

## ON $\mu$ -SPACES AND $k_R$ -SPACES

J. L. BLASCO

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper it is proved that when  $X$  is a  $k_R$ -space then  $\mu X$  (the smallest subspace of  $\beta X$  containing  $X$  with the property that each of its bounded closed subsets is compact) also is a  $k_R$ -space; an example is given of a  $k_R$ -space  $X$  such that its Hewitt realcompactification,  $\nu X$ , is not a  $k_R$ -space. We show with an example that there is a non- $k_R$ -space  $X$  such that  $\nu X$  and  $\mu X$  are  $k_R$ -spaces. Also we answer negatively a question posed by Buchwalter: Is  $\mu X$  the union of the closures in  $\nu X$  of the bounded subsets of  $X$ ? Finally, without using the continuum hypothesis, we give an example of a locally compact space  $X$  of cardinality  $\aleph_1$  such that  $\nu X$  is not a  $k$ -space.

**Introduction.** The topological spaces used here will always be completely regular Hausdorff spaces. If  $X$  is a topological space we write  $C(X)$  for the ring of the continuous real-valued functions on  $X$ , and  $\beta X$  (resp.  $\nu X$ ) for the Stone-Čech compactification (resp. Hewitt realcompactification) of  $X$ . A subset  $M$  of  $X$  is said to be bounded if  $g|_M$  is bounded for all  $g \in C(X)$ . A space is said to be a  $\mu$ -space if every closed bounded subset is compact. Realcompact spaces (closed subspaces of a product of real lines) and  $P$ -spaces (spaces in which every  $G_\delta$  is open) are  $\mu$ -spaces. Write  $\mu X$  for the smallest subspace of  $\beta X$  that contains  $X$  and is a  $\mu$ -space. A real-valued function  $g$  on  $X$  is called  $k_R$ -continuous if  $g|_K$  is continuous in  $K$  for all compact subsets  $K$  of  $X$ . A space such that every  $k_R$ -continuous function is continuous is called a  $k_R$ -space. The associated  $k_R$ -space of a space  $X$ , denoted by  $k_R X$ , will be  $X$  provided with the coarsest topology for which every  $k_R$ -continuous function on  $X$  is continuous. It is easy to see that  $k_R X$  is a completely regular Hausdorff space.

Our work provides the solutions to the following questions:

- (1) If  $X$  is a  $k_R$ -space, is  $\mu X$  a  $k_R$ -space?
- (2) If  $\mathfrak{B}$  is the family of all closed bounded subsets of  $X$ , does the relation  $\mu X = \bigcup \{ \overline{B}^{\nu X} : B \in \mathfrak{B} \}$  hold?
- (3) If  $\nu X$  or  $\mu X$  is a  $k_R$ -space, is  $X$  a  $k_R$ -space?
- (4) If  $X$  is a  $k_R$ -space, is  $\nu X$  a  $k_R$ -space?
- (5) If  $X$  is a realcompact space, is  $k_R X$  realcompact?<sup>1</sup>

---

Received by the editors April 13, 1975 and, in revised form, June 29, 1975, October 13, 1975, and February 2, 1976.

*AMS (MOS) subject classifications* (1970). Primary 54A05, 54C35, 54D50, 54D60, 54G20.

*Key words and phrases.*  $\mu$ -space,  $k_R$ -space,  $k$ -space, bounded subset,  $k_R X$ ,  $kX$ ,  $\mu X$ ,  $P$ -space, bornological space, barrelled space, ultrabornological space, complete space, compact-open topology, measurable cardinal.

<sup>1</sup>This question has been proposed by M. Valdivia.

The answer to question (1) is affirmative. Moreover, if  $X$  is a  $k_R$ -space, it is proven that  $\bigcup \{ \bar{B}^{\nu X} : B \in \mathfrak{B} \}$  is also, and that using this fact one has shown that  $\mu X$  is a  $k_R$ -space. Question (2) has a negative answer; the example is given of a locally compact space  $X$  such that  $X \neq \bigcup \{ \bar{B}^{\nu X} : B \in \mathfrak{B} \} \neq \mu X$ . Using an example of Comfort [3], it is shown that the answer to question (3) is negative. Supposing continuum hypothesis (CH), an infinite class of  $k_R$ -spaces  $X$  is constructed such that  $\nu X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space. Thus question (4) has a negative answer. Further, it is shown that for the spaces  $X$  constructed before,  $k_R(\nu X)$  is not realcompact and therefore question (5) also has a negative answer.

