

## PSEUDOCOMPACTNESS PROPERTIES

SAMUEL BROVERMAN<sup>1</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** A topological extension property is a class of Tychonoff spaces  $\mathcal{P}$  which is closed hereditary, closed under formation of topological products and contains all compact spaces. If  $X$  is Tychonoff and  $\mathcal{P}$  is an extension property, there is a space  $\mathcal{P}X$  such that  $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}X \subseteq \beta X$ ,  $\mathcal{P}X \in \mathcal{P}$  and if  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  where  $Y \in \mathcal{P}$  then  $f$  admits a continuous extension to  $\mathcal{P}X$ . A space  $X$  is called  $\mathcal{P}$ -pseudocompact if  $\mathcal{P}X = \beta X$ . In this note it is shown that if  $\mathcal{P}$  is an extension property which contains the real line (e.g., the class of realcompact spaces),  $X$  is  $\mathcal{P}$ -pseudocompact and  $Y$  is compact, then  $X \times Y$  is  $\mathcal{P}$ -pseudocompact. An example is given of an extension property  $\mathcal{P}$ , a  $\mathcal{P}$ -pseudocompact space  $X$  and a compact space  $Y$  such that  $X \times Y$  is not  $\mathcal{P}$ -pseudocompact.

**1. Introduction.** If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a class of completely regular, Hausdorff spaces which contains all compact spaces such that  $\mathcal{P}$  is closed under the formation of topological products and closed subspaces, then  $\mathcal{P}$  is called a topological extension property. Such classes may also be familiar as the almost-fitting epireflective subcategories of the category of completely regular, Hausdorff spaces. If  $X$  is a completely regular space and  $\mathcal{P}$  is an extension property then there is a space  $\mathcal{P}X$  such that  $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}X \subseteq \beta X$ ,  $\mathcal{P}X \in \mathcal{P}$ , and every continuous map from  $X$  to a space in  $\mathcal{P}$  admits a continuous extension to  $\mathcal{P}X$ . The basic references for this material are [5] and [9]. In what follows, a space will mean a completely regular, Hausdorff space. Given an extension property  $\mathcal{P}$  and a space  $X$ , we call  $X$   $\mathcal{P}$ -pseudocompact if  $\mathcal{P}X = \beta X$ . The class of  $\mathcal{P}$ -pseudocompact spaces is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}'$ . Woods [9] introduced this notion of  $\mathcal{P}$ -pseudocompactness and investigated the class  $\mathcal{P}'$ . If  $\mathcal{P}$  is the class of realcompact spaces then  $\mathcal{P}'$  is the class of pseudocompact spaces. In Theorem 2.2 of [9], it is shown that the class  $\mathcal{P}'$ , for an arbitrary extension property  $\mathcal{P}$ , satisfies many of the properties enjoyed by the class of pseudocompact spaces. It is well known that the topological product of a pseudocompact space with a compact space is pseudocompact (see 9.14 of [4]). It is also known (see Proposition 2.5 of [8]) that a space  $X$  is pseudocompact if and only if  $E(X)$ , the projective cover of  $X$ , is pseudocompact. In [9], the question is raised of whether or not the class  $\mathcal{P}'$  satisfies the above two conditions for an arbitrary

---

Received by the editors December 24, 1975.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 54D60, 54C20.

Key words and phrases. Stone-Cech compactification, extension property, realcompact, pseudocompact.

<sup>1</sup> This research was partially supported by a scholarship from the National Research Council of Canada.

© American Mathematical Society 1976

extension property  $\mathcal{P}$ . In this paper we show that the answer to both questions is, in general, no; however for a large class of extension properties  $\mathcal{P}$  the answer to the first question is yes.

The notation will follow that of [4], and  $N$  will denote the natural numbers.

## 2. Pseudocompactness properties.

2.1. EXAMPLE. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the class of spaces all of whose connected components are compact. Clearly  $\mathcal{P}$  is an extension property. It is also easy to see that  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{P}'$  (where  $\mathbf{R}$  is the real line). But  $E(\mathbf{R})$  is extremally disconnected and noncompact. In particular,  $E(\mathbf{R}) \in \mathcal{P}$  as  $E(\mathbf{R})$  is totally disconnected, hence connected components of  $E(\mathbf{R})$  are points. But by Theorem 2.2 of [9], we must have that  $E(\mathbf{R}) \notin \mathcal{P}'$  as  $E(\mathbf{R})$  is noncompact. This answers the second question mentioned in the introduction.

2.2. EXAMPLE. In what follows, let  $\mathcal{P}$  denote the class of all spaces  $X$  such that every countable subset of  $X$  has compact closure in  $X$ . Such spaces are called  $\aleph_0$ -bounded spaces, and it is shown in [7] that  $\mathcal{P}$  is an extension property and furthermore that if  $X$  is a space then  $\mathcal{P}X$  consists of all points in  $\beta X$  which are in the closure of a countable subset of  $X$ . Clearly any separable space is in  $\mathcal{P}'$ , hence  $N \in \mathcal{P}'$ . We show that  $N \times \beta D \notin \mathcal{P}'$  where  $D$  denotes the discrete space of cardinality  $\aleph_1$ .

