three classes of functions we can describe all possible reductions of a non-reduced  $n$ -tuple in  $W_n$  to a (reduced or non-reduced)  $(n-1)$ -tuple. Further, it is clear that, for each  $p$  (and each  $k_1, \dots, k_n$ ), each  $\lambda_p$ ,  $\mu_p$  and  $\nu_p$  has closed domain and is continuous.

Now we see easily from the definition of  $W_n$  that  $W_n \times W_n = \sqcup G_{l,m}^{i,j}$ , where the disjoint union is over all  $i, j \leq n$  and (for each fixed  $i$  and  $j$ ) all positive integers  $l_1, \dots, l_i, m_1, \dots, m_j$ , and where  $G_{l,m}^{i,j}$  is shorthand for  $(G_{l_1} \times \dots \times G_{l_i}) \times (G_{m_1} \times \dots \times G_{m_j})$  (with  $l$  standing for  $(l_1, \dots, l_i)$  and  $m$  for  $(m_1, \dots, m_j)$ ). To show that  $\Gamma_n = \Gamma \cap (W_n \times W_n)$  is closed in  $W_n \times W_n$ , it therefore suffices to show that  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j} = \Gamma \cap G_{l,m}^{i,j}$  is closed in  $G_{l,m}^{i,j}$  for all  $i, j, l, m$ . We need to distinguish four cases: (a)  $i, j < n$ ; (b)  $i = n, j < n$ ; (c)  $i < n, j = n$ ; and (d)  $i = j = n$ .

In case (a),  $G_{l,m}^{i,j}$  in fact lies in  $W_{n-1} \times W_{n-1}$ , so that  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j} = \Gamma \cap G_{l,m}^{i,j} = \Gamma_{n-1} \cap G_{l,m}^{i,j}$ , which is closed in  $G_{l,m}^{i,j}$  by the inductive assumption.

In case (b), we claim that  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j} = \bigcup_{\sigma} (\sigma \times \iota)^{-1}(\Gamma_{n-1})$ , where  $\iota$  is the identity on  $G_{m_1} \times \dots \times G_{m_j}$ , and where  $\sigma$  runs through all the functions of  $\{\mu_p: p = 1, \dots, n-1\}$ , of  $\{\nu_p: p = 2, \dots, n\}$ , and of  $\{\lambda_p: p \text{ satisfies } l_p = l_{p+1}\}$  (with the superscripts  $(l_1, \dots, l_n)$  assumed). For if  $(w, w') \in \Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$  (with  $i = n, j < n$ ), then  $w$  must be non-reduced, since  $p(w)$  and  $p(w')$  have the same length; and then one of the functions  $\sigma$  just listed, when applied to  $w$ , gives  $w'' \in W_{n-1}$  satisfying  $p(w) = p(w'')$ , so that  $(\sigma \times \iota)(w, w') = (w'', w') \in \Gamma_{n-1}$ . Thus  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j} \subset \bigcup_{\sigma} (\sigma \times \iota)^{-1}(\Gamma_{n-1})$ . Conversely, if  $(\sigma(w), w') \in \Gamma_{n-1}$  for some  $(w, w') \in G_{l,m}^{i,j}$ , then we must have  $p(w) = p(\sigma(w))$ , so that  $(w, w') \in \Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$ . Hence  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j} = \bigcup_{\sigma} (\sigma \times \iota)^{-1}(\Gamma_{n-1})$ , as claimed. Since all the functions  $\sigma \times \iota$  are continuous on closed subsets of  $G_{l,m}^{i,j}$ , and since  $\Gamma_{n-1}$  is closed in  $W_{n-1} \times W_{n-1}$  by assumption, it follows that  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$  is a finite union of closed sets, and is therefore closed in  $G_{l,m}^{i,j}$ . Case (c) is obviously dealt with similarly.

Finally, consider case (d). If  $(w, w') \in \Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$ , then since the lengths of  $p(w)$  and  $p(w')$  are equal,  $w$  and  $w'$  are either both reduced or both non-reduced. If, for any  $p$  ( $1 \leq p \leq n$ ), we have  $l_p \neq m_p$ , then it is clear from the lemma that  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$  can

contain no pairs  $(w, w')$  in which  $w$  and  $w'$  are reduced. An argument like that for case (b) then shows that  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j} = \bigcup_{\sigma, \tau} (\sigma \times \tau)^{-1}(\Gamma_{n-1})$ , where  $\sigma$  runs through the functions specified in case (b), and  $\tau$  runs through a set of functions specified analogously, with (assumed) superscripts  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ . It follows (with the assumption  $l_p \neq m_p$  for some  $p$ ) that  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$  is closed. Now suppose that  $l_p = m_p$  for  $p = 1, \dots, n$ . We claim that under this assumption  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j} = K(l_1, \dots, l_n) \cup \bigcup_{\sigma, \tau} (\sigma \times \tau)^{-1}(\Gamma_{n-1})$ , with  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  as above. To prove this, consider  $(w, w') \in \Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$ . If  $w$  and  $w'$  are reduced, then the lemma shows that  $(w, w') \in K(l_1, \dots, l_n)$ , while if  $w$  and  $w'$  are not reduced, then  $(w, w') \in (\sigma \times \tau)^{-1}(\Gamma_{n-1})$  for suitable  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ , as earlier. Conversely, if  $(w, w') \in K(l_1, \dots, l_n)$ , then the last part of the lemma shows that  $(w, w') \in \Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$ , while  $(w, w') \in (\sigma \times \tau)^{-1}(\Gamma_{n-1})$  implies that  $(w, w') \in \Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$ , much as in case (b). Therefore  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$  is again a finite union of closed sets, and hence is closed.