Nachbin [12] and Shirota [16] give the following characterizations for  $C_c(X)$  (the vector space  $C(X)$  provided with the compact-open topology):

(NS<sub>1</sub>)  $X$  is realcompact if and only if  $C_c(X)$  is bornological.

(NS<sub>2</sub>)  $X$  is a  $\mu$ -space if and only if  $C_c(X)$  is barrelled.

These characterizations provide examples of nonbornological barrelled spaces, answering a question posed by Bourbaki [1]. Warner [18] characterizes the  $k_R$ -spaces as those spaces  $X$  for which  $C_c(X)$  is complete (W).

Question 5 is related to the following problem posed by Dieudonné [4]: If  $E$  is a bornological space, is the completion of  $E$  a bornological space? T. Kōmura and Y. Kōmura [7], supposing (CH), give an example of a bornological space whose completion is not bornological, using sequence spaces of Köthe [8]. Since De Wilde and Schmets have proven [19] that  $X$  is realcompact if and only if  $C_c(X)$  is an ultrabornological space (inductive limit of Banach spaces), the examples of realcompact spaces  $X$  such that  $k_R X$  is not realcompact provide ultrabornological spaces  $C_c(X)$  such that the completion is not a bornological space. Thus, our solution to question (5) is another solution to the problem proposed by Dieudonné, in the context of spaces  $C_c(X)$ .

A space is said to be a  $k$ -space if each of its subsets which has closed intersection with each compact subset is itself closed. Evidently each  $k$ -space is a  $k_R$ -space, but Pták presents [15] an example (credited to Katětov) which shows that the converse implication can fail. Another (completely regular Hausdorff) example has been discovered by Noble [14]. In [3], Comfort gives an example of a locally compact space  $X$  whose cardinality is  $\aleph_2$  such that  $\nu X$  is not a  $k$ -space and asks himself if there exists a space of cardinality  $\aleph_1$  with the same properties as the former one. In [13] Negreponitis, supposing (CH), gives an example of a space with these properties. We give a different example from the former one, this one without (CH).

**Question 1.** If  $X$  is a topological space, let  $\mu X$  be the intersection of all subspaces of  $\beta X$  which contain  $X$  and are  $\mu$ -spaces. Thus,  $\mu X$  is a  $\mu$ -space such that  $X \subset \mu X \subset \nu X$ . It can be easily shown that  $X$  is a  $\mu$ -space if and only if  $X = \mu X$ , and that  $X$  is compact if and only if it is a pseudocompact  $\mu$ -space. The space  $\mu X$  is unique in the following sense: If  $T$  is a  $\mu$ -space which contains  $X$  as a dense subspace and every continuous mapping  $\tau$  from

$X$  into any  $\mu$ -space  $Y$  has a continuous extension  $\bar{\tau}$  from  $T$  into  $Y$ , then there exists a homeomorphism of  $\mu X$  onto  $T$  that leaves  $X$  pointwise fixed. Indeed, let  $\phi$  be a continuous mapping from  $X$  into any  $\mu$ -space  $Y$ ; then  $\phi$  has a Stone extension  $\hat{\phi}$  to the whole  $\beta X$  into  $\beta Y$ . If we prove that  $E = \hat{\phi}^{-1}(Y)$  is a  $\mu$ -space, then the restriction of  $\hat{\phi}$  to  $\mu X$  is a continuous extension of  $\phi$  because  $\mu X \subset E$ . If  $A$  is a bounded subset of  $E$ , then  $B = \overline{\hat{\phi}(A)}$  is a compact subset of  $Y$  and since  $\hat{\phi}^{-1}(B)$  is compact, the subset  $A$  is relatively compact in  $E$ . Therefore every continuous mapping from  $X$  into any  $\mu$ -space  $Y$  has a continuous extension from  $\mu X$  into  $Y$ , and according to [5, 0.12] the proof is complete.

**PROPOSITION 1.** *Let  $X$  be a topological space, let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be the family of all bounded subsets of  $X$ , and let  $E(X) = \bigcup \{B^{\nu X} : B \in \mathfrak{B}\}$ . If  $X$  is a  $k_R$ -space, then so is  $E(X)$ .*

**PROOF.** If  $f$  is a  $k_R$ -continuous function in  $E(X)$ , and  $g$  is the restriction of  $f$  to  $X$ , then  $g \in C(X)$ . If  $h$  is the continuous extension of  $g$  to  $E(X)$  and  $x \in E(X) \sim X$ , then  $x \in \bar{A}^{\nu X}$ ,  $A \in \mathfrak{B}$ , since  $K = \bar{A}^{\nu X} = \bar{A}^{E(X)}$  is compact,  $f(x) = h(x)$  and  $f = h$ .