Let  $\{0, 1\}$  denote the two-point discrete space. Let  $X$  be the  $\Sigma$ -space of  $\{0, 1\}^{\aleph_1}$ , i.e.,  $X$  consists of those points in  $\{0, 1\}^{\aleph_1}$  which have at most countably many coordinates equal to 1. Then  $X \in \mathcal{P}$ . For each  $i \in N$  define

$$A_i = \{p \in \{0, 1\}^{\aleph_1} : |\{k : \pi_k(p) = 1\}| \leq i\}$$

where  $\pi_k$  is the  $k$ th projection map from  $\{0, 1\}^{\aleph_1}$  to  $\{0, 1\}$ . Clearly each  $A_i$  is compact, and if  $A = \bigcup_{i \in N} A_i \subseteq X$  then  $A$  is dense in  $X$ . Thus  $A \notin \mathcal{P}'$ . For by Theorem 2.2 of [9], if  $A \in \mathcal{P}'$  then  $X \in \mathcal{P}'$ , hence  $X \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{P}'$  and  $X$  must be compact, which is not true. Since  $|A_i| = \aleph_1$  for every  $i \in N$ , we have that  $A_i$  is the continuous image of  $\beta D$ . Thus  $A = \bigcup_{i \in N} A_i$  is the continuous image of  $N \times \beta D$ . Since  $A \notin \mathcal{P}'$  we have that  $N \times \beta D \notin \mathcal{P}'$  by Theorem 2.2 of [9]. This answers question one.

2.3. THEOREM. Suppose that  $\mathcal{P}$  is an extension property such that  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{P}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{P}$  contains all realcompact spaces. Then if  $X \in \mathcal{P}'$  and  $Y$  is compact then  $X \times Y \in \mathcal{P}'$ .

PROOF. By 2.2(e) of [9], every member of  $\mathcal{P}'$  is pseudocompact. Let  $X \in \mathcal{P}'$  and let  $Y$  be compact. Then  $X \times Y$  is pseudocompact. Hence, by Theorem 2.1 of [3],  $\beta(X \times Y) = \beta X \times \beta Y = \beta X \times Y$ . Then by Proposition 3.1 of [2],

$$\mathcal{P}(X \times Y) = \mathcal{P}X \times \mathcal{P}Y = \mathcal{P}X \times Y = \beta X \times Y \quad (\text{as } X \in \mathcal{P}') = \beta(X \times Y),$$

i.e.,  $X \times Y \in \mathcal{P}'$ . The condition that  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{P}$  is not necessary for the above result. If  $\mathcal{P}$  is the class of compact spaces then  $\mathbf{R} \notin \mathcal{P}$ , but since  $\mathcal{P}'$  consists of

all Tychonoff spaces,  $\mathcal{P}'$  satisfies the condition that if  $X \in \mathcal{P}'$  and  $Y$  is compact, then  $X \times Y \in \mathcal{P}'$ .  $\square$

**3. 0-dimensional pseudocompactness properties.** If  $X$  is 0-dimensional (i.e., has a base of clopen sets), let  $\beta_0 X$  denote the Banaschewski maximal 0-dimensional compactification of  $X$  (see [1]). The space  $\beta_0 X$  is the Stone space (maximal ideal space) of the Boolean algebra of clopen subsets of  $X$ . If  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is a class of 0-dimensional spaces which contains  $\{0, 1\}$ , is closed hereditary and preserved under the formation of products (an epireflective, almost fitting subcategory of the category of 0-dimensional spaces), then  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is called a 0-dimensional extension property. If  $X$  is 0-dimensional and  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is a 0-dimensional extension property, then there is a space  $\mathcal{P}_0 X$  such that  $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_0 X \subseteq \beta_0 X$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_0 X \in \mathcal{P}_0$ , and any continuous map from  $X$  to a space in  $\mathcal{P}_0$  admits a continuous extension to  $\mathcal{P}_0 X$ . This space can be produced in a way analogous to the construction of  $\mathcal{P}X$  in [5]. The concept of  $\mathcal{P}_0$ -pseudocompactness is analogous to that of  $\mathcal{P}$ -pseudocompactness defined above. Since  $N \times \beta D$  is 0-dimensional, in view of Example 2.2 above, question one asked in the introduction has a negative answer when applied to 0-dimensional extension properties. However, Example 2.1 above will not work in the 0-dimensional case of question two. The following example shows that the answer to question two with respect to 0-dimensional extension properties is negative.