Thus  $\Gamma_{l,m}^{i,j}$  is closed in  $G_{l,m}^{i,j}$  for all  $i, j, l, m$ , whence  $\Gamma_n$  is closed in  $W_n \times W_n$ . The proposition now follows by induction.

From Proposition 4.25 of [7] (or Proposition A.1 of [1]), we may immediately deduce the following result, using the fact that  $W$  is a  $k_\omega$ -space.

**COROLLARY.** *With the quotient topology determined by  $p$ ,  $G$  is a (Hausdorff)  $k_\omega$ -space.*

Continuity of the group operations in  $G$  now follows by a standard argument (cf. [1], [7]) which uses the facts that  $p: W \rightarrow G$  and  $p \times p: W \times W \rightarrow G \times G$  are both quotient maps of  $k_\omega$ -spaces ([1], [7]). It also follows routinely that  $G$  has the universal property required of it by the definition. It thus remains only to show that the restriction of  $p$  to  $G_j$  is a closed embedding, for each  $j$ . This is achieved by a simple inductive argument, modelled on that given above, which shows that if  $C$  is a closed subset of  $G_j$  for any  $j$ , then  $p^{-1}(p(C))$  is closed in  $W$ , so that  $p(C)$  is closed in  $G$ . The outline of this argument is as follows. Write  $\Delta = p^{-1}(p(C))$ . Now  $\Delta \cap W_1 = \bigsqcup_m (\Delta \cap G_m)$ , and clearly  $\Delta \cap G_m$  is  $C$  if  $m = j$ , and is  $i_{j,m}(C \cap A_j)$  otherwise. Therefore  $\Delta \cap W_1$  is closed. We now assume that  $\Delta \cap W_{n-1}$  is closed for some  $n \geq 2$  and show that  $\Delta \cap W_n$  is closed. To do this, it suffices to show that  $\Delta \cap (G_{k_1} \times \dots \times G_{k_n})$  is closed for every choice of  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ . But it is easy to see that  $\Delta \cap (G_{k_1} \times \dots \times G_{k_n}) = \bigcup_{\sigma} \sigma^{-1}(\Delta \cap W_{n-1})$ , with the functions  $\sigma$  as defined earlier, and so the result follows.

This completes the proof of the theorem.

As mentioned in the introduction, we can now provide a new proof of the following result of La Martin [6]; our proof is a topologized version of the original proof ([5]; see also [9]) that epimorphisms of groups are surjective.

**COROLLARY.** *Epimorphisms in the category of (Hausdorff)  $k_\omega$ -groups have dense image.*

**PROOF.** Let  $f: H \rightarrow G$  be an epimorphism of  $k_\omega$ -groups, and let  $A$  be the closure of  $f(H)$  in  $G$ ; thus  $A$  is a  $k_\omega$ -group. Now let  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  be the two natural topological isomorphisms from  $G$  into the topological amalgamated free product  $G *_A G$ . Clearly  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  agree on, and only on,  $A$ . Hence  $\phi_1 f = \phi_2 f$ , and so, since  $f$  is an epimorphism,  $\phi_1 = \phi_2$ . This implies that  $A = G$ , that is, that  $f(H)$  is dense in  $G$ .

## References

- [1] R. Brown and J. P. L. Hardy, "Subgroups of free topological groups and free topological products of topological groups", *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **10** (1975), 431–440.
- [2] Elyahu Katz and Sidney A. Morris, "Free products of topological groups with amalgamation", to appear.
- [3] Elyahu Katz and Sidney A. Morris, "Free products of topological groups with amalgamation. II", to appear.
- [4] Eli Katz and Sidney A. Morris, "Free products of  $k_\omega$ -topological groups with normal amalgamation", *Topology Appl.* **15** (1983), 189–196.
- [5] A. G. Kurosh, A. Kh. Kivshits and E. G. Schul'geifer, "The foundations of the theory of categories", *Russian Math. Surveys* **15** (No. 6) (1960), 1–46.
- [6] W. F. La Martin, "On the foundations of  $k$ -group theory", *Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.)* **146** (1977).
- [7] B. L. Madison, *Congruences in topological semigroups* (Second Florida Symposium on Automata and Semigroups, University of Florida (1971), Part II).
- [8] B. H. Neumann, "An essay on free products of groups with amalgamations", *Philos. Trans. Royal Soc. London (A)* **246** (1954), 503–554.
- [9] Eric C. Nummela, "On epimorphisms of topological groups", *General Topology and Appl.* **9** (1978), 155–167.
- [10] Edward T. Ordman, "Free  $k$ -groups and free topological groups", *General Topology and Appl.* **5** (1975), 205–219.
- [11] Barbara V. Smith Thomas, *Categories of topological groups* (Presented to Second Symposium on Categorical Topology, University of Capetown (1976), Memphis State University Report 76–16).

Department of Mathematics  
University of Queensland  
St. Lucia 4067  
Australia