ABSTRACT. A completely regular, Hausdorff space $X$ is called a Mařík space if every Baire measure on $X$ admits an extension to a regular Borel measure. We answer the questions about Mařík spaces asked by Wheeler [29] and study their topological properties. In particular, we give examples of the following spaces: A locally compact, measure compact space which is not weakly Baire-dominated; i.e., it has a sequence $F_n \downarrow \emptyset$ of regular closed sets such that $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} B_n \neq \emptyset$ whenever $B_n$'s are Baire sets with $F_n \subseteq B_n$; a countably paracompact, non-Mařík space; a locally compact, non-Mařík space $X$ such that the absolute $E(X)$ is a Mařík space; and a locally compact, Mařík space $X$ for which $E(X)$ is not. It is also proved that Michael's product space is not weakly Baire-dominated.

1. Introduction

All spaces are assumed to be completely regular, Hausdorff spaces. Unless otherwise specified, measures are finite, nonnegative, $\sigma$-additive measures. A Baire (Borel) measure on a space $X$ is a measure defined on the $\sigma$-algebra $Ba(X)$ of Baire sets (Bo($X$) of Borel sets) of $X$. A (finitely additive) measure $\mu$ defined on an algebra $\mathcal{A}$ containing all closed sets is called regular if for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $\mu(A) = \sup\{\mu(F) : F \subseteq A, F$ is closed$\}$. In [29, §9], Wheeler fully reviewed a number of interesting topics relating to the problem of when a Baire measure can be extended to a regular Borel measure. In particular, he defined a space $X$ to be a Mařík space if every Baire measure on $X$ admits an extension to a regular Borel measure, and asked several questions thereupon.

This paper falls into two parts. In the first part, §§2 and 3, we answer some of his questions. In the second part, §4, we study how Mařík spaces are preserved under various topological operations. Before stating his questions, we recall some definitions and show which spaces are Mařík spaces. A countably paracompact space is a space each of whose countable, open covers has a locally finite, open refinement. A space $X$ is said to be (weakly) cozero-dominated
if for each decreasing sequence \( \{F_n\}_{n \in \omega} \) of (regular) closed sets in \( X \) with \( \bigcap_{n \in \omega} F_n = \emptyset \) (we write this situation symbolically as \( F_n \downarrow \emptyset \)), there exists a sequence \( \{U_n\}_{n \in \omega} \) of cozero-sets in \( X \) such that \( F_n \subset U_n \) for each \( n \in \omega \) and \( U_n \downarrow \emptyset \). Here, a regular closed set is a set that is the closure of its interior. If cozero-sets are relaxed to Baire sets, then \( X \) is said to be (weakly) Baire-dominated. A Baire measure \( \mu \) on a space is called \( \tau \)-additive if, whenever a net \( \{Z_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in A} \) of zero-sets decreases to a zero-set \( Z \), \( \mu(Z) = \inf\{\mu(Z_{\alpha}) : \alpha \in A\} \).

A space \( X \) is called measure compact, abbreviated as MC, if every Baire measure on \( X \) is \( \tau \)-additive (cf. [29, §8]). The relationship of these spaces to a Mařík space is summarized as the following:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(1) normal and} \\
\text{countably paracompact} \\
\searrow \\
\text{(3) cozero-dominated} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{(4) Baire-dominated} \\
\nearrow \searrow \nearrow \\
\text{(5) MC} \\
\text{(6) weakly Baire-dominated} \\
\text{(7) Mařík}
\end{array}
\]

The implication (1) \( \rightarrow \) (3) follows from [6, 5.2.2]. (2) \( \rightarrow \) (3) \( \rightarrow \) (4) \( \rightarrow \) (6) are obvious. (1) \( \rightarrow \) (7) is a classical result of Mařík [18] and is the origin of the name of a Mařík space. (3) \( \rightarrow \) (7) was proved by Bachman-Sultan [4], and (4) \( \rightarrow \) (7) is a recent result of Adamski [2]. (5) \( \rightarrow \) (7) is due to Knowles [15].

Wheeler’s questions which we now answer are the following; in his papers [28] and [29], the symbol (*) , (***) was used to denote the property of being (weakly) cozero-dominated.

A [29, Problem 8.12]. Is there a locally compact, MC space which is not paracompact?

B [28, Q6]; [29, Problem 9.10]. Is there an MC space which is not (weakly) cozero-dominated?

C [28, p. 95]. Is Michael’s product space (see §2 below) cozero-dominated or weakly cozero-dominated?

D [28, Q5]; [29, Problem 9.15]. Is every countably paracompact space a Mařík space?

A perfect map is a closed, continuous map such that the inverse image of each point is compact. A perfect map is called irreducible if it carries a proper closed subset to a proper subset. A space is called extremally disconnected if the closure of every open set is open. Each space \( X \) is known to be the image of a unique extremally disconnected space \( E(X) \), called the absolute of \( X \), under a perfect irreducible map. For details, see [31].

E [28, Q7]. Is it true that \( X \) is a Mařík space if and only if \( E(X) \) is a Mařík space?

The answers to A and B are positive, and the answers to C, D, and E are negative.
From now on, $|A|$ denotes the cardinality of a set $A$. As usual, a cardinal is the initial ordinal and an ordinal is the set of smaller ordinals. When viewed as a topological space, a set of ordinals has the order topology. Let $\omega$ ($\omega_1$) denote the first infinite (uncountable) ordinal, and let $c = 2^\omega$. If $\alpha$ is a cardinal, then the inequality $\alpha < m_r$ means that $\alpha$ is not real-valued measurable. For a space $X$, $Z(X)$ ($\text{Coz}(X)$) is the set of all zero-(cozero-)sets of $X$, $C(X)$ is the set of all real-valued, continuous functions on $X$, and $C^*(X)$ is the set of all bounded functions in $C(X)$. A zero-set of the form $f^{-1}(0)$, where $f \in C(X)$, is denoted by $Z(f)$. The letter $N$ is used for the set of natural numbers.

Our terminology and notation follow [6] and [13]. For recent surveys of Baire measures and of Borel measures, the reader is referred to [29] and [10], respectively.

2. MC SPACES WHICH ARE NOT BAIRE-DOMINATED

In this section, we give three examples of MC spaces which are not Baire-dominated. They have different features; the first one is locally compact and needs no set theoretic axioms beyond ZFC unlike others; the second one is Michael's product space, which is first countable and submetrizable; and the last one is weakly cozero-dominated. Before proceeding to examples, we show that a nonnormal space yields a space which is not weakly Baire-dominated. Recall that a subspace $S$ of a space $X$ is $C$-embedded in $X$ if every $f \in C(S)$ can be extended continuously over $X$.

**Theorem 2.1.** For each nonnormal space $X$, there exists a space $Y$ which is not weakly Baire-dominated and which is the countable union of closed, $C$-embedded copies of $X$. Moreover, if $X$ is locally compact, then so is $Y$.

**Proof.** Let $X$ be a nonnormal space. Then there exists a pair $K$, $L$ of disjoint closed sets for which every zero-set containing $K$ meets $L$. In fact, take disjoint closed sets $K'$ and $L'$ which can not be separated by disjoint open sets; then, if there is $Z \in Z(X)$ such that $K' \subseteq Z$ and $Z \cap L' = \emptyset$, then the pair $L'$, $Z$
is a desired one. Define $Y$ to be the quotient space obtained from the product $X \times \omega$ by identifying points $(k, 2n)$ with $(k, 2n + 1)$ for each $k \in K$ and $n \in \omega$, and points $(l, 2n + 1)$ with $(l, 2n + 2)$ for each $l \in L$ and $n \in \omega$. Let $\phi : X \times \omega \to Y$ be the quotient map. For each $n \in \omega$ and each $A \subset X$, let $A(n) = \phi(A \times \{n\})$ (see Figure 1). Then $Y = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} X(n)$, and each $X(n)$ is closed, $C$-embedded in $Y$, and homeomorphic to $X$.

Let $\phi : X \times \omega \to Y$ be the quotient map. For each $n \in \omega$ and each $A \subset X$, let $A(n) = \phi(A \times \{n\})$ (see Figure 1). Then $Y = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} X(n)$, and each $X(n)$ is closed, $C$-embedded in $Y$, and homeomorphic to $X$.

Claim 1. For each $B \in \text{Ba}(Y)$ and each $0 < n < \omega$, there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(B(0) \triangle B(n)) \cap F = \emptyset$.

Proof. Since $B(0) \triangle B(n) \subset \bigcup_{i<n} (B(i) \triangle B(i + 1))$, it suffices to prove that for each $i < n$, there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(B(i) \triangle B(i + 1)) \cap F = \emptyset$. In case $i$ is odd, $B(i) \triangle B(i + 1) = \emptyset$, so we prove only the case $i = 0$; other even cases are similar. Since $Z(Y) \subset \{S \subset Y : (S(0) \triangle S(1)) \cap F = \emptyset \text{ for some } F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is a $\sigma$-algebra, it is sufficient to show that $Z(Y) \subset \mathcal{T}$. To do this, let $Z = Z(f) \in Z(Y)$. Define $f_i = f \circ p_i$ for $i = 0, 1$. Since $f_0 \mid K = f_1 \mid K$,

$$K \subset Z(f_0 - f_1).$$

Thus, if we set $F = Z(f_0 - f_1) \cap L$, then $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Since $(Z(f_0) \triangle Z(f_1)) \cap Z(f_0 - f_1) = \emptyset$ and $Z(i) = Z(f_i) \cap L$, $(Z(0) \triangle Z(1)) \cap F = \emptyset$, and hence $Z \in \mathcal{T}$.

Claim 2. The space $Y$ is not weakly Baire-dominated.

Proof. For each $n \in \omega$, let $D_n = \bigcup_{i \geq n} X(i)$. Then $D_n$ is regular closed in $Y$ and $D_n \downarrow \emptyset$. Assume that there exist $B_n \in \text{Ba}(Y)$ such that $D_n \subset B_n$ and $B_n \downarrow \emptyset$. For each $n \in \omega$, by Claim 1, there exists $F_n \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$(B_n(0) \triangle B_n(n + 1)) \cap F_n = \emptyset.$$

Since $L(n + 1) \subset D_n \subset B_n$, $B_n \cap L = L$, so $F_n \subset B_n(0)$, and hence $F_n(0) \subset B_n \cap L(0)$. Consequently, $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} B_n \supset \bigcap_{n \in \omega} F_n(0) \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction.

Finally, assume that $X$ is locally compact. Since $\phi$ is a perfect map, it follows from [6, 3.7.21] that $Y$ is then locally compact. Hence the proof is complete.