If  $\alpha$  is an ordinal, we write  $W(\alpha)$  for the set of all ordinals less than  $\alpha$ . If  $M$  is a set, we denote the cardinal of  $M$  by  $|M|$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $X$  is a  $k_R$ -space, then so is  $\mu X$ .*

**PROOF.** If  $\aleph_\alpha$  is a cardinal larger than  $2^{|\mu X|}$ , let  $\omega_\alpha$  be the first ordinal whose cardinal is  $\aleph_\alpha$ . We define inductively  $\{B_\sigma : \sigma \in W(\omega_\alpha)\}$ , where  $B_1 = E(X)$  and  $B_\sigma = E(\bigcup \{B_\delta : \delta < \sigma\})$ . Let us suppose that  $B_\delta$  is a  $k_R$ -space for every  $\delta < \sigma$ ,  $\sigma \in W(\omega_\alpha)$  and we shall prove that  $B_\sigma$  is a  $k_R$ -space. By Proposition 1 it suffices to prove that  $W = \bigcup \{B_\delta : \delta < \sigma\}$  is a  $k_R$ -space. If  $f$  is a  $k_R$ -continuous function in  $W$ , let  $g$  be the continuous extension to  $W$  of the restriction of  $f$  to  $X$ . If  $x \in B_{\delta_0}$ ,  $\delta_0 < \sigma$ , since  $g$  and  $f$  are continuous in  $B_{\delta_0}$  and coincide over  $X$ , it follows that  $f(x) = g(x)$  and therefore,  $g = f$ . Thus,  $f$  is continuous in  $W$  and so  $W$  is a  $k_R$ -space. Let us now suppose that  $\mu X \neq B_\sigma$  for every  $\sigma \in W(\omega_\alpha)$ , and we choose  $\sigma_1 \in W(\omega_\alpha)$  such that  $|\sigma_1| > |\mu X|$  (we write  $|\sigma_1|$  for the cardinal number of  $\sigma_1$ ). For every  $\gamma < \sigma_1$  we choose a point  $x_\gamma \in B_\gamma \sim \bigcup \{B_\delta : \delta < \gamma\}$ . Therefore  $|B_{\sigma_1} \sim X| \geq |\sigma_1|$  because  $|\sigma_1| = |\{x_\gamma, \gamma \in W(\sigma_1)\}|$  and  $x_\gamma \in B_{\sigma_1} \sim X$  for all  $\gamma < \sigma_1$ . On the other hand, the relation  $|\sigma_1| > |\mu X| \geq |\mu X \sim X| \geq |B_{\sigma_1} \sim X|$  holds, which is a contradiction, so there exists  $\sigma_0 \in W(\omega_\alpha)$  such that  $B_{\sigma_0} = \mu X$ .

**Question 2.** First, we shall give an example of a locally compact space  $X$  such that  $|X| = \aleph_1$  and that  $\nu X$  is not a  $k$ -space. If  $\alpha$  is an ordinal, we write  $\alpha + 1$  for the ordinal which follows it and  $\omega_0$  (resp.  $\omega_1$ ) for the first infinite (resp. uncountable) ordinal. Let  $Y$  be the product space  $W(\omega_1 + 1) \times W(\omega_0 + 1)$ . If  $(\alpha, \omega_0)$  is a point of  $Y$  where  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal ( $\alpha < \omega_1$ ), let  $\{\beta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a strictly increasing sequence in  $W(\alpha)$  which converges to  $\alpha$ . If  $\gamma_n = \beta_{n+1}$ ,  $\alpha_n = \gamma_n + 1$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , it follows that  $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a strictly increasing