**3.1. EXAMPLE.** Let  $\omega_1^* = \omega_1 \cup \{\omega_1\}$  denote the one-point compactification of  $\omega_1$ , the totally ordered space of countable ordinals. Let  $\mathcal{P}_0$  be the class of all 0-dimensional,  $\aleph_0$ -bounded spaces. Then  $X = N \times \omega_1^* \in \mathcal{P}_0$  (if  $p \in \beta_0 X$  and  $p$  is not in the closure of  $N \times \{\omega_1\}$ , then  $p$  is in the closure of a complement of a neighborhood of  $N \times \{\omega_1\}$  which must be countable). For each  $i \in N$  let  $f_i$  be a bijection between  $D$ , the discrete space of cardinality  $\aleph_1$ , and the isolated points of  $\omega_1^*$ , and let  $f_i^*: \beta D \rightarrow \omega_1^*$  be the Stone extension of  $f_i$ . Then  $f_i^*$  is perfect and irreducible (i.e., no proper closed subset of  $\beta D$  maps onto  $\omega_1^*$ ). Thus  $\bigcup_{i \in N} f_i^*: N \times \beta D \rightarrow N \times \omega_1^*$  is perfect and irreducible. By Lemma 2.14 of [8],  $N \times \beta D = E(N \times \omega_1^*)$ . However, Example 2.2 above shows that  $N \times \beta D \notin \mathcal{P}_0$  (we showed  $N \times \beta D \notin \mathcal{P}'$  where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the class of  $\aleph_0$ -bounded spaces, but since  $N \times \beta D$  is extremally disconnected we have  $\beta_0(N \times \beta D) = \beta(N \times \beta D)$  and, hence,  $\mathcal{P}_0(N \times \beta D) = \mathcal{P}(N \times \beta D) \subsetneq \beta(N \times \beta D)$  by Example 2.2).

We can sharpen the result of Theorem 2.3 when restricting ourselves to 0-dimensional extension properties.

**3.2 THEOREM.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}_0$  be a 0-dimensional extension property not all of whose members are pseudocompact. Let  $X \in \mathcal{P}_0$  and let  $Y$  be compact and 0-dimensional. Then  $X \times Y \in \mathcal{P}_0$ .*

**PROOF.** Since not every member of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is pseudocompact it follows that some members of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  contain a  $C$ -embedded, hence closed, copy of  $N$  (see 1.21 and 3B3 of [4]). Thus  $N \in \mathcal{P}_0$ . By Theorem 2.2 of [9], every member of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is pseudocompact.

Let  $X \in \mathcal{P}'_0$  and  $Y$  be compact and 0-dimensional. Then  $X \times Y$  is pseudo-compact. Hence by Theorem 2.2 of [2],

$$\beta_0(X \times Y) = \beta_0 X \times \beta_0 Y = \beta_0 X \times Y.$$

Then by Proposition 3.1 of [2],

$$\mathcal{P}_0(X \times Y) = \mathcal{P}_0 X \times \mathcal{P}_0 Y = \mathcal{P}_0 X \times Y = \beta_0 X \times Y = \beta_0(X \times Y),$$

hence  $X \times Y \in \mathcal{P}'_0$ .  $\square$

Corollary 2.10 of [9] shows that if  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is a 0-dimensional extension property, then either  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is the class of compact 0-dimensional spaces or  $\mathcal{P}'_0$  does not properly contain the class of pseudocompact 0-dimensional spaces. The question is then raised of whether or not the corresponding statement for (not necessarily 0-dimensional) extension properties holds. If  $\mathcal{P}$  is the class of  $I \times N$ -compact spaces (if  $E$  is a space, then  $X$  is  $E$ -compact if  $X$  can be embedded as a closed subset of  $E^m$  for some cardinal number  $m$ ; see [6]), then  $\mathcal{P}$  is an extension property. But clearly  $\mathcal{P}$  contains noncompact spaces (e.g.,  $N \in \mathcal{P}$ ). Also  $\mathcal{P}'$  properly contains the class of pseudocompact spaces. This follows from 2.2(e) of [9] and the fact that  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{P}'$ , and  $\mathbf{R}$  is not pseudocompact. Thus the statement for arbitrary extension properties corresponding to 2.10 of [9] is not valid.

## REFERENCES

1. B. Banaschewski, *Über nulldimensionale Räume*, Math. Nachr. **13** (1955), 129–140. MR **19**, 157.
2. S. Broverman, *The topological extension of a product*, Canad. Math. Bull. (to appear).
3. Z. Frolik, *The topological product of two pseudo-compact spaces*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **10** (85) (1960), 339–349. MR **22** #7099.
4. L. Gillman and M. Jerison, *Rings of continuous functions*, Univ. Ser. in Higher Math., Van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J., 1960. MR **22** #6994.
5. H. Herrlich and J. Van der Slot, *Properties which are closely related to compactness*, Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A **70** = Indag. Math. **29** (1967), 524–529. MR **36** #5898.
6. S. Mrówka, *Further results on  $E$ -compact spaces. I*, Acta Math. **120** (1968), 161–185. MR **37** #2165.
7. R. G. Woods, *Some  $\aleph_0$ -bounded subsets of Stone-Čech compactifications*, Israel J. Math. **9** (1971), 250–256. MR **43** #3997.
8. ———, *Ideals of pseudocompact regular closed sets and absolutes of Hewitt realcompactifications*, General Topology and Appl. **2** (1972), 315–331. MR **47** #7698.
9. ———, *Topological extension properties*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **210** (1975), 365–385.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, CANADA R3T 2N2