The following theorem due to Okada-Okazaki [22] shows that, in Theorem 2.1, if $X$ is MC, then so is $Y$. A subspace $S$ of a space $X$ is said to be Baire-embedded in $X$ if for each $B \in \text{Ba}(S)$, there exists $A \in \text{Ba}(X)$ with $B = A \cap S$. Every $C$-embedded subspace is Baire-embedded (cf. [5, 8.7]).
Okada-Okazaki's theorem. If $X = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} X_n$, and if each $X_n$ is MC and is Baire-embedded in $X$, then $X$ is MC.

Remark 2.2. If there exists a nonparacompact MC space $X$, then there exists a nonnormal MC space. Consider the product of $X$ with its Stone-Čech compactification $\beta X$. By [20, Theorem 5.3], $X \times \beta X$ is MC, while it follows from [6, 5.1.38] that it is not normal.

The preceding theorems and remark show that a positive answer to the question A answers B positively. Thus the following example provides answers to both of the questions.

Example 2.3. There exists a locally compact, nonnormal, MC space $X$.

Proof. Let $D$ be a discrete space of cardinality $\omega_1$. Consider the product $\beta D \times (\omega + 1)$ and its subspace

$$X = (\beta D \times (\omega + 1)) - ((\beta D - D) \times \{\omega\}).$$

Clearly $X$ is locally compact. If we set $K = (\beta D - D) \times \omega$ and $L = D \times \{\omega\}$, then $K$ and $L$ are disjoint closed in $X$ but cannot be separated by disjoint open sets, and hence $X$ is not normal. Define $T = D \times (\omega + 1)$; then $X = T \cup K$.

It is easily checked that $T$ is MC and is Baire-embedded in $X$. On the other hand, being $\sigma$-compact, $K$ is also MC and is Baire-embedded in $X$ by [5, 9.11]. Hence it follows from Okada-Okazaki's theorem that $X$ is MC. □

Remarks 2.4. The space $X$ defined above itself is cozero-dominated. To see this, let $\{F_n\}_{n\in\omega}$ be a sequence of closed sets in $X$ such that $F_n \downarrow \emptyset$. Since each $\beta D \times \{m\}$, $m \in \omega$, is compact, we may assume that $F_n \cap (\beta D \times \{m\}) = \emptyset$ if $m \leq n$. For each $n \in \omega$, define

$$G_n = F_n \cup \left( \bigcup_{n < m < \omega} (\beta D \times \{m\}) \right).$$

Then $G_n \in \text{Coz}(X)$, $F_n \subset G_n$, and $G_n \downarrow \emptyset$. The construction of $X$ was inspired by the argument used by Kato in the proof of his theorem [14, Theorem I].

The second example is Michael’s product space $M \times P$. The letters $R$, $Q$, and $P$ are used to denote the real numbers, rational numbers, and irrational numbers, respectively, and, unless otherwise stated, are assumed to have the usual topologies inherited from $R$. The Michael line $M$ is the set $R$ topologized by isolating the points of $P$ and leaving the points of $Q$ with their usual neighborhoods. As was proved by Michael (cf. [6, 5.1.32]), $M \times P$ is not normal. On the other hand, Moran proved in [20] that $M \times P$ is MC when $\epsilon < m_\ast$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.1, we can make from $M \times P$ an MC space which is not weakly Baire-dominated. Here, in response to the question C, we prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.5.** Michael’s product space $M \times P$ is not weakly Baire-dominated.

The proof is rather difficult and requires the following two theorems, which may be of some interest in their own right. For a space $X$, let $\mathcal{E}_1(X)$ ($\mathcal{E}_2(X)$)}
denote the family of all subsets of first (second) category in \( X \), and define \( \mathcal{C}_0(X) \) to be the family of all subsets \( A \) of \( X \) satisfying that every nonempty open set \( U \) in \( X \) contains a nonempty open subset \( V \) such that \( V \cap A \) or \( V - A \) is in \( \mathcal{C}_1(X) \). When no confusion can arise, we shall write \( \mathcal{C}_i \) instead of \( \mathcal{C}_i(X) \), \( i = 0, 1, 2 \).

**Theorem 2.6.** If \( X \) is a hereditarily Lindelöf space, then \( \mathcal{C}_0(X) \) is a \( \sigma \)-algebra.

**Proof.** Since \( V \cap (X - A) = V - A \) and \( V - (X - A) = V \cap A \), \( A \in \mathcal{C}_0 \) implies \( X - A \in \mathcal{C}_0 \). To complete the proof, suppose that \( \{ A_n \}_{n \in \omega} \subset \mathcal{C}_0 \) is given, and let \( A = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} A_n \). To show that \( A \in \mathcal{C}_0 \), fix any nonempty open set \( U \) in \( X \). We have to prove that there exists a nonempty open set \( V \subset U \) such that \( V \cap A \in \mathcal{C}_1 \) or \( V - A \in \mathcal{C}_1 \). If there exists a nonempty open set \( V \subset U \) such that \( V - A \in \mathcal{C}_1 \) for some \( n \in \omega \), then \( V - A \in \mathcal{C}_1 \) since \( V - A \subset V - A_n \). So suppose that for each \( n \in \omega \) and each nonempty open set \( V \subset U \), \( V - A_n \in \mathcal{C}_2 \). Then, since \( A_n \in \mathcal{C}_0 \), each nonempty open set \( V \subset U \) has a nonempty open subset \( W \) such that \( W \cap A_n \in \mathcal{C}_1 \). For each \( n \in \omega \), define \( \mathcal{W}_n \) to be the family of all nonempty open sets \( W \subset U \) such that \( W \cap A_n \in \mathcal{C}_1 \), and let \( W_n = \bigcup \{ W : W \in \mathcal{W}_n \} \). Then \( W_n \) is dense in \( U \), and hence \( U - W_n \in \mathcal{C}_1 \). On the other hand, \( X \) being hereditarily Lindelöf, there exists a countable subfamily \( \{ W_{ni} \}_{i \in \omega} \) of \( \mathcal{W}_n \) with \( W_n = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} W_{ni} \). Since each \( W_{ni} \cap A_n \) is in \( \mathcal{C}_1 \), \( W_n \cap A_n = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} (W_{ni} \cap A_n) \in \mathcal{C}_1 \). Thus \( U \cap A_n \) is contained in the union of two sets \( U - W_n \) and \( W_n \cap A_n \) in \( \mathcal{C}_1 \), so \( U \cap A_n \in \mathcal{C}_1 \). Consequently, \( U \cap A = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} (U \cap A_n) \in \mathcal{C}_1 \), which completes the proof. \( \square \)

For each \( A \subset M \times P \), define \( A_{\Delta} = \{ x \in P : (x, x) \in A \} \).

**Theorem 2.7.** If \( B \in \text{Ba}(M \times P) \), then \( B_\Delta \in \mathcal{C}_0(P) \).

**Proof.** By the preceding theorem \( \mathcal{C}_0(P) \) is a \( \sigma \)-algebra. Since \( \{ B_\Delta : B \in \text{Ba}(M \times P) \} \) is a \( \sigma \)-algebra generated by a family \( \mathcal{F} = \{ G_\Delta : G \in \text{Coz}(M \times P) \} \), it suffices to prove that \( \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{C}_0(P) \). Suppose not, and let \( G_\Delta \in \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{C}_0(P) \). Then there exists a nonempty open set \( U \) of \( P \) such that for each nonempty open set \( V \subset U \), \( V \cap G_\Delta \in \mathcal{C}_2 \) and \( V - G_\Delta \in \mathcal{C}_2 \). Since \( G \) is a cozero-set, there exists an increasing sequence \( \{ G_i \}_{i \in \omega} \subset \text{Coz}(M \times P) \) such that \( \text{cl}_{M \times P} G_i \subset G_{i+1} \), \( i \in \omega \), and \( G = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} G_i \). For each \( i, j \in \omega \), define

\[
A_{ij} = \{ x \in U \cap G_\Delta : \{ x \} \times B_j(x) \subset G_i \},
\]

where \( B_j(x) = \{ y \in P : |x - y| < 1/2^j \} \). If \( x \in U \cap G_\Delta \), then, since \( (x, x) \in G \), \( \{ x \} \times B_j(x) \subset G_i \) for some \( i, j \in \omega \), so \( x \in A_{ij} \). Hence \( U \cap G_\Delta = \bigcup_{i, j \in \omega} A_{ij} \).

By the hypothesis of \( U \), \( U \cap G_\Delta \in \mathcal{C}_2 \), so there exist \( k, l \in \omega \) such that \( A_{kl} \in \mathcal{C}_2 \). Therefore, there exists a nonempty open set \( V \subset U \) such that

\[
V \cap A_{kl} \text{ is dense in } V.
\]

Fix such \( k, l, V \), and define

\[
B_m = \{ x \in V - G_\Delta : \{ x \} \times B_m(x) \cap G_{k+1} = \emptyset \}
\]
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for each \( m \in \omega \). If \( x \in V - G_\Delta \), then, since \( (x, x) \notin G \), \( \{x\} \times B_m(x) \) \( \cap G_{k+1} = \emptyset \) for some \( m \in \omega \), so \( x \in B_m \). Hence \( V - G_\Delta = \bigcup_{m \in \omega} B_m \). By the hypothesis of \( U \) again, \( V - G_\Delta \in \mathcal{G}_2 \), so there exist \( n \in \omega \) and a nonempty open set \( W \subset V \) such that

\[
W \cap B_n \text{ is dense in } W.
\]

(2) Define \( s = \max\{l, n\} \), and pick a point \( q \in (\cl R W) \cap Q \). Then, by (1) and (2), \( q \in (\cl R A_{kl}) \cap (\cl R B_n) \). Since \( q \in (\cl R A_{kl}) \),

\[
\{q\} \times B_s(q) \subset \cl_{M \times P} \left( \bigcup \{\{x\} \times B_s(x) : x \in A_{kl}\} \right) \subset \cl_{M \times P} G_k.
\]

On the other hand, since \( q \in (\cl R B_n) \),

\[
\{q\} \times B_s(q) \subset \cl_{M \times P} \left( \bigcup \{\{x\} \times B_s(x) : x \in B_n\} \right) \subset (M \times P) - G_{k+1}.
\]

This contradicts the fact that \( \cl_{M \times P} G_k \subset G_{k+1} \). Hence \( \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{G}_0(P) \), which completes the proof. \( \Box \)

**Corollary 2.8.** If \( A \in \Ba(M) \), then \( A \cap P \in \mathcal{G}_0(P) \).

**Proof.** Since \( A \in \Ba(M) \), \( B = A \times P \in \Ba(M \times P) \). Hence it follows from Theorem 2.7 that \( B_\Delta = A \cap P \in \mathcal{G}_0(P) \). \( \Box \)

**Proof of Theorem 2.5.**

**Claim 1.** There exists a sequence \( \{X_n\}_{n \in \omega} \) of subsets of \( P \) such that \( X_n \downarrow \emptyset \) and for each \( n \in \omega \) and each nonempty open set \( U \) of \( P \), \( U \cap X_n \in \mathcal{G}_2(P) \).