sequence which converges to  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha_n$  being an isolated point of  $W(\omega_1)$ . If  $p$  is a positive integer we write  $A_{p,\alpha} = \{(\delta, p): \alpha_p \leq \delta \leq \alpha\}$  and  $U_{n,\alpha} = \{(\alpha, \omega_0)\} \cup \{\cup_{p=n}^\infty A_{p,\alpha}\}$ . If  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal of  $W(\omega_1)$  let  $f_\alpha$  be the function defined on  $Y$  as  $f_\alpha(\alpha, \omega_0) = 0$ ,  $f_\alpha(A_{n,\alpha}) = \{1/n\}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , and, otherwise, as 1. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the weak topology on  $Y$  associated to  $C(Y)$  and to the family of functions  $\{f_\alpha, \alpha \text{ limit ordinal of } W(\omega_1)\}$ . Then  $(Y, \mathcal{F})$  is a nonpseudocompact completely regular space, because  $\{(\gamma_n, n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a copy of  $N$  (discrete space of positive integers), which is  $C$ -embedded in  $Y$ . For the topology  $\mathcal{F}$  a basis of the neighborhoods of  $(\eta, \sigma) \in Y$ , when  $\sigma < \omega_0$ , is the family of the neighborhoods of this point in the product topology. The same is true for  $(\omega_1, \omega_0)$  and  $(\eta, \omega_0)$  when  $\eta$  is a nonlimit ordinal of  $W(\omega_1)$ . If  $\eta$  is a limit ordinal of  $W(\omega_1)$ , a basis of the neighborhoods of  $(\eta, \omega_0)$  is the family  $\{U_{n,\eta}: n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ . If  $X = Y \sim \{(\omega_1, \omega_0)\}$ , let us see that  $X$  is locally compact. If  $\eta$  is a limit ordinal of  $W(\omega_1)$  and  $\{V_i, i \in L\}$  is an open cover of  $U_{1,\eta}$  there exists  $n_0 \in N$ ,  $i_0 \in L$  such that  $U_{n_0,\eta} \subset V_{i_0}$ . If  $\{V_j: 1 \leq j \leq K\}$  is a finite subcover of the compact set  $\cup \{A_{p,\eta}: 1 \leq p \leq n_0\}$ , then  $\{V_j: 0 \leq j \leq K\}$  is a finite subcover of  $U_{1,\eta}$ . Now we shall prove that  $X$  is  $C$ -embedded in  $Y$ . If  $f \in C(X)$ , there exists  $\gamma \in W(\omega_1)$  such that if  $\beta \geq \gamma$ , then  $f(\beta, n) = f(\omega_1, n)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . By continuity, it results that  $f(\beta, \omega_0) = f(\gamma, \omega_0)$  if  $\beta \geq \gamma$ ,  $\beta < \omega_1$ . If  $\hat{f}$  is the function that coincides on  $X$  with  $f$  and  $\hat{f}(\omega_1, \omega_0) = f(\gamma, \omega_0)$  it follows that  $\hat{f}$  is a continuous extension of  $f$ . If we prove that  $Y$  is realcompact, we shall have  $Y = vX$ . Let us suppose that  $M$  is a free real maximal ideal of  $C(Y)$ .<sup>2</sup> Then  $M \neq \{f \in C(Y): f(\omega_1, \omega_0) = 0\}$  and if  $Z(M) = \{Z(g): g \in M\}$  there will be  $Z^1 \in Z(M)$ ,  $\sigma_0 \in W(\omega_1)$  such that  $Z^1 \cap \{(\beta, \omega_0): \sigma_0 + 1 \leq \beta \leq \omega_1\} = \emptyset$ . Since  $H_n = \{(\alpha, n): 1 \leq \alpha \leq \omega_1\}$  is a compact zero-set, then  $H_n \notin Z(M)$ . Thus there exists  $Z_n \in Z(M)$  such that  $Z_n \cap H_n = \emptyset$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Since  $M$  is real, if  $Z^2 = \cap_{n=1}^\infty Z_n$ , then  $Z^2 \in Z(M)$  and, therefore,  $Z = Z^1 \cap Z^2 \in Z(M)$ ,  $Z \subset \{(\beta, \omega_0): 1 \leq \beta \leq \sigma_0\}$ , and so  $Z = \{(\gamma_K, \omega_0)\}_{K=1}^\infty$ ,  $1 \leq \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \dots \leq \sigma_0$ . Because  $\{(\gamma_K, \omega_0)\}$  is a zero-set in  $Y$ ,  $K = 1, 2, \dots$ , and since  $M$  is real, there exists  $K_0 \in N$  such that  $\{(\gamma_{K_0}, \omega_0)\} \in Z(M)$  and, therefore,  $M$  is not free. This contradiction shows us that no free real maximal ideals in  $C(Y)$  exist, and that, therefore,  $Y$  is realcompact. As the set  $\{(\sigma, \omega_0): 1 \leq \sigma < \omega_1\}$  meets the compact subsets of  $Y$  in closed sets but is not closed, it results that  $Y$  is not a  $k$ -space.

We are now going to resolve negatively question (2) with an example. Let  $T$  be the subspace  $Y \sim \{(\omega_1, n): 1 \leq n \leq \omega_0\}$ , which is locally compact, and we shall prove that  $T \neq \cup \{\bar{B}^{vT}: B \in \mathfrak{B}\} \neq \mu T$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}$  being the family of all closed bounded sets of  $T$ . Since  $T$  is  $C$ -embedded in  $Y$  it follows that  $Y = vT = vX$  and so  $\mu T \subset \mu X$ . The equality  $X = \cup \{\bar{B}^{vT}: B \in \mathfrak{B}\}$  is a direct consequence of the following lemmas.