**Proof.** By Bernstein's theorem (cf. [15, §40]), there exists a partition \( \{Y_n\}_{n \in \omega} \) of \( P \) such that \( |K \cap Y_n| = \epsilon \) for each \( n \in \omega \) and each uncountable closed set \( K \) of \( P \). Define \( X_n = \bigcup_{k \geq n} Y_k \), \( n \in \omega \). Then, obviously \( X_n \downarrow \emptyset \). For our end, let \( n \in \omega \) and let \( U \) be a nonempty open set of \( P \). If \( U \cap X_n \in \mathcal{G}_1 \), then \( U \cap X_n \in \mathcal{G}_0 \) since \( Y_n \subset X_n \), so there exists a sequence \( \{D_i\}_{i \in \omega} \) of nowhere dense closed subsets of \( P \) with \( U \cap Y_n \subset \bigcup_{i \in \omega} D_i \). Let \( E = U - \bigcup_{i \in \omega} D_i \). Since \( U \) is nonempty open, \( U \in \mathcal{G}_2 \), and hence so is \( E \). Therefore \( E \) is an uncountable Borel set of \( P \). Hence it follows from [15, §37, Theorem 3] that \( E \) contains a copy of the Cantor set \( C \). By the property of \( Y_n \), \( |C \cap Y_n| = \epsilon \), while

\[
C \cap Y_n \subset (U \cap Y_n) - \bigcup_{i \in \omega} D_i \subset \left( \bigcup_{i \in \omega} D_i \right) - \left( \bigcup_{i \in \omega} D_i \right) = \emptyset,
\]

a contradiction. \( \Box \)

For each \( n \in \omega \), define

\[
F_n = \cl_{M \times P} \left( \bigcup \{\{x\} \times B_n(x) : x \in X_n\} \right),
\]

where \( B_n(x) \) is the same as in the proof of Theorem 2.7. Then each \( F_n \) is regular closed in \( M \times P \), and it is easily checked that \( F_n \downarrow \emptyset \). To show that \( M \times P \) is not weakly Baire-dominated, let \( \{B_n\}_{n \in \omega} \) be a sequence in \( \Ba(M \times P) \) such that \( F_n \subset B_n \) for each \( n \in \omega \). We have to prove that \( \bigcap_{n \in \omega} B_n \neq \emptyset \).
Claim 2. Suppose that $X$ is a subset of $P$ such that for each nonempty open set $U$ of $P$, $U \cap X \in \mathcal{E}_2(P)$, and $B$ is a Baire set of $M \times P$ containing $\{(x,x) : x \in X\}$. Then $P - B_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{E}_1(P)$.

**Proof.** By Theorem 2.7, $B_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{E}_0(P)$. Since $X \subseteq B_{\Delta}$, $U \cap B_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{E}_2$ for each nonempty open set $U$ of $P$. Hence, by the definition of $\mathcal{E}_0(P)$, for each nonempty open set $U$ of $P$, there exists a nonempty open set $V \subseteq U$ such that $V - B_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{E}_1$. Define $\mathcal{Y}$ to be the family of all nonempty open sets $V$ of $P$ such that $V - B_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{E}_1$, and let $W = \bigcup \{V : V \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. Then $W$ is open and dense in $P$, so $P - W$ is nowhere dense in $P$. On the other hand, $P$ being hereditarily Lindelöf, there exists a countable subfamily $\{V_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ of $\mathcal{Y}$ with $W = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} V_i$. Since $V_i - B_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{E}_1$, $W - B_{\Delta} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} (V_i - B_{\Delta}) \in \mathcal{E}_1$. Since $P - B_{\Delta} \subseteq (P - W) \cup (W - B_{\Delta})$, $P - B_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{E}_1$, thus proving the claim. □

Since $\{(x,x) : x \in X\} \subseteq F_n \subseteq B_n$, it follows from Claim 2 that $P - (B_n)_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{E}_1$. Thus $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} (B_n)_{\Delta} = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} B_n \neq \emptyset$, and hence $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} B_n \neq \emptyset$. The proof of Theorem 2.5 is now completed. □

The following corollary (to the proof of Theorem 2.5) will be used in §4.

**Corollary 2.9.** Suppose that $X$ is a subset of $P$ such that for each nonempty open set $U$ of $P$, $U \cap X \in \mathcal{E}_2(P)$, and $X \subseteq A \in \text{Ba}(M)$. Then $P - A \in \mathcal{E}_1(P)$.

**Proof.** Apply Claim 2 in the proof of Theorem 2.5 by putting $B = A \times P$. Then $P - B_{\Delta} = P - (A \cap P) = P - A \in \mathcal{E}_1(P)$. □

The third example needs Martin’s axiom plus the negation of the continuum hypothesis, abbreviated as $\text{MA} + \neg \text{CH}$, from which $c < \mathfrak{m}$ is deduced. Under this assumption, there exist many examples of nonparacompact MC spaces. For example, every nonmetrizable, normal, Moore space of cardinality $\leq c$ is this case (cf. [25, §IV]); however, such a space is countably paracompact by itself. Perhaps the most interesting one is the nonnormal space $N^\omega_{\omega_1}$ the product of $\omega_1$ many copies of a countable discrete space $N$. It was proved by Fremlin in [7] that $N^\omega_{\omega_1}$ is MC under $\text{MA} + \neg \text{CH}$. The space $N^\omega_{\omega_1}$ has the following properties:

**Theorem 2.10.** For each $\lambda > \omega$, $N^\lambda$ is weakly cozero-dominated but not Baire-dominated.

**Proof.** If $B$ is a regular closed set or a Baire set of $N^\lambda$, then, by [23, Theorem 3] and [24, Theorem 2.3], it is a set of the form $\pi^{-1}_\lambda(\pi_\lambda(B))$ for some countable subset $\Lambda$ of $\lambda$, where $\pi_\lambda$ is the projection from $N^\lambda$ to $N^\Lambda$. Hence the first assertion is easily proved. To prove that $N^\lambda$ is not Baire-dominated, let

$$F_n = \{f \in N^\lambda : \text{for each } i \leq n, |\{\alpha \in \lambda : f(\alpha) = i\}| \leq 1\}$$

for each $n \in N$. Then $F_n$ is closed in $N^\lambda$ and $F_n \downarrow \emptyset$. Assume that there exists a sequence $\{B_n\}_{n \in N} \subseteq \text{Ba}(N^\lambda)$ such that $F_n \subseteq B_n$ and $B_n \downarrow \emptyset$. Then there exists a countable subset $M$ of $\lambda$ such that for each $n \in N$, $B_n = \text{License or copyright restrictions may apply to redistribution; see http://www.ams.org/journal-terms-of-use}
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If we choose a bijection $g : M \rightarrow N$, then $g \in \cap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_M(F_n) \subset \cap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_M(B_n)$, and hence $\cap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. \hfill \Box

We have been unable to decide if $\mathcal{N}^{\omega_1}$, or more generally $\mathcal{N}^\lambda$, is a Mařík space without MA+$\neg$CH. If regularity of the Borel extension is negligible, then we have a much stronger result. To show this, we call a space $X$ a quasi-Mařík space if each Baire measure on $X$ admits an extension to a (not necessarily regular) Borel measure on $X$. For a space $X$, $vX$ denotes the Hewitt realcompactification of $X$.

**Theorem 2.11.** Assume that $X$ is a quasi-Mařík space and $X \subset Y \subset vX$. Then $Y$ is a quasi-Mařík space.

**Proof.** Let $\mu$ be a Baire measure on $Y$. As is well known, every $B \in \text{Ba}(X)$ extends to a unique $B' \in \text{Ba}(vX)$ in such a manner that if $\{B_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ is disjoint, then so is $\{B'_n\}_{n \in \omega}$. Therefore, if we define $\mu_X(B) = \mu(B \cap Y)$ for $B \in \text{Ba}(X)$, then $\mu_X$ is a Baire measure on $X$. By the assumption, $\mu_X$ extends to a Borel measure $\nu_X$ on $X$. For each $A \in \text{Bo}(Y)$, define $\nu(A) = \nu_X(A \cap X)$. Then $\nu$ is a Borel extension of $\mu$. \hfill \Box

**Corollary 2.12.** For any family $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ of metric spaces, the product $X = \Pi_{\alpha \in \lambda} X_\alpha$ is a quasi-Mařík space. In particular, $\mathcal{N}^\lambda$ is a quasi-Mařík space.

**Proof.** Consider a $\Sigma$-product $\Sigma$ of $X$; i.e., define

$$
\Sigma = \{f \in X : \{|\alpha \in \lambda : f(\alpha) \neq g(\alpha)|\} \leq \omega\} \subset X,
$$

where $g$ is a fixed point of $X$. By [26, Theorem 2.2] $\Sigma$ is $C$-embedded in $X$, so $X \subset v\Sigma$. By [12, Theorem 1] $\Sigma$ is normal, and by [6, 5.2.9] $\Sigma$ is countably paracompact. Consequently, $\Sigma$ is a Mařík space, and hence it follows from Theorem 2.11 that $X$ is a quasi-Mařík space. \hfill \Box

The following questions remain open.

**Question 2.13.** Is $\mathcal{N}^\lambda$ a Mařík space for each cardinal $\lambda$?

**Question 2.14.** Is $vX$ a Mařík space, whenever $X$ is?

**Question 2.15.** Is every quasi-Mařík space a Mařík space?

By our results, a positive answer to 2.15 answers 2.14 positively, and a positive answer to 2.14 answers 2.13 positively.

## 3. Non-Mařík spaces

In this section, we answer both of the questions D and E negatively. Let us begin by making criteria to check that a space is not a quasi-Mařík space. Some terms and symbols are needed. The continuous extension of $f \in C^*(X)$ over $\beta X$ is denoted by $f^\beta$. Clearly, $Z(f) = Z(f^\beta) \cap X$. A measure is called locally zero if each point has a neighborhood of measure zero. Let $\mu$ be a Baire measure on $X$; then $\mu^\beta$ denotes the Baire measure on $\beta X$ defined by
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\( \mu^\beta(B) = \mu(B \cap X) \) for \( B \in \text{Ba}(\beta X) \). Define \( S(\mu^\beta) = \bigcap \{ Z \in Z(\beta X) : \mu^\beta(Z) = \mu^\beta(\beta X) \} \), which is called the support of \( \mu^\beta \). A space \( X \) is called a D-space if for each discrete subspace \( S \subset X \), \( |S| < \infty \) (cf. [29]).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( \mu \) be a locally zero, Baire measure on a space \( X \) with \( \mu(X) > 0 \). Assume that there exist \( Z_0 = Z(f) \in Z(X) \) such that \( S(\mu^\beta) \subset Z(f^\beta) \), a continuous map \( \psi \) from \( Z_0 \) to a paracompact D-space \( Y \), and an open cover \( \mathcal{U} \) of \( Y \) satisfying the following condition: (1) For each \( U \in \mathcal{U} \), there exists \( B \in \text{Ba}(X) \) such that \( \psi^{-1}(U) \subset B \) and \( \mu(B) = 0 \). Then \( \mu \) cannot be extended to any Borel measure on \( X \).

**Proof.** Let \( \mathcal{S} = \{ Z \in Z(\beta X) : \mu^\beta(Z) = \mu^\beta(\beta X) \} \). Then \( Z_1, Z_2 \in \mathcal{S} \) implies that \( Z_1 \cap Z_2 \in \mathcal{S} \). Thus, \( \{ Z(f^\beta) \cup Z : Z \in \mathcal{S} \} \) is a net. Since \( S(\mu^\beta) \subset Z(f^\beta) \),

\[
Z(f^\beta) = \bigcap \{ Z(f^\beta) \cup Z : Z \in \mathcal{S} \}.
\]

Since \( \beta X \) is MC, \( \mu^\beta \) is \( \tau \)-additive. This can be combined with (2) to yield

\[
\mu^\beta(Z(f^\beta)) = \inf \{ \mu^\beta(Z(f^\beta) \cup Z) : Z \in \mathcal{S} \} = \mu^\beta(\beta X).
\]

Hence, \( \mu(Z_0) = \mu^\beta(Z(f^\beta)) = \mu^\beta(\beta X) = \mu(X) > 0 \). Suppose that there exists a Borel extension \( \nu \) of \( \mu \). For each \( A \in \text{Bo}(Y) \), define \( \nu_Y(A) = \nu(\psi^{-1}(A)) \). By condition (1), \( \nu_Y \) is a locally zero, Borel measure on \( Y \). It is known [10, 7.6 and 10.2] that every locally zero, Borel measure on a paracompact D-space is identically zero. Hence \( \nu_Y(Y) = 0 \), while \( \nu_Y(Y) = \nu(Z_0) = \mu(Z_0) > 0 \), which is a contradiction. \( \square \)

Recall from [11, 6.5 and 8.7] that for each \( p \in \nu X \), \( A^p = \{ Z \in Z(X) : p \in \text{cl}_\beta X \} \) is an ultrafilter in \( Z(X) \) with the countable intersection property. Define a map \( \mu_p : \text{Ba}(X) \rightarrow \{ 0, 1 \} \) by \( \mu_p(B) = 1 \) if \( B \) includes some element of \( A^p \), and \( \mu_p(B) = 0 \) otherwise. Then \( \mu_p \) is a Baire measure on \( X \) such that \( S(\mu_p) = \{ p \} \) (cf. also [10, 8.11]).

**Corollary 3.2.** Assume that there exist \( p \in \nu X \), \( Z_0 \in Z(X) \) with \( p \in \text{cl}_\beta X Z_0 \), and a closed, continuous map \( \psi \) from \( Z_0 \) to a paracompact D-space \( Y \) such that \( p \notin \text{cl}_\beta X \psi^{-1}(y) \) for each \( y \in Y \). Then \( X \) is not a quasi-Mařík space.

**Proof.** Let \( \mu_p \) be the \( \{ 0, 1 \} \)-valued Baire measure on \( X \) defined as above. Then \( S(\mu_p^\beta) = \{ p \} \subset Z(f^\beta) \) by our assumption. For each \( y \in Y \), choose \( V_y \in \text{Coz}(\beta X) \) such that \( \text{cl}_\beta X \psi^{-1}(y) \subset V_y \) and \( p \notin \text{cl}_\beta X V_y \). Then, since \( p \in \text{cl}_\beta X(X-V_y) \), \( \mu_p(X-V_y) = 1 \), and hence \( \mu_p(X \cap V_y) = 0 \). Since \( \psi \) is closed, there exists an open neighborhood \( U_y \) of \( y \) in \( Y \) such that \( \psi^{-1}(U_y) \subset V_y \). Put \( \mathcal{U} = \{ U_y : y \in Y \} \); then \( \mathcal{U} \) satisfies the condition (1) in the preceding theorem. Hence, \( \mu_p \) cannot be extended to any Borel measure on \( X \). \( \square \)
Corollary 3.3. Assume that there exists $Z_0 \in Z(X)$, which is a paracompact $D$-space as a subspace, such that $\operatorname{cl}_{\beta X} Z_0 \cap (\nu X - X) \neq \emptyset$. Then $X$ is not a quasi-Mařík space.

Proof. This follows from Corollary 3.2 if we consider the identity of $Z_0$ as $\psi$. □

Remarks 3.4. (1) In 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, “paracompact $D$-space” can be weakened to a space on which each locally zero, Borel measure is identically zero. Such a space was investigated by Gardner [9] and Adamski [1] and is now called a weakly Borel measure complete space. It is known that every weakly $\theta$-refinable $D$-space is weakly Borel measure complete. For details, see [10].

(2) Two typical examples of non-Mařík spaces were exhibited by Wheeler in [28]: the square $S^2$ of the Sorgenfrey lines under $\epsilon < m$, and the Dieudonné Plank D. We can reconfirm that those spaces are not quasi-Mařík spaces by use of Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.3, respectively.

The following example, which is a cubic deformation of the Dieudonné Plank, provides a negative answer to the question D.

Example 3.5. There exists a countably paracompact space $X$ which is not a quasi-Mařík space.

Proof. Step I. Let $\omega_2$ be the second, uncountable, initial ordinal. Note that $\omega_2 \neq \omega^2$. For $\omega_2$ denotes the square of $\omega$. Define

$$A = ((\omega_2 + 1) \times (\omega_2 + 1)) - \{(\omega_2, \omega_2)\} \quad \text{and} \quad G_4(\alpha) = \{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in A : \alpha < \alpha_i \leq \omega_2, \ i = 1, 2\}$$

for $\alpha \in \omega_2$. Then $A$ is $\omega_1$-compact, i.e., every open cover of cardinality $\leq \omega_1$ has a finite subcover, and it is easily checked that each $f \in C(A)$ is constant on some $G_4(\alpha)$. Let us set $A_\Box = A \times \omega^2$. For each $\beta \in \omega^2$, there exist uniquely $n, m \in \omega$ and $i \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $\beta = \omega n + 2m + i$. Let $B$ be the quotient space obtained from $A_\Box$ by identifying points $(\omega_2, \alpha, \omega n + 2m)$ with $(\omega_2, \alpha, \omega n + 2m + 1)$ for each $\alpha \in \omega_2$ and $n, m \in \omega$, and points $(\alpha, \omega_2, \omega n + 2m + 1)$ with $(\alpha, \omega_2, \omega n + 2m + 2)$ for each $\alpha \in \omega_2$ and $n, m \in \omega$. Then the quotient map $\phi: A_\Box \to B$ is perfect. For each $\alpha \in \omega_2$ and each $n \in \omega$, let

$$G(\alpha) = \phi(G_4(\alpha) \times \omega^2) \quad \text{and} \quad B(n) = \phi(A \times \{\beta \in \omega^2 : \omega n \leq \beta < \omega^2\}).$$

In what follows, a subspace $S$ of a space $T$ is said to be normally placed in $T$ if for every open set $U$ with $S \subset U$, there exists an open set $V$ such that $S \subset V \subset \operatorname{cl}_T V \subset U$.

Claim 1. For each $n \in \omega$, $B(n)$ is closed and normally placed in $B$, $B(n+1) \subset \operatorname{int}_B B(n)$, and $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} B(n) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Let $U$ be an open set with $B(n) \subset U$, and let

$$\beta_* = \sup(\pi[A_\Box - \phi^{-1}(U)])$$
where \( \pi \) is the projection from \( A \) to \( \omega^2 \). Since \( \pi \) is closed by [6, 3.7.10], \( \beta_* < \omega n \). Define
\[
V = \phi[A \times \{\beta \in \omega^2 : \beta_* + 2 \leq \beta < \omega^2\}].
\]
Then \( V \) is closed in \( B \) and \( B(n) \subset \text{int}_B V \subset V \subset U \), and hence \( B(n) \) is normally placed in \( B \). Other assertions are obvious. \( \square \)

**Claim 2.** Each \( f \in C(B) \) is constant on some \( G(\alpha) \).

**Proof.** For each \( \beta \in \omega^2 \), there exists \( \alpha_\beta \in \omega_2 \) such that \( f \circ \phi \) is constant on \( G_A(\alpha_\beta) \times \{\beta\} \). Let \( \alpha = \sup\{\alpha_\beta : \beta \in \omega^2\} \). Then \( \alpha < \omega_2 \) and \( f \) is constant on \( G(\alpha) \). \( \square \)

**Step II.** Define \( C = B \times (\omega + 1) \) and \( C_\triangledown = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} (B(n) \times \{n\}) \subset C \).

**Claim 3.** The space \( C \) is \( \omega_1 \)-paracompact; i.e., every open cover of cardinality \( \leq \omega_1 \) has a locally finite, open refinement.

**Proof.** In [17] Mack proved that the product of an \( \omega_1 \)-compact space with a metric space is \( \omega_1 \)-paracompact. Hence \( A \times (\omega + 1) = A \times (\omega^2 \times (\omega + 1)) \) is \( \omega_1 \)-paracompact. If \( \text{id} \) is the identity of \( \omega + 1 \), then \( \phi \times \text{id} \) is a perfect map from \( A \times (\omega + 1) \) onto \( C \). By [17, Theorem 16] again, \( C \) is \( \omega_1 \)-paracompact. \( \square \)

**Claim 4.** The set \( C_\triangledown \) is closed and normally placed in \( C \).

**Proof.** Since \( \bigcap_{n \in \omega} B(n) = \emptyset \), \( C_\triangledown \) is closed in \( C \). Let \( U \) be an open set with \( C_\triangledown \subset U \), and let \( \pi_B : C \to B \) denote the projection. For each \( n \in \omega \), since \( B(n) \) is normally placed in \( B \) by Claim 1, there exists an open set \( V_n \) in \( B \) such that
\[
B(n) \subset V_n \subset \text{cl}_B V_n \subset \text{int}_B B(n - 1) \cap \pi_B[U \cap (B \times \{n\})],
\]
where \( B(-1) = B \). Define \( V = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} (V_n \times \{n\}) \). Then \( V \) is open in \( C \) and \( C_\triangledown \subset V \). Since \( \bigcap_{n \in \omega} \text{cl}_B V_n \subset \bigcap_{n \in \omega} B(n - 1) = \emptyset \), \( \text{cl}_C V \subset U \). \( \square \)

**Step III.** Let \( D \) be the set \( \omega_1 + 1 \) with the topology obtained from the order topology by making all points of \( \omega_1 \) isolated. Define
\[
X = (C \times D) - ((C - C_\triangledown) \times \{\omega_1\}),
\]
topologized as a subspace of \( C \times D \). We show that \( X \) is the desired example. Let \( D_0 = D - \{\omega_1\} \).