<sup>2</sup>We say that  $I$  is an ideal of  $C(X)$  if it is a subring of  $C(X)$  and if  $f \in I$ ,  $g \in C(X)$  implies  $gf \in I$ . An ideal  $I$  of  $C(X)$  is said to be free when  $\cap \{Z(f): f \in I\} = \emptyset$ . A space  $X$  is realcompact if for every free maximal ideal  $I$  of  $C(X)$ , the residue class ring  $C(X)/I$  is not isomorphic with the ring of the real numbers.

**LEMMA 1.** *If  $A \subset T$  and  $\{\sigma_K\}_{K=1}^\infty$  is a strictly increasing sequence in  $W(\omega_1)$  such that  $(\sigma_K, \omega_0) \in A$ ,  $K = 1, 2, \dots$ , then  $A$  is not bounded in  $T$ .*

**PROOF.** If  $\eta \in W(\omega_1)$  is not a limit ordinal we write  $B(K, n_K) = \{(\eta, n): n_K \leq n \leq \omega_0\}$ , and if it is a limit ordinal then  $B(K, n_K) = U_{n_K, \eta}$ . We define inductively a neighborhood  $B(K, n_K)$  of  $(\sigma_K, \omega_0)$  satisfying  $B(K, n_K) \cap U_{1, \gamma} = \emptyset$  where  $\gamma = \sup_K \sigma_K$  and for  $1 \leq j \leq K-1$ ,  $B(j, n_j) \cap B(K, n_K) = \emptyset$ ,  $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_K$ . The function whose value is  $K$  in  $B(K, n_K)$ ,  $K = 1, 2, \dots$ , and vanishes otherwise, is continuous in  $T$  and nonbounded in  $A$ .

**LEMMA 2.** *If  $A$  is a closed set in  $T$  and  $(\omega_1, \omega_0) \in \bar{A}^Y$ , then  $A$  is not bounded in  $T$ .*

**PROOF.** Since  $(\omega_1, \omega_0) \in \bar{A}^Y$  it is possible to choose a sequence  $\{(\gamma_K^1, n_K^1)\}_{K=1}^\infty$  in  $A$  such that  $n_K^1 < n_{K+1}^1, \gamma_K^1 < \gamma_{K+1}^1$ ,  $K = 1, 2, \dots$ . With the product topology this sequence converges to  $(\sigma_1, \omega_0)$ , where  $\sigma_1 = \sup_K \gamma_K^1$ . If this sequence does not converge with the topology  $\mathcal{F}$  to  $(\sigma_1, \omega_0)$ , then it is a discrete closed set  $C$ -embedded in  $T$  contained in  $A$ . Therefore  $A$  is not bounded in  $T$  and the lemma is proved. If the sequence converges to  $(\sigma_1, \omega_0)$  in the topology  $\mathcal{F}$ , we can consider a sequence  $\{(\gamma_K^2, n_K^2)\}_{K=1}^\infty$  in  $A$  satisfying  $n_K^2 < n_{K+1}^2, \gamma_{K+1}^2 > \gamma_K^2 > \sigma_1$ ,  $K = 1, 2, \dots$ , and we shall proceed as before. If for  $p = 1, 2, \dots$ , the sequence  $\{(\gamma_K^p, n_K^p)\}_{K=1}^\infty$  converges to  $(\sigma_p, \omega_0)$  with the topology  $\mathcal{F}$ , then  $(\sigma_p, \omega_0) \in A$ ,  $\sigma_p < \sigma_{p+1}$ ,  $p = 1, 2, \dots$ , and therefore, from Lemma 1, the set  $A$  is not bounded in  $T$ .

Returning to our example, from Lemma 2 we deduce that  $X = \bigcup \{\bar{B}^{vT}, B \in \mathfrak{B}\} \subset \mu T$ , so that  $\mu X \subset \mu T$  and consequently  $\mu X = \mu T$ . Thus,  $X \neq \mu X$  since the set  $\{(\omega_1, n): 1 \leq n < \omega_0\}$  is closed and bounded in  $X$  and noncompact.

*Note.* Since  $Y = \mu X = vX$ , by Proposition 1 it results that  $Y$  is a  $k_R$ -space. In [17] it is proved that  $kY^3$  is not a regular space.