**Claim 5.** The space \( X \) is countably paracompact.

**Proof.** Let \( \{F_n\}_{n \in \omega} \) be a sequence of closed sets in \( X \) with \( F_n \downarrow \emptyset \). By [6, 5.2.1] it suffices to find open sets \( W_n \) in \( X \) such that \( F_n \subset W_n \) and \( \text{cl}_X W_n \downarrow \emptyset \). In case \( \bigcap_{n \in \omega} \text{cl}_C \times D F_n \neq \emptyset \), there exists a closed set \( F \subset C \) with \( \bigcap_{n \in \omega} \text{cl}_C \times D F_n = F \times \{\omega_1\} \). Since \( F \cap C_\triangledown = \emptyset \), by Claim 4 there exists an open set \( H \subset C \) such that \( F \subset H \subset \text{cl}_C H \subset C - C_\triangledown \). Let \( E = \text{cl}_C H \times D_0 \). Since \( \text{cl}_C H \) is countably paracompact by Claim 3 and \( D_0 \) is discrete, \( E \) is countably paracompact. Thus there exist open sets \( U_n' \) in \( E \) such that \( F_n \cap E \subset U_n' \) and...
For each \( n \in \omega \), define \( U_n = U'_n \cap (H \times D_0) \). Then \( U_n \) is open in \( X \) and
\[
(1) \quad F_n \cap (H \times D_0) \subseteq U_n \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cl}_X U_n \downarrow \emptyset.
\]
In case \( \bigcap_{n \in \omega} \text{cl}_{C \times D} F_n = \emptyset \), define \( U_n = H = \emptyset \), \( n \in \omega \). Observe that \( U_n \) and \( H \) then also satisfy (1). Next, for each \( n \in \omega \), let \( F'_n = \text{cl}_{C \times D} F_n - (H \times D) \). Then \( F'_n \) is closed in \( C \times D \) and \( F'_n \downarrow \emptyset \). We show that there exists a sequence \( \{V_n\}_{n \in \omega} \) of open sets in \( C \times D \) satisfying that
\[
(2) \quad F'_n \subseteq V_n \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cl}_{C \times D} V_n \downarrow \emptyset.
\]
Since \( C \) is countably paracompact, there exist open sets \( I_n \subseteq C \) such that
\[
F'_n \cap (C \times \{\omega_1\}) \subseteq I_n \times \{\omega_1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cl}_C I_n \downarrow \emptyset.
\]
Define \( F' = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} (F'_n - (I_n \times D)) \). Then \( F' \) is closed in \( C \times D \) and \( F' \cap (C \times \{\omega_1\}) = \emptyset \). For each \( \xi \in D_0 \), let \( J_\xi \) be the union of all open sets \( G \subseteq C \) such that \( (G \times (\xi, \omega_1)) \cap F' = \emptyset \), where \( (\xi, \omega_1) = \{\eta \in D : \xi < \eta \leq \omega_1\} \). Then \( \mathcal{F} = \{J_\xi : \xi \in D_0\} \) is an open cover of \( C \) such that \( J_\xi \subseteq J_{\xi'} \) if \( \xi < \xi' \). By Claim 3 and [17, Theorem 5], there exists a locally finite open refinement \( \{K_\xi : \xi \in D_0\} \) of \( \mathcal{F} \) such that \( \text{cl}_C K_\xi \subseteq J_\xi \) for each \( \xi \in D_0 \). Let \( L = \bigcup_{\xi \in D_0} (K_\xi \times (\xi, \omega_1)) \). Then \( L \) is an open set in \( C \times D \) such that
\[
C \times \{\omega_1\} \subseteq L \subseteq \text{cl}_{C \times D} L \subseteq (C \times D) - F'.
\]
Since \( C \times D_0 \) is countably paracompact, there exist open sets \( O_n \subseteq C \times D_0 \) such that
\[
F'_n \cap (C \times D_0) \subseteq O_n \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cl}_{C \times D_0} O_n \downarrow \emptyset.
\]
For each \( n \in \omega \), let \( V_n = (I_n \times D) \cup (O_n - \text{cl}_{C \times D_0} L) \). Then \( V_n \)'s are open in \( C \times D \) and satisfy (2). Finally, define \( W_n = U_n \cup (V_n \cap X) \) for each \( n \in \omega \). Then \( W_n \) is open in \( X \), and it follows from (1) and (2) that \( F_n \subseteq W_n \) and \( \text{cl}_X W_n \downarrow \emptyset \), as required. \( \square \)

Recall that \( X \subseteq B \times (\omega_1 \times D) \). In the rest, we denote a point of \( X \) by a triplet, such as \((b, m, \eta)\), of points of \( B \), \( \omega_1 \), and \( D \). For each \( \alpha \in \omega_2 \), \( n \in \omega \), and \( \xi \in D_0 \), let
\[
G(\alpha, n, \xi) = \{(b, m, \eta) \in X : b \in G(\alpha), n < m \leq \omega, \xi < \eta \leq \omega_1\}.
\]
We add an ideal point \( x_\infty \) to \( X \), and define a neighborhood base of \( x_\infty \) by \( \{\{x_\infty\} \cup G(\alpha, n, \xi) : \alpha \in \omega_2, n \in \omega, \xi \in D_0\} \).

Claim 6. The point \( x_\infty \) is in \( vX \).

Proof. By [5, 1.16], it suffices to prove that \( X \) is \( C \)-embedded in \( X \cup \{x_\infty\} \). To do this, let \( f \in C(X) \). For each \( n \leq \omega \) and each \( \xi \in D_0 \), by Claim 2 there exists \( \alpha_{n\xi} \in \omega_2 \) such that \( f \) takes on the constant value \( r_{n\xi} \) on \( \{\langle b, n, \xi : \langle b, n, \xi : b \in G(\alpha_{n\xi})\}\} \). Let \( \alpha_* = \sup\{\alpha_{n\xi} : n \leq \omega, \xi \in D_0\} \); then \( \alpha_* < \omega_2 \). For each \( n \in \omega \), pick \( \beta_n \in G(\alpha_*) \cap B(n) \). Since each \( G_{\beta} \) in \( D \) is open, there exists \( \xi_n \in D_0 \) such
that \( f \) is constant on \( \{(b_n, n, \eta): \xi_n < \eta \leq \omega_1 \} \). Let \( \xi_* \) be \( \sup \{ \xi_n : n \in \omega \} \). Then, for each \( n \in \omega \), \( \xi_* < \xi < \xi' < \omega_1 \) imply that \( r_{\xi_n} = r_{\xi_*} \). We denote this constant value by \( r_n \). Pick \( b' \in G(\alpha_*). \) Then, for each \( \xi \), with \( \xi_* < \xi < \omega_1 \),

\[
r_{\omega\xi} = f((b', \omega, \xi)) = f \left( \lim_{n \to \infty} (b', n, \xi) \right) = \lim_{n \to \infty} f((b', n, \xi)) = \lim_{n \to \infty} r_n,
\]

so define \( r_{\omega} = \lim_{n \to \infty} r_n \). Then \( f((b, n, \eta)) = r_n \) whenever \( b \in G(\alpha_*), n \leq \omega, \) and \( \xi_* < \eta \leq \omega_1 \). Extend \( f \) over \( X \cup \{ x_{\infty} \} \) by setting \( f(x_{\infty}) = r_{\omega} \).

To check that \( f \) is continuous at \( x_{\infty} \), let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Then there exists \( n_0 \in \omega \) such that if \( n > n_0, |r_n - r_{\omega}| < \varepsilon \). This implies that if \( x \in G(\alpha_*^+, n_0, \xi_*^+) \), then \( |f(x) - f(x_{\infty})| < \varepsilon \). Hence \( f \) can be extended continuously to \( x_{\infty} \).

Claim 7. The space \( X \) is not a quasi-Mařík space.

Proof. Let \( Z = \pi^{-1}(\omega) \), where \( \pi \) is the projection from \( X \) to \( \omega + 1 \). Then \( Z \in Z(X) \) and \( x_{\infty} \in \text{cl}_\beta Z \). Define a map \( \psi: Z \to D_0 \) by \( \psi((b, \omega, \xi)) = \xi \). Then \( \psi \) is a closed, continuous map, and for each \( \xi \in D_0, x_{\infty} \notin \text{cl}_\beta f^{-1}(\xi) \), since \( G(0, 0, \xi) \cap f^{-1}(\xi) = \emptyset \). Clearly \( D_0 \) is a paracompact \( D \)-space. Hence it follows from Claim 6 and Corollary 3.2 that \( X \) is not a quasi-Mařík space. This completes the whole proof. \( \square \)

We turn to answer question E. By [28, Proposition 4.4], the absolute \( E(X) \) of a countably paracompact space \( X \) is cozero-dominated and hence a Mařík space. Therefore, Example 3.5 also provides a negative answer to question E. Another counterexample is the Dieudonné Plank \( D \). In his earlier paper [27], Wheeler proved that \( E(D) \) is MC, while \( D \) is not a Mařík space. However, neither example is locally compact. Here we show that the Dieudonné Plank can easily be modified to a locally compact space.

Example 3.6. There exists a locally compact space \( Y \) which is not a quasi-Mařík space, such that \( E(Y) \) is cozero-dominated and MC.

Proof. Let \( \alpha D = D \cup \{ \infty \} \) be the one-point compactification of a discrete space \( D \) of cardinality \( \omega_1 \). Define

\[
Y = (\alpha D \times (\omega + 1)) - \{ (\infty, \omega) \}.
\]

Clearly \( Y \) is locally compact. Let \( Z = D \times \{ \omega \} \). For each \( B \in \text{Ba}(Y) \), it can easily be checked that either \( |B \cap Z| \leq \omega \) or \( |Z - B| \leq \omega \). Define a Baire measure \( \mu \) on \( Y \) by \( \mu(B) = 0 \) in the former case and \( \mu(B) = 1 \) in the latter case. Then there exists \( y \in \nu Y - Y \) such that \( S(\mu^B) = \{ y \} \). Since \( Z \) is a discrete zero-set with \( y \in \text{cl}_\beta Z \), it follows from Corollary 3.3 that \( Y \) is not a quasi-Mařík space. To see that \( E(Y) \) is cozero-dominated and MC, let \( X \) be the space defined in the proof of Example 2.4. Then the natural map \( \phi: X \to Y \) collapsing the set \( (\beta D - D) \times \{ n \} \) to the point \( (\infty, n) \) for each \( n \in \omega \) is perfect irreducible. Thus, by the uniqueness of the absolute, \( E(X) = E(Y) \). As we have
proved in 2.4 and 2.5, \( X \) is cozero-dominated and MC, and hence so is \( E(Y) \) by [27, Theorem 2] and [28, Remark 4.3]. □

The space \( \Psi = N \cup R \), described in [11, 51, p. 79], is a locally compact, pseudocompact space in which \( N \) is dense, and \( R \) is a discrete zero-set with \( |R| \leq \epsilon \). Since all subsets of \( \Psi \) are Borel sets, \( \Psi \) is weakly Borel measure complete if \( \epsilon < m_r \). In [19], Mrówka proved that \( R \) can be chosen so that \( |\beta \Psi - \Psi| = 1 \). We use this \( \Psi \) to show that \( E(Y) \) need not be a Mařík space even if \( Y \) is.