This example provides a solution to problem 2 of Buchwalter [2].

**Question 3.** Now we give an example of a topological space  $X$  such that  $\mu X = vX$  is a  $k_R$ -space and  $X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space. Comfort [3] gives an example of a pseudocompact space  $X$  whose cardinality is  $c$  such that  $N \subset X \subset \beta N$ . Since every infinite closed set in  $\beta N \sim N$  has cardinality  $2^c$  [5, 9.12], it follows that the compact subsets of  $X$  are finite. But  $X$  is not discrete, so that it is not a  $k_R$ -space and  $\mu X = vX = \beta X$ .

**Question 4.** Firstly, let us note that every quotient space of a  $k_R$ -space is a  $k_R$ -space. This result is intimately connected with the fact that  $k_R$  is a coreflector (see [6] or [10]). Thus, if a topological product is a  $k_R$ -space then each factor space also is.

A subset of a topological space  $X$  is said to be  $k$ -closed if it intersects every

<sup>3</sup>If  $X$  is a topological space, the associated  $k$ -space to  $X$ , denoted by  $kX$ , will be  $X$  provided with the topology for which a set is closed if and only if it intersects every compact set of  $X$  in a closed set.

compact subset of  $X$  in a closed set of  $X$ . Therefore, a  $k$ -space is a space in which every  $k$ -closed subset is closed.

**PROPOSITION 2.** *If  $X$  is a  $\mu$ -space and  $\nu X \sim X$  is  $k$ -closed in  $\nu X$ , then  $\nu X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space.*

**PROOF.** Since  $X$  is a  $\mu$ -space  $C$ -embedded in  $\nu X$ , then  $X$  is  $k$ -closed in  $\nu X$ . Moreover  $\nu X \sim X$  is  $k$ -closed in  $\nu X$ . Therefore, the function whose value is 0 on  $X$  and 1 on  $\nu X \sim X$  is  $k_R$ -continuous but is not continuous in  $\nu X$ .

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a family of clopen pairwise disjoint sets in  $\beta N \sim N$  and let  $X = N \cup \{\cup_{i \in I} U_i\}$ . If  $|\nu X \sim X| < 2^c$  and the points of  $\nu X \sim X$  are not adherent to any countable subset in  $X \sim N$ , then  $X$  is a locally compact  $\mu$ -space and  $\nu X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space.*

**PROOF.** As  $\beta X = \beta N$  and  $X$  is open in  $\beta X$ , it results that  $X$  is locally compact. Let us see that  $X$  is a  $\mu$ -space. Suppose that there is a noncompact closed bounded subset  $A$  in  $X$ . Since  $\nu X$  is a  $\mu$ -space it follows that  $K = \overline{A}^{\nu X}$  is compact. If  $A$  intersects infinitely many  $U_i$  we can choose a sequence  $x_n \in A \cap U_{i_n}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , with  $i_n \neq i_m$  if  $n \neq m$ , such that  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  has no adherent points in  $N$  and  $X \sim N$  because  $U_i$  is open in  $X \sim N$  for every  $i \in I$  and  $U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset$ ,  $i \neq j$ . Further, this sequence has no adherent points in  $\nu X \sim X$  by hypothesis, and therefore  $K$  is not compact. Thus, there is a finite sequence  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n, i_j \in I$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , such that if  $i \neq i_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , then  $A \cap U_i = \emptyset$ . Let  $W$  be a closed neighborhood of  $\nu X \sim X$  such that  $W \cap U_{i_j} = \emptyset$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Then  $A \cap N \cap W$  is a nonempty bounded subset in  $X$  and  $K_0 = A \cap N \cap W^{\nu X}$  is compact. So  $K_0 \cap U_i = \emptyset$  for every  $i \in I$  and, therefore,  $|K_0| < 2^c$ , which is a contradiction since the infinite compact subsets of  $\beta N$  have cardinality equal to  $2^c$ . Thus every bounded closed subset of  $X$  is compact. On the other hand,  $\nu X \sim X$  is closed in  $\nu X$  and from Proposition 2 we have that  $\nu X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space.

A point  $x \in X$  is a  $P$ -point in  $X$  if  $Z(f)$  is a neighborhood of  $x$  for all  $f \in C(X)$  such that  $f(x) = 0$ . Then,  $X$  is a  $P$ -space if and only if every point is a  $P$ -point in  $X$ .