**Example 3.7.** Assume \( \epsilon < m_r \). Then there exists a pseudocompact, locally compact, Mařík space \( Y \) for which \( E(Y) \) is not a quasi-Mařík space.

**Proof.** Let \( \Psi \) be the space due to Mrówka stated above, and let \( \beta \Psi - \Psi = \{p\} \).

Define

\[
S = (\beta \Psi \times (\omega + 1)) - \{(p, \omega)\},
T = ((\omega_1 + 1) \times (\omega + 1)) - \{(\omega_1, \omega)\},
\]

and \( X = S \oplus T \), where \( \oplus \) means the topological sum. The desired space \( Y \) is the quotient space obtained from \( X \) by identifying points \((p, n)\) with \((\omega_1, n)\) for each \( n \in \omega \). Let \( \phi : X \to Y \) be the quotient map. Since \( \Psi \) is pseudocompact and locally compact, so is \( Y \). First, we show that \( Y \) is a Mařík space. Although the proof is essentially the same as the proof, due to Wheeler [28, p. 101], that his space \( T#D \) is a Mařík space, we do this in detail for the convenience of the reader. Observe that \( |\beta Y - Y| = 1 \), and let \( \beta Y - Y = \{y\} \).

Since \( Y \) is pseudocompact, \( \beta Y = vY \). Let \( \mu \) be a Baire measure on \( Y \). We have to prove that \( \mu \) extends to a regular Borel measure. Let

\[
r = \inf \{\mu(U) : y \in U^\beta, U \in \text{Coz}(Y)\},
\]

where \( U^\beta \) is the unique Baire set of \( \beta Y \) (= \( vY \)) with \( U = U^\beta \cap Y \). For each \( B \in \text{Ba}(Y) \), define \( \mu_1(B) = r \) if \( y \in B^\beta \), and \( \mu_1(B) = 0 \) otherwise. Then \( \mu_1 \) is a Baire measure on \( Y \). Define \( \mu_2 = \mu - \mu_1 \). Then, since \( \inf \{\mu_2(U) : y \in U^\beta, U \in \text{Coz}(Y)\} = 0 \), \( \mu_2 \) is \( \tau \)-additive by [15, Theorem 2.4], and hence \( \mu_2 \) has a regular Borel extension \( \nu_2 \) (see [15, p. 144]). On the other hand, let

\[
\mathcal{T} = \{\phi(E \times \{\omega\}) : E \text{ is a closed unbounded set of } \omega\},
\]

For each \( A \in \text{Bo}(Y) \), either \( A \) or \( Y - A \) contains a set \( F \in \mathcal{T} \). Define \( \nu_1(A) = r \) if \( A \) contains a set \( F \in \mathcal{T} \), and \( \nu_1(A) = 0 \) otherwise. Then \( \nu_1 \) is a regular Borel extension of \( \mu_1 \). Consequently, \( \mu \) extends to a regular Borel measure \( \nu = \nu_1 + \nu_2 \) on \( Y \). Hence \( Y \) is proved to be a Mařík space. Next, we show that \( E(Y) \) is not a quasi-Mařík space. Since \( \phi \) is perfect irreducible, \( E(X) = E(Y) \), and \( E(X) = E(S) \oplus E(T) \). It is known [22, Theorem 3.3 and 3, Corollary 4.13] that weakly Borel measure complete spaces are preserved by countable unions and perfect preimages. Using these results, we can check that \( E(S) \) is weakly Borel measure complete. Since \( X \) is pseudocompact, so is \( E(X) \) by [30, Proposition 2.5], and hence \( \beta E(X) = vE(X) \). Consequently,

\[
\overline{\beta E(X)} \cap (vE(X) - E(X)) \neq \emptyset.
\]
Hence it follows from Corollary 3.3 and Remark 3.4 that \( E(X) \), and hence \( E(Y) \), is not a quasi-Mařík space. □

Remark 3.8. That the space \( \Psi \) is not a quasi-Mařík space under \( c < m_r \) was first observed by Adamski in [1]. This provides a negative answer to another Wheeler's question [29, Problem 9.16], whether every pseudocompact space is a Mařík space. The following question is yet unanswered.

Question 3.9. Is there a pseudocompact space which is not a (quasi-) Mařík space without assuming \( c < m_r \)?

4. Topological properties of Mařík spaces

Generally speaking, Mařík spaces are badly behaved under topological operations. We can, however, prove a few positive results. We begin by considering how Mařík spaces are preserved in subspaces. A subset \( S \subseteq X \) is called a generalized Baire set if for each open set \( G \) with \( S \subseteq G \), there exists \( B \in \text{Ba}(X) \) such that \( S \subseteq B \subseteq G \).

Theorem 4.1. Let \( X \) be a Mařík space and \( Y \) a Baire-embedded, generalized Baire set of \( X \). Then \( Y \) is a Mařík space.

Proof. Let \( \mu \) be a Baire measure on \( Y \). For each \( A \in \text{Ba}(X) \), define \( \mu_X(A) = \mu(A \cap Y) \). Then \( \mu_X \) is a Baire measure on \( X \), and hence \( \mu_X \) extends to a regular Borel measure \( \nu_X \) on \( X \). For each \( B \in \text{Bo}(Y) \), define

\[
\nu(B) = \inf\{\nu_X(G) : B \subseteq G, G \text{ is open in } X\}.
\]

Then, by [10, Proposition 3.6], \( \nu \) is a regular Borel measure on \( Y \). Since \( Y \) is a Baire-embedded, generalized Baire set, it follows from the next lemma that \( \nu \) is an extension of \( \mu \). □

Lemma 4.2. Let \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) be the same as above, and let \( Y \) be the generalized Baire set. Then, for each \( A \in \text{Ba}(X) \), \( \mu(A \cap Y) = \nu(A \cap Y) \).

Proof. Let \( A \in \text{Ba}(X) \). Then

\[
\mu(A \cap Y) = \mu_X(A) = \inf\{\mu_X(U) : A \subseteq U \in \text{Coz}(X)\}
\]

\[
= \inf\{\nu_X(U) : A \subseteq U \in \text{Coz}(X)\} \geq \nu(A \cap Y).
\]

To prove the converse, let \( \epsilon > 0 \). Then there exists \( Z \in \text{Z}(X) \) such that \( Z \subseteq A \) and \( \mu_X(A) - \epsilon < \mu_X(Z) \). For each open set \( G \) in \( X \) with \( A \cap Y \subseteq G \), by the condition of \( Y \) there exists \( J \in \text{Ba}(X) \) such that \( Y \subseteq J \) and \( J \cap (Z - G) = \emptyset \). Define \( Z_0 = Z \cap J \); then \( Z_0 \in \text{Ba}(X) \) and \( Z_0 \subseteq G \). Since \( Z_0 \cap Y = Z \cap Y \),

\[
\mu_X(Z) = \mu_X(Z_0) = \nu_X(Z_0) \leq \nu_X(G),
\]

so \( \mu(A \cap Y) - \epsilon = \mu_X(A) - \epsilon < \nu_X(G) \). Since \( G \) and \( \epsilon \) are arbitrary, it follows that \( \mu(A \cap Y) \leq \nu(A \cap Y) \). □

Corollary 4.3. Let \( X \) be a Mařík space and \( Y \) a cozero-set of \( X \). Then \( Y \) is a Mařík space.
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Remarks 4.4. (1) As Wheeler mentioned in [29], the space $T#D$ in [28, p. 101] shows that a $C$-embedded, regular closed subspace of a Mařík space need not be a Mařík space (see also Example 3.7).

(2) We do not know whether the assumption in Theorem 4.1 that $Y$ is Baire-embedded can be removed.

Recall from [2] that a space $X$ is Baire-separated if for each pair $F_1, F_2$ of disjoint closed sets, there exists $B \in \text{Ba}(X)$ such that $F_1 \subseteq B$ and $B \cap F_2 = \emptyset$.

All normal spaces are Baire-separated, but the converse is not true. For example, the space $X$ defined in the proof of Example 2.3 is certainly the case. The proof of the following lemma is left to the reader since it is routine.

Lemma 4.5. For a space $X$, the following conditions are equivalent:

(a) $X$ is Baire-separated.

(b) For each pair $F_1, F_2$ of disjoint $F_\sigma$-sets of $X$, there exists $B \in \text{Ba}(X)$ such that $F_1 \subseteq B$ and $B \cap F_2 = \emptyset$.

(c) Every $F_\sigma$-set of $X$ is a generalized Baire set.

(d) Every $F_\sigma$-set of $X$ is Baire-embedded in $X$.

Theorem 4.6. Let $X$ be a Baire-separated, Mařík space and $Y$ a generalized Baire set of $X$. Then $Y$ is a Mařík space.

Proof. Let $\mu$ be a Baire measure on $Y$. Let $\mu_X, \nu_X$, and $\nu$ be the same as in the proof of Theorem 4.1. We have to prove that $\nu$ is an extension of $\mu$.

To do this, let $B \in \text{Ba}(Y)$. For each $i \in N$, by the regularity of $\nu$, there exist a closed set $F_i$ and an open set $G_i$ in $Y$ such that $F_i \subseteq B \subseteq G_i$ and

\[
\nu(B) - 1/i < \nu(F_i) \leq \nu(G_i) < \nu(B) + 1/i.
\]

Similarly, we can choose $Z_i \in \text{Z}(Y)$ and $U_i \in \text{Coz}(Y)$ such that $Z_i \subseteq B \subseteq U_i$ and

\[
\mu(B) - 1/i < \mu(Z_i) \leq \mu(U_i) < \mu(B) + 1/i.
\]

We may assume that $\{F_i\}$ and $\{Z_i\}$ are increasing and $\{G_i\}$ and $\{U_i\}$ are decreasing. For each $i \in N$, there exist a closed set $E_i$ in $X$ with $E_i \cap Y = F_i \cup Z_i$, and an open set $H_i$ in $X$ with $H_i \cap Y = G_i \cap U_i$. Since $Y$ is a generalized Baire set, there exists $J \in \text{Ba}(X)$ such that $Y \subseteq J_i$ and $J_i \cap (E_i - H_i) = \emptyset$.

Let us set $J = \bigcap_{i \in N} J_i$. Then $Y \subseteq J \subseteq \text{Ba}(X)$, so $\mu_X(J) = \mu(Y)$. For each $i \in N$, take $K_i \in \text{Z}(X)$ such that $K_i \subseteq J$ and $\mu_X(J) - 1/i < \mu_X(K_i)$, and define $K = \bigcup_{i \in N} K_i$. Then, since $\mu_X(J - K) = 0$, $\mu(Y - K) = 0$. On the other hand, since

\[
\nu(Y - K) \leq \nu_X(Y - K_i) = \mu_X(Y - K_i) < 1/i
\]

for each $i \in N$, $\nu(Y - K) = 0$. Thus

\[
\nu(Y - K) = \mu(Y - K) = 0.
\]

Since $E_i \cap K \subseteq H_i \cap K$, by Lemma 4.5 there exists $A_i \in \text{Ba}(X)$ such that $E_i \cap K \subseteq A_i$ and $A_i \cap (K - H_i) = \emptyset$. Then, for each $i \in N$,

\[
(F_i \cup Z_i) \cap K \subseteq A_i \cap K \cap Y \subseteq (G_i \cap U_i) \cap K.
\]
Define \( A_\ast = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{i \geq j} (A_i \cap K \cap Y) \) and \( A^\ast = \bigcap_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{i \geq j} (A_i \cap K \cap Y) \); then
\[
\left( \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} F_i \right) \cap K \subset A_\ast \subset A^\ast \subset \left( \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i \right) \cap K.
\]
Since \( \nu((\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} F_i) \cap K) = \nu(B) = \nu((\bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i) \cap K) \) by (1) and (2),
\[
\nu(B) \leq \nu(A_\ast) \leq \lim \inf \nu(A_i \cap K \cap Y) \leq \lim \sup \nu(A_i \cap K \cap Y) \leq \nu(A^\ast) \leq \nu(B),
\]
and hence
\[
\nu(B) = \lim_{i \to \infty} \nu(A_i \cap K \cap Y).
\]
Similarly,
\[
\mu(B) = \lim_{i \to \infty} \mu(A_i \cap K \cap Y).
\]
Since \( A_i \cap K \in \text{Ba}(X) \), it follows from Lemma 4.2 that \( \nu(A_i \cap K \cap Y) = \mu(A_i \cap K \cap Y) \) for each \( i \in \mathbb{N} \). Consequently, \( \nu(B) = \mu(B) \), which completes the proof. \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.7.** Let \( X \) be a Baire-separated, Mařík space, and let \( Y \) be either an \( F_\sigma \)-set or a Baire set of \( X \). Then \( Y \) is a Mařík space.

**Remarks 4.8.** (1) In Theorem 4.6, “generalized Baire” cannot be replaced by “open.” Consider a locally compact, non-Mařík space \( X \) (see Example 3.6) as a subspace of \( \beta X \).

(2) A Baire set of a Baire-separated, Mařík space need not be Baire-embedded, so Theorem 4.6 cannot be reduced to Theorem 4.1. To see this, let \( M \) be the Michael line defined in §2 and \( P \) the subspace of irrational numbers. Being paracompact, \( M \) is a Baire-separated, Mařík space, and \( P \in \text{Ba}(M) \). We show that \( P \) is not Baire-embedded in \( M \). Let \( \{P_1, P_2\} \) be a partition of \( P \) with the usual topology such that \( U \cap P_i \in \mathbb{C}_2(P) \) for each nonempty open set \( U \subset P \) and \( i = 1, 2 \). The existence of such a partition can be shown similarly to Claim 1 in the proof of Theorem 2.5. Since \( P \) is discrete in \( M \), \( P_1 \) is a Baire set of \( P \) in \( M \). Suppose that there exists \( A \in \text{Ba}(M) \) with \( P_1 = A \cap P \). Then, since \( P_1 \subset A \), it follows from Corollary 2.9 that \( P - A \in \mathbb{C}_1(P) \). But \( P - A = P_2 \in \mathbb{C}_2(P) \), a contradiction. This also shows that, in Lemma 4.5, “\( F_\sigma \)-set” cannot be replaced by “Baire-set.”

We now turn to the preservation under taking unions.

**Theorem 4.9.** Assume that \( X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n \), and each \( X_n \) is a Mařík space and is a Baire-embedded, generalized Baire set of \( X \). Then \( X \) is a Mařík space.

**Proof.** Let \( \mu \) be a Baire measure on \( X \). For each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and each \( B \in \text{Ba}(X_n) \), define
\[
\mu_n(B) = \inf \{ \mu(U) : B \subset U \in \text{Coz}(X) \}.
\]
Since \( X_n \) is Baire-embedded, \( \mu_n \) is a Baire-measure on \( X_n \), and hence \( \mu_n \) extends to a regular Borel measure \( \xi_n \) on \( X_n \). For each \( i \in \mathbb{N} \), take \( J_{ni} \in \text{Coz}(X) \) such that \( X_n \subset J_{ni} \) and \( \mu(J_{ni}) < \mu_n(X_n) + 1/i \), and define \( J_n = \).
Then \( X_n \subset J_n \in \mathrm{Ba}(X) \) and \( \mu(J_n) = \nu_n(X_n) \). For each \( C \in \mathrm{Bo}(J_n) \), define \( \nu_n(C) = \xi_n(C \cap X_n) \). Then \( \nu_n \) is a Borel measure on \( J_n \).

**Claim 1.** For each \( A \in \mathrm{Ba}(X) \), \( \nu_n(A \cap J_n) = \mu(A \cap J_n) \).

**Proof.** It is easily checked that \( \nu_n(A \cap J_n) \leq \mu(A \cap J_n) \). To prove the converse, let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Then there exists \( V \in \mathrm{Coz}(X) \) such that \( A \cap X_n \subset V \) and \( \mu(V) < \mu_n(A \cap X_n) + \varepsilon = \nu_n(A \cap J_n) + \varepsilon \). Let \( W = (A \cap J_n) - V \). Then \( \mu(W) = 0 \) by the definition of \( J_n \). Since \( A \cap J_n \subset V \cup W \), \( \mu(A \cap J_n) \leq \mu(V \cup W) = \mu(V) \), and hence \( \mu(A \cap J_n) \leq \nu_n(A \cap J_n) \). \( \square \)

**Claim 2.** For each \( D \in \mathrm{Bo}(J_n) \), \( \nu_n(D) = \sup \{ \nu_n(F) : F \subset D \text{ and } F \text{ is closed in } X \} \).

**Proof.** We first prove that \( \nu_n \) is a regular measure on \( J_n \). For this end, by [10, Proposition 6.2], it suffices to prove that for each open set \( G \) in \( J_n \),

\[
\nu_n(G) = \sup \{ \nu_n(H) : H \subset G \text{ and } H \text{ is closed in } J_n \}.
\]

Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Since \( \xi_n \) is regular, there exists a closed set \( H' \) in \( X_n \) such that

\[
\xi_n(H') > \xi_n(G \cap X_n) - \varepsilon/2 = \nu_n(G) - \varepsilon/2.
\]

Since \( X_n \) is a generalized Baire set, there exists \( K \in \mathrm{Ba}(X) \) such that \( X_n \subset K \) and \( K \cap (\overline{\xi_nH'} - G_0) = \emptyset \), where \( G_0 \) is an open set in \( X \) with \( G_0 \cap J_n = G \).

Take \( Z \in \mathcal{Z}(X) \) such that \( Z \subset K \) and \( \mu(K - Z) < \varepsilon/2 \), and define \( H = \overline{\xi_nH'} \cap Z \cap J_n \). Then \( H \) is closed in \( J_n \) and \( H \subset G \). Since \( H' \cap Z = H \cap X_n \) and \( H' - Z \subset K - Z \),

\[
\xi_n(H') = \xi_n(H' \cap Z) + \xi_n(H' - Z) \\
\leq \xi_n(H \cap X_n) + \mu(K - Z) < \nu_n(H) + \varepsilon/2.
\]

It follows from (1) and (2) that \( \nu_n(H) > \nu_n(G) - \varepsilon \). Thus \( \nu_n \) is proved to be regular. Let \( D \in \mathrm{Bo}(J_n) \), and let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) again. Since \( \nu_n \) is regular, there exists a closed set \( F' \) in \( J_n \) such that \( F' \subset D \) and \( \nu_n(F') > \nu_n(D) - \varepsilon/2 \). Take \( Z' \in \mathcal{Z}(X) \) such that \( Z' \subset J_n \) and \( \mu(J_n - Z') < \varepsilon/2 \), and define \( F = F' \cap Z' \). Then \( F \) is closed in \( X \), \( F \subset D \), and by Claim 1

\[
\nu_n(F) \geq \nu_n(F') - \nu_n(J_n - Z') \\
> (\nu_n(D) - \varepsilon/2) - \mu(J_n - Z') > \nu_n(D) - \varepsilon,
\]

thus proving the claim. \( \square \)

To complete the proof, let \( Y_n = J_n - \bigcup_{i<n} J_i \) for each \( i \in N \). Then \( X = \bigcup_{n \in N} Y_n \), \( Y_n \in \mathrm{Ba}(X) \), and \( Y_n \cap Y_m = \emptyset \) if \( n \neq m \). For each \( E \in \mathrm{Bo}(X) \), define \( \nu(E) = \sum_{n \in N} \nu_n(E \cap Y_n) \). Then it follows from Claims 1 and 2 that \( \nu \) is a regular Borel extension of \( \mu \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.10.** Assume that \( \mathcal{Z} \) is a locally finite cover of a space \( X \) by cozero-sets such that each \( U \in \mathcal{Z} \) is a Mařík space and \( |\mathcal{Z}| < m_r \). Then \( X \) is a Mařík space.
Proof. By [21, Theorem 1.2], \( \mathcal{V} \) has a refinement \( \mathcal{V}' = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{V}'_n \) by cozero-sets such that each \( \mathcal{V}'_n = \{ V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda_n \} \) is discrete. For each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), let \( X_n = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} V_\lambda \); then \( X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n \) and \( X_n \in \text{Coz}(X) \). By Theorem 4.9, it suffices to prove that each \( X_n \) is a Marik space. For this end, let \( \mu \) be a Baire measure on \( X_n \). Since \( \mu \) is finite, there exists a countable set \( M \subset \Lambda_n \) such that \( \mu(V_\lambda) = 0 \) if \( \lambda \in \Lambda_n - M \). Define \( Y_n = \bigcup_{\lambda \in M} V_\lambda \). Then \( Y_n \in \text{Coz}(X) \) and \( Y_n \) is a Marik space by Theorem 4.9, so \( \mu|_{\text{Ba}(Y_n)} \) extends to a regular Borel measure \( \nu_n \) on \( Y_n \). Since \( |\Lambda_n - M| < \infty \), \( \mu(X_n - Y_n) = 0 \). Consequently, if we define \( \nu(B) = \nu_n(B \cap Y_n) \) for each \( B \in \text{Bo}(X_n) \), then \( \nu \) is a regular Borel extension of \( \mu \). \( \square \)

Corollary 4.11. Assume that \( X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n \) is a Baire-separated space, and each \( X_n \) is a Marik space and is either a closed set or a Baire set of \( X \). Then \( X \) is a Marik space.