Let us now look at an example of a space satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 2. Assume (CH). According to Rudin [5, 6V] there is a  $P$ -point  $p$  in  $\beta N \sim N$ . Let  $\{G_\alpha\}_{\alpha < \omega_1}$  be a basis of clopen neighborhoods for  $p$ , such that  $G_\alpha \subset G_\beta$ ,  $G_\alpha \neq G_\beta$  for all  $\beta < \alpha$ . We define inductively a family of non-empty clopen sets  $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha < \omega_1}$  in  $\beta N \sim N$  such that  $V_\alpha \subset G_\alpha \sim G_{\alpha+1}$  for all  $\alpha < \omega_1$ . If  $X = N \cup \{\cup_{\alpha < \omega_1} V_\alpha\}$ , according to Negrepointis [13],  $\nu X = X \cup \{p\}$  and since  $p$  is a  $P$ -point in  $\beta N \sim N$ , it is not adherent to any sequence in  $X \sim N$ . From Theorem 2 we deduce that  $X$  is a  $k_R$ -space and that  $\nu X$  is not, with which question (4) is negatively resolved.

From this example we shall give an infinite class of  $k_R$ -spaces  $Z$  for which  $\nu Z$  is not a  $k_R$ -space. By a  $\{0,1\}$ -valued measure on a set  $F$ , we mean a countably additive function defined on the family of all subsets of  $F$  and

assuming only the values 0 or 1. We call a cardinal  $m$  measurable if a set  $F$  of cardinal  $m$  admits a  $\{0,1\}$ -valued measure  $\sigma$  such that  $\sigma(F) = 1$ , and  $\sigma(\{x\}) = 0$  for every  $x \in F$ . A discrete space is realcompact if and only if its cardinal is nonmeasurable [5, T.12.2].

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $X$  be a locally compact space such that  $\nu X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space. Let  $Y$  be a pseudocompact  $k$ -space and suppose that  $X \times Y$  has nonmeasurable cardinal. Then  $\mu(X \times Y)$  is a  $k_R$ -space and  $\nu(X \times Y)$  is not.*

**PROOF.** The locally compact spaces are characterized by the property that the products with  $k$ -spaces are  $k$ -spaces [11, T.3.1]. Therefore  $X \times Y$  is a  $k$ -space and from Theorem 1,  $\mu(X \times Y)$  is a  $k_R$ -space. On the other hand,  $\nu(X \times Y) = \nu X \times \nu Y$  [3, T.2.4], and since  $\nu X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space, it follows that  $\nu(X \times Y)$  is not a  $k_R$ -space.

From (W), (NS<sub>1</sub>) and (NS<sub>2</sub>), we now obtain the following corollary.

**COROLLARY.** *Assuming (CH), there exist infinite spaces  $Z$  for which  $C_c(Z)$  is a complete, barrelled, and nonbornological space.*

*Note.* If  $X$  is a discrete space of measurable cardinal then  $\nu X$  is a nondiscrete  $P$ -space and, therefore,  $\nu X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space.

**Question 5.** The main result which we shall now prove is that for  $k_R$ -spaces  $X$  the condition that  $\nu X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space is equivalent to the fact that  $k_R(\nu X)$  is not realcompact. In [9] the following theorem is proved:

**THEOREM A.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a completely regular Hausdorff space and let  $Y$  be a subset in  $\beta X$  which strictly contains  $X$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_0$  be a topology on  $Y$  strictly finer than the induced topology by  $\beta X$  such that the restriction of  $\mathcal{F}_0$  to  $X$  coincides with  $\mathcal{F}$  and that  $X$  is a dense subset in  $Y$  for  $\mathcal{F}_0$ . Then  $(Y, \mathcal{F}_0)$  is not a completely regular space.*

If  $X$  is a topological space provided with the topology  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $M$  is a subset of  $X$ , we denote by  $M[\mathcal{F}]$  the set  $M$  provided with the topology induced by  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**THEOREM 4.** *If  $M$  is a  $k_R$ -space, then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a)  $\nu M$  is not a  $k_R$ -space.
- (b) The associated  $k_R$ -space to  $\nu M$  is not realcompact.