Proof. By the proof of Theorem 4.9, it suffices to prove that for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), there exist \( J_n \in \text{Ba}(X) \) with \( X_n \subset J_n \) and a Borel measure \( \nu_n \) on \( J_n \) satisfying the Claims 1 and 2. In case \( X_n \) is closed, we can define such \( J_n \) and \( \nu_n \) quite similarly since \( X_n \) is then a Baire-embedded, generalized Baire set by Lemma 4.5. In case \( X_n \in \text{Ba}(X) \), define \( J_n = X_n \). For each \( i \in \mathbb{N} \), take \( K_i \in \mathcal{Z}(X) \) such that \( K_i \subset J_n \) and \( \mu(K_i) > \mu(J_n) - 1/i \), and define \( K = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} K_i \). Since \( K \) is Baire-embedded by Lemma 4.5, it follows from Theorem 4.1 that \( K \) is a Marik space. Hence, if we consider \( K \) instead of \( X_n \), then we can define \( \nu_n \) on \( J_n \) similarly to the proof of Theorem 4.9. \( \square \)

Remarks 4.12. (1) The space \( Y \) defined in the proof of Example 3.6 shows that the union of two Marik spaces need not be a quasi-Marik space even if one is a cozero-set and the other is a zero-set.

(2) We do not know whether the assumption in Theorem 4.9 that each \( X_n \) is a generalized Baire set can be removed. The assumption was used only to ensure the regularity of the extension \( \nu \). Thus \( X \) is a quasi-Marik space even if each \( X_n \) is only assumed to be Baire-embedded.

Question 4.13. Let \( X = Y \cup K \) be the union of a Marik space \( Y \) with a compact space \( K \). Then is \( X \) is Marik space?

Question 4.14. Let \( X = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} X_\lambda \) be the disjoint sum of Marik spaces \( X_\lambda \), \( \lambda \in \Lambda \). Then is \( X \) a Marik space even if \( |\Lambda| \) is real-valued measurable?

Finally we are concerned with the preservation under maps and products. Examples 3.6 and 3.7 show that the image and the preimage of Marik spaces under perfect maps need not be quasi-Marik spaces, respectively. If we make some additional assumptions, then Marik spaces are preserved under perfect maps. To show this, we need a theorem due to Bachman and Sultan [4]. Before stating their theorem, let us agree on some terminology. Let \( \mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2 \) be two lattices, closed under countable intersections, of subsets of a set \( X \), and let \( \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_i) \) denote the smallest algebra containing \( \mathcal{L}_i \), \( i = 0, 1 \). Then \( \mathcal{L}_2 \) is said to be \( \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \)-countably paracompact if \( A_n \downarrow \emptyset \) in \( \mathcal{L}_2 \) implies the existence of
a sequence \( \{B_n\}_{n \in \omega} \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \) such that \( A_n \subset B_n \) and \( B_n \downarrow \emptyset \). A (finitely additive) measure \( \mu \) defined on \( \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \) is called \( \mathcal{L}_1 \)-regular if for each \( B \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \), \( \mu(B) = \sup\{\mu(A) : A \subset B, A \in \mathcal{L}_1\} \).

**Bachman-Sultan’s extension theorem.** Let \( \mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2 \) be the same as above. Then every finitely additive, \( \mathcal{L}_1 \)-regular measure \( \mu \) defined on \( \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \) can be extended to a finitely additive, \( \mathcal{L}_2 \)-regular measure \( \nu \) defined on \( \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2) \). If \( \mathcal{L}_2 \) is \( \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \)-countably paracompact and if \( \mu \) is \( \sigma \)-additive, then so is \( \nu \).

For a space \( X \), \( \text{Ba}^\omega(X) \) \( (\text{Bo}^\omega(X)) \) denotes the smallest algebra containing all zero-sets \( \text{closed sets} \) of \( X \). It is well known (cf. [13, 10.36]) that every measure \( \mu \) defined on \( \text{Ba}^\omega(Y) \) \( (\text{Bo}^\omega(X)) \) can be extended to a unique Baire \( (\text{Borel}) \) measure \( v \) on \( X \), and if \( \mu \) is regular, then so is \( v \).

**Theorem 4.15.** Let \( f \) be a continuous map from a Mařík space \( X \) onto a space \( Y \) such that for each \( Z \in \mathcal{Z}(X) \), \( f(Z) \in \mathcal{Z}(Y) \), and such that for each \( y \in Y \), \( f^{-1}(y) \) is relatively pseudocompact in \( X \); i.e., each \( g \in C(X) \) is bounded on \( f^{-1}(y) \). Then \( Y \) is a Mařík space.

**Proof.** Let \( \mu \) be a Baire measure on \( Y \). Define \( \mathcal{L}_1 = \{f^{-1}(Z) : Z \in \mathcal{Z}(Y)\} \) and \( \mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{Z}(X) \). Then \( \mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2 \) and \( \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) = \{f^{-1}(B) : B \in \text{Ba}^\omega(Y)\} \).

For each \( B \in \text{Ba}^\omega(Y) \), define \( \lambda(f^{-1}(B)) = \mu(B) \). Then \( \lambda \) is a \( \mathcal{L}_1 \)-regular measure defined on \( \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \). By the condition of \( f \), it is easily checked that \( \mathcal{L}_2 \) is \( \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \)-countably paracompact, and hence it follows from Bachman-Sultan’s theorem that \( \lambda \) can be extended to a \( \mathcal{L}_2 \)-regular measure \( \lambda_1 \) defined on \( \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2) \) \( (= \text{Ba}^\omega(X)) \). Since \( \lambda_1 \) extends to a Baire measure on \( X \) and \( X \) is a Mařík space, \( \lambda \) extends to a regular Borel measure \( \xi \) on \( X \). For each \( A \in \text{Bo}(Y) \), define \( \nu(A) = \xi(f^{-1}(A)) \). Then, since \( \mu(\text{Ba}^\omega(Y)) = \nu(\text{Ba}^\omega(Y)) \), \( \mu = \nu \mid \text{Ba}(Y) \), and hence \( \nu \) is a regular Borel extension of \( \mu \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.16.** Let \( f \) be an open, perfect map from a Mařík space \( X \) onto a space \( Y \). Then \( Y \) is a Mařík space.

**Proof.** By [8, Lemma 3.4], an open perfect map carries a zero-set to a zero-set. Hence this follows from Theorem 4.15. \( \square \)

**Theorem 4.17.** Let \( f \) be a closed, continuous map from a space \( X \) onto a Baire-separated, Mařík space \( Y \) such that for each \( y \in Y \), \( f^{-1}(y) \) is countably compact. Then \( X \) is a Mařík space.

**Proof.** Let \( \mu \) be a Baire measure on \( X \). We have to prove that \( \mu \) admits a regular Borel extension. For each \( B \in \text{Ba}(Y) \), define \( \lambda(B) = \mu(f^{-1}(B)) \); then \( \lambda \) is a Baire measure on \( Y \). Since \( Y \) is a Mařík space, \( \lambda \) extends to a regular Borel measure \( \xi \) on \( Y \). On the other hand, by Bachman-Sultan’s theorem, \( \mu(\text{Bo}^\omega(X)) \) extends to a finitely additive, regular measure \( \nu_1 \) defined on \( \text{Bo}^\omega(X) \). For each \( A \in \text{Bo}^\omega(Y) \), define \( \xi_1(A) = \nu_1(f^{-1}(A)) \). Then \( \xi_1 \) is regular. We now prove that

\[
(1) \quad \xi_1 = \xi \mid \text{Bo}^\omega(Y).
\]
Since both $\xi$ and $\xi_1$ are regular, it suffices to show that they coincide on open sets. To do this, let $G \subset Y$ be open and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists a closed set $E \subset G$ such that $\xi(E) > \xi(G) - \varepsilon$. Since $Y$ is Baire-separated, there exists $J \in \text{Ba}(Y)$ with $E \subset J \subset G$. Then
\[
\xi(J) = \lambda(J) = \sup\{\lambda(Z) : Z \subset J, Z \in \mathcal{Z}(Y)\} = \sup\{\xi_1(Z) : Z \subset J, Z \in \mathcal{Z}(Y)\} \leq \xi_1(G),
\]
so $\xi(G) - \varepsilon < \xi(J) \leq \xi_1(G)$, and hence $\xi(G) \leq \xi_1(G)$. Conversely, let $\varepsilon > 0$ again, and take a closed set $F \subset G$ and $K \in \text{Ba}(Y)$ such that $\xi_1(F) > \xi_1(G) - \varepsilon$ and $F \subset K \subset G$. Then
\[
\xi_1(F) = \nu_1(f^{-1}(F)) \leq \inf\{\nu_1(V) : f^{-1}(K) \subset V \in \text{Coz}(X)\} = \mu(f^{-1}(K)) = \lambda(K) = \xi(K),
\]
so $\xi_1(G) - \varepsilon < \xi(K) \leq \xi(G)$, and hence $\xi_1(G) \leq \xi(G)$. Thus (1) is proved. To see that $\nu_1$ is $\sigma$-additive, let $\{F_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ be a sequence of closed sets in $X$ with $F_n \downarrow \varnothing$. By the condition of $f$, $f(F_n)$ is closed and $f(F_n) \downarrow \varnothing$. Since $\xi$ is $\sigma$-additive, it follows from (1) that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \nu_1(F_n) \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \nu_1(f^{-1}(f(F_n))) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \xi(f(F_n)) = 0.
\]
Consequently, $\nu_1$ is $\sigma$-additive, and hence $\nu_1$ can be extended to a regular Borel measure on $X$, which is a required extension of $\mu$. □

**Corollary 4.18.** Let $Y$ be a Baire-separated, Mařík space. Then the absolute $E(Y)$ is a Mařík space.

**Corollary 4.19.** Let $X$ be a Baire-separated, Mařík space and $Y$ a compact space. Then $X \times Y$ is a Mařík space.

Example 3.7 shows that the assumptions in Theorem 4.17 and Corollary 4.18 that $Y$ is Baire-separated cannot be removed; however, the following questions remain unanswered.

**Questions 4.20.** Is the product of a Mařík space with a compact space a Mařík space? More generally, is the preimage of a Mařík space under an open, perfect map a Mařík space?
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