**PROOF.** That (b) implies (a) is trivial. We are going to prove that (a) implies (b). Write  $\mathcal{F}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{U}$ ) for the topology of  $X = \nu M$  (resp.  $k_R X$ ). Suppose that  $X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space. Since  $X \neq k_R X$  we have that  $\mathcal{U}$  is strictly finer than  $\mathcal{F}$ . Thus, since  $M[\mathcal{F}]$  is a  $k_R$ -space, it follows that both topologies coincide on  $M$ . According to Theorem A,  $M$  is not dense in  $k_R X$ . Suppose that  $k_R X$  is realcompact and let  $H = \overline{M}^{\mathcal{U}}$ . Then  $X \neq H$  and  $H[\mathcal{U}]$  is realcompact. Let us now see that  $C_{\mathcal{U}}(H) \subset C_{\mathcal{F}}(H)$ , where  $C_{\mathcal{F}}(H)$  (resp.  $C_{\mathcal{U}}(H)$ ) is the ring of all continuous real-valued functions on  $H[\mathcal{F}]$  (resp.  $H[\mathcal{U}]$ ). If  $f \in C_{\mathcal{U}}(H)$  and  $g = f|_M$  then  $g \in C(M)$  and there is an extension  $\hat{g} \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(H)$  of  $g$  to  $H$ , because  $M$  is  $C$ -embedded in  $X$ . Thus,  $\hat{g} \in C_{\mathcal{U}}(H)$  and  $\hat{g}|_M = f|_M$  and

therefore  $f = \hat{g}$  and  $f \in C_{\mathfrak{q}}(H)$ . From here it results that  $C_{\mathfrak{q}}(H) = C_{\mathfrak{q}}(H)$  and that therefore  $H[\mathfrak{F}]$  is realcompact, which is impossible, since  $X = \nu M$  and  $X \neq H$ . Then  $k_R X$  is not realcompact.

As a consequence of Theorem 3 we have the following

**COROLLARY.** *Let  $X$  be a locally compact space such that  $\nu X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space and let  $Y$  be a pseudocompact  $k$ -space. If  $X \times Y$  has nonmeasurable cardinal, then  $k_R(\nu(X \times Y))$  is not realcompact.*

*Note.* If  $X$  is a discrete space of measurable cardinal we know that  $\nu X$  is not a  $k_R$ -space and, according to Theorem 4,  $k_R(\nu X)$  is not realcompact.

I am informed that Question 2 was also proven by R. Haydon with a different example.

#### REFERENCES

1. N. Bourbaki, *Sur certains espaces vectoriels topologiques*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **2** (1950), 5–16. MR **13**, 137.
2. H. Buchwalter, *Parties bornées d'un espace topologique complètement régulier*, Séminaire Choquet: 1969/70, Initiation à l'Analyse, Fasc. 2, Exp. 14, Secrétariat Mathématique, Paris, 1970, pp. 1–15. MR **44** #3282.
3. W. W. Comfort, *On the Hewitt realcompactification of a product space*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **131** (1968), 107–118. MR **36** #5896.
4. J. Dieudonné, *Recent developments in the theory of locally convex vector spaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **59** (1953), 495–512. MR **15**, 963.
5. L. Gillman and M. Jerison, *Rings of continuous functions*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, N. J., 1960. MR **22** #6994.
6. J. F. Kennison, *Reflective functors in general topology and elsewhere*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **118** (1965), 303–315. MR **30** #4812.
7. T. Kōmura and Y. Kōmura, *Sur les espaces parfaits de suites et leurs généralisations*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **15** (1963), 317–338. MR **28** #451.
8. G. Köthe, *Topological vector spaces*. I, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1969. MR **40** #1750.
9. M. Lopez Pellicer, *Sobre ciertos espacios topológicos no completamente regulares*, Rev. Mat. Hisp.-Amer. **36** (1976), 125–132.
10. S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, Graduate Texts in Math., vol. 5, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1971. MR **50** #7275.
11. E. Michael, *Local compactness and Cartesian products of quotient maps and  $k$ -spaces*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **18** (1968), 281–286. MR **39** #6256.
12. L. Nachbin, *Topological vector spaces of continuous functions*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **40** (1954), 471–474. MR **16**, 156.
13. S. Negreponitis, *An example of realcompactifications*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **20** (1969), 162–164. MR **39** #6265.
14. N. Noble, Doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y., 1967.
15. V. Pták, *On complete topological linear spaces*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **3** (78) (1953), 301–364. MR **16**, 262.
16. T. Shirota, *On locally convex vector spaces of continuous functions*, Proc. Japan Acad. **30** (1954), 294–298. MR **16**, 275.
17. M. Valdivia, *On certain topologies on a vector space*, Manuscripta Math. **14** (1974), 241–247. MR **50** #14151.
18. S. Warner, *The topology of compact convergence on continuous functions*, Duke Math. J. **25** (1958), 265–282. MR **21** #1521.
19. M. de Wilde and J. Schmets, *Caractérisation des espaces  $C(X)$  ultrabornologiques*, Bull. Soc. Roy. Sci. Liège **40** (1971), 119–121. MR **45** #872.